

This is Google's cache of <http://roissy.wordpress.com/2010/06/17/the-end-of-beta-providers/>. It is a snapshot of the page as it appeared on Jul 20, 2011 18:51:04 GMT. The [current page](#) could have changed in the meantime. [Learn more](#)

These search terms are highlighted: **the end of beta providers**

[Text-only version](#)

- [Home](#)
- [About](#)
- [Alpha Assessment Submissions](#)
- [Beta Of The Year Contest Submissions](#)
- [Female Photo Submissions](#)
- [The Sixteen Commandments Of Poon](#)
- [Dating Market Value Test For Men](#)
- [Dating Market Value Test For Women](#)
-

Citizen Renegade

Where pretty lies perish.

Feeds:

[Posts](#)

[Comments](#)

« [Women Don't Want You To Remember Everything About Them Study Confirming My View Of The Job-Sexual Marketplace Nexus](#) »

The End Of Beta Providers

June 17, 2010 by [Heartiste](#)

Hanna Rosin wrote a stream of consciousness diatribe against men in The Atlantic recently called “[The End of Men](#)“. As with most of these articles written by foot soldiers of the femborg collective lamenting — or celebrating, if the tone is any indication — the regression of men into second and third class status in American society, evidence for certain assertions is woefully lacking, and where the authors uncover something truthful about the condition of modern men, they only paint half a picture because of their refusal, out of ignorance or deceptiveness, to confront the full reality of the sexual market; in particular, female hypergamy. Without grasping the very different compulsions that animate men's and women's sexual drives, one will never have a clear understanding of male-female relations and cultural trends. Because ultimately, all culture, all markets, spring from the fundamental sexual market.

In the '90s, when Ericsson looked into the numbers for the two dozen or so [fertility] clinics that use his process, he discovered, to his surprise, that couples were requesting more girls than

boys, a gap that has persisted, even though Ericsson advertises the method as more effective for producing boys. In some clinics, Ericsson has said, the ratio is now as high as 2 to 1. Polling data on American sex preference is sparse, and does not show a clear preference for girls. But the picture from the doctor's office unambiguously does. A newer method for sperm selection, called MicroSort, is currently completing Food and Drug Administration clinical trials. The girl requests for that method run at about 75 percent.

Leaving aside the possibility of selection bias in the couples who make gender requests at fertility clinics, a trend toward proactively favoring girls over boys would be expected and predicted by evolutionary psychologists in a culture where an individual woman had an increasingly better chance of reproducing in adulthood than an individual man. As women are the limiting reproductive variable, and as men's provider value is decreasing at the same time they are falling behind in the resource acquisition race relative to women, it makes far more sense for parents who, subconsciously, want children who can grow up to give them lots of grandchildren, to favor daughters over sons when a choice is available. It's a reasonable bet hedge.

Even more unsettling for Ericsson, it has become clear that in choosing the sex of the next generation, *he* is no longer the boss. "It's the women who are driving all the decisions," he says — a change the MicroSort spokespeople I met with also mentioned. At first, Ericsson says, women who called his clinics would apologize and shyly explain that they already had two boys. "Now they just call and [say] outright, 'I want a girl.' These mothers look at their lives and think their daughters will have a bright future their mother and grandmother didn't have, brighter than their sons, even, so why wouldn't you choose a girl?"

That's one reason. The other reason is that young girls are simply easier to raise than young boys. I have little nieces and nephews, and it's easy to observe how much louder, rambunctious, temperamental, and ill-behaved the boys are compared to the girls. This is not an excuse to drug them; that same whirling dervish quality also imparts boys with the innate ability to invent, improve, and build civilizations from the ground up... and fight and screw like champs. For dual earning, self-absorbed parents on the go go go, better behaved daughters who don't demand so much of their attention are a welcome relief.

Up to a point, the reasons behind this shift are obvious. As thinking and communicating have come to eclipse physical strength and stamina as the keys to economic success, those societies that take advantage of the talents of all their adults, not just half of them, have pulled away from the rest.

"Thinking"? I can see an innate advantage in communicating, as women are generally more extraverted and verbally adept than men, but in the thinking department men have the edge. Not only do more men occupy the far right tail of genius on the IQ bell curve, they also have a [higher mean IQ than women](#).

And because geopolitics and global culture are, ultimately, Darwinian, other societies either follow suit or end up marginalized.

There is agreement among the commentariat that societies with emancipated and economically empowered women outperform societies with traditional sex roles, and that it is assumed this performance differential will hold up for eternity. But things change, the center cannot hold. Who's to say gender egalitarian societies don't contain within themselves the seed of their destruction? Or: this ride ain't over yet.

What if the modern, postindustrial economy is simply more congenial to women than to men?

Conscientious application to menial desk jockey multitasks is what women's brains are best at. Our society exists at a strange moment of economic limbo between two worlds — the past manufacturing based world and the future transhuman world — a limbo where paper pushing, legalistic gear grinding, government welfare administration, and service with a smile has infested like a toxic mold almost every tier of vertical and horizontal economic productivity. It is the kind of work, in substance and in psychological reward, that is soul-crushing to men but fulfilling to women. And it is the kind of work for which colleges, with their mile wide but inch deep liberal arts programs and their empty-headed women's studies classes, are preparing with perfect precision their students for the female-majority workforce of the anticipated future.

The postindustrial economy is indifferent to men's size and strength. The attributes that are most valuable today—social intelligence, open communication, the ability to sit still and focus—are, at a minimum, not predominantly male.

[As I've written before](#), all that female-oriented yapping, organizing, and paper shuffling means nothing if you don't have the male-dominated engineers and scientists to produce the products that yappers huddle about to sell.

Yes, the U.S. still has a wage gap, one that can be convincingly explained—at least in part—by discrimination.

Unlike articles written by respected authors in respectable magazines with a national exposure read by millions, we here at this little internet outpost must abide the truth. And the truth is that [little to none of the sex wage gap has to do with discrimination](#). It is instead a result of differences in occupational choice, (mediated by women's natural biological proclivity to prefer pursuing careers in lower paying nurturing jobs), and by women's decisions to take time off work for family reasons.

I'd say pwned, but I think Hanna RosinPlotzinDingleheimerSchmidt would enjoy that.

Yes, women still do most of the child care.

Because Rosin doesn't confront the existence of female hypergamy and status whoring, she does not reflect on the fact that men who do play kitchen bitch and contribute half or more of the child care and domestic duties quickly betatize themselves straight into sexless purgatory. Women can bitch all they want about unhelpful men in the home, but when push comes to shove, those women stop pushing into the crotches of their enlightened domesticated partners. Smart men know this, so they learn to ignore the bitching in favor of getting their dicks wet.

It may be happening slowly and unevenly, but it's unmistakably happening: in the long view, the modern economy is becoming a place where women hold the cards.

One of the commenters absolutely schooled Rosin about some of her assumptions of a female-dominated economy. You can [read that comment here](#).

The list of growing jobs is heavy on nurturing professions, in which women, ironically, seem to benefit from old stereotypes and habits.

Stereotypes don't materialize out of thin air. They usually have a very large kernel of truth.

Theoretically, there is no reason men should not be qualified. But they have proved remarkably unable to adapt.

This is the new talking point you're going to hear from feminists now. "Men are not adapting." Funny, when men were 80%+ of the workforce 50 years ago those feminists weren't sorrowfully noting that women weren't adapting. They were banging the multicultural, West-loathing, equalist drums of Zion against the eeeeevils of discrimination.

Nursing schools have tried hard to recruit men in the past few years, with minimal success.

If a high rate of female participation puts men off from working in certain fields, then it stands to reason gay marriage will put men off from marrying, if we follow feminist logic down rich avenues of discussion. Damn logic... you scary!

There is probably some truth to that, but the bigger reason is likely biological; men don't enjoy working in nurturing jobs because men don't like nurturing people. It doesn't give us a scrotal tingle. Now smashing shit up... that's fun!

But even the way this issue is now framed reveals that men's hold on power in elite circles may be loosening. In business circles, the lack of women at the top is described as a "brain drain" and a crisis of "talent retention."

Serious question: how much of a free market economy is positive sum? Is it not inconceivable that adding twice as many workers to the job market would displace a bunch of men already working into unemployment or underemployment, instead of adding to overall growth? Why is "brain drain" the default assumption, instead of "brain rearrange"?

Even around the delicate question of working mothers, the terms of the conversation are shifting. Last year, in a story about breast-feeding, I complained about how the early years of child rearing keep women out of power positions.

Poor fembot! Suck it up.

For recent college graduates of both sexes, flexible arrangements are at the top of the list of workplace demands, according to a study published last year in the *Harvard Business Review*. And companies eager to attract and retain talented workers and managers are responding.

Single moms like to talk about how they do things on their own, and they "don't need a man". But in fact, flex time and related corporate incentives *are* a form of substitute husband and father. That money for flex time has to come from somewhere, usually in higher prices for the company's products or in lowered salaries for its employees. It is private welfare, but welfare just the same. Now companies can choose to offer this to their heart's content; after all, no one is forcing me to buy their products or work there and thus subsidize the lifestyles of a bunch of single moms and harried working moms. But my advice to men who want to maximize their earning potential — work for companies that don't offer generous payoffs in an effort to recruit working moms. It is likely you will command a higher salary with more patriarchal companies.

Researchers have started looking into the relationship between testosterone and excessive risk, and wondering if groups of men, in some basic hormonal way, spur each other to make reckless decisions. The picture emerging is a mirror image of the traditional gender map: men and markets on the side of the irrational and overemotional, and women on the side of the cool and levelheaded.

That same testosterone that causes men to make risky stock market decisions also causes them to risk building gleaming civilizations and all the creature comforts therein that you ingrate feminists couldn't live without.

Most important, women earn almost 60 percent of all bachelor's degrees—the minimum requirement, in most cases, for an affluent life.

Only about 1/5th to a quarter of Americans are genetically capable of succeeding at undergraduate college. So is Rosin here suggesting that 4/5ths of Americans are doomed to a long eternal struggle to make ends meet? And, in light of this, what is her opinion on the importation of millions of peasant class Mexicans?

In a stark reversal since the 1970s, men are now more likely than women to hold only a high-school diploma. “One would think that if men were acting in a rational way, they would be getting the education they need to get along out there,” says Tom Mortenson, a senior scholar at the Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education. “But they are just failing to adapt.”

There's that word rational again. And that word adapt. Here's a scary thought for the platitude spouters to chew on: Perhaps men **are** acting in a rational way. Perhaps they are adapting to the new culture, aka [sexual market ver. 2.0](#). When in the past men could reliably attract women with a decent middle class job working in a dreary corporate office or along a clattering assembly line, they put in the effort needed to get those jobs and paychecks. But now, in a mating landscape where women work and earn almost as much as men and, consequently, have devalued the traditional currency of barter in the mating market and shrunk their dating pool, men are responding to this disincentive to bust their balls for diminished sexual reward by dropping out (omegas), doping out (video gaming and porn consuming betas), and cadding about (alphas and practitioners of game).

Maybe men see the matrix better than Rosin thinks. If the economic empowerment of women means men have to work three times harder just to get the same old, now rapidly fattening, pussy they got in the past for less effort, then maybe they've figured out that the system is rigged against them. Maybe they've made a very rational decision to get access to this pussy by other means. And let it be said that there is more than one way to stroke a kitty. Remember, women don't get wet for a paycheck; they get wet for the alpha demeanor that a man who is good at collecting paychecks exudes. And as any reader of this site knows, that alpha demeanor can be learned and applied.

When financially self-sufficient women turn away from beta providers as a source of sexual arousal, they substitute other alpha male qualities in its place. That is why Rosin's article would have been better titled “**The End of Beta Providers**”. It's a brave new world, and the answer is [more game, more players, more sexual healing](#). It's win-win for everyone... except modern society.

Victoria is a biology major and wants to be a surgeon; soon she'll apply to a bunch of medical schools. She doesn't want kids for a while, because she knows she'll “be at the hospital, like,

100 hours a week,”

Do you want a girl who talks like this operating on you?

...and when she does have kids, well, she'll "be the hotshot surgeon, and he"—a nameless he—"will be at home playing with the kiddies."

Translation: she'll be the subpar surgeon, and he will be at home masturbating furiously to teen porn while she's out getting creampie'd by the biker patient with the sleeve tattoo who knows how to press her submissiveness buttons.

And yet, for all the hand-wringing over the lonely spinster, the real loser in society—the only one to have made just slight financial gains since the 1970s—is the single man, whether poor or rich, college-educated or not. Hens rejoice; it's the bachelor party that's over.

I've never seen such an obvious case of cunt projection. I'm here to report, Mizz RosinFluffinHack, that no marriage, no kids, lotsa sex is a bachelor party without end. Far from being over, it's in full swing.

Still, they are in charge. "The family changes over the past four decades have been bad for men and bad for kids, but it's not clear they are bad for women," says W. Bradford Wilcox, the head of the University of Virginia's National Marriage Project.

Bad for men who don't have game or other compensatory alpha traits to secure sex. Definitely bad for kids. Good for women? Questionable. While women may think they are getting what they want right now, in the long term those fatherless kids are more likely to grow up into sluts and juvenile delinquents. And then the pendulum will swing back with an unstoppable force slicing and dicing the illusion of material comfort and free choice into a million little gelatinous bits. Single moms are literally breeding their undoing.

At the same time, a new kind of alpha female has appeared, stirring up anxiety and, occasionally, fear.

Fear and anxiety and intimidation, oh my! The classic femcunt squid ink to complicate the very simple truth that men don't find afeminine, go-getting, ball-busting alpha tankgrls sexually attractive. Well, unless they're really hot, in which case refusing a pump and dump would be... uncivilized.

The cougar trope started out as a joke about desperate older women. Now it's gone mainstream, even in Hollywood, home to the 50-something producer with a starlet on his arm. Susan Sarandon and Demi Moore have boy toys, and Aaron Johnson, the 19-year-old star of Kick-Ass, is a proud boy toy for a woman 24 years his senior.

For every cougar dating a younger man, there are 100 older men dating younger women.

A character played by George Clooney is called too old to be attractive by his younger female colleague and is later rejected by an older woman whom he falls in love with after she sleeps with him—and who turns out to be married. George Clooney! If the sexiest man alive can get twice rejected (and sexually played) in a movie, what hope is there for anyone else?

Yo, Hanna Montana, it's a movie. You're not making the point you think you're making here. In real life, aging George Clooney smartly avoids marriage and boffs a steady stream of hot young babes.

In fact, the more women dominate, the more they behave, fittingly, like the dominant sex. Rates of violence committed by middle-aged women have skyrocketed since the 1980s, and no one knows why.

This is one of those claims that I'm just sure is being massaged into a teetering steaming shitpile, but I'm too lazy to go digging for the relevant studies confirming or denying.

Then the commercial abruptly cuts to the fantasy, a Dodge Charger vrooming toward the camera punctuated by bold all caps: MAN'S LAST STAND. But the motto is unconvincing. After that display of muteness and passivity, you can only imagine a woman—one with shiny lips—steering the beast.

Mrs., or is it Ms.?, Hanna Rosin had her kids named RosinPlotz, after her last name and her husband's last name. I wonder what their wedding vows were?

"I, Hanna's grateful half, take you, Hanna, to be my lawfully wedded spousal partner, in sickness and in health, in good times and in bad, and in joy as well as sorrow. I promise to love you unconditionally, to allow you to love whomever whenever and not complain when you are self-actualizing, to support you in your goals, sexual or otherwise, to honor and respect you and the man you will eventually shack up with when you tire of my honoring and respecting, to laugh with you at me and to cry with myself on the day you so choose to expand your horizons and capacity for love to others, and to cherish you for so long as you choose to let me keep my money, house, and quality time with our kids."

"I, Hanna, accept your marital terms, and promise to append your surname to the ass end of my surname for our kids, so that they may always know who is in charge."

Man's last stand, indeed.

Share this: [StumbleUpon](#) [Digg](#) [Reddit](#) 0

Posted in [Beta](#), [Culture](#), [Goodbye America](#), [Misandry](#), [Ugly Truths](#) | 309 Comments

Like 2 bloggers like this post.



309 Responses

1. on [June 17, 2010 at 2:51 pm](#)  [Xamuel](#)

I laughed out loud that she used "Up In The Air", of all things, to make her point. The movie sheds a VERY poor light on the liberal-art bachelorette, not-canonically-declared-feminist-but-obviously-is-

one, side character in that movie. She royally fucks a company over and causes an older woman to jump off a bridge. Not only is she quoting a movie as if it's as good as anecdotal evidence, she's quoting one which doesn't help her cause— no wonder women aren't good soldiers, with this tendency of theirs to shoot themselves in the knee!



2. on [June 17, 2010 at 2:54 pm](#) Gorbachev

@Roissy

" yet, for all the hand-wringing over the lonely spinster, the real loser in society—the only one to have made just slight financial gains since the 1970s—is the single man, whether poor or rich, college-educated or not. Hens rejoice; it's the bachelor party that's over."

I've never seen such an obvious case of cunt projection. I'm here to report, Mizz RosinFluffinHack, that no marriage, no kids, lotsa sex is a bachelor party without end. Far from being over, it's in full swing.

These feminists are only in their 20's-30's. Wait until their 40's, and the Alpha train grinds to a halt.

When in their 50's-60's, just wait for the catcalling and recriminatory op-eds.

Their granddaughters are, without a doubt, going to totally repudiate this self-destructive ideology.

Bad for men who don't have game or other compensatory alpha traits to secure sex. Definitely bad for kids. Good for women? Questionable. While women may think they are getting what they want right now,...

A lot of women love this: it's what they always wanted. Sexual freedom to have all the hot men they desire; the vast majority of Betas relegated to the sidelines. Woman's sexual value exaggerated out of proportion.

But the rules of hypergamy breed a specific response from males:

- Withdrawal from society and productive work
- Alpha men not having relationships but lots of sex, and women being tooled
- Men deciding women aren't worth the trouble
- A backlash against misandrist laws

men don't find afeminine, go-getting, ball-busting alpha tankgrrls sexually attractive. Well, unless they're really hot, in which case refusing a pump and dump would be... uncivilized.

You're wrong. Some men do: whipped Betas who don't mind being cuckolded and want the pat-on-the-head that women give them.

For every cougar dating a younger man, there are 100 older men dating younger women.

Why do women insist this isn't true in the media? I see it all the time. It should scare the shit out of younger women, but they're told pretty convincing lies.

The backlash is beginning, and then the shit hits the fan, it'll be women leading it, actually.


They'll all be accused of "false consciousness", I'm sure.

Anyway, it doesn't matter: We're not-breeding Western societies into oblivion. Also something no-one wants to talk about.


Take a country like Canada: It seems to be simply replacing its older populations with completely different cultures. Women in the US are consigning American Anglo culture to the same fate.

3. on [June 17, 2010 at 2:54 pm](#)  *Polymath*

Shooting fish in a barrel, this post is.

4. on [June 17, 2010 at 2:59 pm](#)  *Heman*

Can your next post plz have pictures in it?

5. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:00 pm](#)  *Reader*


You just wrote your best ever piece roissey

6. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:02 pm](#)  [ahappinessexperiment](#)

Great post.

"As I've written before, all that female-oriented yapping, organizing, and paper shuffling means nothing if you don't have the male-dominated engineers and scientists to produce the products that yappers huddle about to sell"

most engineering jobs these days don't require much thinking. a lot of engineers have their souls crushed by the mindless monotony. the real thinking takes place in R&D, but R&D is a small part of the economy. only a few males are needed to keep the economy going. this is why the best and brightest males go work on wall street and create little value for anyone but themselves.

7. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:03 pm](#)  Dalrock

@Polymath

Shooting fish in a barrel, this post is.

Yeah, but all of the fish had it coming.

8. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:05 pm](#)  Paul

This map up in the classics section in 2500 about the Era of Feminism.


9. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:06 pm](#)  Dalrock

The classic femcunt squid ink

Who says poetry is dead?

10. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:08 pm](#)  Paul

Typo: This may end up in the classics section someday.

11. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:13 pm](#)  The Truth

Fuck em. These harpies are nothing but trolls. They will get what's comin to em. Essentially a life of solitude with their 20 cats or little yapping toy dog.

12. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:16 pm](#)  Sidewinder

“Our society exists at a strange moment of economic limbo between two worlds — the past manufacturing based world and the future transhuman world — a limbo where paper pushing, legalistic gear grinding, government welfare administration, and service with a smile has infested like

a toxic mold almost every tier of vertical and horizontal economic productivity. It is the kind of work, in substance and in psychological reward, that is soul-crushing to men but fulfilling to women.”

This is one of the most insightful observations I’ve read in a long time. We are definitely at a crossroads without a workable solution how to get to the next economic phase. We are wealthy, efficient, and extremely productive, due mainly to technology. The unavoidable fact is that we do not need the labor inputs that we have had in the past. Our economy would probably operate more efficiently if 20% of the workforce were eliminated and those positions consolidated.

The net outcome is a good thing: we produce more wealth for less. What used to take a huge workforce can now be done with one 20% smaller. But how do we maintain social order in a society with 20-30% unemployment? There is no alternative but some form of wealth re-distribution. The problem is, we have not developed any workable system that can pull this off.

The only solution the human race has come up with is socialism or communism. Communism can’t work because top down control of economic markets can never react fast enough, or accurately enough. Socialism can work for a generation or two, but by then the drive for innovation in the society is eroded by more and more rational actors figuring out that its better to be a free-rider than a producer.

So we’re stuck in this quasi-world that the editor so accurately describes. Everybody is trying to hold on to what they have, and the ethos of the workforce is to cover one’s butt.



13. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:18 pm](#) *Anon*

“Hanna Rosin had her kids named RosinPlotz, after her last name and her husband’s last name. I wonder what their wedding vows were?”

Keep in mind that a lot of liberal, leftist garbage is spouted by JEWS.

There is something innate in them that makes them seek to undermine the established patriarchy of whatever nation-state, not named Israel, that they are living in.

Jews sing a siren song of leftist, liberal politics to foment dissent among the non-Jew populace, even though Jews themselves are **EXTREMELY CONSERVATIVE** when it comes to their **JEWISH ESTABLISHMENT**.

They love to divide, foment dissent, and conquer.

When America has long been overrun by baby mammas and Mexicans, Jews will still be here and running the show.

There’s a reason why countries all over the world have kicked Jews out at one time or another.

14. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:19 pm](#)  askjoe

Yo, Hanna Montana, it's a movie. You're not making the point you think you're making here. In real life, aging George Clooney smartly avoids marriage and boffs a steady stream of hot young babes.

damn, that's good stuff. These navel-gazing goofs just need their pretty lies.


15. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:25 pm](#)  ahappinessexperiment

“Keep in mind that a lot of liberal, leftist garbage is spouted by JEWS.”

Anon, you are a fucking moron.

16. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:27 pm](#)  2bone

Ignore nature at your peril. She's a real bitch.

17. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:27 pm](#)  X to the Z

Ever since this article came out I've awaiting your response, Roissy. Another homerun.

18. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:28 pm](#)  Gorbachev

Economics

To few people ask this question.

Economic service levels build on each other.

Agriculture (Survival/Food) – Manufacturing (durable goods) – Servicing (serving other levels) – Luxuries (culture)

Government jobs, education, etc., while critical in some cases, when paid for from taxation on other sectors, are drains in the short-term, though value-adding (only possibly) in the long-term.

My question:

If this economy sustainable? Manufacturing in the US and the West seems to be on the wane. The most critical segment of the economy seems to be less and less productive.

The service sector needs something to service.

The public sector sucks off the teat of production like a kind of half-benign half-corrupting parasite.

How long is this “feminized” economy sustainable if we’ve transferred our manufacturing jobs, wealth-building enterprises and management to other countries, like China?

I think this feminized economy is a blip. I think the collapse of the entire Service-Economy is inevitable, unless a manufacturing base is rebuilt. Without the manufacturing base, also, the trade base will collapse.

There’s just something wrong with a service-sector / public-sector only economy.



19. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:31 pm](#) *dragnet*

“One of the commenters absolutely schooled Rosin about some of her assumptions of a female-dominated economy.”

Yeah. The quality of the commenters is pretty high on that post. When the article was first posted I assumed the comment section would be overrun by trumpeting feminazis and assorted loathsome characters, but there’s a lot of decent guys—and women—there who haven’t bought into the bullshit.

People have been taking the red pill—and they are doing it in ever increasing numbers. We can all celebrate that.



20. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:31 pm](#) *Dat Truth Hurts*

I’m deployed, about to get out of the Army, and I’ve got about 10 different women lined up for sex when I get back. I won’t have to rent an apartment for a few months while I separate from the military. Most of these women are 28-38, decent looking and live alone. Some have BF’s or husbands but want to fuck anyway.

Thank you ladies for working so hard to support my addiction to fucking outside of a committed relationship!

Sure, society sucks for a whole lot of people. Not for fit guys in their 30’s with some game and a decent body. I luv u Roissy.



21. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:31 pm](#) [luvsic](#)

The Atlantic is on a roll the way BP is on a roll. Spewing waste with no end in sight.

This post really fired me up, especially the rational response that is likely playing itself out as you outlined.

I entertain myself more and more by denying women I know the beta-providing entitlements they've come to expect. Just the other day a female acquaintance asked me for \$2 to spot part of her lunch purchase. I said 'nah'. She said, 'oh ok, if you don't have it'. I said 'oh, I have it.' Look on her face was priceless. Actually, that makes me want to donate to Roissy again. Here's \$2 bro.

BTW, your link to the comment doesn't go directly to it. Most likely because the page requires you to 'Load more comments' and it's not in the default list. Can you just quote it in an ed: note.

Dragnet did a great job on banging away on that birdbrain in the upfront comments section.



22. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:32 pm](#) [Jack Napier](#)

Our society exists at a strange moment of economic limbo between two worlds — the past manufacturing based world and the future transhuman world — a limbo where paper pushing, legalistic gear grinding, government welfare administration, and service with a smile has infested like a toxic mold almost every tier of vertical and horizontal economic productivity. It is the kind of work, in substance and in psychological reward, that is soul-crushing to men but fulfilling to women.

...perfectly summed up what i've been feeling since 1999.



23. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:34 pm](#) [Ovid](#)

Here is a most illuminating quote:

And yet, for all the hand-wringing over the lonely spinster, the real loser in society—the only one to have made just slight financial gains since the 1970s—is the single man, whether poor or rich, college-educated or not. Hens rejoice; it's the bachelor party that's over.

When men are “losers” in society it is a cue for women to “rejoice”.

If things one day turn bad for these joyous scumbags can anybody justly complain when male “losers” return the favor and do some rejoicing of their own?



24. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:34 pm](#) [The Rookie](#)

Anyone who claims that men, or any other group, are acting “irrationally,” should revisit their assumptions about what being rational means to that group. Making lots of money these days is worthless for a guy, unless it’s in the millions. And without loads of talent and years spent grinding away, most of us won’t ever make that much. Hell, even those with the talent and willingness to work 100 hours per week might not make it. There’s really no point unless you like lots of expensive toys. I like quality pussy. I’m doing what I think is the best way to get it.



25. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:36 pm](#) [askjoe](#)

And would it be, dare I say, uncouth to mention the less-civilized cultures out there churning out males? Whether it’s in the hood, Iran, or China, Hanna’s sissified utopia isn’t going to be long for this world without some real men.



26. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:37 pm](#) [subnuclear](#)

I like pointing out that the Chloe Sevigny character in “Shattered Glass” (the person directly responsible for editing Stephen Glass at The New Republic) was based on Hannah Rosin.

Its also kind of weird for a feminist writer to work for her husband.



27. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:37 pm](#) [Texan99](#)

What an odd, angry article. It makes me wonder how many men I know and like could secretly be thinking this way. Though I’ve always been able to earn a good living, I never wanted an endless stream of boy-toys or alphas or anything else described in this article, only a grown-up life partner who was interested in making a home and a life with me, which he is, God bless him, after 27 years of marriage.

I pick up such a strong sense of “you’re gonna get yours” here. Also a sense that, if women have good jobs these days, it must be because the jobs turn out to be really stupid and wimpy. Back when women couldn’t get those jobs, it was because they were too important and beyond women’s capacity. And what’s with the weird notion that a few men behind the scenes are still doing all the really important work of some mysterious and wholly-male nature?

There are lots of worthwhile occupations for human beings. I don't waste any time drawing a circle around a bunch of them as sacred to the female half of the race, then worrying about keeping men from trying them, or denigrating them as soon as men get a toehold. How about if we just let people work on whatever they're good out without coming unspooled? That's another definition of "adapting."



28. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:38 pm](#) [game in bk](#)

What is the name of said commentator?

the link provided does not go directly to the comment- instead it redirects to the top of the article.

Too many beta men are in pain. No work, no women, divorce horror stories.

This article doesn't apply to alphas, but for betas this article tells it like it really is.

Most men are beta- and most men are living in hell just as this article states.

There are more women in the workforce than men.

Women control more than 50% of this nations wealth.

More women go to and graduate college.

There are more female managers than males.

Of course there are more alpha male ceo's than females- but this a tiny fraction of the overall population.

Normal men are losing this battle. In the courts, the media (pop culture), and on the streets there is real male pain and bloodshed being shed.



29. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:42 pm](#) *Anonymous*

I don't know why, but it is indeed a habit of lunatic pro-feminists to cite the plots of movies and novels as evidence when building arguments. I had to read "White Guys" by self-loather Fred Pfeil while studying at my Ivy League alma mater; he spent an entire chapter referring to some detective novel when making points about how men should act. And this is an accepted text in the canon of feminist literature.

It's mind-boggling how little grasp these "academics" can have on logic, reason and reality.

Then again, most of the 40 majors at my school were complete jokes. What happened to studying science and math? Not necessary at today's colleges.



30. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:46 pm](#) *Roark*

I wonder if one reason women are asking for daughters at fertility clinics is that they're aware of how slutty their own generation has been. In other words, only a daughter can give you grandchildren that are guaranteed to be yours; a son's children might not be related to you. Women who have had a dozen or more sexual parnters — maybe even cuckolded their own husbands — would be aware of that, at least unconsciously. Picking a daughter is the safer bet if you're trying to pass your genes to your grandchildren.



31. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:47 pm](#) *Gorbachev*

@Ovid

If things one day turn bad for these joyous scumbags can anybody justly complain when male "losers" return the favor and do some rejoicing of their own?

Sure.

Learn Game. Be free. Play. Don't marry them or breed with them.

Very simple.

Give them exactly, precisely what they want.



32. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:52 pm](#) *Sidewinder*

@ Roark,

While you and the chateau make interesting arguments to explain parent picking daughters, I think the reason is much more pathetically simple. People are picking girls now because its trendy. Everyone hears about China and other backwards countries abandoning female babies for sons, and this is another expression of equality by the enlightened.



33. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:55 pm](#) *jhbowden*

“men are responding to this disincentive to bust their balls for diminished sexual reward by dropping out (omegas), doping out (video gaming and porn consuming betas), and cadding about (alphas and practitioners of game).”

There's nothing manly about getting married in 2010; to put it differently, there's no reason to be a patriarch without the patriarchy. It follows that people who follow progressive social norms are suckers. This contrast can be seen in the film *There Will Be Blood*— Plainview, the wily bachelor, always gets what he wants, while everyone else looks like a helpless dupe.

Plainview: Too much confusion! Thank you for your time.

Townie: No, no, no! There's no confusion! If you just...

Plainview: (stops, stares down the townie) I wouldn't take the lease if you gave it to me as a gift.

34. on [June 17, 2010 at 3:59 pm](#)  askjoe

Maybe because the misandrists recognize their own inability to produce (e.g., be creative...invent...do math) they ostracize engineer types as punishment for their own shortcomings. That's why engineer nerds have it hard.

35. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:00 pm](#)  OI

nice. thanks for the commentary. i'm sure 400 readers sent you this article, but i like that my request for your pov was met nonetheless.

36. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:01 pm](#)  Original JB

“So we're stuck in this quasi-world that the editor so accurately describes. Everybody is trying to hold on to what they have, and the ethos of the workforce is to cover one's butt.”

So the logical solution is simply to repeal all gender discrimination laws. There goes your 20-30% unemployment. Kitchen, kinder, all that good stuff. Barefoot-n-pregnant will save our society. Let the smart women do homeschooling instead – there oughta be a way to save a ton on public education.

I'm not kidding. We don't have terraforming tech where we can dump troublemakers on Mars, war is too messy and unpredictable, and it's hard to count on epidemics.

So we're gonna have to oppress women for the good of society.

37. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:02 pm](#)  Anonymouses Anonymous

I read much of it and will finish it later. But the greater interpretation was missing from what I read.

What these statistics really mean is these pre-selected genome projects will be marrying immigrant non-aborted Chinese men.

America will die a tragic death of a rampage of car crashes of adult children who are good at math. All will result in fatalities because the grizzled old nurse will refuse to treat anyone who cannot pronounce “Emergency Room” without Ls.



38. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:03 pm](#) *Anonymous*

@Texan99,

“Also a sense that, if women have good jobs these days, it must be because the jobs turn out to be really stupid and wimpy.”

It isn't that the jobs are stupid and wimpy, it is that the modern workplace is more suited for women than men. most men don't want to spend most of their day inside some office where they have to mind their Ps and Qs. they want to cuss and sweat and be themselves while they work. if they must sit in an office they want to have a swig of scotch every now and then.

women like following rules, men don't. too many rules. too many rules.



39. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:04 pm](#) *Balzac*

Fascinating. Come here to learn how to get laid, stay for the economics and politics lessons (which all relate back to getting laid). Just wow.



40. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:05 pm](#) *Original JB*

“America will die a tragic death of a rampage of car crashes of adult children who are good at math.”

Nah. We'll have self-driving cars by then.

We will die of boredom, though.



41. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:06 pm](#) *dragnet*

<http://finance.yahoo.com/news/Outofwork-job-applicants-told-cnm-3498252371.html?x=0>

“The last thing someone who is unemployed needs to be told is that they shouldn’t even apply for the limited number of job openings that are available. But some companies and recruiters are doing just that.

Employment experts say they believe companies are increasingly interested only in applicants who already have a job.”

Aaaand the situation get bleaker still for the guys who lost their jobs in the mancession...



42. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:08 pm](#) [vomlox](#)

repeal women’s suffrage

deindustrialize

life will be as it should



43. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:13 pm](#) [she is old and ugly](#)

Who gives the fuck what this stupid ugly old bitch thinks? All I had to do was look at her picture to immediately dismiss everything she wrote in her article. I don’t give a flying fuck what dumb bitches like her think. EVER. Nobody else should either.



44. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:19 pm](#) [Aunt Haley](#)

Sidewinder:

While you and the chateau make interesting arguments to explain parent picking daughters, I think the reason is much more pathetically simple. People are picking girls now because its trendy. Everyone hears about China and other backwards countries abandoning female babies for sons, and this is another expression of equality by the enlightened.

I don’t think girls are trendy so much as that girls make better accessories. There is no end to the cute clothes that you can put little girls in, and you can give them cute hairstyles with cute barrettes and ribbons or pigtails. Little girls like to carry around dolls and purses. Little boys like to carry around ugly monster figurines or toy guns. Who’s going to make a better accessory for upper class white

parents?



45. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:20 pm](#) [game in bk](#)

I believe 8 million jobs were lost- men lost 7 million of those jobs.

if an employer has to lay off one employee, and they have to choose between a man or a woman. All other things being equal- who is going to get the ax?




46. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:22 pm](#) [Seth](#)

Wow fucking great post.

Why are some fembots so fucking dumb? Like it seems many of them can't construct a logical argument. Why are they incapable of seeing what is directly in front of their face: nature? Why are they dissatisfied with the role that nature has designed for their bodies: childbirth and child rearing? Fuck if I was a woman, I would be HAPPY to have that job. Why would women want these ball busting careers when they can have babies and raise kids?

I have an idea why. (White) men created science and technology to free our bodies from nature. Now women hardly ever die from childbirth, which is now conducted in a sanitary medical facility. Don't want your baby? Well we have medically safe abortion for that. Easy in, easy out. Poop flushes down the toilet so you don't even have to look at it. Vaccines and antibiotics have virtually eliminated the most horrific scourges to mankind. Now privileged white women are free to bitch bitch bitch about the evil patriarchy.

The birth control pill, invented by men, has freed more women than any fembot ever has. Now we are being told we are obsolete, that are services are no longer necessary, that "we are failing to adapt." What a crock of shit. When nature rears its ugly head, when disaster hits, who is going to save your precious Harvard educated, pilates toned ass? Yeah that's right – its going to be the real men you hate so much – the ones with guns who like to fuck and kill and secretly make your gina tingle you disingenuous bitch.



47. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:23 pm](#) [Cane Caldo](#)

@Texan99

Actually the jobs were always stupid and wimpy. The difference is that it is no longer worth it for many men to subject themselves when the pay-off is so low: fat women who encourage each other to get divorced and take half the marital property and all the progeny. What a deal...

@Roissy

Parents who choose IF are more likely to choose girls because

- 1) they *perceive* that girls are easier. This is an error.
- 2) Because they favor girls generally. It's not 25yo couples in the clinics; it's 42 yo Dr. and Mr. Sonia Jones-Smith.



48. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:26 pm](#) *Dr. Kenneth Noisewater*

Damn, outstanding work..



49. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:29 pm](#) *JM*

Which commenter 'schooled' rosin? curious to read it, your link didn't go directly to it.



50. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:32 pm](#) *James Westfall*

Soft, gyno-centric "societies" are just a prelude to much more difficult times coming down the path.



51. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:36 pm](#) [ahappinessexperiment](#)

even if parents didn't choose to have more girls, with the reproductive tilt favoring girls humans will evolve to naturally produce more girls — if the hypothesis here is correct.

we could end up like ants.



52. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:36 pm](#) *jackson*

Whenever I read an article from a woman, I immediately type her name into google images if I don't know what she looks like. 99.99999% of the time I don't even bother finishing the article after I see some repulsive, old ass woman staring back at me on my computer screen.

53. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:37 pm](#)  [whiskey](#)

I don't think we are on the road to transhumanism. If anything our future looks like Sarajevo, or South Africa, or other places that were wealthier and more stable generations ago. Detroit, Leeds, York, Bath, Milan, Paris, and Mexico City come to mind as well.

Wealth requires not just "genius" folks dreaming up new R&D, but a productive workforce, generally small, highly skilled, using extensive capital investment to compete against lowest cost mass labor. Germany, Japan, Switzerland, and South Korea vs. China and India and Vietnam.

This requires beta males doing highly skilled things like precision machinery, high tech metallurgy, and so on. Along with regular engineering drudge work, and such. The very guys bred out of existence by women.

I also think Women are quite aware of this, and quite happy by it. Most women would rather live violent, dangerous lives if the men they have sex with are Alpha in one way or another, than a boring life with boring men doing boring things. Look at all the middle and upper middle class and upper class girls chasing violent, abusing bad boys. Even rich starlets like Denise Richards choose a Charlie Sheen over a Jon Cryer.

Five minutes of Alpha beats five years of beta.

Most/all women are perfectly aware they are first breeding beta men out of existence (and White folks generally) and replacing them bad boy Alphas and non-Whites (who are definitely Alpha-dominant). They know what life they will lead when they are older and unattractive. They are perfectly fine with that trade-off.

Obsidian may have his flaws, but he's right about the relative failure of White women to have kids vs. Mexican, Black, and Muslim women in the West. It is because a Mexican or Black gang-banger may have poor prospects, but he's violent, dangerous, and bad. A Muslim man may work in a boring, middle class job in the West, but is likely to go on Jihad to kill people (arousing in and of itself to women) and treats women like dirt (also arousing to women in general). Nobody does boring, steady, dependable, White Knight, pedestalizing, supplicating beta, like White guys. No wonder in their prime child-bearing years, White women pursue Alphas, and Mexican/Black/Muslim women, living in the West, with the same economic/sexual/anonymous freedoms generally have multiple kids with their male peers.

You can see this too in White British Chavs. Your average boyo with multiple tattoos and scars from being "glassed" will have three-four kids with several different women, while John Bull Nerdling living in East Woking, working 9-5 in a cube farm, goes home alone to his porn collection.

The relatively hidden point of Idiocracy, and Extract, was Mike Judge's observation that women desire Alpha a-holery not "niceness" or boring betaness and will sacrifice ANYTHING, including intelligence or couthness, to get it. That's not exactly popular in Hollywood but think about the films.

Therefore I think the future will be a crumbling infrastructure, over-run by Third World folks, Whites as a discriminated, fourth-class citizenry, violence everywhere — and women would not have it any other way!

[Notice how much White women LOVE to go to decrepit third world hellholes for "adventure." Why go abroad when you can have it here, like in NYC, or LA, etc?]



54. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:39 pm](#) [game in bk](#)

<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2010/07/the-end-of-men/8135/1/>

watch the family video.



55. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:41 pm](#) [Yoloslim](#)

The irony is that men have become such good providers that they are no longer needed in great numbers. The moral is to only help your kin and direct relations.



56. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:43 pm](#) [J](#)

One of the commenters absolutely schooled Rosin about some of her assumptions of a female-dominated economy. You can read that comment here.

Link not working. What's the name of the commenter?

They were banging the mutlicult [sic], West-loathing, equalist drums of Zion against the eeeeevils of discrimination.

Zion? Um, I don't think that's going to go down well in some quarters.



57. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:43 pm](#) [nupinup](#)

So they are moving the sex ratio towards more girls? CAN we perhaps subsidize that so we can all get fresh pussy when we retire?



58. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:45 pm](#) *Longfellow*

I wouldn't attribute the increased desire for females at fertility clinics to trendiness, accessorizability, or general ease of child rearing, but to the overarching values our culture and society possesses at the deepest, most fundamental levels. Women are most likely to embody these values. The willingness to discriminate, dominance, strength, triumphant victory, and heroism have taken the back seat to tolerance, submissiveness, non-combativeness, "playing fair", and banality. Of course, these various values are referred to euphemistically and through nondirect, subconscious portrayals, but nonetheless, the order of rank of values has been subverted.



59. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:48 pm](#) *PRCalDude*

In fairness, if I looked like Hanna Rosin and married a gay man like she did, I'd probably be a feminist too. I think Sailer's law of female journalism applies here.

Here she is warring against women who breastfeed:

<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2009/04/the-case-against-breast-feeding/7311/>

The subtext is that she, being ugly, had to get back to work to provide for her beta husband and family after her pregnancies. Hotter women find richer men and don't have to do the same. Social mores must be overturned such that, Come the Revolution, Rosin will be found more desirable.

Here she is arguing with here husband (of another last name, lol) and son:

<http://www.theatlantic.com/video/archive/2010/06/resolved-girls-are-better-than-boys/57552/>

Can child protective services rescue the son? The daughter is already doomed to catherding.




60. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:50 pm](#) *Science*

Soon our society will be like lions. Lionesses do the hunting, big males fuck all day and steal the food from the females. Shit keeps getting better.




61. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:50 pm](#) *ishmael*


stupid fucking jew. get a nose job you revolting monster.

62. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:54 pm](#)  [Science](#)


That “end of men” article is soaked in sad manhate. How can she not know how transparent she is?

63. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:54 pm](#)  [jkr](#)

Best. Article. Everrrr.

64. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:56 pm](#)  [Sam Spade](#)

That article has been pissing me off all week. You nailed it, Roissy. That’s all I have to say.

65. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:58 pm](#)  [Anonymous](#)

valenti is preggo

<http://www.thedailyfemme.com/femme/2010/06/interview-with-jessica-valenti-feminist-writer-and-founder-of-feministing-com/>

As a mother to be, do you ever feel that some feminists undermine motherhood? For example, Alice Walker referred to motherhood as a form of servitude, what are your thoughts on this?

“I don’t think motherhood inherently denigrates women but as it is imagined and idealized in US culture, it is very problematic and does kind of require servitude. This idea of being a perfect mother means something very different than what it means to be a perfect father. For example a dad takes his kid to a soccer game and he is Dad of the Year but if a mother misses one recital then she is the world’s biggest asshole. It is that standard that is the problem. However, I think that women are bucking those norms and are finding their own way to mother their kids that feels right and comfortable.”

66. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:58 pm](#)  [game in bk](#)

-PRCaldDude-

the kid is alpha- he argues and holds his own more than the husband does.
he probably got the mom’s high t infusion.

67. on [June 17, 2010 at 4:58 pm](#)  *Awake now*

van der Sloot's ex girlfriend:

With van der Sloot now awaiting trial in a Peruvian prison, Granadillo says while she doesn't regret their experience together, the man whose eyes she loved looking into is long gone.


"It's not connectable. You can't connect that. It's not the same person," she said. "You see he's hurt. You see he's in trouble."

Roissy opened my eyes to see this clearly now.

68. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:00 pm](#)  *Alan*

The commenter who 'schooled' Rosin goes by the name allynk.

The comment starts with: "ROSIN: LAST CALL FOR DATASETS!"

69. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:02 pm](#)  *Anonymous*

Seth said: "Why are some fembots so fucking dumb? Like it seems many of them can't construct a logical argument."


Well, female multitasking comes from making shallow emotional decisions on the multiple things one's juggling... actually stick to one thing and reason it through? They can't do it without practice (it's an aquired skill, even for men) and they don't get the practice.

70. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:04 pm](#)  *Gx1080*

Yeah. The fun part is that womens like that, when Father Time cunt-punch them out of the Alpha Carrousel are going to be so despised by the generation after them that the measily wealth not misexpended is going to be taken of them and they wil be left to rot.

I see a future with no pensions.

Meanwhile, While-collar at day, riding thug cock at night.

71. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:10 pm](#)  [sdaedalus](#)

I really can't help feeling that the author of this article is smarting from not having had a date to the school prom. There is almost a personal glee to her comments.

From my own experience as a woman working with women, I've yet to be convinced that they are more empathetic or better managers in the workplace, I would say the contrary more often applies.

It is my experience (and I include myself in this) that women find it more difficult to handle stress at work and also have more difficulty separating the personal from the professional. I find that good female managers (and when good, they are usually very good) are those who have recognised these tendencies in themselves and taken steps to minimise the problems arising from them.

However a lot of women, particularly self-professed feminists deny having any tendencies in this regard and instead go on about their empathy, team-building and so forth (these are always the women who are worst to work for). Imo women do bring positive qualities to the workplace but a team bonding atmosphere or empathy is most definitely not one of them, women are individuals rather than team players by nature, the so called male hierarchial system actually suits women far better.

In "Up in the Air" the irony was that George Clooney was far better at his job than his junior female colleague, and a far nicer person than the two-timing mangina (in the real sense of the word) he was shagging.

I agree that women tend to be bunched towards the middle of the creativity/criminality spectrum and in this regard innovation could be stifled as female control of the corporate culture increases.


However what I would say is that innovation never comes from within the corporate culture anyway. It is worth considering whether in fact the corporate developments outlined in the article (a lot of which in my view are pure propaganda) might by encouraging men away from this culture into self-employment actually increase innovation.

72. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:13 pm](#)  J

Zion? Um, I don't think that's going to go down well in some quarters.

On second thought, he may be referring to this truly revolting scene in one of the Matrix sequels:


[editor: nailed it. yes i was referring to that grotesque one world multicult zion in the matrix movie.]

73. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:13 pm](#)  [Alte](#)


Ever since this article came out I've awaiting your response, Roissy. Another homerun.

I agree, and I was also waiting. Thank you for writing this. That article made my blood boil. I can't even watch the video, as [The Thinking Housewife](#) reported on how vile it is, and I don't wish to lose my lunch.

Politics makes strange bedfellows.

74. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:15 pm](#)  [jkr](#)

Bitch is scary.

75. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:18 pm](#)  [Laura](#)

Well said, Roissy. I think you hit on two very valid reasons why couples would prefer girl children to boy children. Also, it sounds like for most of these couples the wives are calling the shots in the

relationship.



76. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:20 pm](#) [greatbooksformen](#)

lzzozlzozlzllzllzozllozzozl!!!

rosin is just pr for the fed which trains womenz to transfer and destory welath lzozlzozlzozo

WE ARE \$15,000,000 TRILLION IN DEPBT FUCKTWATS!!!!!!!!!!

WOMEN IN THE WORKPLACE DID *NOT* INCREASE OVERALL PRODUCTIVITY NOR WEALTH

THEY CREATED TRILLINJOS IN DEDBT FUCKTARD

AND USED THAT DEBT TO TRANSFER WELATH TO EBERNAKE AND HIS FREINEDS!!!!

JEsus fucking christ would womenone other than me do the simple numbers just once lzozlzozozlzozl and think for a change? lzozlzozlzllzozl



77. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:21 pm](#) [Cap'n Bob](#)

“I see a future with no pensions.”

Truth is, the West is royally, Berlin-in-1945 screwed.

The only consolation, when the Islamists take over, is that all this feminazi nonsense will cease.

Two things though:

Hanna Rosin is pretty good looking for her age.

David Plotz regardless of his Omega status for letting the brood get such a bizarre name as Rosinplotz – (sounds like one of Saul Bellow’s weaker efforts), is a pretty good, if depressingly liberal writer.

“Blogging the Bible” was an interesting Slate series.



78. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:24 pm](#) [Roanoke](#)

“In fact, the more women dominate, the more they behave, fittingly, like the dominant sex. Rates of violence committed by middle-aged women have skyrocketed since the 1980s, and no one knows

why.”

Maybe these violent women in their middle-age are simply not adjusting well to hitting the wall and realizing that they squandered their youth. Causing them to become violent with their pent up rage and their inability to attribute their failure to themselves but instead to society which they feel obviously failed them.



79. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:24 pm](#) *Cap'n Bob*

“while John Bull Nerdling living in East Woking, working 9-5 in a cube farm, goes home alone to his porn collection.”

Whiskey – that is gold.

The amazing thing is how the liberal intelligentsia merrily undermine the whole basis of our civilisation, and don’t even notice the cracks in the walls.



80. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:27 pm](#) *Cap'n Bob*

Kipling said it all, in “The Gods of the Copybook Headings”

“On the first Feminian Sandstones we were promised the Fuller Life
(Which started by loving our neighbour and ended by loving his wife)
Till our women had no more children and the men lost reason and faith,
And the Gods of the Copybook Headings said: “The Wages of Sin is Death.”



81. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:29 pm](#) *Cannon's Canon*

They can’t do it without practice (it’s an acquired skill, even for men) and they don’t get the practice.

what specifically can be done as practice?

IQ doesn’t correlate to self-awareness and rationality, as far as i can tell.

i was recently “exposed” to a 28 year old female lawyer’s dating blog. it is magnificently solipsistic and contradicting, predictably. all of the stereotypical contradictions of ‘what a girl wants’ and what she responds to are absolutely flaunted.


pointing fingers, i could blame “society”. this should be condensed to blaming her parents, and explicitly, her father, for having raised such a miserable person. then, my train of thought wanders to

the “genetic junk” classification. next, i ponder eugenics, a mass population culling. could this combat the tyranny of liberalism, staving off the morlocks? if liberalism collapses upon itself, will there be a window to rise again?

in the ‘great books for men’ of old, heroes amongst the eloi could fend off such oppression. in the randian tales of godlessness, the implosion of predatory morlock socialism is the first step forward toward course of nature redemption.

what guise might fascism take on to convince the herds of idiots that they are doing the right thing and living the dream? maybe we are living it right now; maybe we got close to a better version 70 years ago.

thanks, 28 year old humanitarian anti-capitalist lawyer/blogger who is looking for love! positive vibes all around.

82. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:35 pm](#)  [J DeVoy](#)

Great read. A coda to Rosin’s piece: Well-credentialed men are waking up to realize their scarcity relative to women, and they are tired of seeing their love interests cavorting with thugs and ne’er-dowells. Those who learn game are reaping rewards; those who can’t undo the white knight instincts they’ve been inculcated with since birth are becoming increasingly frustrated. Being in the latter class must be an awful existence, especially since it’s a self-inflicted wound.

83. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:37 pm](#)  [greatbooksformen](#)

jesus fucking christ wake me up when bernanke has run out of fiat dopllars to wire to womenz and tucker max butthexers to write about blah blah blah the end of men and the reign of butthex lzozlzlozlozlo

it is not offencisive or stupid so much as it is FUCKING BORING!!!!

roissy you are 10x the man as i to make it through her article, and the only way i could read it was with your comments the whole way on down, like virgil guiding dante on down into hell in dante’s inferno lzozlzozlzl

cut off the fiat dollar which puts us all in debt and enriches beernakne and his skankes, and all this bullshit would come to an end and we would again be free lzozlzl


84. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:40 pm](#)  [polymath](#)

Cap'n Bob,

Great Kipling reference, bullseye.

Here's another prophetic Kipling poem:

[The City of Brass](#)

85. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:44 pm](#)  Gorbachev

@J DeVoy

Great read. A coda to Rosin's piece: Well-credentialed men are waking up to realize their scarcity relative to women, and they are tired of seeing their love interests cavorting with thugs and ne'er-do-wells. Those who learn game are reaping rewards; those who can't undo the white knight instincts they've been inculcated with since birth are becoming increasingly frustrated. Being in the latter class must be an awful existence, especially since it's a self-inflicted wound.

Advice to white-knight good-boy credentialed males: If you're reasonably attractive, have some credentials and an interesting enough job (or not even) – then learn game.

Because if you learn Game, and give up your illusions about women -

THIS IS YOUR TIME.

Learn. Game.

You'll just clean up like there's no tomorrow.

86. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:48 pm](#)  James Westfall

“When the Islamists takeover. . .” You giant fucking pussies.

The Islamists couldn't run a jug fuck. They're one serious terrorist attack (nuke, bio) from being genocided in the same ol' way by the remains of the white man. They're an internal pest with no justifiable place in Western society, but they're no existential threat.

Dumb little brown cruise missiles from down south in Incaville are more of a threat to our way of life.

87. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:48 pm](#)  Thor

Roissy:

“Only about 1/5th to a quarter of Americans are genetically capable of succeeding at undergraduate college. So is Rosin here suggesting that 4/5ths of Americans are doomed to a long eternal struggle to make ends meet? And, in light of this, what is her opinion on the importation of millions of peasant class Mexicans?”

This one of the perennial buggaboos. Without a college degree (and, more to the point, without the intellectual firepower to be ABLE to get one, whether you actually do get one or not), your chances of getting well-to-do are fairly small.

HOWEVER, your chances of having a decent life are excellent, IF YOU OBSERVE SOM RULES. Mainly, get a job, almost any job. Observe work ethic. If female (or even male) DO NOT have kids unless you are married. Live within your means.

And odds are, you will do OK, not “doomed to a long eternal struggle”. But, OK, the expensive bars in DC will NOT be your normal haunts. But I bet you can live with that. And some of the commentariat will think of your life as “unwertiges Leben”. You can live with that too!

Thor

88. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:49 pm](#)  *Cinco Jotas*

A real looker, this Hanna Rosin.

89. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:50 pm](#)  *Cinco Jotas*

Second try...

<http://calitreview.com/267>

90. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:54 pm](#)  *Jayz*

I know that this is probably going to get me flamed, but isn't feminism a good thing for gamers?

If society suddenly changed tomorrow, and feminism were to die out and be replaced patriarchy, wouldn't the supply of 22-year-old "party girls" drop precipitously?

I mean, if the ship is sinking anyway, why not just enjoy the ride down to the end?

[editor: yes, parts of feminism have been very very good indeed for womanizers. this will be the subject of a future post.]



91. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:55 pm](#) Jayz

Ah, this should read:

If society suddenly changed tomorrow, and feminism were to die out and be replaced BY patriarchy, wouldn't the supply of 22-year-old "party girls" drop precipitously?



92. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:55 pm](#) Cap'n Bob

Polymath,

“Swiftly these pulled down the walls that their fathers had made them –
The impregnable ramparts of old, they razed and relaid them
”

Sometimes, I reckon that old Rudyard must have had access to a time machine, and spent a lot of time looking at the 21st Century West.



93. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:57 pm](#) Joe

Everything you say is about right except for this:

“a trend toward proactively favoring girls over boys would be expected and predicted by evolutionary psychologists in a culture where an individual woman had an increasingly better chance of reproducing in adulthood than an individual man”


Any evolutionary psychologist who “predicts” this would be a total crackpot (not that they'd stand out). There cannot be an evolutionary (gene-propagation) advantage on average to having a girl rather than a boy, for well-known and simple arithmetic reasons. This would be true even if we killed 99 out of 100 boys at birth, barring technology that allows women to conceive without any man's involvement (which is not far off by the way). Everything you say about why people would prefer

girls is plausible (it's the risk-averse choice and also the selfish one with respect to grandkids), but it is not adaptive in the immediate genetic sense you suggest, so I'd file it under "psychology", not "evolutionary psychology". I say this not to undermine the program of evolutionary psychology but to defend it.

Now let me suggest an opposing force that could turn the tide once again in favor of men economically. It has been predicted that in the near future the economy will become "high resolution" (see E.g. Paul Graham's essay "The High-Res Society"). Women are good at networking within cushy bureaucracies, but not so much at direct competition in winner-take-all labor markets. If due to communication technology economic friction drops, the average size of companies (particularly successful ones) should go down, in some sectors approaching an optimal average of 1-5 people (in the case of 1 person we just call them a freelancer or contractor). A lot of noise has been made in the tech blogosphere about the end of 9-5 jobs and "lifestyle design" around custom self-managed careers. The jury is still out on this, but it seems likely that this arrangement will favor men. Some people say in this new world networking will be even more important than ever, but men and women network in different ways and at different scales (See Roy Baumeister's "Is There Anything Good About Men" for an interesting angle on this).

Both women and men may prefer to have female co-workers, but it may be equally true that both would prefer to have male co-founders. Very few executives are women. In a start-up, everyone is an executive at least some of the time. Finally, tiny firms are never subject to the workplace-diversity, sexual-harassment scrutiny that large firms are (the two are of course causally related).

The main thing I see that would fuck this up is if the government starts owning more and more of the economy, which has also been a trend. And not coincidental. Think about it.

94. on [June 17, 2010 at 5:57 pm](#)  *Yoloslim*


Yeah, some people just can't bear to see the ship sinking.

95. on [June 17, 2010 at 6:00 pm](#)  *Anonymous*

The "feminist" movement has pushed so hard, not for equality, but for female favoritism in any/every sector of society. Now, men are forced to push back in order to recapture social and economic power. The battle-lines are drawn by gender. The tragedy to me is this entirely new (well, since the mid-20th century) paradigm of gender warfare. How can men and women ever ally in cooperative relationships when the message that they are on opposite teams is so frequently repeated?

96. on [June 17, 2010 at 6:04 pm](#)  *Cloud*

Girls being born right now will grow up and say to the feminists: “Hold on a second. There was a time when beta males would go to work, and I could just stay home and take care of the kids?? Why did ruin this?! Now there’s no more betas left! They all learned game! Damn you!”



97. on [June 17, 2010 at 6:14 pm](#) *Forbes*

Here’s a counterargument to Rosin:

<http://www.thefrisky.com/post/246-girl-talk-what-the-hell-is-happening-to-30-something-guys/?TrackID=obpaid&obref=obnetwork>

Well, not really. It’s just more self-indulgent, complaining sludge from 30-something women that don’t like how things have worked out in the world Rosin describes. The writer can’t find any great guys, but she’ll screw a n’er-do-well when she’s horny—just what every guy is looking to marry: everyone else’s pump n’ dump.

And Rosin claims the postindustrial job market suits women’s “thinking.” ROTFLMAO



98. on [June 17, 2010 at 6:16 pm](#) *Cap'n Bob*

Jay Z,

It depends on whether you are considering the short or long-term game.

In the short term, the wholesale rejection of the poor old beta providers gives Game a potency never before seen in history. Don Juan and the Earl of Rochester never had it so good as the alpha of today.

In the long term, our society will collapse if these trends continue. Already the demographic situation is appalling (even from a pension point of view – most Western European countries will be bankrupt in 50 years).



99. on [June 17, 2010 at 6:16 pm](#) *old women are worthless*

girls have no value after age 22. once they turn 23, just round them all up and put them on a island somewhere so they don’t pollute the earth with their filth.



100. on [June 17, 2010 at 6:21 pm](#) *SGOTI*

Excellent points Joe from above. Esp. “Finally, tiny firms are never subject to the workplace-diversity, sexual-harassment scrutiny that large firms are (the two are of course causally related).”

Personally, as a serial entrepreneur with more than one active business- I’ve kept one small (in effect a partnership) and another I allowed to downsize (below 10 pax now) due to attrition- I couldn’t agree more. In fact, the first thing my only woman employee asked was about a “work-life” balance in her interview. My response should have been “Here’s balance: You’ll work your ass off to make me money, and you’ll be amply rewarded:. That should have been a red flag. She was also the first to go.

Where I disagree is about the female co-workers, unless at the admin level. None of my partners or senior, high bill rate consultants (granted, small sample size) really wants to work with women at this point in their careers. Eye candy is nice, but sack scratching, sports talk and lewd jokes is even better. We see all the tail we want at lunch and happy hour.



101. on [June 17, 2010 at 6:22 pm](#) *Master Beta*

First off, those of you that think the Islamic world is going to come out on top of all of this is insane. Yes, they breed like bunnies, but so do Africans and you don’t see them taking over anything anytime soon. The only reason we care about those omega castoffs at all is because they have oil. Once the oil stops, so does any credible threat from their puritanical masturbatorium. Check the OKCupid numbers sometime – Muslim women don’t like Muslim men because the men are too omega. They’re not even fit to be beta providers. Alphas aren’t afraid of female sexuality – they embrace it. Omegas, on the other hand, fear and loathe female sexuality because it only serves to remind them of what they will never experience. There’s a reason Muslim Puritans insist on veils and head scarves – if they can’t have female sexuality, nobody can.

The group that’s going to benefit the most from our little death spiral is the so-called “developing world” – developing Asia and South America. Brazil and Turkey working together is not an accident. Turkey is positioning itself to become the South Africa of the Middle East (big fish in a small pond; a position Japan used to its advantages in the early 20th century until they overplayed their hand) and Brazil is the only country in South America that actually has its shit together. Throw in China (handicapping itself long-term via birth restrictions) and India (not handicapping itself at all, demographically speaking, and developing nicely) and you’re looking at a pretty interesting world.



102. on [June 17, 2010 at 6:30 pm](#) *anise*

this is wrong: “Conscientious application to menial desk jockey multitasks is what women’s brains are best at.”

I’m definitely a better cook and housekeeper than menial desk jockey. Wasn’t as much implied here?

Menial desk jockeying is a soul-suck for everyone. And it makes everyone fatter, esp the women who

cotton to it. lose-lose.

Both traditional jobs and paper shoveling do require a pretty high level of multitasking ability tho. As for seeing something through, you mean like, raising a child to adulthood? I hear some women are good at that. YMMV.



103. on [June 17, 2010 at 6:30 pm](#) Lily

Just wondering if people consider the deputy PM in the UK, Nick Clegg beta?

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1287357/Clegg-vows-end-tradition-women-doing-bulk-parenting-offering-flexible-leave-dads.html>

Come to think of it, the PM, David Cameron too?

They are similar in terms of background, demeanour and both married to high-earning women.



104. on [June 17, 2010 at 6:33 pm](#) Cap'n Bob

Master Beta, agree with a lot of your demographic picture. India looks a much better long term prospect than China, for example. And Brazil's rise is incredible (and sustainable).

You're overlooking Western Europe. If you look at the demographics, most of these societies (except for Ireland) have death spiral replacement rates (think it's 0.8 for Italy), combined with the rapid demographic rise of Islam, (e.g. France, the "eldest daughter of the Church" is now 10% Islamic).



105. on [June 17, 2010 at 6:41 pm](#) Robert Seymour

Roissy,

Studies consistently show that women assault their partners at roughly the same rate as men. The difference is that men's claims are not taken seriously.

How does this relate to dominance? Maybe not being dependent on their betas women harm them in an expression of subconscious sexual frustration.



106. on [June 17, 2010 at 6:49 pm](#) Anonymous

Demographics? I think I'm gonna knock out 20 kids by different women (and invest in their

rearing.... I'm young and rich). How do you like them demographics?



107. on [June 17, 2010 at 6:52 pm](#) *Cap'n Bob*

“I think I'm gonna knock out 20 kids by different women (and invest in their rearing.... I'm young and rich). How do you like them demographics?”

If you can do that and not get bankrupt. – congratulations.

But in every alley in every Western city – there's a tattooed scumbag who's already outbred you. And he gets the state to pay for his brood. Such is our brave new world.



108. on [June 17, 2010 at 6:59 pm](#) *Anonymous*

Nevertheless, I'm going for it. Fact is, I'm adapting to our new economy, social mores and marriage laws.



109. on [June 17, 2010 at 7:02 pm](#) *Yoda*

1. welfare/feminist laws for dumping men
2. free access to easy sex without stigma
3. vibrators
4. “I will survive” victim ideology romanticizing dumping “abusive” men
5. absurd expectations for love and relationship

why should women bother to reform their entitled ways to have a healthy relationship? forget about marriage and loyalty... buy a dog, not a wife. Choose your wife carefully and “alpha up” to keep her in line if you go down that path because don't think she won't spend her days scheming to dump you.



110. on [June 17, 2010 at 7:11 pm](#) *Original JB*

“How can men and women ever ally in cooperative relationships when the message that they are on opposite teams is so frequently repeated?”

Obvious answer: remove the messengers.



111. on [June 17, 2010 at 7:12 pm](#) *lil*

The Van der Sloot girlfriend piece is here, and priceless:

<http://abcnews.go.com/2020/TheLaw/joran-van-der-sloots-girlfriend-dutch-playboy-exclusive/story?id=10935055>



112. on [June 17, 2010 at 7:13 pm](#) *j*

Haha, brilliant. Even more than the game advice, this is the reason I love this blog; 'where pretty lies perish,' indeed. Though this lie is more of the cancerous, ugly variety. Thanks for another excellent debunking.



113. on [June 17, 2010 at 7:16 pm](#) *Yoda*

this morning my out-of-my-league goddess GF tried dumping me, moving out (pile of stuff ready to go) and yelling at me... I broke down in tears for a moment (OUT OF HER SIGHT) walked outside for 5 minutes... came back poker faced and asked her flatly if she needed any help carrying her stuff out to her car (FU BITCH!!).

It goes without saying that she backed down and I set the terms for the relationship. Less composure would have ended it right there. Without these skills your girl will hold you in utter contempt. Relationships are high wire acts where she is shaking the rope.



114. on [June 17, 2010 at 7:19 pm](#) *whiskey*

China is screwed because they face, sooner or later, massive revolution at home by all those betas without women (50 million by 2050) and extensive women hoarding by top Red Princes, along with separatist movements in XianXing (Uighur Muslims) and Tibet and various parts of Southern China. They'll get old before they get rich.


India is a low-IQ peasant caste with a massive Maoist insurgency in tribal areas and a hundred different languages and peoples who all hate each other, along with 100 million Muslims. The High-IQ Brahmin caste is thin and not enough to pull them out of poverty. Like China their sole advantage is dirt-cheap labor depending on dirt-cheap transport costs to developed nations that have money to pay for things.

Brazil is an export (commodities and raw materials) economy oriented towards China, with masses of

low-IQ thugs and criminals. They make a few things that compete on price (not quality) like Embraer and other small jets. That's it. Turkey is a mass of Islamist Anatolian peasants with low IQs looking to restore the Caliphate against weak regional actors. They are not even Japan.

Japan in 1940 had the most advanced aircraft carriers (and more of them) in the world. Filled with the best planes and most highly trained pilots. They just could not rapidly adapt like the US did (in 1940 the US was 89% White, 10% Black, and 1% everything else). Because of a rigid caste system. By 1944 the US had gone through three different carrier airplanes (Wildcat, Hellcat, Corsair), four different Army planes (Tomahawk, Lightning, Thunderbolt, Mustang), and radically new Carriers. Meanwhile the Japanese ... stuck with the Zeros.

Flat, relatively non-hierarchical social systems do best when under severe stress. War has not been outlawed just because people wish it. If anything, the AK-47, shipping container, nuclear proliferation, and drones make it even cheaper for drug gangs, terrorists, minor nations, and the like.



115. on [June 17, 2010 at 7:23 pm](#) *quetal*

the North American empire will fall like the Greeks did, the Roman did, the medieval Arabs did... enjoy the party while it lasts!



116. on [June 17, 2010 at 7:24 pm](#) *Original JB*

“The group that’s going to benefit the most from our little death spiral is the so-called “developing world” – developing Asia and South America.”

Turkey and Brazil have mean IQs probably below 90.

Turkey is Islamicizing — its dumber population is outbreeding its smarter population.

Brazil could of course attract the better immigrant that the US used to, but that might not happen for some time.

I suppose if they played it right every step of the way they could parlay their situation into serious sustained national growth, but it’s by no means a given.

Anyway the ending isn’t written yet by any means. Change is accelerating socially and technologically. I suspect esr is onto something when he suggests the future lies with complex adaptive system paradigms.



117. on [June 17, 2010 at 7:43 pm](#) *Texan99*

When I was growing up, we were taught that a guy would crumble if we could do anything better than him. I always thought it was silly, and wouldn't have wanted a guy that insecure anyway. Ditto with making money. If I can make money, my guy never has to worry that I'm sticking with him for the meal ticket. Why isn't that better for both of us? He's never had to question my loyalty. We don't have to excel at the same things, and we don't have to compete with each other, either. We're on the same team.

Many posters here don't seem much interested in anything about a woman except whether she's pretty. No wonder they're embittered about all their relationships! They're choosing women on the silliest and shallowest there is. It's like women who choose men strictly on the basis of their income, then are surprised because the men have no character. Hey, trying making someone's character one of the things you select for!

And that business about how the office jobs always were wimpy and no one wanted them even way back when? I can't square that with how hard guys fought to keep them away from women. Just seems like sour grapes to me now. You don't like those jobs? Cool, get another kind of job. Who's making you choose something you don't like? Some woman? Sheesh. It all sounds like the kind of thing I hear from the worst sort of feminists: "The men are making us do everything! We want the world to be more hospitable to our own predilections!"



118. on [June 17, 2010 at 7:50 pm](#) [greatbooksformen](#)

"Yoda

this morning my out-of-my-league goddess GF tried dumping me, moving out (pile of stuff ready to go) and yelling at me... I broke down in tears for a moment (OUT OF HER SIGHT) walked outside for 5 minutes... came back poker faced and asked her flatly if she needed any help carrying her stuff out to her car (FU BITCH!!).

It goes without saying that she backed down and I set the terms for the relationship. Less composure would have ended it right there. Without these skills your girl will hold you in utter contempt. Relationships are high wire acts where she is shaking the rope."

Dude—having to hide your tears from a woman makes you a fucking pussy.

Dump that bitch and move one. lzozlzllzllzllzllz

I couldn't imagine me crying outside and then coming in to see a fiat desouled berannkified gina lzozlzllzllzllz

Think about it.

So mahy others had it younger hotter tighter for free and now you are paying for it and afraid of it in your house that you can't even show emotion nor your true emotion.

There's a story of a prisoner in the holcaust who used to laugh all the time and tell jokes.

the guards could never laugh as it was against rules to laugh.

and so the prisoner one day said, "who is the freer man—me behind bars who can laugh, or you on the other side—who cannot."

dude—you're a fucking prisoner in your own fucking home.

can't you get sum pussy elsewhere?

lzozllz



119. on [June 17, 2010 at 7:51 pm](#) *devilmaycare*

@Jayz

I was just thinking the same about the betas being beneficial to gamers. I'm a college student in my early 20's and thanks to the betas all I have to do is run elementary game (negs, take aways, etc) and the girls go nuts because I refuse to put them on a pedestal. What happens when the betas disappear? Dare I say I might have to actually work for ass?



120. on [June 17, 2010 at 7:53 pm](#) *Anonymous*

Don't worry Texan99, we will indeed change jobs. We will adapt, and we will thrive no matter what the parameters applied on us are.

Well, not all of us. The weakest and dullest men will suffer. But what feminists (and socialists and all other power-hungry social engineers) fail to realize is, you can change the rules of the game but the true winners always manage to find a way to win in the end. If we have to do it by changing the entire nature of society and the economy, then we'll do that. And there is no doubt that we will be assailed then too.



121. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:00 pm](#) *Gotz*

Brazil's average IQ is around 85. Luckily there are quite a good number of italians and japanese here (only Japan has more japs than Brazil), and a lot of intelligent people among the mid class and upper with portuguese heritage.

We're in a good growth ratio, but it seems we'll be negative very quickly. Everything that takes a century to happen up north happens here in a decade. The result is pure chaos.

122. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:01 pm](#)  Lily

@ Whiskey

“Brazil is an export (commodities and raw materials) economy oriented towards China’
Isn’t the US Brazil’s biggest trading partner both ways?”

123. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:04 pm](#)  Texan99

“Don’t worry Texan99, we will indeed change jobs. We will adapt, and we will thrive no matter what the parameters applied on us are.”

I’m happy for you. I’d be even happier if you could say that in a happy and self-confident way instead of seething. It’s the way people are supposed to be, so what’s the problem?

124. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:05 pm](#)  Lily

@ Yoda

Sorry to hear about that.

But
“out-of-my-league goddess”
and
“dumping me”

Hmmm...? Connection? Maybe you’ve put a bandaid on it for now....

125. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:09 pm](#)  f(solar)

It’s funny how some people think that men won’t be able to adapt. Yes, there are lots of men that aren’t able to do that, but their genes are therefore worthless anyways. To paraphrase: yo, evolution, bitch!

Also, what Anonymous said – if society and economy have to change, then it will happen so. Too bad it will all go to shit just because women can’t think with their heads (using logic) instead of their vaginas (relying on emotions). Because sure, it is fun to suck cock for 2 generations, but after that shit

will be fucked up and it's the stone age all over again or maybe even Idiocracy.

Because I dream that mankind will explore the Universe, I truly hope that it won't go that way – the Dark Ages fucked us enough already. But right now it really seems to go the way of Dark Ages II. :<



126. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:09 pm](#) [PRCalDude](#)

I'm happy for you. I'd be even happier if you could say that in a happy and self-confident way instead of seething. It's the way people are supposed to be, so what's the problem?

Give it up, Hanna. Get a nose job while you're at it.



127. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:10 pm](#) [Lily](#)

@gbfm

“There's a story of a prisoner in the holcaust who used to laugh all the time and tell jokes. the guards could never laugh as it was aginst rules to laugh. and so the prisoner one day said, “who is the freer man–me behind bars who can laugh, oir you on the other side–who cannot.”

Out of interest, was this Frankl?



128. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:11 pm](#) [jhbowden](#)

Awww, Texan99 wants attention. How adorable!



129. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:14 pm](#) [Thor](#)

@Major beta


“The only reason we care about those omega castoffs at all is because they have oil. Once the oil stops, so does any credible threat from their puritanical masturbatorium. Check the OKCupid numbers sometime – Muslim women don't like Muslim men because the men are too omega. They're not even fit to be beta providers”

The oil will last for a long time. It is irrelevant what Muslim women want – they are held as slaves and told what to do – or else. (NO, I don't approve of this, I am just the messenger. Check anything by Ayaan Hirshi Ali

or Nonie Darwish, both (ex-)Muslim women).

But it is true that Muslim men are culturally unfit to be beta providers. The culture is optimized for caravan raiding, real men TAKE what they need at the point of a sword, only peons actually WORK. Muslims, unless they go through a very rapid Enlightenment (highly unlikely) are capable only of being rentiers (as when sitting on enough oil) or of being robbers/conquerors.

Thor

130. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:15 pm](#)  RT

“Damn logic... you scary!”

Roissy, did you write this as a reference to the obscure Family Guy clip? If you did, my admiration for you increases 10x.

[editor: sure did!]

131. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:22 pm](#)  [Texan99](#)

PRCalDude: I'd hardly have written the article that Hanna Whatever-Her-Name-Is did. It was silly,

crowling, and shrill. So then, why respond to it with exactly the same sort of thing, but with the gender roles reversed? The last thing men and women need is more fear and contempt between them.



132. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:25 pm](#) z

Debt is paying for our current situation, just like GBFM says in his peculiar vernacular.

When our lenders no longer lend to us (10 years? 20 years?) a bazillion government jobs will end, many company -mandated-quota-jobs-specifically-created-for-females will end, many schoolteaching jobs will end, many educatocracy jobs, hospitality jobs, extra-executive-assistant jobs and the like, will end.

Borrowing and fiat money pays for all of it. The extra productivity being squeezed out of the industries we have are masking the inflation that should be occurring right now. They are working people very hard out there in productive industries, trying to get as much value per dollar as they can. But the wage slaves are working about as hard as they can. Not much extra worth can be squeezed out of them without significant advances in either technology (robotics) or cheaper energy.

We assaulted men's employment with 1)outsourcing, 2)illegal aliens, and 3)H1B visas. Those three things have unemployed millions of men in the United States.

MEN WERE NOT WARNED ABOUT THIS. Regular men in 1985 knew this was coming. Regular men in 1990 were told it would pass. Only those of us (like me) were cynical enough in 1995 to notice what was slowly being allowed to transpire (on purpose) by our elites. I hoped the election of George Bush might stop the insanity, but as I privately feared, he was a corporate-whore to the bone who embraced what was happening to the middle class. By 2001 I was on the net' some in my spare time trying to see if others were seeing what I was seeing happening to the country we grew up in. I found that there were some, but not as many as I'd hoped. More people are opening their eyes now though.

The younger generation of teen males probably know whats up, and will react accordingly. But for the 20-and-30-something guys, this was a "blitz" on their lives that they were not told to prepare for, hence their flat-footed reaction to it.

If the elite wanted to destroy the extended family, they could have hardly have done a better job of it than what they have done.



133. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:30 pm](#) Anonymous

Texan99: I guess it's easier to see 'seething' in my neutral-toned post, rather than engage it intellectually.

As for other men, perhaps they are 'seething' because being a male (and specifically a white male)

automatically makes one an acceptable target for society-approved abuse and attacks.

The liberals can attack white males all they want — the irony is that winner white males will thrive in society no matter what the rules of the game are; the ones who end up suffering from the new societal regime are the white males at the bottom of the ladder. These are the men who hardly even bear the benefits of white male privilege to begin with. That's my point.



134. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:30 pm](#) [PRCalDude](#)

The last thing men and women need is more fear and contempt between them.

What men and women need is for feminism to be ridiculed, as Roissy did in his response, and then marginalized.

You are obtuse, thick-headed, ignorant of history and economics, and quite possibly stupid, which is why you've missed the point



135. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:32 pm](#) [RF Interference](#)

“The other reason is that young girls are simply easier to raise than young boys. I have little nieces and nephews, and it's easy to observe how much louder, rambunctious, temperamental, and ill-behaved the boys are compared to the girls.”

Boys are pretty much the same level of headache throughout adolescence for parents. Roissy, you're correct that girls are much easier to deal with, but that is only until they hit puberty, then they go batshit insane and make up for all their good behavior prior to their teenage years.



136. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:40 pm](#) [Anonymous](#)

There's one main reason woman-dominated society will never be stable (and we'll always revert back to a male-dominated society):

bitches be bonkers

and especially crazy one week per month



137. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:40 pm](#) [The Sarlacc](#)

Ah, seeing the food discuss things is always amusing. The bottom truth is a lot simpler: The mammalian system is a stupid evolutionary outcome. Only when you reach a point where your progeny can be sent out to take care of itself with the resources of the environment (which, I may add, includes accepting the inevitable fact that some, perhaps many, will perish in the process) your species will be able to go forth and dominate.

Interestingly, you seem to be going the other way. The more dominant a group of food is, the more expensive its progeny becomes.

I think your “transhumanism” will not get you far unless you start considering the premises and examining the desired outcome. Free advice from an evolutionary superior lifeform, take it as you will.



138. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:41 pm](#) [Jack Donovan](#)

“Nursing schools have tried hard to recruit men in the past few years, with minimal success.”

It’s always funny to me that feminists try to sell their “breaking down gender stereotypes” package to men with the “men would feel more comfortable choosing careers in, say, nursing” as if that were the only carrot they could come up with.

Nursing is a GENDERED profession.

The name of it is something a woman does with her breast to feed a baby.

A lot of nursing is actually close to what doctors do...It’s a highly skilled area of health care from what I gathered working in the healthcare recruitment department at UCLA years ago. It’s not exactly candy stripping. A lot of those women are go-getting career-minded bitches on wheels. The “kiss-a-boo-boo” stuff is done by lower level assistants, if anyone.

If they really wanted to open up the nursing profession to men, they could start *renaming it.* Come up with something gender-neutral, like they did for “administrative assistant.” But they figure getting men to stop caring about being perceived is easier than changing the stationary.



139. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:48 pm](#) [ahappinessexperiment](#)

@Texan99

“Just seems like sour grapes to me now. You don’t like those jobs? Cool, get another kind of job. Who’s making you choose something you don’t like? Some woman?”

Most people work because they have to not because they want to. “Blessed are those who find their

work”. So of course many men have traditionally worked, not for themselves, but as a sacrifice for their family. They worked jobs they didn’t necessarily like because not to do so would have made them losers.

Now a lot of men working making good money are finding out they are still losers in the sexual market. They were brought up to believe that making a 6 figure income would help attract a suitable mate. However, this is not the case anymore, or at any rate it is much less the case than it used to be. So the 35 year old making good money but not getting laid finally thinks: fuck it! What is the point? Why don’t I just quit my job and smoke dope on the couch all day? And that is what a lot are choosing to do.

The resentment some men have about changes in society are not directly about women making more money. It’s the indirect result. The unexpected result. The result being that guys who went to school, studied hard, got a good job, worked hard, got promoted etc. are shocked to find out they are still losers in the world.

It isn’t that men want women to want them for their money. It’s that most men were taught that being responsible made one a catch. Now, because women have more financial security many more are choosing irresponsible men to hook up with instead of responsible ones.

At least that seems to be the current narrative. To what degree it is true is the question.



140. on [June 17, 2010 at 8:58 pm](#) *Rollo Tomassi*

Conspicuous absence or participation of Feministix, Anony, and all the rest of the Feministing concern trolls noted without comment.

Feminism has never been about “equality”. From the beginning it’s been about retribution and restitution, for the perceived wrongs of the past, legitimate or otherwise. Just desserts, the big get even, what’s good for the goose,..But retribution and restitution are ugly words you can’t found a movement upon, so the first wave feminists called it ‘equality’ – so much prettier a lie. All this article does is serve to confirm that. Congratulations ladies, you can drop all the pretense now while your teenage daughters proudly call themselves the triumph of feminism as they grind to the music of Ke\$ha in the clubs to celebrate. I can hardly wait for the 4th wave.



141. on [June 17, 2010 at 9:00 pm](#) *greatbooksformen*

lozlzlozzlzl

ben bernanke prints money while creating fiat debt zlozlzll

he wires womenz lotsa fiat dollars and trains ythem how to assault and belittle men and transfer tehirl
welth 2 womenz lolsozllzllzl

and women go

“look how smart we are!! look how great we are!!” lzozlzlz

ignoring the trillions upon trillions in debt and looking at their college university dumbed down degrees printed on fiat paper lzozlzlzlzlzl omg lzozllzll

ignoring the fact that every every everything the car the tires on it the tires on it the computer the lights were made invented by men and their freedom bought and made by men lzozlzl

but the fiat masters in conquering our country used our women and desecrated them in secretive tapings of butthumping sessions and sent them forth to seize our assets lzozlllzlzozllozll and write stupid little articles about the end of men lzozlzlzlzlzl

well, until Ben Bernanke and the head of Goldman Sachs is replaced by a woman, and will not believe it lzozllz

Bernanke and Goldman Sachs hire women to write these articles as the entire male bashing program and diminishing program was about one thing—the transfer of a man’s wealth, life and liberty to Bernanke lzozlzlzozlzlzl



142. on [June 17, 2010 at 9:07 pm](#) Gorbachev

@Rollo Tomassi

Conspicuous absence or participation of Feministix, Anony, and all the rest of the Feministing concern trolls noted without comment.

Conspicuous by absence: they’ve got nothing to say, support or comment on Rosin’s piece or Roissy’s comment.

They don’t really care what men do; what men think; or what state men find themselves in. If all men disappeared, they’d throw a party.

This little debate has no great interest for them. If they have sons, they already know everything they need to know about their sons, and need no guidance from anyone else. And if they don’t – men play no positive role in their lives.

They’ve got what they want. Of course, they’ve also got the consequences, which are only recently starting to bite. When these consequences start to chomp down, wait for the squealing and the cries of “This isn’t our fault”, “We didn’t do this” and then “There’s nothing we can do.” Ultimately, they’ll blame men.

Because far be it for a woman’s movement (much less a woman) to admit she was short-sighted or made a mistake. No, it’s always the fault of the men.



143. on [June 17, 2010 at 9:08 pm](#) PA

GBFM — the Duggar women aren't desouled. To all the pussies melwing about the death of the West (looking at you, Whiskey) just because challenging times are ahead — in the long run the Duggars trump Bernake.



144. on [June 17, 2010 at 9:13 pm](#) Mac

So...More girl babies here...tons of soon to be warlike male babies in other cultures (like Islam).

Yeah. There's a great recipe for the future of the West...



145. on [June 17, 2010 at 9:14 pm](#) Grampa

Talk of female domination just makes me smile.

Does anybody know of any large organization staffed and run and maintained solely by women? Talk of female dominance is ridiculous. They are just not capable of the sort of cooperation and rational thinking that men are. Nor do they have the complete tool kit (physical or mental.)

I have been closely involved in breast cancer treatment for over 30 years. The advent of female domination of this area of medicine has resulted in the most outlandish, irrational therapeutic decisions imaginable. Rational discussion these days with a woman oncologist/breast surgeon is almost impossible. They can't think. They follow some rules invented by men that they only half understand. My God, almost everything is written down for them these days. They essentially follow a cookbook. Yet the call themselves doctors.

Some idiotic common practices these days:

eg. Five days to diagnosis from initial visit for a breast cancer patient.

eg. Measuring surgical margins to the nearest mm for a malignant process in a large, anatomically poorly defined area like the breast.

eg. The mania to "save the breast" at all costs, including killing the patient, eventually. Any approach which removes the breast entirely, no matter how rational and effective, is rejected unless local surgery is simply impossible.

eg. Trying to use local surgery to treat an essentially diffuse process in the breast.

eg. Over treating small, bland low grade cancers in old women while under treating aggressive cancers in young women, by using the same treatment modalities for each type of patient. They just follow the book.

eg. Complete inability to distinguish relative benefit from absolute benefit. That is, a 10% “projected” improvement in 5 year survival for a disease that only kills 10% of the patients is only a 1% improvement in survival for any given patient. All they can do is slobber over a p value.

It is a joke.

All the advances in breast cancer treatment have been done by men. And, are still being done by men.

Look how well women are doing raising children and educating children in female dominated social settings. (Black ghettos). The outcomes are better in the white suburbs for single mom’s kids, but that’s because they tend to be the exception, not the rule.

I am not worried about “female domination” except in the area of politics. There, there are too many men willing to enable female oppression of men. Think divorce laws and title IX, as examples. So, betas, getting married is a REALLY bad idea. The idea of marrying a female who is an economic inferior (makes less money than you) should be absolutely verboten. Don’t become a useful tool.

If Obama (“May my leg tingle.”) fails to keep bailing out the various States, we will start seeing a lot of these women losing jobs just like the men (teachers and bureaucrats). Then, instead of hearing about how females have failed to adapt to the new workplace realities, we will hear about how unfair it all is, to women.

But remember, most people are OK. It is the job of politicians to make us hate each other.



146. on [June 17, 2010 at 9:19 pm](#) *RMM*

What’s interesting is how well Roi^HChateau’s analysis reflects what has been my experience in my field: Bioinformatics. When I started work after my Master’s degree, I was working in a company where the group’s leader was going on a recruiting spree getting guys freshly pressed out of Uni and throwing them at problems they had no training dealing with. The company had, IMO, rather bad management, so things were always in a panic “we need to do this NOW!” kind of thing.

We thrived on that. Quite frankly, I get the feeling us younger chaps would have followed our boss to hell for dinner. This was a good 10 years ago, with the early complete drafts of the human genome and all that, there was ample opportunity for novel stuff going through that mountain of novel and not-quite-sure-how-to-deal-with data. And all done in the “NOW!” way. It was stressful, but awesome at the same time.

There was a single woman in the team. Not a token one though, she was in charge of sysadming of a particularly complex and finicky data management/analysis system, the kind of job that required diligently crossing all the t’s and dotting all the i’s. She was excellent at it, that shit ran like clockwork

under her watch.

Eventually bad management ended up with the company downsizing, and my boss and a bunch of us moved on (before the axe fell, mind you), and I found myself in a different company – and under a female boss. There was nothing particularly bad about her, but she kept charging me with the most dreading, soul-crushing menial jobs she could find. It's not that she was targetting me, her idea of Bioinformatics was that we were not there to do anything original or interesting, the lab guys did the research and all we did was slightly customized IT support. My performance suffered, and she wasn't happy about it. I moved on, but before I did she “moved on” and we got some new management – a guy with a plan and a purpose to help launch a new product. He immediately pulled me out of the shit I was doing and made me get data for the product launch. I had never done that, but he didn't care, he wanted me to find out what the scientists were doing with the competing products, what kind of innovative research it had allowed, the works. I had never done anything like that, but he didn't care. I'm sure he had an idea of what he wanted, but he gave me free rein with only occasional guidance because, I think, he wanted to see if I would come up with things they didn't think of. I did great, which probably surprised the VP and all the higher ups who only heard mediocre reports about me from the former boss.

And right now I'm in a mixed team with men and women in another company. I have hit it off with some of the “difficult” people they had had to deal with in the past, and I've found out that these “difficult” people were so only because they were expecting Bioinformatics to be able to come up with new shit and do some original or lateral thinking – and so far they had only interacted with the women.

These women, however, are excellent when it comes to detailed analyses made with existing pipelines, their job is thorough and detailed, and will spot and sort out the usual problems with uncanny accuracy. Better than me without a doubt. But I excel at the new stuff, the “we have never done this before” pilot project, the projects where we are looking at something that has not been explained before.

I think it's interesting how both aspects are just about as important in my field. It is, however, highly unlikely that pointing out the gender correlation would be politically correct.

147. on [June 17, 2010 at 9:35 pm](#)  [Wow](#)

Wow.

Wow is all I can say.

148. on [June 17, 2010 at 9:50 pm](#)  *Unconformist Sheep*

Sidewinder, your economics are a bit off. Involuntary unemployment is a coordination problem, and

the causes are varied. Anyway, one way to see the flaw in your logic is to take your scenario of 20% chronic unemployment for granted, and run with it for the long-run. These unemployed people have bellies to feed, roofs to cover, bodies to cover, etc. You expect these people to just roll over and die? No, they'd start producing and exchanging between themselves thus creating a 2nd economy.

Another way to look at it is that if it's true that capital productivity is growing relatively to labor, then capital becomes more expensive, motivating people to replace and use labor more abundantly. (e.g. Why would you buy that expensive machine when 100 people can do the job just as cheaply?)

Indeed, what we're seeing is increasing returns to investments in education, which shows in the skilled and unskilled wage differentials.



149. on [June 17, 2010 at 9:51 pm](#) [ahappinessexperiment](#)

<http://www.theonion.com/articles/housewife-charged-in-sexforsecurity-scam,948/>



150. on [June 17, 2010 at 10:05 pm](#) [Nicole](#)

AHE, I'll admit it. I laughed.




151. on [June 17, 2010 at 10:18 pm](#) [Nicole](#)

As to why people are selecting girl children, girls are not only better behaved children and better students. The reason for this is because they are better drones. In test after test for social dependence, people in general were fatal conformists.

Males however, had a higher rate of nonconformity. Females on the other hand, just about never disobeyed the white coats or went against committing some horrid atrocity or disagreed with the popular falsehood.

Google milgram experiment.

Breed out men, and you breed out independence, or role models for the scant few independent females it's a miracle to produce.



152. on [June 17, 2010 at 10:25 pm](#) [anoukange](#)

Cinco Jotas–

Now that just wasn't right... I had sensed sarcasm on your part and I was enjoying a perfectly made gyro in hand when I ventured on over to that link. Needless to say my bite went down hard. ouch!



153. on [June 17, 2010 at 10:29 pm](#) Mike

Conscientious application to menial desk jockey multitasks is what women's brains are best at. Our society exists at a strange moment of economic limbo between two worlds — the past manufacturing based world and the future transhuman world — a limbo where paper pushing, legalistic gear grinding, government welfare administration, and service with a smile has infested like a toxic mold almost every tier of vertical and horizontal economic productivity. It is the kind of work, in substance and in psychological reward, that is soul-crushing to men but fulfilling to women.

This is so spot on correct it is scary. Essentially, my job is nothing but desk jockey multitasking with Excel. Nothing really creative, nothing requiring ingenuity or thinking. The other 2 women in my group appear to have no problem doing it day in day out. I personally find it maddening and soul-crushing and can't wait for the day I have enough saved to walk out the door and start my own business.



154. on [June 17, 2010 at 10:51 pm](#) Cauthon

A mainstream source to back the theory behind this post:

<http://www.bakadesuyo.com/what-would-men-do-if-they-didnt-have-to-impre>



155. on [June 17, 2010 at 11:42 pm](#) Badger Nation

Texan99,

“I pick up such a strong sense of “you're gonna get yours” here.”

Yep. It comes from years of the male experience with women, overanxious, hyper-picky women with pumped-up egos telling us (or getting it back to us through the grapevine) that we're not good enough for her...we don't make enough money, we're not tall enough, whatever checklist item we don't match for her perfectly planned and accessorized life.

The other phenomenon we see is the “have my fun” crew, girls that want to ride the carousel until their magic runs out, then they expect some dude to pick them up at age 28 and “make an honest woman of her” after she's been rooted out by God knows how many sausage casings. It's annoying

and insulting to be played for Mr. Chump after she gave it away for a bunch of players when she was hot enough to get them.

In any case, just like this Hanna Rosin article, the ladies doth protest too much. “I DON’T NEED A MAN! I CAN TAKE CARE OF MYSELF! I’M NOT GOING TO SETTLE!!!” they tell us...and then go running to another man.

So yes, we do want to see these kinds of women “get hers.”



156. on [June 17, 2010 at 11:52 pm](#) *Doughty*

“Most important, women earn almost 60 percent of all bachelor’s degrees—the minimum requirement, in most cases, for an affluent life.”

Maybe that is because men tend to move out of their parents house become more independent and support themselves sooner than women, rather than spend mommy and daddys, or the governments money all the way through university.



157. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:21 am](#) *Rum*

The brain-contents of the typical 35 year old single woman is quite easy to decode. Just be a reasonably attractive guy with some game who will make sure to give her enough booze to terminally impair her self-deception-hamster. By and by, she will talk. She will tell you of spending nearly 20 years on the thug-cock-carosael and how she now wants to get away from all that and to latch onto a well intentioned naive rich guy who will overlook the fact that 97% of her marketable hotness has expired or been “used up”...

If you can keep yourself sober and aware then the whole thing will surely devolve into a very high grade – if extremely sick form of entertainment – even if you do not get yur dick wet.

Just remember that you can walk away.



158. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:23 am](#) *greatbooksformen*

^^^^^^

lozzlzlozzli cant believe you talk 2 35 year olds lzozlzlzozoz



159. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:24 am](#) *ahappinessexperiment*

the graduation rates suggest men r now figuring out at earlier ages that traditional routes to achieving status arent working as well. the sexual market is efficient.



160. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:36 am](#) [Badger Nation](#)

sdaedelus,

“the so called male hierarchial system actually suits women far better.”

I want to differentiate two ideas: work value and personal value.

The basic male work structure is one of hierarchical work value, where everyone has a job that fits into a ladder of accountability, some guys having major responsibilities and others doing grunt work on the bottom.

But there’s basically flat personal value. The big dog is obviously a winner, but the group accords more or less equal respect to every member who does HIS job. Think of a football or baseball team – you do your job, you are “one of the guys.” It’s actually the quarterback’s job to praise the little-used backup receiver and whatnot to keep the overall team morale high.

The female work structure is the opposite – work value is built around shifting ideas of job description and a lack of hardcore “chain of command,” but the personal value is highly differentiated, with the queen bee on top and various levels existing underneath. So on the org chart it may look flat, there’s a deep structure (hat tip to Chomsky) that regulates the group, and you have to pay proper tribute to the top or you will be left on the outside.

As we advance in our white-collar society, the personal nature of the jobs makes personal value blur with work value, which might explain your thesis that the corporate ladder fits well the female archetype.



161. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:40 am](#) [sdaedalus](#)

@Badger Nation

That is a very good point, I hadn’t considered the hive issue.

I agree that the corporate work culture as currently organised probably suits many women better than it does men (women are by definition more conformist & respectful of authority & feel less corralled by it) but it wouldn’t work for me and I’m not sure it is good for society generally.



162. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:42 am](#) *Underachiever*

Society could survive (and even thrive) if genetic engineering comes along to make kids more intelligent or if women decide to get sperm donations from extremely intelligent men when they have kids.



163. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:46 am](#) *The Real Vince*

Roissy writes:

Serious question: how much of a free market economy is positive sum? Is it not inconceivable that adding twice as many workers to the job market would displace a bunch of men already working into unemployment or underemployment, instead of adding to overall growth? Why is “brain drain” the default assumption, instead of “brain rearrange”?

It seems highly unlikely assuming economists are right about the Lump-of-labor fallacy.

Re: women outnumbering men in bachelor degrees:

Here’s a scary thought for the platitude spouters to chew on: Perhaps men **are** acting in a rational way. Perhaps they are adapting to the new culture, aka sexual market ver. 2.0.

...

Maybe they’ve made a very rational decision to get access to this pussy by other means. And let it be said that there is more than one way to stroke a kitty. Remember, women don’t get wet for a paycheck; they get wet for the alpha demeanor that a man who is good at collecting paychecks exudes. And as any reader of this site knows, that alpha demeanor can be learned and applied.

You’re overplaying your hand, and contradicting what you say elsewhere. I highly doubt that, on the whole, a majority of these men are acting rationally.

The most important insight into the sexes is the one validated time and again in research, and represented graphically in the form of a bell curve: Men have a flatter, more varied distribution than women, as discussed countless times in this blog (as well as the linked article on IQ). The brightest minds belong to men... along with the dullest.

When it comes to some decent middle-class jobs requiring the stamp of “an overpriced IQ-notarizing ivory tower,” women probably have the traits that will generate middling success. They’re a bit more docile and focused on the task set before them.

Men — a tiny minority of them — will do very, very well indeed. This is exactly what’s been happening with widening economic inequality over the last thirty years. Call it the free-market, or the natural order of things. However, as the “world becomes flatter,” and over hundreds of millions of

unemployed and underemployed people join the global workforce, we can expect the laws of iron wages to kick in.

164. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:49 am](#)  Nico

Great post.

165. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:01 am](#)  Whatever

@ GBFM... well applied holocaust story analogy. If there's crying, end it for your own sake.

@ AHappiness... great Onion Article.

I actually like the Atlantic as a magazine, ... her take was about as enlightened as a feminist is going to get. Still off, but females in general will never see the male perspective. Just not gonna happen. They don't understand the sexual effort and struggle.

I'm all for wholesome family fun, but that video was UN- Fuckin-WATCHABLE!!.... The little girl reminds me of some of my easiest lays, a few comments to trump her and she'll give it all.... Society is in trouble, and it saddens me.

166. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:02 am](#)  Blanchard

I didn't even get past the abstract. It was this line that got me;

“What if modern, postindustrial society is simply better suited to women?”

Isn't this exactly the same type of attitude that feminists have been fighting since the industrial age? And now that the shoe is on the other foot it's ok? I've always said it's not equality if it's forced, and society has clearly been forcing the issue for the past 40 years.

167. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:05 am](#)  Steve Johnson

Rollo Tomassi

Feminism has never been about “equality”. From the beginning it's been about retribution and restitution, for the perceived wrongs of the past, legitimate or otherwise.

No.

Feminism is and always has been for women who are losers in the mating market so they work to change things to their advantage.

Back when monogamy existed, women needed to have good looks and a pleasing personality to land a top quality man. Women without these traits are still women and still want top quality men. However, in the past unless a woman was extraordinary she couldn't support herself meaning she *had* to get a man. Result? Ugly and manly women wound up very frustrated.

First order of feminist business: make it so a woman can make a living and support herself. With that accomplished, women didn't have to settle any more. New problem: they avoid loser men but still don't get access to desirable men.

Next items: undermine marriage (check) and propagandize men into finding the unpleasant traits that feminists have a status marker ("ooh, your wife is an x, impressive" instead of "wow, your wife keeps a nice house and treats you well").

The whole thing has to break down because (a) society is dependent on the contributions of beta males – betas that will not contribute if they don't get desirable women as wives (i.e., 20 year olds) and (b) under monogamy some number of women are always going to be stuck with men they don't want and women who are driven to become shrieking journalisticly inclined harpies are likely to be those women – that just can't last. They'll either use their positions to agitate for feminism or they won't be allowed to hold such positions.

Any way you cut it, the situation right now isn't a long term equilibrium.

168. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:11 am](#)  [Whatever](#)

As far as crying... its also real Gay

169. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:12 am](#)  [Vincent Ignatius](#)

I usually don't read an article once I see that it's written by a woman. When it's something that has to do with gender, it's usually something like this, but even business articles are full of this same thoughtless tripe.

You find this in a lot of the fluffier articles in Bloomberg. Some bitch writing about how we need to recruit even more women to do the jobs in business that men can do better.

The sickening part is that I'm starting to see a lot more of this garbage in Latin American business news. The majority of Latin America is still 30-50 years behind the states in terms of feminaziation,

but the trendier cities are maybe only 10-20 years behind. Jesús lloró.

Women may not even have the capability to maintain the civilization that men built. If the power shifts too much in their favor, we won't even be lucky enough to get stagnation. Civilization will enter another dark age.



170. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:35 am](#) *Cannon's Canon*

The little girl reminds me of some of my easiest lays, a few comments to trump her and she'll give it all....

WELL, THEN!!!



171. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:35 am](#) *ahappinessexperiment*

Texan99 is clearly intelligent, so those calling her thick headed only show themselves to be. But she mistakes this post for having been about the workplace when it was about the sexual marketplace.

normally one thinks of women as more intuitive, more holistic in thought, etc... yet when it comes to the issue of workplace vs. sexual marketplace women generally draw a thick doublethink line between the two, whereas men clearly see them as two hands clapping.



172. on [June 18, 2010 at 2:10 am](#) *unlearning genius ...*

good article roissy .. cannot believe this is mainstream media .. but being lesser brains women find it very hard to see beyond their own indoctrinations and rationalizations .. the truth is indeed so cold and beautiful .. it grinds your soul for a while but then there is always lifts the fear ..



173. on [June 18, 2010 at 3:39 am](#) *Browncoat*

Chinese makin' too many boy babies.
Americans makin' too many girl babies.
Sounds like the start of an Alliance, don't it now?



174. on [June 18, 2010 at 4:32 am](#) [TAS](#)

Feminists should be careful of celebrating the transformation of America into a female-farming society. Those are common in Africa and among Africans in America, yet in those societies, women are generally treated pretty badly.



175. on [June 18, 2010 at 5:20 am](#) [Paul](#)

Except white girls don't like Asian keyboard jockeys.



176. on [June 18, 2010 at 5:29 am](#) [RMM](#)

@TAS:

>Feminists should be careful of celebrating the transformation of America into a female-farming society.

You suggest that feminists should have a sudden influx of insight. True, but it's akin of saying that pigs should really learn to fly if they want to take over the world.



177. on [June 18, 2010 at 6:17 am](#) [Grampa](#)

Oh, another thing. That great sucking sound you hear is not jobs going to Mexico but money going from men to women.

Imagine two retirement systems, one for men, funded by men, and one for women, funded by women. Women live about 2x as long after retirement as men, yet we men have to pay into a system to support women. So, we pay more, retire later, and get fewer benefits because we are forced by law to support women, who in many cases, despise men. (The same goes for black men, BTW, who are the one group that pays more to S.S. than they get back. They are too dumb to complain, and their "leaders" have royally screwed them, but, what does that say about the rest of us men?)

Imagine two health care systems, one for men and one for women, with the different genders only paying insurance to support their own gender based system. It would lower the health costs for men greatly. I would estimate that at least 2/3rd's of the patients I see going through my lab are female. And, I would reckon they are about 75% of our revenue. And, I have yet to see a Male Pavilion or a Prostate center or a Men's Health initiative to compete with the Women's Pavilion, the Breast Center, and the endless well woman programs my hospital runs. The apologists for this sort of anti-male

discrimination say it is just about money, that is, there is more money to be made providing health care to women. Fine. That just proves my point. But, why do we men have to pay for it?

Women are becoming intolerable parasites. And, they bitch and moan constantly about how unfair it is to them.

The concept of “fairness” to a woman is very different from that concept to a man. But, that is fodder for another rant.

I guess one practical conclusion from this sort of rumination is this: Avoid professional situations where there is a large proportion of women in the workforce. An all male working environment will be much more lucrative for most men. Women lower the standards of performance and pay in most jobs, and raise costs.



178. on [June 18, 2010 at 6:31 am](#) f(solar)

Because subconsciously women want to be treated badly, the summary subconscious of women wants to be treated badly as a whole. Because patriarchies take care of women and won't let any harm come to them, matriarchy is a better form because of the pump-and-dump mentality it entails. Therefore, the ultimate goal of feminism is society's regression to paleolithic.



179. on [June 18, 2010 at 6:40 am](#) TheDarkLord

Nicole said: *The reason for this is because they are better drones*

Right. But this is exactly why there are going to be big changes in the not only the economy, but also in society.

In the economy, men can't stand doing these drone jobs so we will naturally start managing our lives so that we can bear 'work'. I've certainly managed it in my life.

This is also happening in education. One reason why women get 60% of bachelor degrees is because men have checked out. The higher education system is a scam and bachelor degrees are hugely devalued.

These days having a bachelor's degree is significant of nothing and as such are a waste of time. All they qualify you for is being a cubicle jockey (and sometimes not even for that). So why bother? Many men have decided that they won't.

When you have a huge portion of society questioning the system, then the system is going to have to change.


So, here's an idea. One reason that information and indeed 'bachelor's degrees' are devalued is


because of the internet. Much of the information is available for free on the internet – you can read it yourself you don't need some smelly professor to tell you what it is.

So, what is not available on the internet? What is going to retain its value in the world of the information superhighway? Some such things may be traditional male jobs, say bricklaying, plumbing, construction, earthwork. None of these things can be emailed to you by a cubicle drone in China.

So my advice to young men, is not to waste their time getting a pointless degree from a third rate college, rather they should learn a trade and get themselves apprenticed to someone they admire.

Incidentally, Hanna Rosin, as a fembot, won't see the irony in article title. However, those of us who have some financial market experience know that once the press starts coming out with articles entitled 'The End of...', we know it's the start of the new up-trend.



180. on [June 18, 2010 at 6:51 am](#)  *Original JB*

“Society could survive (and even thrive) if genetic engineering comes along to make kids more intelligent”

That's the big question in all these gloomy prognostications: can technology and science outrun the idiotic social engineering?



181. on [June 18, 2010 at 7:09 am](#)  *Original JB*

“So my advice to young men, is not to waste their time getting a pointless degree from a third rate college, rather they should learn a trade and get themselves apprenticed to someone they admire.”

There are signs this is already happening.

Higher ed bubble WILL burst. Whether tomorrow or in 2 years. Technical schools will see an increase.



182. on [June 18, 2010 at 7:16 am](#)  *The Editor*

Amen brother, excellent truths. Women go into pointless endless debt for school only to take up pointless jobs that feminists wanted to free women from. It is profoundly hilarious.

A commentor brought up David Cameron? Really? Guess who is behind him helping him?? The guy brought in that stumpy cunt...Anita Dunn I wrote about it here

<http://thelp72980.wordpress.com/2010/04/16/same-teams-different-countries/>

Same group of global elitest, different countries.

Thanks to men we have self employment. It is the men who go out on their own and make their own ways/careers in life. Women, well meaningly, just push paper around and wish for 5pm. The Do'ers and the sustainers. We women sustain things, men make things happen...

And as for who is more intelligent, men have been proven to be more intelligent than women time after time. Are women embracing science, math, economics, engineering? No, they are not wired for that...

Anyways, this is the post of the week.




183. on [June 18, 2010 at 7:32 am](#) Tyrone

on June 17, 2010 at 3:25 pm ahappinessexperiment
 "Keep in mind that a lot of liberal, leftist garbage is spouted by JEWS."

Anon, you are a fucking moron.

Actually, he's right. They invented all of this crap we have to deal with now. Ever hear of the Frankfurt School, Marx, Engels, Friedan, Steinem, Dworkin? I'm a big fan of Charles Krauthammer, pro-Israel, and not anti-semitic myself, but anonymous has a point and you are spouting pretty lies in this case by denying the obvious.



184. on [June 18, 2010 at 8:04 am](#) Jason

Some of you people are fucking morons. You sound like the 3rd world savages who abort their female children. You seem to be afraid of having a surplus of vagina on the market. For all the talk of alpha this, and beta that, most of you people are fucking clueless.

Most of the problems in society are due to the fact that males are beginning to noticeably outnumber females. Why is this a problem? Well other than the most significant problem which is a lack of sufficient vaginas to pump and dump, we can examine the problems that stem from vagina deficiency.

1. When a minority has something the majority wants (vagina), the majority will do anything to get what minority has. In other words, divorce laws suck for men because a few women told a bunch of beta males that their chances of getting pussy would go up if they passed divorce laws that favor women.

2. Men will take aging, rancid, herpes infected snatch when the alternative is their hand.

3. Beta male characteristics are amplified when there is a shortage of vagina on the market.

Roissy says that manufacturing jobs are beta. Maybe they are. Anyone watch Gran Torino? Beta Clint, the retired factory worker would have bitch slapped most of you readers and fucked your mother while you watched in awe. 1950s beta destroys 2010s alpha any day of the week. Can you imagine what 1940s alpha must have been like after culling millions of young males from the world's herds? Touching the scrotum of 1940s alpha would be as significant as the hand of God giving life to Adam in the Sistine Chapel.

I say bring on the ladies. Once we get back to a point where men are in their rightful place as a minority, feminism will end. Affirmative action bureaucracy and socialism will end. Multi-culturalism will end, and riding thug cock will go back to its rightful place as the ultimate shame a girl can bring on her family.

And all of you fags who love being up to your eyeballs in pent-up dick, kill yourselves please.



185. on [June 18, 2010 at 8:18 am](#)  Jerry

Re: @Jayz point and Roissy's future post on the idea that Hanna Rosin might actually be describing a great future for educated alpha males (although I will describe later below why a patriarchy is still best for alpha males to operate in):

I and others publicly messaged Hanna on Twitter last week <http://www.twitter.com/HannaRosin> asking her why she felt that males who already had advanced degrees and no chance of being bypassed in their careers would have a problem with what would obviously be more women for them.

I asked @HannaRosin Are you prepared to share the best men with the 20 something women who can't find suitable peers?

The only way Rosin's rosy matriarchy could be good for older women like her is if women under 30 ignore and reject older alpha males worldwide despite their being fewer qualified male peers around them.

These US feminists can't see beyond their own noses. Far from becoming a world like Candace Bushnell's "Lipstick Jungle," Rosin was describing a future more like "1001 Nights."

Meanwhile, controlled breeding to produce girls is what we men want – short and long term. It is the opposite of what has happened in China. I want a world 18 years from now where 18 year old females outnumber 18 year old males 2:1. I could only wish there were now more young Chinese women than Chinese men.

However, if we reverse the lunacy the feminists have inflicted upon *themselves* and beta males – and go back to a patriarchy – it won't be worse for alpha males either.

Here's why: women perk up and take men seriously at a younger age when a patriarchy is in place.

Eastern Europe is a generation behind the USA and England in feminist thought and women here still fight each other to get married to the best men before they turn 25 and become spinsters. They take men seriously at a younger age.

It actually doesn't hurt a single man's MLTR and MSTR prospects to see all the best women already married by age 24.

Why? Because he can expect to be dealing with fresh 18-24 year olds anyway at least for recruiting new entrants to an MLTR. In the search for a husband early in adulthood, young women will certainly want to snare an alpha and, hopefully, be too young/naive to know it isn't likely they will get one all to themselves.

By "wanting to snare a husband" they will be nicer to men.

They won't have a hateful "I don't need men until my 30s" phase that, in America and England, results in flaky behavior including outrageous rudeness and websites like Hollaback that condemn men for trying to meet women in public.

QED: There will be more friendly and single 18-24 year olds in a patriarchy than a matriarchy. There will be less flaking. There will be more women open to being met in public when feminist sites like Hollaback are discredited.

It wasn't just The Atlantic that spewed BP-style sewage this past week.

The Washington Post just wrote on Wednesday that women should wait until their 30s to marry – and to have established a career before that:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/discussion/2010/06/09/DI2010060905873.html>

This attitude almost *always* results in women being rude and disinterested in men in their late teens and early 20s, which is when it all matters most for men.

Rudeness is the biggest enemy of the PUA. Feminism promotes it in young women.



186. on [June 18, 2010 at 8:27 am](#) *Badger Nation*

No one's mentioned what these college-educated career women buy with their money when they go home from their fuzzy jobs. Women are still buying airheaded reading material like Cosmo and chick lit, overpriced fattening drinks like Cosmos and Long Islands, and pointlessly expensive conspicuous consumption items like handbags.

GBFM has it right – fiat money makes a leisure economy possible. Sad to see a once-great nation hoisted by its own designer belt.



187. on [June 18, 2010 at 9:03 am](#) Jerry

Long term, patriarchies are better for alpha males than matriarchies because there will be more 18 year old females (higher ratio compared to active alpha males) 18 years from now in a patriarchy.

Since an alpha – especially a younger alpha – is more likely than a beta to be planning on still being on the prowl and having sex with young women 18 years from now, he wants a high birth rate being maintained now. Otherwise, the ratio of beautiful women to men of all ages will slowly fall....well below the high ratio needed for young women to bother being friendly to men.

Matriarchies tend to breed future young women (competitors) out of the picture by reducing the baby count.

Beta males in matriarchies don't have any skin in the game when it comes to the prospect of there being fewer and fewer 18-24 year old women in their society. They are trained to neither be interested in young women nor expect that the younger women would be interested.

Meanwhile, an alpha in a matriarchy would be well aware that it doesn't matter how slutty young women in the matriarchy are...if there are so few of them going forward, they will be that much harder to get at.

This is simple mathematics.




188. on [June 18, 2010 at 9:05 am](#) josh

To those of us who care about the future and about civilization; what the fuck are we going to do?



189. on [June 18, 2010 at 9:10 am](#) josh

Do these women not think it could hurt economic growth that the most intelligent children are being more and more raised by unintelligent, manana-culture, peasant nannies? I suppose human capital is only accumulated in official "education" institutions.



190. on [June 18, 2010 at 9:20 am](#) [rebelliousvanilla](#)

Is this woman utterly stupid? What in the name of God is my benefit as a woman to have less men and more women around? More competition and less men around?

Roissy, I disagree with you about boys being harder to raise. My parents had both and I will use my father's words – "Raising a boy is easy. You have to take care of only one penis. When you have a girl, you have to take care of all the penises in the world." I mean, sure, if you wouldn't mind your daughter being a slag, I guess daughters are easier to raise.

Also, boys have better ROIs. Supposing I have a single child, which one will be more likely to take care and be able to take care of me a bit when I will be old? Since by the time I will retire, Ponzi pension schemes won't exist anymore. Heck, by the time people in their 40s now will retire they won't exist anymore. I also do agree with you that men are better thinkers. Way better actually.

And about societies with working women being better fit economically, which is their range of time? I mean, due to the demographic disaster that having career focused women (there's a difference in between having a job and a career), on the long run, having economically 'empowered' women is an unmitigated disaster. All the economies that have these demographics will implode eventually (except Africa which will implode whenever people will stop giving them foreign aid).

Also, the post-manufacturing world doesn't exist. Not making goods means just going into debt and having a huge service sector economy that will implode when people won't lend money to you anymore. This is where America is and all the women who have careers in useless services will lose their jobs. The only people making money in the future will be those that produce. And maybe finance (way less than until now though).

The wage gap is the result of the female lower IQ and its distribution, combined with our choices. If you control the study by number of worked hours, time off and all the other variables, you will get 98 cents to the dollar, which is statistically equal. And men around the house do more complicated things. My father fixes stuff, at least. And he is good at it. And he vacuums. But that's about it. Me and my mother do the rest. I value more what my dad does than what my mother does and it's probably more expensive to hire a repairman every time something breaks down than hiring a maid. Just saying.

As Roissy said, it's quite funny that we were whining about discrimination when we weren't fit. But as soon as men draw the short stick – you go grrrl. I noticed this related to academic achievement – I guess women are smarter now, but when we had poorer results, we were just kept down by the evil patriarchy.

And to answer your question – the whole free market economy is a positive sum. Long term, more capital is built up and everybody gets employed, unless the government ruins capital accumulation. What's hilarious though is that women are employed in worthless governmental created or unproductive jobs. Also, if men are better at top management positions (and with someone who had a job, I'd take a male boss over a female one every time of the day), wouldn't promoting women over them be a brain drain? I also doubt that working single mothers make goods more expensive, unless governments enforce equal pay. If they want flexible time, they get paid less. If they work how I want them to work, they get full wages.

About risk, risk carries reward. The financial situation of 2008 was created by the Fed and the government, not risk nor greed. It's called moral hazard – I wish these idiots who are clueless would stop talking about economics. And since when are women cool headed and men overemotional? I must be living in a different world. The men who drop out will have a better life than the idiots who

wasted 10 years of their lives getting an education in something that won't be there in another 10 years. Also, it's a reasonable choice to make to not pursue college education considering how expensive tuition are and what a low reward being educated has. You can learn all that by working already or just buying books. This way at 25 you will have savings instead of debt. Just ask real employers how much they care about degrees. Here they don't. My brother didn't finish college until he was 30 and now he makes about \$600,000 an year, two years later. QED

And who would marry Victoria? I wouldn't. Heck, unless I'd want to divorce her and get the kids(which I would, even if I was a man, because the bias against men is the bias against who puts food on the table) and child support. Sure, she will join the line of women crying discrimination now, even if they didn't mind doing it themselves.



191. on [June 18, 2010 at 9:31 am](#) [johnny five](#)

@ gorbs

But the rules of hypergamy breed a specific response from males:

...

- A backlash against misandrist laws

perhaps.

however, you're neglecting the fact that, of "males" *who are capable of a successful ascent to power*, the vast majority are alphas, to whom the misandrist laws are at worst a nuisance, and at best a seismic tilting of the playing field directly in their favor.

but, you ask, aren't there alphas whose primary concern is the greater good?

sure there are, but most of those guys will trip over the second barrier, which is the fact that, in any society other than a strictly hereditary monarchy, only *those who actively want power over others* gain power over others.

as a result, your "backlash" is mostly a backlash of the have-nots — in terms of power, social influence, and, to a lesser extent, great wealth — against the haves.

that ain't going nowhere until blood is literally spilled in the streets.

do you think the spearhead crowd is going to spill blood in the streets anytime really soon?

(not a rhetorical question)

look at what it took to get civil-rights legislation passed.

1964 – 1863 = 101 years.

one hundred and one years.

and we men aren't even at our version of 1863 yet.



192. on [June 18, 2010 at 9:35 am](#) [johnny five](#)

more @gorbs


The backlash is beginning, and then the shit hits the fan, it'll be women leading it, actually.

nope. not literally.

if women “lead” the backlash, they will do so only by their time-tested method of standing safely in the rearguard while yelling commands and exhortations to tractable male foot soldiers.

and, even if this happens, it won't happen *en masse* until a critical mass of backlash is already reached.

female brain, improvisation, leadership, etc.



193. on [June 18, 2010 at 9:48 am](#) [rebelliousvanilla](#)

Gorbachev, you nailed it. I don't see why I'd mind older men liking younger women though. I like older men. And no, if you're not a feminist, you're accused of being a gender traitor and a self-hating person.

Sidewinder, America isn't wealthy, nor productive. You have over 80 trillion of unfunded liabilities, on top of your \$13 trillion debt. And this just at the governmental level. Then you add corporate and consumer debt. How the heck are you wealthy? Singapore is wealthy. And productive? Last time I checked, you have a current account deficit and a trade deficit. Also, you don't need to have 30% of the people unemployed. It's called capital accumulation and economic expansion. Sure, the 70% would be more efficient, but in order to have a competitive economy, the 30% who should get other jobs, would do something else. The biggest myth comes from the idea that having unemployed people raises aggregate productivity. If you can produce more wealth due to productivity increases and sack 30% of the people, you can make even more wealth by employing those 30% too. Socialism is bankrupt, just like communism.

game_in_bk, women make over 80% of the buying decisions, regardless of who makes it. I'd say we control more than 50% of the wealth.

whiskey is also right. I disagree with you about the failing of white people to have kids threatening us in any way. I don't see why blacks, Muslims, Mexicans and whatnot are allowed in the Western societies to begin with. Then it would be hardly a contest. I do agree with you about white men though. Their betaness resides in sacrificing their own in the name of social justice. If I have the kid of an African Muslim, the African Muslim community will be altruistic towards it, combined with white men circle jerking over social justice. What's the point of having the kids of a man who is willing to discriminate against his own kids? None. Especially since my group identity is a social construct and we can include whoever we feel like it inside it. Longfellow is right over why girls are preferred, probably.



194. on [June 18, 2010 at 9:51 am](#) [game in bk](#)

from an early age schools are geared towards women- here are some reasons why.

If boys do less well in school than girls, and if they are seriously under-represented in higher education, then perhaps the reason lies in the way schools have undertaken to boost the self-esteem of girls at the expense of boys. This unfortunate tendency was provoked by Carol Gilligan's book *In a Different Voice*.

For a picture of how this plays itself in the schoolroom we turn to another article by Hanna Rosin. In this week's *New York Magazine* Rosin shows how one form of what I and Mark Perry would call social engineering works: "For at least a decade, a subtle shift has been happening in the educational system that seems to be working against boys, who tend to be later verbal bloomers. New initiatives have emphasized more literacy skills in preschool, long before boys are ready. And early standardized testing— now the norm— sets up boys to see themselves as academic failures." [Link here.](#)

If boys are being conditioned to see themselves as academic failures and if the curricula tend to overemphasize subjects at which they are less adept, it should not be surprising to see them underrepresented in colleges and universities. Not because of any natural progression but because policies have been established to diminish them.

As I said, Rosin is not just indulging another round of feminist mythmaking. She is well aware of the negative consequences of this "war against boys."

In here words: "But allowing generations of boys to grow up feeling rootless and obsolete is not a recipe for a peaceful future. Men have few natural support groups and little access to social welfare; the men's-rights groups that do exist in the U.S. are taking on an angry, anti-woman edge. Marriages fall apart or never happen at all, and children are raised with no fathers. Far from being celebrated, women's rising power is perceived as a threat."

Ask yourself this. Is this outbreak of anger toward women just a speed bump on the road to feminist utopia, or is it the natural consequence of poorly conceived social engineering? Is it payback for the educational system's systematic bias against boys?

Are we really surprised that young men who are brought up without fathers in the new feminist dystopia are drawn to gangs and crime. We have seen exactly the same thing happen in the American inner cities over the past few decades. Single-parent families, headed by women, do not produce a cohort of healthy young males. See Kay Hymowitz' article [here.](#)

Astonishingly, those who are directing this great American social experiment have acted as though they thought— consciously or unconsciously— that it would be a good idea to have all of America emulate the example of inner city life.

<http://stuartschneiderman.blogspot.com/2010/06/american-man-rip.html>

195. on [June 18, 2010 at 9:51 am](#)  dragnet

@ GBFM

“roissy you are 10x the man as i to make it through her article, and the only way i could read it was with your comments the whole way on down, like virgil guiding dante on down into hell in dante’s inferno zlzozlzozl”

Fucking brilliant.

196. on [June 18, 2010 at 10:05 am](#)  almost 40 year old virgin

Little girls BETTER behaved than boys?
HOHO Hah!

In public perhaps.

You should hear the damn little princes next door scream her head of constantly when she doesn’t get her way.

Out in the “field” they’re cute and all. Boys simply act more directly and are less deceiving like females are born and bred to be.

Also the reason his nieces act so nicely around Roissy is because they subconsciously react even more to his innate game than women already do.

Nothing pedo-creepy about it. Just simple gender encoded behavior. Only we in the west think kids are some innocent little angels.

197. on [June 18, 2010 at 10:19 am](#) [FM newswire for June 18, interesting articles about geopolitics « Fabius Maximus](#)

[...] the 4th generation of warfare between the sexes: “The End Of Beta Providers“, Chateau, Citizen Renegade 17 June 2010 — The generations are 4 ages of humanity: [...]

198. on [June 18, 2010 at 10:30 am](#)  Original JB

This is why my idea of repealing gender discrimination laws works so well. The smarter women can get to work educating their own (and even running home schools.) No peasant nannies required.

“To those of us who care about the future and about civilization; what the fuck are we going to do?”

I tell you what you don't do (something many high IQ types are unfortunately prone to) — you don't keep repeating “we're doomed! doomed I tell ya.” It isn't very productive once you've sounded the alarm. Warning is fine; when it lapses into demoralization and resignation, it's too much. The reason why the left has been successful? They are irrationally optimistic about achieving their goals. Many cons are just so annoyingly eeyorish you just want to smack them.

As I've said before, you have to reverse the Gramscian march through the institutions. You need to go on OFFENSE instead of allowing the cultural left to set the terms of the debate. You utilize every sphere — political, educational, economic. You organize. You recruit. You sacrifice your time and energy.

In other words, you have to beat the left at their own game.

That's all there is to it. It's that simple. You fight, you might win. You don't, you DEFINITELY lose.

199. on [June 18, 2010 at 10:54 am](#) [Study Confirming My View Of The Job-Sexual Marketplace Nexus « Citizen Renegade](#)

[...] 18, 2010 by Chateau Apropos yesterday's post: This paper examines the extent to which human capital and career decisions are affected by their [...]



200. on [June 18, 2010 at 11:09 am](#) [rebelliousvanilla](#)

Anonymous, related to Valenti. Isn't she hypocritical? I mean, if a man can't provide for his children or if he doesn't protect his wife, isn't he considered a deadbeat?

Roissy, if I was Neo in that scene, I'd ask agent Smith to plug me back into the Matrix. lol

James, I agree. All it would take is for the European armies to seal down the ghettos in which the Islamists live and cut the utilities with their only out being an out of the country.

Jayz, there is a difference in between short term and long term outlooks. Short term, the sane thing to do for men is to be cads. Long term, it is to replace feminism. The supply of party girls will dry up regardless.

Anonymous, even if feminism pushed for equality, it would still be a problem. The equality paradigm is the problem, not feminism in particular.

Master Beta, actually what Muslims do with the veils is called mate guarding. It's actually an alpha trait in my view. Only beta losers are willing to share their women with outsiders.

whiskey, the whole world is screwed demographically.

z, American men were assaulted by the American government making the US uncompetitive. It was hardly outsourcing.

lol@PRCalDude.

Mac, if I had kids and I predicted my group going down the toilet, I'd have daughters too. What's the point of having men when daughters will pass my genes on by having the kids of the invaders?

Uncomformist Sheep, those differences will get narrower again as the Ponzi American economy collapses.

Browncoat, I doubt it. Unlike brainwashed Americans, the Chinese actually see themselves as a nation. Not a multicultural melting pot in which everybody can become Chinese.

TheDarkLord, the college education system is devalued because of degree inflation. If everybody has one, they're worthless. So employers ask for masters. The truth of the matter is that higher education should be for those who deserve it, not some egalitarian myth.

Jason, you have it the other way around. Feminism rose because women outnumbered men. In order to get a man than, you have to put out. If there are more men than women, than relationships become more important. With more women than men, it pays to be a cad, since you have lots of vagina to screw. If there are more women, then women can become more demanding about long term commitments and it pays to be a dad. Obviously, not an idiotic dad that is willing to marry a 35 years old woman who spent her youth getting gang banged.

Jerry, the thing is, in a patriarchy young women don't spread their legs as easily. I mean, being disowned for riding "thug cock"(to quote someone) makes it unworthy. Women do it because it's cool and trendy to do it.

game_in_bk, that's why I support boys schools and girls schools.

To people who wonder what to do about the future – don't worry, just come with a different paradigm to replace Americanism. Get back to the Greco-Roman roots of European civilization. Tada. The coming collapse will be a great thing for it since it will destroy the current paradigm. Your work is to replace it. What you need to get is that politics isn't just four year electoral cycles. It's shaping the mind of the people. I don't see what people expect – America and France which are the historically leftist-revolutionary countries won two world wars and exported their ideology. As they will collapse, so it will the ideological diarrhea that was exported.



201. on [June 18, 2010 at 11:24 am](#) Dalrock

@Grampa

Imagine two retirement systems, one for men, funded by men, and one for women, funded by women. Women live about 2x as long after retirement as men, yet we men have to pay into a system to support women. So, we pay more, retire later, and get fewer benefits because we are forced by law to support

women, who in many cases, despise men.

Excellent point. One interesting offshoot of this is the financial incentives for divorce theft should shift from women to men at some point approaching retirement or soon thereafter, although this doesn't seem to be recognized yet.

Imagine a newly retired couple: man age 65, woman age 60 with 1 million in combined net assets. She watches Oprah one day and decides it would be terribly exciting to start life new so she files for divorce. The kids are adults now so no "child support" to stealthily nest alimony in. They decide not to give a huge chunk to lawyers so they each end up with \$500k net to retire on.

Now have each of them go purchase a Single Premium Immediate Annuity (SPIA) to convert their \$500k into an income stream for life*. He is 5 years older and since he's a man actuarially expected to die much sooner. As a result, he gets around \$3,060 per month for his \$500k. She is younger and expected to live to an older age, so her \$500k only buys her around \$2,600 per month. If you assume they were each 5 years older but everything else the same, the estimates would be \$3,450 per month for him at age 70 and \$2,840 for her at 65. Note that he would still get an extra \$200 per month than her if both were aged 65. This gap jumps to \$300 per month if both are aged 70. None of this includes inflation protection but that would only further the gap since exposure to inflation is a function of how long you are going to live.

This is just income. You mentioned the difference in health care costs, so she will need to set aside more for that. Also, I think it is fair to say that women have greater needs for housing and probably cars as well. Women need nicer neighborhoods, alarms, etc for security and trendiness.

So he is clearly better off financially since he would have been subsidizing her retirement and additional housing needs had they stayed married. But it doesn't end there. The sexual marketplace has moved dramatically in his favor as well. Partly because of the way men and women's value changes with age, partly because of the much smaller number of men vs women as people get older.

I'm not advocating divorce theft in either direction, but just contemplating how the incentives might change with age.

*I used the Berkshire Hathaway EZ Quote tool at: <http://www.brkdirect.com/spia/EZQUOTE.ASP> to come up with estimated numbers. You could call a bunch of life insurance companies and get similar results.



202. on [June 18, 2010 at 11:27 am](#) Sidewinder

@ vanilla –

"Sidewinder, America isn't wealthy, nor productive. You have over 80 trillion of unfunded liabilities, on top of your \$13 trillion debt. And this just at the governmental level. Then you add corporate and consumer debt. How the heck are you wealthy? Singapore is wealthy. And productive? Last time I checked, you have a current account deficit and a trade deficit. Also, you don't need to have 30% of

the people unemployed. It's called capital accumulation and economic expansion. Sure, the 70% would be more efficient, but in order to have a competitive economy, the 30% who should get other jobs, would do something else. The biggest myth comes from the idea that having unemployed people raises aggregate productivity. If you can produce more wealth due to productivity increases and sack 30% of the people, you can make even more wealth by employing those 30% too. Socialism is bankrupt, just like communism."

Let me start with where we agree. Socialism as a system is probably more bankrupt than communism. Most of western civilization is socialist to one degree or another, America included, and its easy to see the correlation between state control and oversight and the decreasing enthusiasm for new business creation. I don't think tax rates have nearly the negative effect that conservatives think they do, but i've seen firsthand how state bureaucracy and regulation have discouraged business creation.

I think our disagreement on productivity comes down to one assumption that you are making: that there is no limit theoretically to market demand. However, I think the exhaustion of capital is exactly what we are seeing in the U.S. The U.S. consumer market is so over-spent that it has over-leveraged itself in debt to spend money that the consumer doesn't have. There is no shortage of good ideas and technology. And consumers still want this stuff. There is just no capital for it. In an effort to keep the markets ever-expanding, creditors created ways by which the consumer could convince him/herself that even though middle-class, they could afford that luxury car, or that boat, truck, 3500 sq. ft. house if it were just financed until 2115.

So if there were an endless supply of capital, or if capital were just some relative concept unattached to real value, then I'd agree with you. There would be no productivity increase in 30% unemployment because everyone should stay in the game and continue to try to create products to sell to people. Keep expanding the pie. But because capital is not a relative, "monopoly-money" concept, and it derives its worth from labor and value, there is a ceiling to the market. Not only have we hit that ceiling, but we've tried to debt-finance our way through it. It won't work. There will not be a true expansion of the economy until there is a paradigm-shifting technological/historical event, like mechanized-interchangeable parts, the assembly line, electricity, telephone, internet...

However, the capital for some potential expansion of the consumer market does exist in the U.S. The money just isn't in play and is focused in .005% of our population. If that were spread out amongst consumers, it could have some effect. 10 billion spread out over millions of consumers will expand the market much more effectively than 10 billion held between 5 guys. But this is really a different issue than U.S. manufacturing and production.

What many people don't realize, is that while employment in the manufacturing sector has dropped severely in the past 30 years, the U.S. is still the top manufacturing country in the world. From heavy machinery to automobiles to computer components. The manufacturing just isn't being done by people predominantly. The U.S. is still THE industrial/economic/consumer heavyweight in the world. It just doesn't need the labor inputs that were needed in the past.



203. on [June 18, 2010 at 11:49 am](#) *PRCalDude*

Grampa's posts are full of win. It pays to listen to your elders.



204. on [June 18, 2010 at 11:58 am](#) *Dalrock*

A few caveats to my thoughts on shifting financial incentives for divorce theft above. Someone is likely to point out that annuitizing all of your assets isn't a wise way to approach retirement. Unless you purchase inflation protection you have unacceptable exposure there. Moreover, emergencies can come up and this method doesn't allow for anything left over for heirs. I used this method because insurance products like this are generally the easiest way to tease the underlying reality out. In fact, if anything fully annuitizing understates his advantage because annuitizing allows him to maximize his spending. If they don't buy annuities they need to be more conservative in how much they can spend each month. As a married couple since he would likely die sooner this means that during retirement she would control even more of the marital assets (either to spend or bequeath). Most retirement planning aims for a steady income stream after accounting for inflation, so that would work out in her favor as well (living on an income designed for 2 after his death).

I'm not an expert on divorce law but it strikes me that this also suggests married men likely have a disincentive to annuitize much of the retirement assets. Had they bought a joint annuity with the full \$1 million the day before she watched Oprah, my guess is that in the divorce the monthly payments from the annuity would have been split evenly.



205. on [June 18, 2010 at 11:59 am](#) *rebelliousvanilla*

Sidewinder, actually tax rates are fairly important since it influences the decisions of people to open new businesses (combined with the costs of regulation). Actually, there is no difference in between regulations and taxes – they're both business costs that are taken into account. And the reason why Americans need two incomes to have a middle class life is the tax system. Just look at graphs who show how much tax rates increased in the last 60 years, combined with the non-adjusting by inflation of deductions (for kids, for example, which are a third of what they were in real terms in 1950).

Capital exhaustion comes from a lack of productivity. In aggregate terms, supply creates its own demand if you don't differentiate per goods classes and brands. The US consumer is overspent because it consumed more than he produced. And the go out and spend paradigm comes out of politicians not wanting to pay the political costs of recessions, hardly a growth solution. This is simply recession delaying, which leads to bigger recessions in the future (see the dot com becoming the housing bubble). Also, when somebody buys a good, the producer has the money and spends it on something else. The spent money doesn't just disappear. When you're too much into debt, which is the case of America and it was the case in 2000 too, you produce more and consume less, you don't go on a spending binge. So all of this isn't keeping markets ever expanding, it's just avoiding structural changes in the markets.

And no, there is no ceiling to capital. Sure, there's a shortage of capital in the American economy

because your country is bankrupt. There's no shortage of capital in Singapore. I have no idea how you see economics, to be honest. Your view is a complete mess. How can you say that spending borrowed money increases productivity? It doesn't. Actually, this is the way, combined with high taxes and regulations in which you cannibalized your industry. As I said, if America produced so much, you wouldn't have a trade deficit. And 1000 people buying bread or a rich dude buying a yacht is the same thing. Out of curiosity, what economics books did you read?

And by the way, if 30% of the people being unemployed helps, why not have just a dude employed and the rest just consuming?



206. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:17 pm](#) [Lexington Green](#)

Holy smokes.

Best post yet.

You have to write the damn book.



207. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:27 pm](#) [Gorbachev](#)

@Mike said on The End Of Beta Providers

This is so spot on correct it is scary. Essentially, my job is nothing but desk jockey multitasking with Excel. Nothing really creative, nothing requiring ingenuity or thinking. The other 2 women in my group appear to have no problem doing it day in day out. I personally find it maddening and soul-crushing and can't wait for the day I have enough saved to walk out the door and start my own business.

Towards the end of my marriage, I made it my overriding goal (along with saving my marriage, which didn't happen, thankfully), to convert my career from supporting people who did what I do to doing it: Getting out from behind a desk.

It made my life.

Best idea in the world.

Oh, and game.



208. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:41 pm](#) [Gorbachev](#)

@RMM

Love your story re: Not adapting to drudgery.

My experience:

I work in media, so the personalities tend to be very aggressive and relatively extroverted.

- In all support roles, men fare better than women; they're able to relax and laze in between moments in intense, brutal activity. In these moments of activity, you have to be 150% all the time, and there's no room anywhere for mistakes or errors.

- In front of the camera, all bets are off, but the women and men both tend to be showboaters. And neurotic. Of course.

Men are way better at this Intense – relax – Intense – relax style than women. There are women, but I'd say in my specific industry it's about 75-25%, if not 85-15.

Management: There are lots of women in middle-management, but for upper management, you need a special sort of bastard to be able to efficiently run things.

And women absolutely suck at this, generally.

Any woman who can do it is seen as a bitch and a cunt by everyone, because she probably doesn't have the same respect for her underlings that the bastard males have. It's not because they expect her to be nice, and are surprised by her cuntiness. There are men like this, too, but they're dragged off and beaten on a regular basis.

That said, there are a few good female top dogs. If they're married, which is about 50%, it's to serious Ueber-Alpha types, usually with money but always the kind of guy you never, ever want to cross because he takes pleasure from picking your sticky remains out of his shoe treads.

She may seem like an Iron Lady, but next to her, the husband is "Don't cross that bastard if you want to live."



209. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:44 pm](#) Gorbachev

@

The Sarlacc

Ah, seeing the food discuss things is always amusing. The bottom truth is a lot simpler: The mammalian system is a stupid evolutionary outcome.

...

I think your "transhumanism" will not get you far unless you start considering the premises and examining the desired outcome. Free advice from an evolutionary superior lifeform, take it as you will.

I love the Sarlacc.



210. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:46 pm](#) Gorbachev

@Badger Nation

I want to differentiate two ideas: work value and personal value.

The basic male work structure is one of hierarchical work value, where everyone has a job that fits into a ladder of accountability, some guys having major responsibilities and others doing grunt work on the bottom.

But there's basically flat personal value. The big dog is obviously a winner, but the group accords more or less equal respect to every member who does HIS job. Think of a football or baseball team – you do your job, you are “one of the guys.” It's actually the quarterback's job to praise the little-used backup receiver and whatnot to keep the overall team morale high.

The female work structure is the opposite – work value is built around shifting ideas of job description and a lack of hardcore “chain of command,” but the personal value is highly differentiated, with the queen bee on top and various levels existing underneath. So on the org chart it may look flat, there's a deep structure (hat tip to Chomsky) that regulates the group, and you have to pay proper tribute to the top or you will be left on the outside.

As we advance in our white-collar society, the personal nature of the jobs makes personal value blur with work value, which might explain your thesis that the corporate ladder fits well the female archetype.

Badger Nation: You got it exactly. The differential hierarchies are what I see every day. You put a voice to it. Thanks.



211. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:50 pm](#) Gorbachev

@josh

To those of us who care about the future and about civilization; what the fuck are we going to do?


- 1) Save money. Invest it well.
- 2) Don't vote for feminist policies or conservative white-knights
- 3) Buy things made in the West.
- 4) Build a compound

There's nothing you can do. The Enemies of Civilization own the Means of Communication. Nothing you can do.



212. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:52 pm](#) *Slayer*

I used to love this blog, but his diatribes have become way too long. Keep it tighter Roissy. What happened to Beta of the Month?



213. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:56 pm](#) *rebelliousvanilla*

I agree with what you should do related to the future with Gorbachev, except that I'd vote for Democrats and their pet idiots since the sooner the insanity collapses, the better. Also, I don't see why you'd feed unionized fatcats. Investing wisely and buying things made in the West are opposite things too. lol




214. on [June 18, 2010 at 12:59 pm](#) *TLM*

Roissy,

Your Translation comment “She’ll be a subpar surgeon” was absolutely spot on! Especially when it concerns the ObGyn field. Since feminism’s glorious rise, males entering the ObGyn field have dramatically decreased. Now you have over 80 to 88% of all ObGyns coming out of residency are chicks. Regardless of what any woman has to say, **THEY WILL NEVER BE AS GOOD AS SURGEONS AS MEN!** They have a tendency to shit the bed and lose it when something goes wrong intraoperatively. Many, and I mean many, are very poor technicians. Considering that men have better hand eye coordination and temperment in stressful situations, this is easily understood by those that have never been hoodwinked by the feminist dogma. Never let a chick surgeon operate on you!

Additionally, as it pertains to ObGyns, all of these women are coming out of residency and joining large female practices where they can essentially work part-time. Long gone are the days of the hard-working male ObGyn who puts in 16hrs a day delivering babies, performing hysterectomies, and seeing patients in the office. These men became highly proficient at each task and could handle about any complication thrown at them.

Now you have many women ObGyns who after joining these large groups will “specialize” in treating only Gyn problems or those that only practice the Ob side. Obviously this makes them not nearly as productive or experienced as the men ObGYns of old. Good luck ladies when your empowered female ObGyn perforates your uterine artery on a lap hysterectomy only to give you a lovely mid-line 8in incision because she couldn’t calm her hysterical (pun intended) nature down long enough to control the bleeding. But I’m sure it’s great you “feel” comfortable visiting a doctor that shares your gender.



215. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:11 pm](#) [rebelliousvanilla](#)

TLM, I wouldn't have a female ObGyn. At first I didn't want to have a male one, for obvious reasons, but after a couple of them that didn't please me (too brutal, not warming up the medical stuff before using it, which made me uncomfortable and not bonding with me in any way to make me ok with actually going to their office), I went to a male one, who remained my ObGyn ever since. Great guy – he is funny and makes me feel comfortable, he is delicate and treats me softly and so on. Really, I have nothing to complain about him.

I wonder why women are rougher during consults and stuff though.



216. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:31 pm](#) [Dalrock](#)

@RV

I wonder why women are rougher during consults and stuff though.

My wife has made the same observation, especially during her second pregnancy. We had to do several “Level II” Sonograms with a specialist. Two of the specialists were women, one was a man. The man was very gentle, and still got the best images. The one woman was in her late 20s I would guess, and was the next best. The worst was a 45 (guess) year old woman who was really bitchy both times we saw her.

I can't fault my wife for not wanting to go to a male OBGYN, but I do think she would get higher quality care overall if she did.

Great quote from Dracula Dead and Loving it:

Dr. Steward: Count Dracula, allow me to introduce Professor Abraham Van Helsing of London University. He's a doctor of rare diseases as well as theology and philosophy.

Van Helsing: And gynaecology.

Dr. Steward: Oh, I didn't know you had your hand in that!



217. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:33 pm](#) [Firepower](#)

So...you folks disagree with the positions in the Atlantic article.

Perhaps – if you view life through the realistic lens of Les Bar, SWANKBar or Opus Bar in Trendoid, AnyState, USA.

But, if you step outside your attendance at umpteenth Game Seminar Held by Famous Guru #50302-b3 to take a look at that thing called Real Life being played out on your Street, you may notice some creeping reality from the corner of your eye, as you remove your head from your ass.



218. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:34 pm](#) *You're mom*

1) Save money. Invest it well.

My take is get and stay debt free before investing. If you have debt, you can be controlled. If you are going to invest, do it in a way that your wealth cannot be destroyed by retards on Wall Street. Use accumulated cash to buy real estate and/or gold. Live on or near your real estate. Don't buy more than you can defend yourself with a rifle.

2) Don't vote for feminist policies or conservative white-knights

Check.

3) Buy things made in the West.

Pffft. I will support people who make decent stuff regardless of where they are located. Western manufacturing has been dominated by commie union thugs. They can kiss my ass.

4) Build a compound

Check.

Bonus: Find a good woman (yes, they do exist, if you can't find one you're looking in the wrong place), breed furiously, and raise your kids far far away from pop culture. The Dark Ages are coming, and the way you preserve civilization is by passing it on to the next generation yourself.



219. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:42 pm](#) *Justin*

Feminist realized awhile ago that there ideas were bullshit and go against human nature. Now its just about playing the "power" game. Women have been on the sidelines watching how men dominate and now they think they figured it out and are on a mission to rule the world so to speak. The anti male propaganda trains women how to be dominate. What they dont realize is that they can never be dominate. A real man will never be dominated by a women cuz he aint scared of her he knows she cant whoop his ass. All through out the animal kingdom the alpha male spot is earned by kickin ass! nobody fucks with the alpha male cuz they dont want an ass whoopin! If a women cant whoop my ass then she cant be alpha period!



220. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:44 pm](#) Doug1

What's your country Rebellious? Just curious. This isn't setting up a bait. You've said or implied a number of times that it isn't the US, and yet most of your country specific comments are about the US, and none that I've seen have talked about another country a lot. Canada?



221. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:46 pm](#) Dalrock

@TLM

Regardless of what any woman has to say, THEY WILL NEVER BE AS GOOD AS SURGEONS AS MEN!

Even worse, a black woman OBGYN.

The OBGYN practice my wife has always used added a black woman in between the birth of our daughter and our son. They had a policy of trying to get a different doc for each appt during pregnancy so you would "get to know them all". That way they can only have one doc on call for deliveries and you get pick of the draw. For our daughter this wasn't a big concern, as all of the docs seemed pretty good. For our son, every visit seemed to be with the one black doctor, who was obviously not on the ball. At first I assumed she had a cold and was just *really cloudy* that visit because she sniffled a bit. But she must have had allergies because the slight sniffle never stopped but she never got any clearer. She wasn't just slow in comparison to the doctors, but to all of the nurses as well. I've never seen anything like this before. I can only imagine how much affirmative action it took to get her there.

When our son was born we lucked out and the on call doc was from another practice they pooled with. She was very good, and handled a minor problem where the cord was wrapped around his neck very competently in my layman's view.




222. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:49 pm](#) PRCalDude

TLM,

I could have used this advice before my wife delivered. The female OB/GYN botched the episiotomy and had to be practically dragged back to fix it. Scar tissue developed after the "fix." I'm considering suing.

My wife has a new OB/GYN now who is also female, but there is a man in the area and I think we'd be better off seeing him the next time around for the reasons you mentioned.



223. on [June 18, 2010 at 1:57 pm](#) [rebelliousvanilla](#)

Also, I'd like to highlight something to you Gobrachov. Why should I buy Romanian made goods, for example, if they wouldn't be made by ethnic Romanians? I care about Somalis just as much if they live in Somalia or my country. Same with Chinese. If they're Chinese American or Chinese living in China, they're pretty much Chinese, you know?

I suggest you buy a huge house on a fixed interest long term mortgage with no downpayment. I think you will get a house for free.



224. on [June 18, 2010 at 2:04 pm](#) [Obstinence Works](#)

@rebelliousvanilla

Treats you softly? I read some of your blog. You're economically conservative I guess, and you are also hot. I'll pay you the highest compliment this redneck will a woman. You got a purty mouth.



225. on [June 18, 2010 at 2:04 pm](#) [omarion](#)

“To people who wonder what to do about the future – don't worry, just come with a different paradigm to replace Americanism. Get back to the Greco-Roman roots of European civilization. Tada.”

The sad part of this is the fact that old-school Americanism had a lot in common with the “Greco-Roman roots of European civilization”. This “classical” Americanism seemed to wither and die in the late 60s at the hands of Baby Boomers and has devolved into the absolute mess we have on our hands today.

Part of the problem honestly seems to be the fact that America has no idea what to do with itself if it doesn't have a strong economic and cultural competitor driving it forward (i.e., the USSR, Britain, etc). When the Cold War ended, for instance, we completely lost the plot and essentially have been loafing around ever since.



226. on [June 18, 2010 at 2:07 pm](#) [omarion](#)

“At first I assumed she had a cold and was just really cloudy that visit because she sniffled a bit. But she must have had allergies because the slight sniffle never stopped but she never got any clearer.”

Blowing coke, perhaps? Although that usually makes people somewhat sharper.



227. on [June 18, 2010 at 2:19 pm](#) *Gorbachev*

Advice from my great grandfather

My great grandfather was a legend in my family. He immigrated to the US as a single *man* at the age of 15.

When I was 22, my great-grandfather was 101. He was a serious “breeding” alpha.

When I was 16, he gave me this advice, when I told him I thought religion was bunkus (which I still do):

- Religion is great for keeping the wimmin in line.

When my grandmother jokingly asked him to give me and my brother advice about women and life, he said a lot, but this is all I remember. Some of it was white-knight stuff that no longer applies, but damn, did it work for him.

- Be a real man (he never explained this)

- Always talk politics with the Dad. Pretend to agree with the mom on anything religious. They know you're faking it, but the polite thing is to show you have respect and can pull it off.

- Keep it in your pants unless you want to get reamed. If you don't, shut the fuck up about it. Women will hate you, and women pull the strings.

- Never, ever trust a woman with a secret. Ever.

- Corollary: If you want something to go public and not have to take responsibility for doing it yourself, tell a woman.

- Do whatever is necessary to avoid going to war. Don't fight for other people, that's for dupes. Unless foreign troops are actually on your country's soil. If this is true, and you don't go and fight, you don't deserve to live. Any politician who lets foreign troops get on your country's soil should be killed.

He knew what he was talking about, too. He had stuff left over, in boxes, that he never talked about.

- Any woman who's been with more than 3 guys is a whore. Actually, he presumed any woman worth her salt would be a virgin. Don't touch whores (he meant don't marry them). He didn't say not to fuck them, now that I think about it.

- If you see a doctor, see two.

- Make very good friends with a mechanic. It'll save you thousands of dollars over your lifetime. They're also usually good people.
- Dancing is for pussies. On the other hand, if you want to dance, fucking do it well or don't bother. Half-assed jigging is for children.
- Never apologize for doing your job, even if you fuck up.
- Hold the door open for women. But don't let them tell you how to fix a radio.
- Don't make excuses for being a pussy. Any dimwit can drywall: figure out how to do it.
- Women are great, but we all have a role in life.
- If a woman hits you before you get married, dump her. If she does it after you get married, get another woman on the side who knows how to treat you well. If you can't dump her, hit her back. Never hit a woman first. Don't worry, they'll hit you soon enough.
- Be tough with your kids: Don't accept excuses. If they're being retarded or get in trouble, make sure they get the full force of the consequences. Help them to pick up the pieces after, but let them suffer the consequences.
- Save your money. Always, always, always save your money. Don't buy anything you don't actually need.
- Don't let your woman tell you how to do your job. Don't tell her how to wash dishes.
- Know this: Winter always comes. Save your money. Don't gamble.

He had a pretty good life:

- Married twice.

First marriage, age 18. First wife had 3 children, the 4th killed her.

Second marriage: His age: 26. My great-grandmother was 17. They had 14 children, 2 died.

Result: Serial monogamy, 18 children that survived to breed.

They all had at least 6 kids, most had 8.

Their kids (my parents' generation) had about 3 each.


Most in my generation have had some kids (about 1 each on average; I have 6 nieces/nephews alone).

At his 100th BD party, there were 530 direct descendants, many who couldn't be there. 5 generations.

An endless train of married-bred-in relatives, with 7 different countries represented:

US/UK/Canada/Aus/India/HK/Brazil.

Not too shabby. By my age, he created a village and it became a town.



228. on [June 18, 2010 at 2:33 pm](#) Tyrone

@JB

As I've said before, you have to reverse the Gramscian march through the institutions. You need to go on OFFENSE instead of allowing the cultural left to set the terms of the debate. You utilize every sphere — political, educational, economic. You organize. You recruit. You sacrifice your time and energy.

In other words, you have to beat the left at their own game.

That's all there is to it. It's that simple. You fight, you might win. You don't, you DEFINITELY lose.

Exactly. I've been saying this for a long time.




229. on [June 18, 2010 at 2:35 pm](#) Firepower

rebelliousvanilla...specul-ated:

TLM, I wouldn't have a female ObGyn. At first I didn't want to have a male one, for obvious reasons, but **after a couple of them that didn't please me (too brutal, not warming up the medical stuff before using it, which made me uncomfortable and not bonding with me** in any way to make me ok with actually going to their office), I went to a male one, who remained my ObGyn ever since. **Great guy – he is funny and makes me feel comfortable, he is delicate and treats me softly and so on. Really, I have nothing to complain about him.**

It sounds like you're ready to bring him home to meet the folks.



230. on [June 18, 2010 at 2:40 pm](#) Polichinello

That's one reason. The other reason is that young girls are simply easier to raise than young boys. I have little nieces and nephews, and it's easy to observe how much louder, rambunctious, temperamental, and ill-behaved the boys are compared to the girls.

As another posted alluded, just wait until the teen years. It's not just the dating scene, but the innate rivalry that springs up between mother and daughter for the father's attention. There are momma's boys and daddy's girls, but there's no such thing as a momma's girl. To one degree or another almost all resent their mothers until they hit 30 or so.

Really, boys aren't all that bad. They're cheaper to maintain, and if you use a firm hand up front, they fall in line pretty well. Women, however, aren't as good at controlling them as men, so that would explain the initial preference.



231. on [June 18, 2010 at 2:49 pm](#) *Badger Nation*

“Last time I checked, you have a current account deficit and a trade deficit.”

“The biggest myth comes from the idea that having unemployed people raises aggregate productivity. If you can produce more wealth due to productivity increases and sack 30% of the people, you can make even more wealth by employing those 30% too.”

That's not necessarily true. There are employees with negative effective productivity – their presence in either fucking up the workflow or pissing off their coworkers actually brings down the team's performance compared to not having them there. Let's say there are ten people and one fuckup...as a manager you are better off firing the fuckup, distributing his work to the other nine in 11% increments and giving them a commensurate raise, which will be higher than the fuckup's salary because the product is better without him.

The challenge of a society pushing productivity and efficiency is to develop a system to keep the takers fat and happy on the sideline, while not discouraging the producers from turning into takers themselves. I think it has to be based around a pride or shame principle, the idea that any able-bodied efficient person should work, and that the people who get welfare dollars are economic cripples the producers shouldn't want to so much as associate with.

I'm not advocating, just telling you what it would require.

“Socialism is bankrupt, just like communism.”

Socialism is bankrupt not because it keeps fuckups out of the workforce but because it incentivizes everybody to become fuckups and suck off the “steat” (the state teat).

Communism is bankrupt because command authoritarianism is a poor organizing principle in both directing resources and motivating the proletariat. “We pretend to work and they pretend to pay us.”



232. on [June 18, 2010 at 3:06 pm](#) *Badger Nation*

“Last time I checked, you have a current account deficit and a trade deficit.”

Unless pirates are raiding a country's shipping docks, trade deficit is a misnomer. The trade “deficit” is not a deficit...goods go out and money comes in, and vice versa. It's not a barter economy where if we don't export as much as we import we've gotten ripped off.



233. on [June 18, 2010 at 3:15 pm](#) *Dougl*

Trade deficits are generally financed in the long run by increased indebtedness. They can be financed by other foreign equity investments into America to, which is more benign, but still is shifting wealth towards the peoples of other nations.

America had a lot of room to increase it's national indebtedness in 1980, when it began. Ours was quite low then by international comparison, and remained up and down not too bad even by 2000. But the last decade has seen a huge and unsustainable increase in it.

Similar or worse problems are true in the most of the EU, other than Germany. Which has some issues but is now one of the strongest developed states, financially – except for it's demographics issue, which is by no means among the worst in the EU.

Canada since it's strong reforms in the 1990s is now looking better than most. East Asia of course, and some of the petro states, is where the huge surpluses and uber strong finances are. Even Brazil is NOW looking strong, since LuLu largely continued the economic polices of the strongly reforming long running predecessor conservative government there.



234. on [June 18, 2010 at 3:18 pm](#) *Badger Nation*

“I used to love this blog, but his diatribes have become way too long. Keep it tighter Roissy. What happened to Beta of the Month?”

Always going to be a few of these “dude, talk about bagging chicks.”

What the fu** do you think happened? The pressure of these times is producing timeless work from our dear blogger, and you want to laugh at betas?



235. on [June 18, 2010 at 3:22 pm](#) *Badger Nation*

Dougl,

Nice analysis. My point was simply that the “trade deficit” is not a problem per se, the way a budget deficit is; it indicates a macroeconomic structural trend with consequences.

As I understand it, a trade surplus nation (a la oil countries) have access to everybody else's currency and thus can drive other nations' monetary and bond policies. A net importer has the opposite problem, it lets everybody else pee in its swimming pool.



236. on [June 18, 2010 at 3:51 pm](#) *Badger Nation*

“- Any woman who’s been with more than 3 guys is a whore. Actually, he presumed any woman worth her salt would be a virgin. Don’t touch whores (he meant don’t marry them). He didn’t say not to fuck them, now that I think about it.”

If only we could discuss this sort of thing in public. Girls give me crap when I explain that guys try to get girls to give it up quickly but you shouldn’t take the bait. They respond with horror; I explain it’s women who are master of shit tests, of asking men to do something and when they do it the woman loses respect for him. Men basically have one shit test, the slut test.

“- If you see a doctor, see two.”

Hell yeah. I’ve had no fewer than three bizarre, allegedly catastrophic diagnoses overturned by competent second opinions in the last two years.

“- Make very good friends with a mechanic. It’ll save you thousands of dollars over your lifetime. They’re also usually good people.”

Make friends with people who can do things with their hands. Way too many paper pushers in today’s economy.

“- Dancing is for pussies. On the other hand, if you want to dance, fucking do it well or don’t bother. Half-assed jigging is for children.”

Ballroom-style dancing can backfire into betatude, but if played right, it’s alpha training. Be bold, invite the woman to be your dance partner, learn to push her and pull her firmly, embrace your role as the lead. My game skills went up after I took a ballroom class (not to mention preselection opportunities if the class has hot girls).

“- Never apologize for doing your job, even if you fuck up.”

Again the male code, do your job and you are one of the guys. Too many manginas today are looking to suck up to the boss before they go home and suck up to the wife.

“- Hold the door open for women. But don’t let them tell you how to fix a radio.”

Yes, remember that comfort is key to game – death of chivalry does not equal rudeness.

“- Don’t make excuses for being a pussy. Any dimwit can drywall: figure out how to do it.”

With the Internet there’s literally no excuse for not being able to do any basic household task.

“- Women are great, but we all have a role in life.”

Men are sold on the mystique of women from childhood. It’s silly. They’re just people.

“- If a woman hits you before you get married, dump her. If she does it after you get married, get another woman on the side who knows how to treat you well. If you can't dump her, hit her back. Never hit a woman first. Don't worry, they'll hit you soon enough.”

Gramps didn't live in the era of no-fault vaginamony.

“- Be tough with your kids: Don't accept excuses. If they're being retarded or get in trouble, make sure they get the full force of the consequences. Help them to pick up the pieces after, but let them suffer the consequences.”

YES. Be a parent, NOT your kid's best friend. Unless you are Bill Gates or the POTUS, kids are your only real legacy; use them to invest in civilization.

“- Save your money. Always, always, always save your money. Don't buy anything you don't actually need.”

People buy so much shit they don't need it blows my mind to kingdom come.

“- Don't let your woman tell you how to do your job. Don't tell her how to wash dishes.”

Signs of controlling behavior must be gamed or dumped immediately. Learn to tell control apart from somebody wanting to help and contribute, which calls for a “thank you but I've got this covered” response.

“- Know this: Winter always comes. Save your money. Don't gamble.”

And get a rifle. You better damn believe it. Be the ant, not the grasshopper, and don't forget the story of the little red hen.



237. on [June 18, 2010 at 3:57 pm](#) *Dougl*

rebelliousvanilla-

I care about Somalis just as much if they live in Somalia or my country.

If both honest and accurately self knowing and assessing it's quite unusual. It's not such an unusual posture among the liberal intelligencia or those much influenced by them or aping them throughout the West. But usually it's heavily that. As well it tends to be a very ideological, forebrain type thought, as opposed to most people's gut feeling, or really how they'd tend to act if feeling threatened or otherwise in less good circumstances.

I certainly don't remotely feel that way about Somalis. In fact though I have no doubt there are many great Somalis, as a culture there's not much I like about it, with it's current quasi anarchy and war lordism. And it's strong tendency for widespread organized brigandage engaged in by large parts of the population. As seen in the huge extortions and extractions form foreign aid groups, UN and

otherwise, which brought on the US humanitarian/bringing order mission in the 90s, that Clinton withdrew when virtually all armed Somalis in Mogodishu, controlled by one of the most predatory brigandage clan and warlord, tried to kill as many Americans as possible, hiding behind their own civilians as a general matter. Portrayed in the apparently well researched book *Black Hawk Down*, which I read, and by the movie of same name. Yeah the US had gone after Mododishu's top warlord Aidid and some of his top lieutenants only in a failed raid, after they refused in negotiations to cease their brigandage on UN and NGO aid convoys.

Oh and Somali piracy. No I don't find it romantic. Pirates used to be summarily hanged or otherwise executed and should be again. No I'm not a Euro lefty bleeding heart. Or if pirates were enough of a problem, as they are from Somalia, their towns and villages used to be burned to the ground and or shelled to rubble, perhaps after a seafaring nation declared war on their nation or local warlords refusing or unable to reign in the pirates operating from their soil and sanctuary. See e.g. the US Marines war on the Barbary Coast states and pirates, as ordered by Thomas Jefferson. See some of the British treatment of pirates and pirate states in the 18th and 19th centuries.



238. on [June 18, 2010 at 7:41 pm](#) [rebelliousvanilla](#)

Doug1, my point was that I don't give a flying cat about Somalis regardless where they live. If they'd live across the street from me, they'd be the same people as those living in Somalia. Completely irrelevant. You took it the wrong way. lol

Badger, any man who can dance any ballroom style had +5 points from me. But I'm biased since I was fairly into it for quite a while in my life. The only way you can get minus points is if you lie that you're good and you're crap or you want me to lead. If you're ok at it and you take the lead, I'm going to like it, even if I'm most likely a better dancer than you. Oh, and as a female, I try to explain that men care about the number of sexual partners that we have to other girls only when they care about us. I'm a woman and they refuse to listen to me and say it's unfair. And yes, basically China can control American policy. If I was the Chinese PM, I'd call Obama and tell him that if he doesn't repeal Obamacare in two months, I'm dumping all the US treasuries on the market. It goes like this. The Americans did it to the British related to the Suez, for example.

Also, the trade deficit is actually worse than the budget deficit. A budget deficit can be financed by the population of a country, like the Japanese do. Basically, the Japanese government owes its debt to the Japanese citizens. This isn't a huge problem. The real budget deficit issue comes when mostly foreigners own the debt since they gain control over policy to a certain degree (just like with the trade deficit). Still, in the trade deficit case, the US is more complicated to explain due to the USD being the reserve currency. I won't really get into it here, but I will tell you that exporting without importing is utterly idiotic. Or at least hoarding fiat money is utterly idiotic.

And another thing, money is worthless. The purpose of foreign trade is to profit out of the comparative advantage of other countries. For example, my country makes cheap cars and we sell them to Germans. Germans make tanks and they sell them to us. If the value is equal, there's no problem. What's the interest of my country in hoarding Euros if the productive capacity behind the Euro is gone (Germans making tanks)? None. It's the same with America. Also, technically, due to the

peg of the yuan, you are exporting inflation for Chinese goods. Since they want to keep their currency tied to yours, they expand their own money supply when inflation goes up in the US. So they basically lose twice on trading with you. In a sane world, they'd just cut their currency loose and let the dollar fall through the floor. Then yes, when you'd have deficits, the USD would go down even more. The whole world's monetary system is a huge joke due to the dollar being the reserve currency.

Also, if someone is a parasite in the workforce, he will get fired. If I'd be a manager, I'd fire him. And if he won't change, he will starve to death or make a lousy pay as a crap shoveler where his negative productivity won't matter that much. Wages in a free market are reflected by productivity so the fuck up won't make the same as the others. The whole point of being a producer is to be a taker though. There are no fuckups. Heck, I will pay those unemployed fuckups \$20 a month to clean my room. Better than being unemployed.

Polymath, I loved my father more ever since I could say daddy. lol. Actually, I didn't really care in any way about my mother until my teenage years. I bonded with her a lot more since then since we started to have common fields of interest – like her teaching me how to not be played out by men and other womanly issues. Now I love my parents both in more or less the same way.

omarion, the Greco-Roman roots of European civilization died in the American Civil War and French revolution. Since then all it took is knocking down the remaining pillars that supported the old.

Obstinance, I'm conservative in all the ways possible. Since you didn't read my comments at Mangan's or GoV or my debate on my own blog, I'd pretty much turn the clock back about 200-250 years and start from a fresh base.

Dalrock, to be honest, I was really uncomfortable about spreading my legs to a man too(the circumstances made it even more uncomfortable too). Still, it was by far one of the best medical decisions I took about my life(he was also really nice since I called him once during the night due to a functional ovarian cyst). Maybe women were rough out of sexual envy? Related to surgeons, I had good experiences with both women and men. Women seemed to have better bedside manners though(public care so that's optional, I guess).



239. on [June 18, 2010 at 8:22 pm](#) *Rum*

In my humble opinion, this blog has attracted an amazingly bright group of commenters. I mean, 99.99% of web comments in most places are no more intelligent or insightful than a fart; whereas this place continues to be rather compelling.

[editor: ow, my balls! i'm 'batin.]

240. on [June 18, 2010 at 8:33 pm](#) [Economic Issues | Safety Culture | Conservative Politics | Considerations](#)

[...] [...]



241. on [June 18, 2010 at 8:38 pm](#) *Badger Nation*

daedelus,

“Badger, any man who can dance any ballroom style had +5 points from me. But I’m biased since I was fairly into it for quite a while in my life. The only way you can get minus points is if you lie that you’re good and you’re crap or you want me to lead. If you’re ok at it and you take the lead, I’m going to like it, even if I’m most likely a better dancer than you.”

My ballroom class beat the last throes of latent betatude out of me. It was the responsibility of the lead that finally opened my eyes wide to the degree women hate the beta. All I had to do was watch other guys (or in occasional cases, me) stumble awkwardly and see the look of disgust and disappointment in the women’s eyes.

Not knowing the steps is not even an excuse; the game is played thusly – the man leads and the woman follows. It builds attraction and comfort at the same time. Like girls at the club who are begging to be gamed, the women want to be led or they wouldn’t be at the damn dance hall to begin with. (BTW, the dreaded “back-lead” is the ballroom equivalent of the ball-busting lawyer chick.)

Like basic game, the steps for northern ballroom are not difficult. I won’t even go into the advanced dance-game of the Latin dances, except to say you can pick up the gina tingles in the room with a seismograph.

A man who doesn’t know the steps but firmly and confidently leads his partner through whatever he makes up is a ten times better experience than a guy who knows the steps but is timid leading them. I have found this transfers well to both socializing and sex.

A thinker’s job is to be right. A leader’s job is to lead. Women like leaders. Don’t confuse the two.

“I won’t really get into it here, but I will tell you that exporting without importing is utterly idiotic. Or at least hoarding fiat money is utterly idiotic.”

But that’s backwards of America – we don’t manufacture most of what we consume, we import more than we export, and we send fiat money overseas for places like China to hoard.



242. on [June 18, 2010 at 8:40 pm](#) *gig*

In my humble opinion, this blog has attracted an amazingly bright group of commenters

true



243. on [June 18, 2010 at 8:48 pm](#) *Badger Nation*

Rum,

“In my humble opinion, this blog has attracted an amazingly bright group of commenters.”

I agree. I love the fact that we have subthreads going on about female gynecologists, male-female work structures, trade deficit, fiat money and butthex (obligatory), and what nationality you should buy your manufactured products from.

I think it's that Roissy is such a hard hitter that haters and trolls, unless unusually intelligent and inured to rough-and-tumble, can't last long. This is a debate meritocracy...pretty lies are pushed out of the discussion quickly.



244. on [June 18, 2010 at 9:41 pm](#) *epiclolz*

the anger and vitriol in her prose betrays the resentment of a person who is frustrated can't exercise their own power upon the mating market place. she speaks as if this were truly a karmic justice, righting all her past wrongs or compensating for past inability to exercise her power.



245. on [June 18, 2010 at 9:45 pm](#) *gig*

omarion, the Greco-Roman roots of European civilization died in the American Civil War and French revolution. Since then all it took is knocking down the remaining pillars that supported the old.

It always amazes me how people manage to introduce the most unrelated subjects imaginable into a conversation.

It started with beta providers. Now we reached the Greeks and Romans. What about the Carthaginians? No one will talk about them just because they were Africans???



246. on [June 18, 2010 at 10:55 pm](#) *Jeffrey of Troy*

Roissy (Roissies?),

Reading your post on HR's article, a question occurred to me that I'm now wondering why I never wondered it before: why are there so many fucking men in the world?

Seriously, there are at least twice as many as we need. Biologically, each man can impregnate many women. In Hunter-Gatherer times, it wouldn't have taken many men to go out in a small party, kill a mammoth, and drag its carcass back to share with the tribe. Why do you need any more men than that? Maybe a few to protect the women and children from predators (humans and otherwise) while the hunting party is out.

But then came The Agricultural Revolution, and the cities it caused. Very labor intensive. This also fits with the different IQ distribution for men versus women. Many average-to-stupid men to do mindless physical work that would drive a smart man crazy, and also a few really smart guys to keep track of all the activities of a city of a few thousand people.

However, as this site has pointed out many times, most women – and especially the hotties – would rather either share an alpha or go without than let a beta have her. Women can go a long time without sex. They may not like it; it may not even be healthy. But they don't kill over it. Millions of men see the hotties, want to fuck them, can't, and you get wars. Or that guy with the rifle in the aerobics class.

Now we've come full circle. Technology and efficient methods have rendered a billion+ men obsolete – we've returned to hunter-gatherer ratios. Only the actual population on the ground hasn't caught up. Gonna be a rough ride.

But Hanna is wrong about two things: we still need some men (specifically the smart ones), and we still need “traditional” (biological) gender roles.



247. on [June 18, 2010 at 10:59 pm](#) [Jeffrey of Troy](#)

“Now smashing shit up... that's fun!”

or creating greatness. From Fallingwater to the 458 Italia.



248. on [June 18, 2010 at 11:05 pm](#) [Jeffrey of Troy](#)

Sidewinder

“The only solution the human race has come up with is socialism or communism. Communism can't work because top down control of economic markets can never react fast enough, or accurately enough. Socialism can work for a generation or two, but by then the drive for innovation in the society is eroded by more and more rational actors figuring out that its better to be a free-rider than a producer.”

Any description of the world that completely leaves out the psychopaths (people whose brain defect makes them unable to feel they've done anything wrong) is some sort of lie. They are only 1-2% of the population, but their influence is way beyond their numbers.



249. on [June 18, 2010 at 11:10 pm](#) [Jeffrey of Troy](#)

Anon

“Hanna Rosin had her kids named RosinPlotz, after her last name and her husband’s last name. I wonder what their wedding vows were?”

Keep in mind that a lot of liberal, leftist garbage is spouted by JEWS.

There is something innate in them that makes them seek to undermine the established patriarchy of whatever nation-state, not named Israel, that they are living in.

Jews sing a siren song of leftist, liberal politics to foment dissent among the non-Jew populace, even though Jews themselves are EXTREMELY CONSERVATIVE when it comes to their JEWISH ESTABLISHMENT.”

SOME jews have long promoted multiculturalism in every nation – except Israel – to make other safer for the jews who live there, regardless of the damage done to the host nation. A book called “The Culture of Critique” is about this, and a great review is here:

nations<http://www.heretical.com/miscellx/culturec.html>



250. on [June 18, 2010 at 11:47 pm](#) [samseau](#)

“It always amazes me how people manage to introduce the most unrelated subjects imaginable into a conversation.


It started with beta providers. Now we reached the Greeks and Romans. What about the Carthaginians? No one will talk about them just because they were Africans???”

Dude man... the greeks and the romans. Kind of a big deal. Definitely had some of the best social organization known to history, and produced some amazing achievements.

Our greco-roman heritage has never really died, but it was fundamentally changed after the enlightenment. That’s why it has appeared to die, but it’s just evolving into something bigger and better.

I would compare the european enlightenment’s achievements to Athens achievements, and America’s achievements to Rome’s achievements.

Like Rome, we’ve produced little of original value compared our heritage; like Greece, the intellectual achievements of the enlightenment thinkers have yet to be surpassed.



251. on [June 19, 2010 at 12:13 am](#) [rebelliousvanilla](#)

samseau, actually once America will collapse, probably all the alterations done to the sound Greco-Roman system would be aborted, hopefully anyway. A lot of the Enlightenment ideas are things that need to be made illegitimate. The whole quest of equality, with its offshoot of non-discrimination, universal egalitarianism and so on need to die. And what has America produced culturally? I mean, besides exporting multiculturalism, feminism and all this 1960s crap and the 1910s Wilsonian garbage? Rome actually became so great that the city itself became irrelevant and it spread itself across Europe. America when will collapse, Americanism will collapse with it.

Badger, I agree about dance. About America's economy though, this dynamic will come to an end. And then if Americans will want to consume, they'll have to produce. You're going bankrupt because you're backwards. lol



252. on [June 19, 2010 at 1:25 am](#) [samseau](#)

“samseau, actually once America will collapse, probably all the alterations done to the sound Greco-Roman system would be aborted, hopefully anyway. A lot of the Enlightenment ideas are things that need to be made illegitimate. The whole quest of equality, with its offshoot of non-discrimination, universal egalitarianism and so on need to die.”

Just as there were plenty of bad ideas produced during the greco-roman era, so too have plenty of bad ideas come out of the enlightenment. This does not mean there is no merit to greek philosophy or enlightenment philosophy.

Hobbes (not really enlightenment, but whatever) – Descartes – Locke – Hume – Rousseau – Kant revolutionized ethics, epistemology, and politics that ushered in a new age of science, government, psychology, and art.

The problem with the enlightenment was its 19th-20th century bastard offspring, Hegel – Marx – Comte – Mach – Heidegger – Wittgenstein.

Regardless of the bad philosophers to have come since the enlightenment, the enlightenment thinkers I listed were just as good as any of the ancients, some even rivaling Plato and Aristotle (hello Kant).

The good enlightenment ideas will live on, as Locke lives through the US Constitution, as Kant lives through the scientific revolution, and even still most of the great thinkers of the enlightenment have yet to be fully appreciated (hello Rousseau).

As America dies the great enlightenment ideas will profligate once again; the sophistry that followed it shall fade.



253. on [June 19, 2010 at 1:29 am](#) *samseau*

Little blonde, are you even aware that the Austrian economics you espouse so much on your blog is a direct heritage of Kantian epistemology?



254. on [June 19, 2010 at 2:02 am](#) *Black and white*

Little blonde, are you even aware that the Austrian economics you espouse so much on your blog is a direct heritage of Kantian epistemology?

Bullshit. The origins are the Spanish monks and it later progressed to Britain.

Kant had an influence, but an epistemology? No.



255. on [June 19, 2010 at 2:53 am](#) *Jason*

Rebelliousvanilla, I thought you were a cool chick until you spouted typical eurotrash drivel. “And what has America produced culturally?” I got news for you, multiculturalism was a mainstay of European culture before the US ever existed.



256. on [June 19, 2010 at 3:25 am](#) *Breezy*

“In a stark reversal since the 1970s, men are now more likely than women to hold only a high-school diploma. “One would think that if men were acting in a rational way, they would be getting the education they need to get along out there,” says Tom Mortenson, a senior scholar at the Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education. “But they are just failing to adapt.”

Three years ago, I dropped out of college for a semester to take a break and just chill and make a little bit of money to support myself. I lived in Amherst at the time and being brown, male, and not SWPL enough, couldn’t get hired at places like the Black Sheep. The only job I could land in that oppressive job market was at Subway. One of my coworkers was a high school senior attending vocational school to become an electrician.

Despite making the “rational” decision to pursue a journalism degree at Umass, I eventually moved back home around the time the stock market crashed to find no job openings at the few newspapers that are left. The few writing jobs left were in special interest publications geared towards a female audience.

My old coworker, on the other hand, got a nice paying job as an electrician right out of high school. The last I heard from him he started working at Western Mass Electric making \$50K a year. If only I had taken CAD or carpentry instead of calculus, I wouldn't put myself tens of thousands of dollars in debt to pursue a liberal arts degree that would put me in direct competition with the glut of under employed and over educated people out there with their bachelors and masters.

My story has a happy ending. I went blue collar and opened an alterations shop. I make any where from \$20 to \$100 an hour fixing clothes. It may not be masculine or prestigious, but I get to flirt with women all day and they pay me expand the waistline of their skirts, because of the fat accumulates on their asses from sitting in office chairs all day writing about dresses.

[editor: this reads like a lost chapter out of fight club. i like it.]



257. on [June 19, 2010 at 3:41 am](#) Ronin

THUMBS UP!!



258. on [June 19, 2010 at 3:50 am](#) Browncoat


@rebelliousvanilla

Have to disagree with you here. The Chinese see themselves as a people and a chosen people at that, this is much more powerful than seeing yourself as a nation. I've lived right next door to Chinatown for 30 years now and have gotten to know them pretty well.

As for multiculturalism Red China constantly spews this as official policy because in fact today's China is much a much bigger place than just the Chinese homeland. Everyone there pretends to believe this crap but only officially, in private they do not.

My post was a tongue in cheek tip of the hat to Joss W., as a non American it is possible you did not get the reference. Google, "firefly", "Serenity" and "Browncoat".

Like your blog by the way.



259. on [June 19, 2010 at 8:34 am](#) rebelliousvanilla

Browncoat, that's what all sane nations(old definition) do – see themselves as a different and special people.

samseau, I didn't say we should discard the whole European Enlightenment, just the current ideals.

For example, I like Locke's work, but his tabula rasa philosophy is crappy, besides false. All these ideas will be purged.



260. on [June 19, 2010 at 9:24 am](#) *samseau*

R”Bullshit. The origins are the Spanish monks and it ater progressed to Britain. Kant had an influence, but an epistemology? No.”

Considering you used the word epistemology incorrectly, its doubtful you know what you are talking about.

Little blonde, tabla rasa isn't that crazy when we consider 97% of our behavior is learned. See: feral children.



261. on [June 19, 2010 at 9:26 am](#) *Anonymous*

“In my humble opinion, this blog has attracted an amazingly bright group of commenters. I mean, 99.99% of web comments in most places are no more intelligent or insightful than a fart; whereas this place continues to be rather compelling.”

A few days ago someone suggested that Roissy make his articles “Shareable” on Facebook. I agree. It would spread like wildfire.



262. on [June 19, 2010 at 9:45 am](#) *OhioStater*

As I realize Roissy equals the truth, the more I realize America is doomed.



263. on [June 19, 2010 at 11:32 am](#) *Badger Nation*

“A few days ago someone suggested that Roissy make his articles “Shareable” on Facebook. I agree. It would spread like wildfire.”

I think this would bring on way more trolls. Roissy is smart to keep his Internet identity contained and highly pseudonymized.



264. on [June 19, 2010 at 12:05 pm](#) [sdaedalus](#)

@BadgerNation

daedelus,

“Badger, any man who can dance any ballroom style had +5 points from me. But I’m biased since I was fairly into it for quite a while in my life. The only way you can get minus points is if you lie that you’re good and you’re crap or you want me to lead. If you’re ok.....

Although addressed to moi, I suspect this is really intended for the lovely (and equally pale-skinned) Rebellious Vanilla. I must say, I’m very flattered, but I don’t have much to add on the subject of ballroom dancing.

265. on [June 20, 2010 at 12:02 am](#) [Weekend Link Fest – Father’s Day Edition « Seasons of Tumult and Discord](#)

[...] The Sexual Market Stripped Naked, Women Don’t Want You To Remember Everything About Them, The End Of Beta Providers, Study Confirming My View Of The Job-Sexual [...]



266. on [June 20, 2010 at 1:07 am](#) [Word Around the Campfire – the Father Knows Best edition « Hidden Leaves](#)

[...] Renegade: Women Don’t Want You to Remember Everything About Them, The End of Beta Providers, and God’s Perfect [...]



267. on [June 20, 2010 at 5:13 am](#) [Bob Smith](#)

The picture emerging is a mirror image of the traditional gender map: men and markets on the side of the irrational and overemotional, and women on the side of the cool and levelheaded.

I can’t help but notice the not so hidden socialism in this quote. If women are so levelheaded, why didn’t they predict the market crash?

I can see an innate advantage in communicating, as women are generally more extraverted and verbally adept than men

Women do indeed *speak more* than men do. Verbal adeptness, however, is not *communicating*. I see the verbally adept use that skill much more often in the service of deceit and obfuscation than in the

service of improved communication. Indeed, I think the proposition that women are better *communicators* a rather dicey one. Exhibit one: the frequency with which women demand men read their minds to determine the meaning of their spoken words.



268. on [June 20, 2010 at 6:01 am](#) *RevoRob*

“That same testosterone that causes men to make risky stock market decisions also causes them to risk building gleaming civilizations and all the creature comforts therein that you ingrate feminists couldn’t live without.”

Amen to that. If I had five cents for every time I have heard some idiot feminist (a redundant statement as ALL feminists are idiots), I could retire. Is it coincidence that 99.96% of all patents taken out are held by men? Of course not. We, the superior sex, built the world. Dopey women just decorate it and populate it with their cuckold babies.

To paraphrase another correspondent: “If there were no men, women would be living in dark caves, shivering in the cold and wondering why there’s nothing to eat”.

269. on [June 20, 2010 at 6:03 am](#) [Linkage is Good for You: Amusing Coincidence Edition \(NSFW\)](#)

[...] Sexual Market Stripped Naked“, “The Self-Deception of the White Knight“, “The End of Beta Providers“, “Study Confirming My View of the Job-Sexual Marketplace Nexus“, [...]



270. on [June 20, 2010 at 9:51 am](#) *gig*

As I realize Roissy equals the truth, the more I realize America is doomed.

America is not alone in that...



271. on [June 20, 2010 at 11:21 am](#) *Brando*

gig,

The entire industrialized world and any brown hordes that depend on it are doomed. Near-term – ten years till serious shit hits the fan at most.

Look at a graph of human population with a scale of even as little as 2k years, and it’s obvious: were yeast in a petree dish. The yeast doesn’t know it depends on the medium...it just eats it till its gone, then dies. We have exploded in population by exploiting FINITE resources that are becoming

exponentially more expensive and environmentally dangerous to procure.

That aside, I was wondering if anyone could tell me how to anonymously email this fucking awesome article to a certain high priestess of academic misandry who professionally vomits forth her projection at my old college...?



272. on [June 20, 2010 at 1:35 pm](#) Ronin

The mind that is anxious about future events is miserable.

Seneca



273. on [June 20, 2010 at 1:44 pm](#) xsplat

More, Walawala; once you cultivate this sense of command and stop saying please, your woman will be offended and hurt if you say please before asking her to do something. She'll assume you think she doesn't love you.

NEVER say please. It means you don't deserve her labor.

Her labor is her love. You deserve it, and you demand it.

“Make me a carrot juice.”



274. on [June 20, 2010 at 6:50 pm](#) Gorbachev

@rebelliousvanilla


Also, I'd like to highlight something to you Gobrachov. Why should I buy Romanian made goods, for example, if they wouldn't be made by ethnic Romanians? I care about Somalis just as much if they live in Somalia or my country. Same with Chinese. If they're Chinese American or Chinese living in China, they're pretty much Chinese, you know?

I suggest you buy a huge house on a fixed interest long term mortgage with no downpayment. I think you will get a house for free.

That game's over, my Romanian friend. Alas I never played it.

You still never did answer Biktopia's question: How do you feel about Hungarians in Romania, and the big piece of Hungary Romania ate? Or the Gypsies, I'd love to hear about them.

Just curious.



275. on [June 20, 2010 at 7:06 pm](#) [rebelliousvanilla](#)

Gorbachev, I don't care about answering your questions. My questions were rhetorical. In case you forgot it, go over the post where I said I don't care again.



276. on [June 20, 2010 at 7:20 pm](#) [Gorbachev](#)

@Jeffrey of Troy

WTF is it with the Jew-baiting. Anti-semites are so half-bright, it shows how a little information is deadly.

Keep in mind that a lot of liberal, leftist garbage is spouted by JEWS.

There is something innate in them that makes them seek to undermine the established patriarchy of whatever nation-state, not named Israel, that they are living in.

*Jews sing a siren song of leftist, liberal politics to foment dissent among the non-Jew populace, even though Jews themselves are **EXTREMELY CONSERVATIVE** when it comes to their **JEWISH ESTABLISHMENT.**"*

SOME jews have long promoted multiculturalism in every nation – except Israel – to make other safer for the jews who live there, regardless of the damage done to the host nation. A book called "The Culture of Critique" is about this, and a great review is here:

nations<http://www.heretical.com/miscellx/culturec.html>

I have to tell you: You know nothing. It's conspiracy crap. Picking apart Anti-Semitic drivel is so easy, it's almost unfair.

- Leftist Jews are Israel's greatest enemies. The Syrians respect Israel, believe me. So do the Egyptians the Jordanians. With good reason. It's an enemy they truly respect. New York Jews are Israel's greatest allies and greatest enemies.

Most Israelis just want them all to fuck off.

- Jews intermarry and disappear at a huge rate. A vast segment of the white-American population has Jewish blood. A small core of Jews stick to their own. In the 1920's, 3 of 6 Jewish kids married non-Jews. The rate today is roughly 40% exogamy. The kids disappear into the general population.

Don't like Jewish blood? Start killing off white people randomly, 'cause this is the only way to get rid of it.

BTW, this has been going on for 2000 years. Blame the Romans: At one time, 20% of Southern France had jewish blood or self-identified as some kind of "Jew"; in England, most Jews assimilated long before North America was colonized rather than get expelled or discriminated against.

White Anglo blood is powerfully Jewish. It's demonstrable. Hitler knew this, and said that England might have absorbed the best of the Jewish contagion, but that England and English culture remained hopelessly contaminated by Jewishness.

He was delusional, but in this respect, he was exactly correct.

- Jews have grossly over-contributed to every country they live in. America is 2x better off with its Jews than without. This was the hallucinogenic error Hitler made: Jews made the German state strong. He wiped out a singular advantage he had: an almost perfectly integrated German Jewish population that was absolutely German and profoundly productive.

- Anti-Semitism is shit. Every single argument it makes is disingenuous and misleading and always omits crucial information. Not one – not one – holds a drop of water.

- I can make a very strong case for Scottish people trying to take over the world and usurping the British Empire and its financial establishment for this purpose, helping to invent the modern financial system.

And frankly, I can make a better case for this than any anti-Semite can for the Jews.

Jew-Baiting.



277. on [June 20, 2010 at 8:55 pm](#) Gorbachev

@rebelliousvanilla

Gorbachev, I don't care about answering your questions. My questions were rhetorical. In case you forgot it, go over the post where I said I don't care again.

It wasn't my question. It was Biktopia's. And I can guess why you didn't answer it. Says more than I need to know.

But I didn't want to put words in your mouth and assume what you thought, as a "european" white-supremacist, about the Hungarians living in Romania and the effect on Romania as a nation.

I know Hungary and Romania share a lot of words on this subject. Most of them expletives. And mostly because of Romania's oh most "liberal" view of their Hungarian co-citizens.

Mono-ethnic Microstates indeed.

The Balkans and their supremacists have nothing to teach us about social politics except what not to do.



278. on [June 21, 2010 at 1:07 pm](#) BDS

Here's my bet: Rosin eventually tries to save face by saying her article was "satire," "tongue-in-cheek," or some other condescending way of saying she didn't mean it. I'll put the over/under for this at this Friday.



279. on [June 21, 2010 at 1:56 pm](#) polymath

Gorb, I believe RV has said in the past that she is a Euro mix. One may reasonably identify one's ethnicity as "European" if having significant ancestry from more than one European country. (If the countries themselves are ethnically related, such as Norway and Denmark, one could use a mid-level classification like "Scandinavian", but if they are not particularly related apart from being European, such as Hungary and Romania, then calling oneself "European" makes the most sense.)



280. on [June 21, 2010 at 3:23 pm](#) robert61

Hanna Rosin is ugly. Sorry, didn't have the energy to see whether any of the previous 286 commenters have noted this, but there you have it: she's a pig. And sorry to breach the Semitic reserve, but she's a Jewish-looking pig.



281. on [June 22, 2010 at 12:09 am](#) Kilroy

For the benefit of readers who can't find the post Roissy is referring to, I have located it and am posting it verbatim below:

"ROSIN: LAST CALL FOR DATASETS!

I have repeatedly requested your substantiation for the claims asserted in this article. But you must just be too darn busy in your "postindustrial society" publishing feminist screed in online and paper publications (big computer servers, printing production equipment, electric power grid), and being transported (by car, jet, bus on asphalt pavement) to television interviews (w-video production equipment). Ok, to me, your life sounds mundanely industrial, but I'm willing to provide you the benefit of the doubt, IF you cough up your statistical sources. I've asked for them before and I'm tired of waiting.

Rosin: "Earlier this year, women became the majority of the workforce for the first time in U.S. history."

Really? The US Bureau of Labor Statistics doesn't show that. Civilian labor force, 16 years and over,

per BLS is comprised of 82M men and 72M women. <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.t01.htm>
Perhaps we should be looking at the employment participation level of individuals 20 years and older? Per BLS, 71M men, 64M women, <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.t01.htm>

If instead you were looking at statistics of the entire ‘civilian noninstitutional population’, I can see how those numbers might be misrepresented, but as I pointed out earlier that would be discounting institutional populations (like the army or jails), and homeless people, all of whom may be more likely to be male – http://www.bls.gov/cps/eetech_methods.pdf. Besides, Rosin, you used the term “workforce” so you should be using workforce numbers.

You, Rosin, have not provided credible sources to support your position on women’s majority in the workforce. Oh all right, you haven’t provided any sources at all.

Rosin: “Most managers are now women too.”

Really? According to the U.S. Dept. of Labor, 20 Leading Occupations of Employed Women, 2009 Annual Averages, the relative percentage of women managers, including first-line supervisors, is 46% (3,728K women, 8,192K combined men & women) <http://www.dol.gov/wb/factsheets/20lead2009.htm>. Excluding first-line supervisors of retail sales workers, and office and administrative support personnel drops the female managerial percentage to 34% (1,106K women, 3,249 combined men & women) <http://www.dol.gov/wb/factsheets/20lead2009.htm>.

You, Rosin, have not provided credible sources to support your position on women’s majority in the managerial workforce. Oh all right, you haven’t provided any sources at all.

BTW, I’m still waiting for you to explain to me, a lowly female stockholder, why I should be happy about a 43% premium being paid to female CEOs who don’t provide similar returns to investors. While you’re at it maybe you could also explain it to the 97% of secretaries, 92% of RNs, 82% of elementary and middle school teachers, 89% of nurse’s aids, 90% of maids and housekeepers, 95% of childcare workers, 74% of cashiers, 52% of retail salespersons, and 72% of waiters/waitresses — all of whom are women <http://www.dol.gov/wb/factsheets/20lead2009.htm>

Rosin, I have to defer to Karen G. Whitehurst who said it best here, “It is a poorly written article wherein the author makes too many unsubstantiated claims, largely because she does not possess a clear thesis.”


Exactly. What’s the point?”



282. on [June 22, 2010 at 10:25 pm](#) [p gg](#)

The IQ comment would be useful if IQ mattered. Once you get to about 100, you will be successful in society. At 120 you have all the intellect necessary to win a Nobel prize. Very high decreasing returns after that.

The most powerful person at Google after the founders and CEO is a woman.



283. on [June 26, 2010 at 2:46 pm](#) [teageegeepea](#)

“Leaving aside the possibility of selection bias in the couples who make gender requests at fertility clinics, a trend toward proactively favoring girls over boys would be expected and predicted by evolutionary psychologists in a culture where an individual woman had an increasingly better chance of reproducing in adulthood than an individual man.”

This is wrong, see Dawkins on sex-ratio. In the absence of asexual reproduction, the fitness of males & females must be equal. If some men don't reproduce, it means other males are taking up a larger proportion of the reproduction. It is not adaptive to maximize the probability of having any children at all, but to maximize the expected number of children. My guess for why parents choose to have girls is that girls are more conscientious and hence less of a headache.



284. on [June 26, 2010 at 3:17 pm](#) [polymath](#)

@pgg,

Your comment is so ridiculously wrong that it's not even worth refuting. Would you care to back it up with anything other than statistically irrelevant anecdotes?



285. on [June 27, 2010 at 11:48 am](#) [Anonymous](#)

Bitches want shallow Alpha cock? Provider strike! Just no to getting taken for a ride/ruinous alimony! Marriage? Hope your bad boy or vibrator can say “I do,” ho!



286. on [July 10, 2010 at 3:09 pm](#) [susan](#)

@pgg Clearly you're not in the above-100 IQ range are you?

@steve johnson

“Feminism is and always has been for women who are losers in the mating market so they work to change things to their advantage.”

No. This is the problem with you guys and your laughably specious logic and vague understanding of actual social dynamics of the real life, actual world outside D&D and video games. You assume that women's vye for power in society is simply a result of not *being able* to find some sort of unfulfilling, tangential control over life via fiancial support of a man, when in fact it clearly it was

simply enough for them/us. YOU GUYS failed, therefore we left.

Now grow up and deal with it.

Also, is there not a single man on here over 25yo? Or are you all just terrified of a wise, knowledgeable-about-life sort of woman who could see into you and spy your glaring inadequacies?



287. on [July 10, 2010 at 3:12 pm](#) *susan*

(let's be clear: everyone with any social skills o over the age of 25 knows that you know alot less about people and life when you are in your early 20s, as opposed to your early 30s.) So it so ridiculously *obvious*ly appears as if you guys are either abusive predators looking for the weakest prey, or simply very young and therefore not interested in women over 25.

Very, very laughable.

[editor: you know what's laughable? your droning schoolmarm act. please excuse yourself from life, cunt.]



288. on [July 10, 2010 at 3:15 pm](#) *stuchka*

Instead of providing actual arguments, proof or ideas, susan has resorted to just shaming and name-calling. Anyone disagreeing with her is a 'video and D&D gamer' and doesn't understand 'actual social dynamics of the real life' (typical womanspeak for 'I hate you i hate you i hate you but I can't say it out loud because I'm afraid I'll be labelled a nasty cunt').

And I laughed at the last paragraph – ah, mirror mirror on the wall, who is the most beautiful of them all? Well, it isn't you anymore.



289. on [July 10, 2010 at 3:27 pm](#) *susan*

@revorob

“That same testosterone that causes men to make risky stock market decisions also causes them to risk building gleaming civilizations and all the creature comforts therein that you ingrate feminists couldn't live without.”

Oh you silly, silly men. On the contrary, testosterone has not been scientifically linked to IQ (that's just genes, the luck of the draw, my friend)- and there's been much research on it. Further, risky stock market decisions (not always a good thing) are not in the same league as the “risk of building gleamng civilizations”- which stems obviously, from order and stability, even innovation, not risk.

You can't even get your concepts straight. Civilization=stability necessary first, then innovation and creativity. Risky market ventures=no stability necessary, no innovation or creativity needed.

You're confusing risk with intelligence.

Jesus.

The idiocy continues:

“As is coincidence that 99.96% of all patents taken out are held by men? ”

Where'd you get that data? How many of these patents are granted?

“We, the superior sex,” built the world. Dopey women just decorate it and populate it with their cuckold babies.”

Um, no- YOU did not build the world, INTELLIGENT MEN did. You're just the idiot who laid the tracks and herded some cows. You are a joke.

Decorating and populating takes alot more innovation and ingenuity than you have.

“To paraphrase another correspondent: “If there were no men, women would be living in dark caves, shivering in the cold and wondering why there's nothing to eat”.”

Actually, according to anthropologists, the ratio of nutrients gained from hunting means to gathering means has found to be (from loads of surveys) roughly 20:80 to 30:70. But of course your uneducated, plebian, sore loser gamma mind is too feeble and empty to know that, isn't it?



290. on [July 10, 2010 at 3:29 pm](#) *susan*

Also, better to be a lesbian/rug muncher than a straight women ignored by men everywhere. I'm sure there would be statistics to back that up, if only you had ever gotten close enough to a dyke's tropical pube thatch to allow such a stench to be possible. ;)

[editor: susan! i am shocked, shocked, at this confessional.]



291. on [July 10, 2010 at 3:35 pm](#) *susan*

Anyone disagreeing with her is a 'video and D&D gamer' and doesn't understand 'actual social dynamics of the real life' (typical womanspeak for 'I hate you i hate you i hate you but I can't say it out loud because I'm afraid I'll be labelled a nasty cunt').”

Um no, it's more because 99% of the comments on here scream of 'aw poor me in my mommy's

basement girls don't like me cause I'm ugly er ahem* I mean I'm not an alpha who treats women bad and they're all goldiggers with too high standards for anyone (me) to meet so I'll just continue dropping oil from my potatoe chips all over my soiled t-shirt while I play world of warcraft with my loser gamma misogynist whiny friends in my mommy's basement' angst. Also, listen to my words, gamma freak, not my vagina.

“And I laughed at the last paragraph – ah, mirror mirror on the wall, who is the most beautiful of them all? Well, it isn't you anymore.”

Have you answered my question yet?

No, I didn't think so. Try a real woman- you know, one who actually has class, intelligence, looks and is not damaged by serial rape and the molestation of her three uncles who introduced her to porn when she was 13.

Oh right I forgot, you don't know any of those... to bad for you.

[editor: you are the all-singing, all-dancing, all-spewing cliché of this world.]



292. on [July 10, 2010 at 3:35 pm](#) *susan*

*too bad for you.



293. on [July 10, 2010 at 3:38 pm](#) *susan*

Also, does anyone here know what a 'schoolmarm' is?

[editor: a priggish knuckle-rapper.]

I live in the real world, so I haven't heard that word used. Not since maybe..wait a minute... sounds familiar...hmm... oh I know! Little House on the Prairie!


[so you remember little house on the prairie?]

Oh right! Gosh, you're so cool to call a woman a 'schoolmarm' when she could obviously well, eat you for lunch. ;)

[just how fat are you?]

Ta ta!

[pendulous udders!]




294. on [July 10, 2010 at 3:43 pm](#) *gunslingerregi*

”””””I’ve never seen such an obvious case of cunt projection. I’m here to report, Mizz RosinFluffinHack, that no marriage, no kids, lotsa sex is a bachelor party without end. Far from being over, it’s in full swing.”””””

Boooooo yaaaaaah!!!

But if you can do it with marriage and kids then you got it all.




295. on [July 10, 2010 at 4:28 pm](#) *gunslingerregi*

”””””””cunt

You’re just the idiot who laid the tracks ””””

The train tracks are still around and usefull after all these years. What have woman built of sweat and blood and steel that is still around?



296. on [July 10, 2010 at 4:38 pm](#) *gunslingerregi*

Always look to the hardcore shit like work that is getting done or what would be needed to be done if free money wasn’t handed out by government and free money to large cooperations in the us “free market”

You can always take one high producer and let 5 people ride on his back in bullshit jobs.

You can put all the filler levels you want on top of people who actually do the real work with unlimited money.

But when shit hits the fan what are the needed occupations is the question. What if the only jobs available to woman were nurse, teacher and such traditional modes because there were no created jobs for them to do in cooperations.

Then you would just have the jobs left that if not done would make the country stop working in a few days those are the jobs men do.

When the power goes down it would stay down if only woman worked.


If the water stopped flowing it would stay stopped or woman would be hauling it from the river.

If the food ran out people would just die.

The road would just cease to be able to be driven upon

the cars would not be able to be repaired.


The infratructure would crumble.



297. on [July 10, 2010 at 4:52 pm](#) *gunslingergregi*

""""""This is one of the most insightful observations I've read in a long time. We are definitely at a crossroads without a workable solution how to get to the next economic phase. We are wealthy, efficient, and extremely productive, due mainly to technology. The unavoidable fact is that we do not need the labor inputs that we have had in the past. Our economy would probably operate more efficiently if 20% of the workforce were eliminated and those positions consolidated. """"""

Try 70 percent or more.




298. on [July 10, 2010 at 4:57 pm](#) *gunslingergregi*

""""In fact, the more women dominate, the more they behave, fittingly, like the dominant sex. Rates of violence committed by middle-aged women have skyrocketed since the 1980s, and no one knows why. """"

""""""This is one of those claims that I'm just sure is being massaged into a teetering steaming shitpile, but I'm too lazy to go digging for the relevant studies confirming or denying. """"""

I have reserched that and in 1975 england the rate of man killing woman and woman killing men was the same.



299. on [July 10, 2010 at 5:00 pm](#) *gunslingergregi*


""""""A character played by George Clooney is called too old to be attractive by his younger female colleague and is later rejected by an older woman whom he falls in love with after she sleeps with him—and who turns out to be married. George Clooney! If the sexiest man alive can get twice rejected (and sexually played) in a movie, what hope is there for anyone else?""""""

""""""Roissy

Yo, Hanna Montana, it's a movie. You're not making the point you think you're making here. In real

life, aging George Clooney smartly avoids marriage and boffs a steady stream of hot young babes.

Exactly and movies can be made to drive a point opposite of statistics.
Dam nice post man.



300. on [July 10, 2010 at 5:03 pm](#) *gunslingerregi*

"*****" Maybe men see the matrix better than Rosin thinks. If the economic empowerment of women means men have to work three times harder just to get the same old, now rapidly fattening, pussy they got in the past for less effort, then maybe they've figured out that the system is rigged against them.

Oh fuck plus the risk of losing your shit on top of that plus no appreciation.

Appreciation goes a long fucking way.



301. on [July 10, 2010 at 5:26 pm](#) *Rum*

Susan

Guys can figure out rather quickly why females are so uneasy with innovation. First, the female brain is not prone to having thoughts that have not been pre-approved by their social group and so the whole process of innovation feels vaguely threatening to them,
Second, a stable social heirachy makes it easier for them to know which guys they should want to fuck to get their pay-off. It sucks when they have to guess at a young age which guys will be on top of things 20 years in the future. Because if they wait long enough to see, they will be likely too old to act effectively on the knowledge.



302. on [July 12, 2010 at 5:23 pm](#) *Gorbachev*

@Susan,

*So it so ridiculously *obvious*ly appears as if you guys are either abusive predators looking for the weakest prey, or simply very young and therefore not interested in women over 25.*

Very, very laughable.

Unless, of course, men are just physically attracted to youth.

Which is, of course, true.



303. on [July 12, 2010 at 5:34 pm](#) Gorbachev

@Susan,

Oh you silly, silly men. On the contrary, testosterone has not been scientifically linked to IQ (that's just genes, the luck of the draw, my friend)-

That's not the issue. Testosterone is linked to risk-taking behavior. Men take more risks and there are more stupid men and more very intelligent men than women. There are more male outliers.

The inventors and trail-blazers and best leaders and visionaries are the upper-end outliers. There are more of these males than females.

Average intelligence may be the same.

Hence, males do more to create than women do. Women may be better managers of what men create.

and there's been much research on it. Further, risky stock market decisions (not always a good thing) are not in the same league as the "risk of building gleaming civilizations" - which stems obviously, from order and stability, even innovation, not risk. You can't even get your concepts straight. Civilization=stability necessary first, then innovation and creativity. Risky market ventures=no stability necessary, no innovation or creativity needed.

You're confusing risk with intelligence.

Jesus.

The idiocy continues:

"As is coincidence that 99.96% of all patents taken out are held by men? "

Where'd you get that data? How many of these patents are granted?

"We, the superior sex," built the world. Dopey women just decorate it and populate it with their cuckold babies."

Um, no- YOU did not build the world, INTELLIGENT MEN did. You're just the idiot who laid the tracks and herded some cows. You are a joke.

Males did the work. Are still doing the work. Women, as a category, at best, consume and manage.

Actually, according to anthropologists, the ratio of nutrients gained from hunting means to gathering means has found to be (from loads of surveys) roughly 20:80 to 30:70. But of course your uneducated, plebian, sore loser gamma mind is too feeble and empty to know that, isn't it?

This just means that the women managed a process. Them en came up with entirely new concepts.

The stereotype is the male breaking the boundaries and the women Tsk-Tsking:

And this is exactly what generally happens. Most women are very risk-averse and accuse men of irresponsibility when men take chances or develop new ideas.

In a very real sense, men (some men) created the world.



304. on [July 28, 2010 at 11:40 pm](#) duck

I had an interesting experience with the HR division of a company I once worked for.

I was called to HR to go over my personal records because, HR said, they were updating all data. Sounded more like 'make work' to me.

My immediate manager was a woman, fairly intelligent and I had no problems with her or how she ran her department [Although she was somewhat masculine and tended to think more like a male, and she did not bring her personal issues to work with her.]

HR asked all the routine questions about any changes in the family, children, etc, etc, did we still live at the same address, phone number change?

Then she said "I notice that you work under a female manager' do you have a problem with working or taking orders from a woman?"

I answered that I never have had a problem in that regard.

"Never..." she asked, "what do you mean never.?"

I replied that I married my last female boss and have had no problems there.

It was like I hit her between the eyes with a 2 X 4. She turned red, had trouble catching her breath, and began sputtering and grunting unintelligible words under her breath. I really thought she was going to pass out for a moment.

After she had regained her composure, she sat stiff backed, and rigid, and telling me in a low, slow, forced rambling voice that "This is very unusual, not what one would normally expect, I think we are through now, I have enough data...would you please just leave....."

I had a hard time keeping a straight face, it was tough not to laugh out loud and for the rest of the time I worked there, she would avoid looking at me when we passed each other in the hall way or in the lunch room.

My manager asked me one time what I had done to the HR person. My manager stated that the HR person had questioned her on several occasions about me and my work but always asked strange questions that seemed out of place. She never did tell me what the questions were.



305. on [September 10, 2010 at 8:43 pm](#) *Rarfy*

Standard sturm und drang. I have no problem with MLTRs, so who cares what “society” is doing? I’m dating 2 chicks (used to be 3 until a couple of months ago), and have 2 on the side that I could be dating but I’m not really that interested in.

I don’t see what all the fuss is about.

306. on [December 15, 2010 at 12:02 am](#) [Soul crushing « Becoming Alpha](#)

[...] least roissy understands me. how described my job PERFECTLY: Conscientious application to menial desk jockey [...]



307. on [December 19, 2010 at 12:55 am](#) *Jack Hoff*

Chateau wrote: “Our society exists at a strange moment of economic limbo between two worlds — the past manufacturing based world and the future transhuman world — a limbo where paper pushing, legalistic gear grinding, government welfare administration, and service with a smile has infested like a toxic mold almost every tier of vertical and horizontal economic productivity. It is the kind of work, in substance and in psychological reward, that is soul-crushing to men but fulfilling to women.”

Thanks, Chateau. You have given me more insight into my wife, the smiling paper pusher, than 2 years of couples therapy!



308. on [December 19, 2010 at 4:22 pm](#) *Jack Hoff*

Susan, when was the last time, you had a good, stiff cock in your mouth?

(your Uncle Bill doesn’t count)



309. on [March 13, 2011 at 2:23 pm](#) *justadude*

“Conscientious application to menial desk jockey multitasks is what women’s brains are best at. Our society exists at a strange moment of economic limbo between two worlds — the past manufacturing based world and the future transhuman world — a limbo where paper pushing, legalistic gear grinding, government welfare administration, and service with a smile has infested like a toxic mold

almost every tier of vertical and horizontal economic productivity. It is the kind of work, in substance and in psychological reward, that is soul-crushing to men but fulfilling to women. And it is the kind of work for which colleges, with their mile wide but inch deep liberal arts programs and their empty-headed women's studies classes, are preparing with perfect precision their students for the female-majority workforce of the anticipated future."

This is one of your most salient observations on the blog, and that's saying a lot. So much of what sucks in today's world can all be drawn back to this.

Comments are closed.



• Pages

- [About](#)
- [Alpha Assessment Submissions](#)
- [Beta Of The Year Contest Submissions](#)
- [Dating Market Value Test For Men](#)
- [Dating Market Value Test For Women](#)
- [Female Photo Submissions](#)
- [The Sixteen Commandments Of Poon](#)

• [Twitter Updates](#)

- Crazy vagina tattoos. Would it be gay to bang Homer Simpson in the "mouth"? <http://t.co/NckU9PZ> 2 days ago
- The new craze of "owling" looks like a bunch of SWPLs pooping. They should just call it "pooping". [4 days ago](#)
- It's stuff like this that makes me think all of modern art is a massive fraud to do nothing more than signal status. <http://t.co/HVs0jDP> 5 days ago
- Color-coded map of average breast size by country. Go to Russia if you like to motorboat pendulous udders. <http://t.co/PoVaybi> 5 days ago
- Men who marry women much younger than themselves have the most children. As if you needed a reason! <http://t.co/P5EHB7I> 1 week ago
- Nauseating story about a masochistic beta who prostrates himself for a fat, aging, entitled wife who walked out on him. <http://t.co/qmiQtEz> 1 week ago

• Recent Comments



Cadnerd on [Confident Dork Game](#)



xsplat on [Confident Dork Game](#)



John Norman Howard on [Confident Dork Game](#)



xsplat on [Confident Dork Game](#)



Ovid on [Confident Dork Game](#)



John Norman Howard on [Confident Dork Game](#)



xsplat on [Confident Dork Game](#)



Necy on [Confident Dork Game](#)



Bhatti on [Confident Dork Game](#)



xsplat on [Confident Dork Game](#)

• Top Posts

- [Confident Dork Game](#)
- [Softening Your Negs](#)
- [The Power Of Game: From Hello To Kiss In Ten Minutes](#)
- [Female Photo Submissions](#)
- [The Folly Before The Fall](#)
- [Cutter Lover](#)
- [The Sixteen Commandments Of Poon](#)
- [Top Two Rules For Dating Younger Women](#)
- [Potential Rapist Syndrome](#)
- [Women Prefer Dominant Men. You Don't Say!](#)

• Recent Posts

- [Confident Dork Game](#)
- [Softening Your Negs](#)
- [Cutter Lover](#)

- [The Folly Before The Fall](#)
- [Women Prefer Dominant Men. You Don't Say!](#)

• Categories

Select Category

• Archives

Select Month

• Game

- [Cajun](#)
- [KassyK](#)
- [Roosh V](#)
- [Tenmagnet](#)
- [The G Manifesto](#)
- [The Rookie](#)
- [VKs empire of dirt](#)

• Outside Bloggers

- [2blowhards](#)
- [Alias Clio](#)
- [Dusk in Autumn](#)
- [Elysium Revisited](#)
- [Gucci Little Piggy](#)
- [Half Sigma](#)
- [Hyperbole and a Half](#)
- [Jack Goes Forth](#)
- [Mangans Miscellany](#)
- [The Fourth Checkraise](#)
- [The Rawness](#)
- [Udolpho](#)

• Sites of Interest

- [Gene Expression](#)
- [isteve](#)
- [OneSTDV](#)
- [Parapundit](#)
- [People of Walmart](#)

- [PostSecret](#)
- [Stuff White People Like](#)
- [The Daily Sarge](#)
- [The Spearhead](#)
- [Things My Boyfriend Says](#)
- [Treatise of Love](#)
- [WordPress.com](#)
- [WordPress.org](#)
- [xkcd](#)

• Meta

- [Register](#)
- [Log in](#)
- [Entries RSS](#)
- [Comments RSS](#)
- [WordPress.com](#)

[Blog at WordPress.com.](#)

Theme: [MistyLook](#) by [Sadish](#).

Ⓜ