

Limping Towards the Redpill: The Sources of Female Privilege and Power

Matthew Raphael Johnson
Johnstown, PA

In July of 2018, the online journal *Return of Kings* ran an [article](#) called “25 Special Privileges Women Have Over Men—And Yet They Still Complain Like Spoiled Children” by Beau Albrecht. While the title is a tad cumbersome, it's a fact of life. Like all Redpill-style essays, it's painful to read. They offer truth, but of the most uncomfortable sort. For an older man to discover this far too late is like being hit on the foot with a hammer every hour or so. The realizations are too extreme to be true, yet they are.

One of the truths of the Redpill is the simple fact that the “nice guy” or a Beta will get the girl by virtue of this very fact. In a way, the Beta mind is a threat since, after a certain amount of time being nice, he then expects – or thinks he's owed – attention from women. Even more, that this man loses in the romantic world because he seeks attention and approval. That a man will require the approval of a woman makes him look weak.

The corollary to this is that the world, saturated with “nice guys,” serves as a set of feudal-style servitors we call “Beta orbiters.” In a very real way, she has a small army of men who will do anything to please her. This brings us to female privilege, based on this male propensity in Postmodernity. Women are a privileged species due to this traveling circus of Betas. Of course, she hardly gives them more than a second look, but they serve her in hopes that will change. This is the plight of the modern man today, except for a few.

God forbid you look like George Costanza today. Life will be, as Hobbes write, “nasty, poor, brutish and short.” The character of “George” from *Seinfeld* was a Jewish mockery of the gentile “loser” lectured to by the Jewish Alpha almost daily. George was inferior to Jerry in every way. George was a “nice guy,” dressed up a bit for humor. Thank God that I've been spared this fate, but the bottom line is the same. The ultimate thesis of the Redpill is that women are more self-seeking than men. They get away with it due to the Beta orbiter phenomenon.

Albrecht writes:

During Victorian times, many regarded women as delicate flowers needing special protection. Today's feminists assert that women are strong and independent. They're scornful of the old-fashioned concept, but still play it for everything it's worth, angling for more preferential treatment. Here are some ways society already caters to the fem-centric agenda.

I've written about this at some length using the writings of Victorian era socialist Belfort Bax. I've argued, essentially, that feminism isn't about gaining power, but rather maintaining and justifying it. Normally, when one speaks of affirmative action, we're talking about non-whites, especially blacks. This is the first thought, most of the time. It is easy to forget that the primary beneficiaries of this are privileged women who are about the last group that needs this sort of assistance.

In 19th century England, Bax wrote *The Legal Subjection of Men* (though it was published by the New Age Press in 1908). Matriarchy is not the result of feminism, but of elite men

seeking to control the working classes. It is significant that Bax was a materialist and socialist who saw Marxism being subverted by this new feminine aristocracy. Feminism, as he correctly saw, was a weapon of the capitalists. Sex became a layer of protection for the ruling class in the sense that attention can be diverted from the class interests of a woman having money to the fact that she's a woman.

Bax proves with great detail that in both law and practice, the woman has the same relation to the man as the capitalist does to the worker. The woman, regardless of her class, is superior to the man in law. Even a poorer woman is superior to the wealthier male due to her gender as he shows here:

If a man under any provocation, no matter how galling—insolence or violence—strikes a woman, he is sent to hard labour, divorced, and his property confiscated, or his earnings hypothecated—and all this through the prompt instrumentality of the police-court. A woman may assault, stab, set fire to her husband, and he has no remedy, except to summon her to the police court, where, if she be fined, he is compelled to pay the fine, and as likely as not is laughed at. If her crime be revoltingly atrocious, she is perhaps sent to prison—for one-twentieth part of the time awarded to a male offender for a like offence. On her being released, her husband, unless he be a rich man, is bound to take her back, and, rich or poor, support her. The prompt and inexpensive police-court divorce is not for him (Bax, 1907: 20).

For a man to get a divorce at this time, an expensive and embarrassing time in court would be the result. Little has changed. For a woman, divorce was almost instantaneous, and all alimony was mandated without the husband's consent. This was called a “summary separation” and open only to females.

It's a testament to the death of reason where professors will explain that women weren't considered free agents, but forget to explain the implications of that. Without free agency like the logical conception of manhood, men were then obligated to look after them and be responsible for their actions. This means that women were the only free people at the time. You can't have one without the other.

During divorce, man's earnings were attached with as much ferocity as today, but the woman's was never touched as a matter of custom. This was the law in Victorian Britain which makes and it makes a mockery of official history. Punishments, as I've written elsewhere, were far harsher for wife-beaters than today. Female control existed long before feminism. Hence, it must have another source. In the 1970s, the feminist movement was financed by all the major foundations and elite capital to justify what already existed, not to demand new law.

The culprit, according to Bax, was the recent changes in Victorian law, the simply named “Act of 1895” was a radical reform of family court. The text here makes an explicit distinction in crimes committed by men and those by women, with the latter always treated with greater leniency and at a greater standard of proof. These laws, taken together, show many examples of favoritism to women. He cites only three early in the book:

1. Summary Court for Separation. Open to women alone, except in the case of drunkenness (cf. Licensing Act, 1902).
 2. Action for Slander. Open to women alone.
 3. Duty of Husband to maintain his wife—notwithstanding her adultery.—This last a triumph of feminine privileges enacted in 1895!
- It is impossible in any distribution of the main out lines of sex-privilege to avoid

occasionally overlapping. One arrangement of the topics will be convenient. Let us consider women's privileges under the head of Matrimonial Law, and the Civil Law generally, and, further, of the Criminal Law.

These privileges arise indirectly from the action of the legislature, but mainly from that of the Courts, and consist of : first, the deliberate introduction of new rules of law and procedure, and, secondly, the retention of some old-world privileges of women, logical enough when women were dependent, but under modern conditions engines of tyranny against men (Bax, 1908: 5).

In this era, the “Doctrine of Coercion” was used to justify this. This is the idea that, due to the weakness of women, any criminal act committed by one is *ipso facto* seen as the action of her husband or father. Thus, in the name of women's empowerment, women were said to bear no responsibility for her actions.

Worse was the actual practice of divorce litigation. The common law was clear that any female claim of physical abuse was taken as fact, while the man was forced to prove that he did not do it. As the “weaker sex,” abuse could only go one way. Again, nothing has changed. Only the most extreme cases of attempted murder will ever be attributed to the wife. Bax mocks this movement over the ideas implied in the “Coercion Doctrine:”

The hollowness of the sham of the modern dogma of equality between the sexes is shown by the fact that the assumption of inferiority is called into requisition without any hesitation when there is anything to be gained by it for the cause of female privilege. The dogma of equality is reserved for pleading for the franchise, for the opening up of the professions, and similar occasions. According to the current theory, while women are fully equal to men in capacity for government, administration, etc., and hence, while justice demands that these spheres should be accessible to them, they are so inferior to men in the capacity to control their actions and to distinguish right from wrong, that it is not to be thought of that they, poor weak women, should be treated with the same impartiality or severity by the law as is dealt out to men. Women nowadays “want it,” not “both ways” merely, but all ways (Bax, EB. *The Fraud of Feminism*, Grant Richards, 1913).

In court or through witnesses, any harsh words spoken in an argument were seen as de facto proof of all other claims of violence. Males and their witnesses were regularly prosecuted for perjury, while women were almost never taken to task. This proves that feminism was not about taking power, but justifying it.

The custom of the courts, as Bax shows through court documents at the time, were not always part of the law as such. Women in family court were immune (generally speaking) for prosecution for adultery, libel or slander, crimes of violence, and abandonment. These, in other words, were rarely taken into consideration by courts, and even the most flagrant deserter or adulteress could quickly file for a “summary separation” and take a solid half to three quarters of her husband's earnings.

Female privilege is simply an empirical reality. It takes minimal effort to show that women get roughly half the jail time as men for the same crime, something hearkening back to the same Victorian prejudice Bax describes in detail. I was horrified to see a serious proposal in the *Washington Post* demanding the abolition of female prisons entirely. This is an issue gaining traction.

I developed my thesis when I was in college though I was exceptionally pushy about it in class. Back in the 1990s, there was some vague tolerance. Today, that's gone. I noticed, all over campus, there were tall obelisks, usually brown, that permitted someone to press a button that would summon campus security. These were a new development. Its for women only and made solely with women in mind.

I was told that these mysterious brown, phallic obelisks were for women walking back to the dorms or to their car from classes at night. Now, few that have lived on campus have ever seen an woman walking on her own at night – or ever. Also, it is even rarer to walk home with no one else around. These phallic symbols weren't about protecting women, but about blatantly displaying their power. They are the campus equivalent of the TSA. They do nothing to make people safer, but are a symbol of the institution's “commitment” to women.

On its small console, I laughed out loud when I read “An escort will be provided upon request.” I read this after coming home from a class where I was told for the 5000th time that “women” are “second class citizens.” Yet the well-paid professor also knows – and sees every day – that women get their own personal bodyguard. Women have their own security apparatus to protect them against men. An apparatus that serves absolutely no real purpose. Of course, professors, even with this security regime, claim that most college women are sexually assaulted. Immediate expulsion with no due process, personal body guards and a lifetime of shame has not kept male hands off these helpless women. It is hard to believe.

I was born in 1971 and came of age at the consolidation of the sexual revolution during the mid 1980s. Comedies back then encouraged men to do the very same things they'd go to prison for today. Reading E. Michael Jones, I began to realize what a trap the sexual revolution was. Feminists realized that unleashing the male sex drive was a very, very bad idea. Once done, it was hard to get that genie back into the bottle.

This was well known to them in the 1970s, however. Rather, they then criminalized everything that, a decade before, they were demanding. It was a two-stage program: release the male sex drive and then, once it was in the open, criminalize it. These developments don't happen by accident.

I watched beautiful, scantily-clad college girls holding the campus in the palm of their hands while the professors convinced them that they were oppressed. It was almost like, once women received a critical mass of privilege, they needed to increase the rhetoric of “oppression” to avoid dealing with the consequences of the irresponsible use of this power. In denying their power, they don't have to concern themselves with its consequences. Having conquered every social institution, they can do as they please and reject any responsibility.

At the University of Nebraska, a friend of mine in the Economics department had been dumped by his fiance. She was screwing a professor, or so I was told. This unfortunate lived across the street from me and I watched him fall to pieces. He left messages on her phone full of bathos. I felt sorry for him, a tough guy in all (other) respects. It wasn't the first time I saw the toughest of men brought to their knees by a woman doing what she pleased and refusing to deal with the consequences of her actions. It wouldn't be the last.

Within a week or so, he was slapped with a “protective order” imposed without his knowledge or presence. The result was that, since they were both students in the same department, he was no longer permitted to go to class. He was forced out of school because she didn't want to feel guilty anymore and sought to maintain her relationship without worrying about him. Yet, as he told me, even if there was due process for the “protective order,” his professors had been told to not recognize him in class or grade his work.

When he'd attack female privilege that so victimized him, "white knights," often men who did well with women, would condemn his "misogyny." Once, I exploded at a fellow grad student in my own department, asking him if he "was aware of what this women did to him and the power that women must have to – in violation of the 4th and 5th amendments, not to mention the 14th – pull it off?" He was deliberately unaware and taken aback, since this was the first time someone he respected explained female privilege to him.

Apparently, she was telling everyone he was threatening her, but since I heard him leave these messages and few believed her, this couldn't be true. Of course, men, now happy she was single, sided with her without a thought. They were dying to prove their love for her by getting a piece of this hapless man.

She became power mad, behaving almost as a goddess – having an armed bodyguard of orbiters wherever she went, and this doesn't include the campus security force. After hearing all this, I'd then go to class and hear how oppressed women were. I've unfortunately not kept in touch with him after graduation. It was very difficult to watch him rage helplessly against a system so blatantly unjust and to have only me to defend him.

Today, women can be retroactively raped. The case of Brock Turner was a miscarriage of justice to the extreme. The transcripts of his case are all available online for free – the press deliberately distorted the facts beyond recognition. If what he did (which didn't include sex) is considered rape, then half of college males from the 70s onward are guilty.

This proves the thesis about the deliberate criminalization of what they once demanded be free of "social conventions." I guess this is the point. His Olympic dreams are ruined based, as the transcripts state, on no evidence. Since her identity is kept secret, no one can come to an educated conclusion about what happened, though criminal trials are supposed to be public affairs.

There was no reason to keep her identity a secret until it was revealed she was wearing a thong. She likely was known as the campus mattress and was probably after Brock anyway. In keeping her identity secret, no one could draw their own conclusions. There was no legal justification for it.

The press referred to Brock as a "rapist" despite not having had sex with this lovestruck fan. They treated him as guilty from the first moment the accusation hit. He was removed from campus without due process of any kind. Immediately then, with almost no debate, the California legislature redefined rape to include "fingering," not just general penetration. Thus, Brock can now be called, retroactively, a rapist. This is the power one woman has.

She claimed to have been passed out during the whole event, though not a single man asked how she could have been traumatized without either sex nor memory. Any fool knows the prosecution told her to say this so her testimony couldn't be parsed for contradictions by the defense. Funny, the trial transcripts show her sister testifying that she wasn't drinking at all during this party. Brock and she walked out of the place together and she showed not the slightest sign of intoxication.

The judge gave him six months in prison for fingering a sober, willing girl that later, saw the benefits of claiming a sex crime. The judge, because his sentence wasn't harsh enough, was recalled by a massive campaign financed by the nation's wealthy. This spells the end of the independent judiciary. It is under feminine domination. The woman in question has been paid millions by the university and has been showered with money, job offers and marriage proposals because she lied about getting involuntarily fingered by a very popular male student. No aristocracy of centuries ago had this kind of power.

Signs of immense female power are everywhere. These same campuses finance and encourage women-only institutions while banning all-male societies with extreme vehemence and sometimes violence. Since I was in college, the very act of “men visually admiring the bodies women put on display is part of “rape culture.” Where women are concerned, the law doesn't matter. The Constitution doesn't matter. The sex drive of the male, now turned against him, is all that matters.

At the same time, women in business are encouraged and subsidized to form cartels in restraint of trade. Female businesses pay less taxes at the federal and state level. The government had to tighten up the definition of “female owned” because so many ambiguous cases were trying to take advantage of the privilege. This is to say little about female-only scholarships and, far worse, the huge amount of money women's health receives from both the state and private sources. “Breast cancer” has become an obsession while testicular cancer is mocked and called “ball cancer.” Breast cancer research is funded at a rate of 10 times all other forms of cancer, which implies that female lives are worth more than male. This is exactly the message as intended.

A decent looking young woman can do as she pleases sexually. She can act as immaturely as she wants, knowing that there's another guy waiting for her. She then can retroactively withdraw consent and send man to man to prison without evidence. She has her Alpha studs and an army of Beta orbiters who act as a gaggle of serfs, doing all she wants in hops she will give them some attention. Men must have money, be muscular, have great confidence and act as smoothly as anyone can. This will gain him plenty of women. A woman, on the other hand, just has to avoid looking like a land whale.

Once her youth seems terminal, she can say goodbye to the Alphas of her past and lock down the best financial provider she can find. “She'll be taken seriously as wife material despite her high mileage. Dual mating strategy for the win!” says Albrecht. She has the best of both worlds with minimal effort.

A man must approach her, making himself emotionally vulnerable and aware that a rejection, especially a brusque one, can lead to depression and general public humiliation. The woman, on the other hand, only has to breathe, sit down and hold court. Money, jobs and the best of the Alphas are thrown at her. “Women are free to act very provocatively, yet expect attention only from guys they like.” The consequence of the “wrong” kind of attention is being labeled a “creep” and even a “possible rapist.”

The workplace is her private property. The office slut can sleep with the boss for promotion. Not only will the sex buy that for her, but there's also the threat of a lawsuit if the promotion is not to her liking. Even hideous females hold a company hostage. If you don't hire them, it gets worse. One angry woman can bring a firm like Microsoft to its knees. As if that's not enough, for many positions, standards are lessened for them. The firm gets in trouble if the perfect ratio is not found in the human resources office.

Albrecht continues:

The above is far from an exhaustive list of the preferential treatment society bestows upon women. Many guys automatically will take a pretty woman's side in an argument. Men usually pay for dates. In clubs, they'll even allow themselves to be used as vending machines for free drinks. The list goes on.

Anyone disagreeing here, especially if they're male, is being deliberately dishonest. These

are facts easily experienced empirically at any office, school or social institution. Women have rights without responsibilities, which is the very definition of privilege. Men have responsibilities with little freedom, which is the very definition of oppression. Women only have to worry about other women who are prettier than they are, but even there, there are usually enough decent men to go around, at least for the short term. Most of these privileges are available to even average looking women who are not ludicrously obese.

All a pretty woman has to do if she's ever in trouble – and my sister can attest to this – is go into a parking lot and begin to cry. If she's blonde especially, the number of men rushing to her aid will be very large. Money is quickly thrown around as the healthy “white knight” instinct kicks in. Only in this matriarchy is this instinct unhealthy, since she has far more power than the “knight” that pretends to rescue her. Beta orbiters often rush to her aid somehow by intuition. An attractive woman is never poor and is never alone. How many poverty stricken beauties do you know? Unless drug addiction is involved, the answer is zero. I've worked with the homeless and destitute on a volunteer basis in numerous cities. I've yet to see an attractive woman among them. Why is this?

Nothing proves the matriarchy than divorce law. “Family law” came from feminism and has no roots in the common law tradition. The mandated division of assets means that the woman takes at least half of his property whether she earned it or not. Celebrity divorces show the woman walking away with hundreds of millions of dollars her ex husband “earned” through his, not her, ability.

Tiger Woods' ex walked away with \$400 million for existing. The foundation for this is that alimony must be provided “to support her in the manner to which she has become accustomed.” While Tiger can take a massive pay cut, she cannot. He's not able to live according to the manner of his custom. Due to his gender, this is not a problem.

Phil Collins is not blessed with good looks. Yet, just before his final solo tour, he married the beautiful Orianne Cevey who, had he not been Phil Collins, wouldn't have even stood near him. She got two kids out of him, we assume, and, while he was on the road, sued him for divorce and received, over time, \$60 million. Given her looks, it's impossible that she didn't have an Alpha or two waiting in the wings while Phil paid the bill. Given that it was his final tour in 2005, and the album *Testify*, presumably his last, did well, she wanted to cash out. The announcement of his retirement meant he was going to be home more, so she cut the cord and took the multimillion dollar payout she planned from the beginning. On that 2005 tour, there were several times Phil needed to stop the show saying “I can't sing anymore” with a very hoarse voice. Maybe his career was over. She needed to cash out now before his career was over.

So what did this vulture see? Having Phil at home, cramping her style, with a reduced income; her suit for divorce was as predictable as it was inevitable. Phil said, “my ex-wife and I still love each other, but I don't know why we got divorced.” Either Phil is the bluest pill out there or he's lying to himself. It seems impossible that he didn't see this coming.

Phil is short, bald and pudgy, but he *is* Phil Collins. The divorce's timing was perfect: he was at the top of his career, he was settling down, he was getting old, his wealth was growing (for the last time) and she was still young and attractive. Phil then subsidized the army of Alphas that came to spend his money – money he, not she, earned from 30 years on the road.

As a direct result, Phil got Genesis back together the following year to pay her bills. This tour featured 115 trucks and an army of techs. Phil needed this to be a massive success or he was financially finished. In Rome, they played for 500,000 fans. He would have been bankrupt without it. Due to the massive payoff he was forced to give to his ex-wife, Phil was no longer a

wealthy man. She, however, was a wealthy woman. Phil's was the largest divorce settlement in British history, just edging out the similar con job imposed on Paul McCartney.

Phil and many others never saw these divorces coming. There's no doubt that many questioned these marriages. Would Orianne be with Phil if he weren't *the* Phil Collins? That's a stupid question. The worst part was that this was his third pricey divorce. About a third of his \$250 million fortune has been spent on these divorces. There's no excuse for Phil. He's a clean-cut, straight edge musician, but as Beta as a man can get. Rock stardom isn't necessarily a ticket to Alpha status, it just makes them bigger targets.

One of the reasons Robin Williams killed himself was that his ex-was taking six figures a month. Williams had to go back to television – considered a demotion for a movie star – to keep up with these payments. This is why 80 percent of divorces are initiated by the woman and fought by the man. Its the men who fight for their country and its men who fight for their families. No woman has ever died in military combat. Yet, only women profit, especially attractive ones.

As is universally known, women get automatic custody of the children and can alienate them at will with no consequences. How can you prove that in court? Proving parental alienation is almost impossible. All this means is that the woman can demand more cash both in alimony and child support, where, in the words of Bill Burr “it suddenly costs \$10,000 a month to give a kid Fruit Loops.” Child support is not based on the costs of raising a child, but on what a man has to give.

Albrecht points out that child support payments are almost always far higher than the stipend that foster parents receive. Hence, the court implicitly admits that child support is a punitive, not a necessary, measure. The courts have ensured that “gifts” from others do not count in support and such payments, regardless of their source, are immune to taxation.

Today, the matriarchy has come up with “imputed income” in deciding how much support a man owes. Initially, it was instituted to keep men from quitting their jobs to avoid paying, which was a rare and absurd occurrence. Today, its used to assume how much money a man “should” be making relative to his education and experience. This is found in all 50 states and never once has become a public issue.

If a man is well educated but his state is in the midst of a Depression, the support he's ordered to pay is based on how much he would be making in an ideal economy. This is not used against the women, however. The woman might be genius but not working and this will not be used against her.

During divorce or custody hearings, the woman usually receives a court appointed attorney if she even implies there was any “abuse” in the relationship. She can take out a protective order in all 50 states without evidence and shut her husband up as she divorces him. If the new boyfriend moves in and finances her, this is not considered income at all. Thus, the ex-husband has to subsidize the new boyfriend too. Spend a day at the county courthouse and see how many of these you can see.

It's rather comical that feminists still claim they want equality. That's just rhetoric to push their two-faced agenda. At this point, having equal status would be a big step down off of their pedestal. They haven't relinquished the special benefits and protections afforded to them. Instead, they want more goodies for themselves and more restrictions on men. . . . Still, after a certain point, griping about minuscule inconveniences just makes them look silly. What are these spoiled brats complaining about, anyway? Do these overindulged snowflakes believe they're living in a backward village in Afghanistan?

Actually, they pretend that conditions are far worse than even that in their own society that incessantly caters to them.

Any man going through a divorce know this. I've been put through this wringer, watching my lawyer actively cooperate with hers. I fired him and went pro se, which turned things around for me. As I said once in court when the judge asked me why I fired my lawyer, "I don't think my ex-wife requires his protection anymore."

One thing I learned was that male lawyers are in these women's pockets. For a male lawyer, especially an ambitious one, going head to head with the local feminist "advocacy group" is dangerous business. They have far more to lose in pissing *them* off than you. This is a key fact I wish I had known before.

The man who turned me onto the Redpill way of thought was Rollo Tomassi. He writes in Volume I of his famous *The Rational Male*:

The two greatest difficulties for women to overcome in their own methodology is that they are only at a sexually viable peak for a short window of time (generally their early 20s) and the fact that the qualities that make a good long term partner (the Good Dad) and the qualities that make for good breeding stock (Good Genes) only rarely manifest themselves in the same male. Provisioning and security potential are fantastic motivators for pairing with a Good Dad, but the same characteristics that make him such are generally a disadvantage when compared with the man who better exemplifies genetic, physical attraction and the risk taking qualities that would imbue her child with a better capacity to adapt to it's environment (i.e. stronger, faster, more attractive than others to ensure the passing of her own genetic material to future generations). This is the Jerk vs. Nice Guy paradox writ large on an evolutionary scale. Men and women innately (though unconsciously) understand this dynamic, so in order for a woman to have the best that the Good Dad has to offer while taking advantage of the best that the Good Genes man has, *she must invent and constantly modify social conventions to keep the advantage in her biological favor*, and in accordance with her pluralistic sexual strategy (emphasis mine).

This was the most painful thing I'd ever read. It made sense out of my former marriage and divorce. Rollo showed every step of her development. She really went by the book. It all, for the first time, made sense and I was beside myself. The truth was too obvious and clear for me to hide from.

What I highlighted above in italics is the origin of feminism as an ideology. Ultimately, as I've written elsewhere, its an economic issue at root. However, the ideological tack it took derives from altering the "social conventions" that make her self-seeking not only acceptable, but even "brave" or "commendable." You can't modify social conventions without immense power.

Tomassi makes clear that there are two kinds of men in the romantic world – the Alphas and the Betas. Here, I'm using the terms Beta and Alpha not as ideological constructs, but only as means of describing how the two types of men interact with women. They do have a broader application not being used here.

This is an all important distinction women know intuitively. A woman loves the Alpha, Good Genes guy. These are connected because the muscle and looks of the Alpha intuitively tells her that he would be good at creating babies. Mothers want the best for their children and genetics is no different.

The Alpha is hot. He always has women around and there's usually a long line to get to

him. He's confident, ambitious, dominant sexually, very experienced, selfish, knows women well, independent and certainly not willing to be tied down at a young age. If you dump him, he has many other women in reserve. He's a "bad boy" without being exceptionally destructive.

There's nothing a girl wouldn't do for one. Satisfying Alphas is a young girl's life. This means that their sex life is usually amazing. Alphas know how to satisfy a woman. It's what makes them Alphas. They don't get jealous and certainly don't get married. Alphas almost never settle down and they don't have "relationships" and never get involved, since they have many women waiting at any given time.

The Beta is a "nice guy" with far less sexual experience. He often has low self-esteem, usually for no good reason, and occasionally needs reassurance from his mate. He can be needy and clingy but would never dream of cheating on a female. He cries. He shows emotion. He cares. He's sensitive and honest. They're boring, but stable and dependable.

Most women pretend to like them, but they don't. They're actually repulsive to women. They're seen as weak men in a harsh world. They are generous, helpful, friendly, faithful, caring and truly believe women want love, not sex. All women hate them. Women crave protection and security. The truth is that women want to screw Alphas, but need to marry Betas. It's the cause of divorce and female adultery. Tomassi writes:

For this dynamic and the practicality of enjoying the best of both genetic worlds, women find it necessary to 'cheat'. This cheating can be done proactively or reactively. In the reactive model, a woman who has already paired with her long term partner [Beta]choice, engages in an extramarital or extra-pairing, sexual intercourse with a short term partner [Alpha]. That's not to say this short term opportunity cannot develop into a 2nd, long term mate, but the action of infidelity itself is a method for securing better genetic stock than the committed male provider is capable of supplying. Proactive cheating is the Single Mommy dilemma. This form of 'cheating' relies on the woman breeding with a Good Genes male, bearing his children and then abandoning him, or having him abandon her, (again through invented social conventions) in order to find a Good Dad male to provide for her and the children of her Good Genes partner to ensure their security.

I want to stress again that (most) women do not have some consciously constructed and recognized master plan to enact this cycle and deliberately trap men into it. Rather, the motivations for this behavior and the accompanying social rationales invented to justify it are an unconscious process. . . For a female of any species to facilitate a methodology for breeding with the best genetic partner she's able to attract and to ensure her own and her offspring's survival with the best provisioning partner is an evolutionary jackpot.

When I first came across this, I found myself in mental pain as his meaning became clear. His argument is a simple one: women can't marry the same men they want to screw. These are two very different kinds of men. They want to marry the Beta, but they want their babies to take after the Alphas. Having a hot guy *make* the baby while the boring, virtuous guy raise the baby is the "jackpot" Tomassi speaks of here. This is the origin of both adultery and divorce in the western world.

Given the iron law that a *woman will not voluntarily mate with a weak member of the group while other options are available*, why would she risk a less than beautiful child by staying faithful? It's not like the Alpha could ever be in a relationship, so, depending on the obliviousness of the man, to cheat for better genes is a very viable option that women are encouraged to indulge.

Cheating is a universal phenomenon among attractive women in relationships with Betas.

One fight sends her running to an old friend. She meets an old Alpha ex at a party when you're not there. She meets an ex-boyfriend and she's been drinking "out with the girls." The opportunities are endless and constant. She rationalizes "I do so much for my husband, I want to do something for me for once. This guy means nothing to me, so its no different than just using a dildo right? Only in this case, its a live one. Otherwise, there's no difference right?"

If the husband becomes enraged, he can be dumped for thousands of dollars in alimony and child support. Its a win-win. With other options, Alphas require her to work for their affection. Those with few options don't need their affection earned. They give it quickly and freely. Girls realize the Alphas they want aren't men to be trusted with marriage and family.

For a beautiful woman, "sex" or "making love" don't occur outside a loving relationship. If I asked, "how many men did you sleep with in your life?" she'd say "four or five." In her mind, that's not a lie. If I ask if she's ever cheated, she'd say "no." That's also not a lie.

The truth is that she's had sex with many, many men and cheated many times, but its all in how you define the terms. "How many men did you screw?" That's a different story. "Screwing" and "having sex" are two very different things. As different as boyfriends and husbands. In fact, other than the physical act, they have nothing in common.

When they're younger, they never get attached or show feelings because they have so many sexual options. Why would a woman so beautiful settle for one guy? It takes away a lot of good sex, money, dates and travel with other men. Its like a good lawyer having only one client. They know that the men aren't settling for one girl either.

This all creates privileged, superficial and entitled women who are insufferable to all but the most seasoned Alpha. While this is known to most men, only a handful will "do" anything about it because they realize women have total power in the romantic world. This power is both institutionalized and informal, but it is the latter where the power is most insidious.

Women win constantly because of male thirst, to use the Postmodern vernacular. They fear that any mention of their many weapons will hurt his chances with them. Thus, nothing gets done and women become worse and worse to each other and to men that are not their dream mate. This level of power over years and years cannot but have a profound impact on the female mind.

This article has been very depressing to write and, no doubt, to read. Every man will recognize, at some level, that this is invariably true. It is very easy to empirically verify this in any public space. Men who reject its truth do so only out of dishonesty. This can't be true, they might reason, because it means I'm doomed in this regard, doomed to get with the cast offs that are ruined by Alphas. A life trying to satisfy Alpha Widow's is no fun, yet, this is where most of us remain.