Approaching Infinite Whoredom

by **Staff** on December 26, 2024

by Arran Ryan, PhD

On the fateful day of October 19, 2024, British OnlyFans darling Lily Phillips undertook the Herculean task of having sex with a hundred of her male subscribers in a single work day.

Men have sailed the seas, conquered mountains, fought fire breathing dragons, but all of those adventures fail in sheer semen insignificance compared to the massive exertion of whoredom power that this lovely lady exhibited. Each punter had a mere five minutes of sticky vaginal action, after which they ejaculated on her face, much of it getting into her eyes. Thus, when she was interviewed after the event, her eyes were watering.

This led simps on the internet to suppose that she was regretful of the act of self-degradation, but this was not so. Lily loved every minute of it, what she could remember of it. This gave our gal Lil a serotonin high, so much so that in January 2025, she will have sex with a thousand men in another single day.

Lily may need to change her methodology to achieve the thousand count. There are 86,400 seconds in a day, so each man has a theoretical maximum of 86.4 seconds. Take into account that Lily is going to need food and drink over that time to keep up her whore energy as well as toilet breaks. To beat the record apparently set by Lisa Sparxxx that of 919 men in twenty-two hours (she downplays it to a mere one hunded and fifty, so there is hoe-controversy here), Lily will need to be set up, legs spread, and guys lined up, jacking off until hard, then penetrate for one thrust, then back in line, and so on for twenty-four sticky, arduous hours. If that does not cure one of bizarre OnlyFans sex, nothing will.

The main narrative on the internet has been that Lily is a “victim” of feminism and sexual liberation. Biodiversity expert Dr. Ed Dutton saw an “evolutionary” mismatch being produced by these ideologies, and real-world human psychology, but I do not see that; there is nothing exhibited here which has not been seen in history, where women have been allowed to follow their lust and infinite desire for self-promotion and vanity, without restraints. Dr Dutton thinks that Lily’s self-degradation is “kind of our fault.” No, bullshit, it is not; I for one had nothing to do with this fool setting out to wreck her gynecology. She knew what she was doing, in the ultimate act of attention-seeking for notoriety. Lily came from a middle-class family, and was university educated, so she did not need to do OnlyFans. And even if she did do OnlyFans, she did not need to go to the next level of whoredom by engaging in marathon railing.

Former male porn star Stirling Cooper, while not discussing this topic explicitly, has commented that OnlyFans harms men and ruins their lives. OnlyFans gives the illusion of intimacy and female validation, but it is an illusion, with no basis in reality. Cooper notes that forty percent of men are having less sex than men in the same age group thirty years ago. And social media is one major factor leading to this modern sexual arid landscape. Of course, all of this is the mechanical working out of the whole feminist Pandora’s box, opened wide in the 1960s revolution, and now destroying Western civilization.

About
Podcast
Books
Texts
Links


NIHILISM
A Philosophy Based In Nothingness And Eternity
BRETT STEVENS

Avoid woke movies.
Filter out diversity.
Recommend hidden gems.

Popular
Crowdism
Ethnomasochism
The Increasing Mediocrity Of Everything
The Alt Right Is Tired Of Living In Mordor
Nihilism Is The Basis Of Conservatism
The Nationalist FAQ
Beyond the Absolute
Conservationism Versus Environmentalism
The Self-Inventing Totalitarian State
The Biological Basis Of Race
Whites Going Their Own Way
How Individualism Defeats Conservatism

DISSENT WATCH
The Web's Most Forbidden News
DissentWatch.com

The Lily Phillips case runs in parallel to that of fellow sex worker Bonnie Blue, who slept with, and filmed for profit, "barely legal" schoolies (schoolboys). One can imagine the shit storm that would have arisen if the story was reversed and some adult male did the same with "barely legal" school girls! Shades of (((Epstein)))! In any case, both whores who profited from the use of these men are mere sex toys, mechanisms for exploitation and profit. I therefore have zero sympathy for both of these hoes; they are the aggressors and exploiters.

Finally, in accordance with what I believe should be the standard principle for dealing with cultural day and degeneracy: *those who cannot learn to swim, must learn to sink*, I suggest that these lovely ladies going in these sex marathon gangbangs, put their butt holes where their mouths are, so to speak, and simply let the thousand men sodomize them in sequence! Go boldly gals, where no hoe has gone before!

Tags: **lily phillips**, **onlyfans**, **promiscuity**, **prostitution**, **sexual liberation**

God Jul | **Cuckline**

ALSO ON **AMERIKA**

How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love ...
16 days ago · 3 comments
Post 'How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love Kwanzaa' On Amerika.org ...

Why the Left Won for So Long
a month ago · 28 comments
Post 'Why the Left Won for So Long' On Amerika.org realist conservative blog

Modern Agricultural Miracle Collapses
a month ago · 7 comments
Post 'Modern Agricultural Miracle Collapses' On Amerika.org realist ...

Houston Fixes Its Diversity Flooding ...
a month ago · 5 comments
Post 'Houston Fixes Its Diversity Flooding Problem' On Amerika.org realist ...

Democracy I Brought a Re
a month ago · 1
Post 'Democra Brought a Retu On Amerika.or

amerika Comment Policy

We want congenial, productive discourse without viewpoint discrimination.
Please read our Comment Policy before commenting.

Got it

36 Comments 1 Login ▾

Join the discussion...

LOG IN WITH OR SIGN UP WITH DISQUS ?

Name

♡ • Share Best Newest **Oldest**

Gilgamesh's dog
24 days ago edited

Except, hilariously, obviously, one dick or a thousand, the hoe remains the same. How about we discuss how to elevate the hoe? Perhaps not paying her would be a good start. Short of rape she might catch a glimpse of mortality and be humbled - I mean humiliated into the person she can be free from the bonds of others.

3 Reply Share ›

Ray z
24 days ago

Cuckservatives rush forward to assure us this is the fault of men. They can't wait to demonstrate submission before their feminist nation. Their princess daughters (Lilys) certainly must not be held responsible.

One thing the left and right agree on is the inferiority of men compared with their Holy Females. Feminism is a religion and a disease, and you are correct it is destroying western civilization.

3 Reply Share ›

Lars Hanneman ➦ Ray z
24 days ago

Dish out them redpills like its 2014.

Buuuuuuh women buuuuuuuuh

0 Reply Share ›

Lars Hanneman
24 days ago

Oh wow a PhD is so smart that he has to jump onto a OF advertisement campaign that ran out of steam over a week ago.

Great work PhD you are so smart.

0 Reply Share ›

Desert Fox
24 days ago

Hehe. Joke is on you if you care so much about stupid, wasted mid whores, cause that's all they want.
I don't, and never did..Another non-problem solved. Who's next?

1 Reply Share ›

Diana de Poitiers ➦ Desert Fox
22 days ago edited

Bbbb ...but...what about the culture?
I know. It's ugly, but authentic and rife with natural selection.

1 Reply Share ›

Brett Stevens Mod ➦ Desert Fox
21 days ago

The problem is that they are not dying before breeding. Darwinism rewards what breeds for multiple generations, and the idiots are spawning faster than the intelligent.

0 Reply Share ›

Colchester Collection
Digital Books
Know More



Diana de Poitiers
24 days ago edited

Lily may come from a "middle-class" family, whatever that means, but she surely comes from bottom-of-the-barrel ilk. Making whewmuns like this the stars of an article is to dignify their existence with more than it's called for. They are circus animals. They are interesting but —.

One thing I don't get: what would men who bemoan the behavior of such women have preferred? A world where these women would have been moralized into goody form? ... So they can marry them? This is funny.
Got a minute? Change my mind.

1 Reply Share ›

JPW ↗ Diana de Poitiers
23 days ago

So did Kamala. It's apparently the new Get Out of Stupid Free Card.

1 Reply Share ›

Diana de Poitiers ↗ JPW
23 days ago edited

True, the percentage of circus animals in the population has been going up. Not necessarily the rare exception any more. Unfortunately, that's what happens with social mobility and the "Open Society" - dysgenics because Prince Charming and Clueless decides it's a good idea to marry Hot Peasant on the climb. Since there's only one way Hot Peasants climb…this is how the cookie crumbles.

Those who can see past their own outrage and the sex antics designed to shock, can read what's actually there, driving the whole thing: an enormous amount of stupid and ugliness of interior. Ancestors should have been sterilized.

1 Reply Share ›

fish ↗ Diana de Poitiers
23 days ago

Yes, female sexuality is scary for men. It's seen as a wild and unforgiving contest.

So when you can't win it, you want to somehow regulate and equalise it.

1 Reply Share ›

Diana de Poitiers ↗ fish
22 days ago

Women act a lot. The sexual antics are often a manipulative tool and social mobility vehicle.
What is really scary for men is not so much female sexuality as the female mate selection mechanism - at every level. In the absence of Sexual Marxism controls, it brutalizes a not insignificant portion of men, hence history.

1 Reply Share ›

Brett Stevens Mod ↗ fish
21 days ago

I would prefer culture reward good behavior and exclude those incapable of it. Discipline and eugenics.

0 Reply Share ›

Yngve-Frey
23 days ago edited

"There is much that is wrong here," as one on my critics and mentors would say. It shows the failiures of the extended right, much like only stress on an air frame will show faults in design and material. It only took a whore to reveal you, and here we have the value of the whore.

Firstly, this event, a woman having sex with a thousand men (planned) is meaningful, not meaningless, no matter how much you try to downplay it based on morality (feelings). When Emperor Caligula proclaimed a horse a senator, it was likewise significant. Not because of the horse and its alleged qualities, but because of the underlying reality. The senatorial class is from now on a joke. This episode was talked about, and remembered, so much it became part of our history as a scandalous anectdote. When a western woman beats the world record in sex with a number of men, this likewise is talked about, and remembered. If there is a posterity, this too will become a historical anecdote, probably showing how much we fell into extreme materialism, boredom, and with that, the need for the extreme to have any sort of stimulation. The political right is quick to dismiss every symbolic act, and thus they lose to the left, every time. When someone raises their flag on your territory, this is not about a piece of cloth waving around, it is an emotional marker witch shows one groups dominance and potentially erasure over nother. Signs and symbols rule the world, as Confucius said. The lore of the dog is the lore of humans, as Nietzsche pointed out. Both species understand signs, call names and symbols, and not much more. All about it is about dominance.

The failiure in real world interpretation shows a failiure in a deeper, spiritual understanding. A great man will have a great doom, as one of my friends said, and when you speak to me, know that this is your suicide. Someone capable of suicide in public, is also capable of being a great soldier, and whoever is capable of extreme acts, is in the possession of great force. Of course, the political right will never admit this. She is a proletarian, they say. The lowest human being, they say. Not so. You've already admitted she is of the middle class, and she probably have much more potency than the average human being. Most people are bland. They have 3-7 sexual partners in their lives, and do nothing of significance. Their value is as a baseline to fall back to. Her energy, however, was just directed in a negative direction, hence the public suicide, instead of force in a positive direction, probably in the form of a warlike son, or at least, some warlike art. A Norwegian author, Matias Faldbakken, wrote that male heroinists, as a vantage point, are healthier, stronger, and more attractive than the average population. Their hairlines are lower and their testosterone is higher. Why? Remember what I said: The higher the energy and capacity, the greater the potential for the extreme, in either direction, positive or negative. Granted, both for the male heroinist, and the whore, there is probably a testimony of R-selectiveness, but this too, has a place in the world. As for the extremes an K-selective would do ... well, that's probably the tale of neglect towards duty. The problem is therefore not that certain people have become circus animals, but that society at large has become a circus.

To try to underscore my point even further, it is said that all men want a whore, just that is must be their whore. I see the point. What? Do you desire a female autist that proclaims she is asexual? Of course not. Nobobdy wants that. You just want to get the whore, or the sexual force, whilst she is a virgin or something close, to be ordered in the direction you desire. Therefore, the bemoaning of this case by the political right is another form of butthurt, as all the right do these days, and another victory of the left. They plant their flag everywhere and show their dominance. We can dissolve everything. We can keep everything, every woman, outside your grip.

The solution is to let go of morality (feelings) admit that the sexual, violence, the material and hierarchies exist, and then deal with it. With force, towards force. You're being slow, and it's nothing new.

3 Reply Share ›

Diana de Poitiers ↗ Yngve-Frey
23 days ago edited

I see your point - a valid one - but you may have misunderstood. I (for one) am not moralizing here. Just assessing. No matter this woman's level of energy and aspiration to excellence in something, moral or not, she is a one-trick pony due to her genetics, and those make for primitive societies.
But yes, she achieved her notoriety goal.

1 Reply Share ›

Yngve-Frey ↗ Diana de Poitiers
23 days ago

She's powerful (I love the falling line dancer - Nietzsche) but she is R-selective. Regardless, she's not a prole. She's a relatively higher class gone awry, one that even aristorcrats would breed with, if you look at history. But power is power. It can be translated into something else. So, she could have done something else, given the society/incentive. My point is that those who would condemn this woman as a subhuman or whatnot, have married themselves to an even greater subhumandom, as they lack the life-force and even condemn it. To put it to the extreme - A western whore is better than an Indian sage.

The writer of the article also misunderstood Edward Dutton. Evolutionary psychology isn't about moral choices. It's about making choices based upon physical reality over time. Either expand RIGHT NOW (R-selective) or build quality over time (K-selective). Some time ago I realized the political right are like dinosaurs, because they still believe in moral choices, and even demand this from circus-artists, dwarves, and the like. It's incredibly stupid and speak of their Platonism (standards outside of this world). Moral choices don't exist. Physical realities do.

3 Reply Share ›

Gilgamesh's dog ➜ Yngve-Frey
23 days ago

In the Christian book is written that three women each named Mary stand outside of the tomb of Christ and witness to his resurrection. One is the mother of Christ. One is the condoned prostitute, the woman freed from all bonds and representing the font of power. One is the wife of Christ. The symbolism is clearly Greek and Vedanta influenced. All the better that there is so much more excellent literature upon that theme elsewhere.

1 Reply Share ›

Diana de Poitiers ➜ Yngve-Frey
22 days ago edited

Higher class gone awry, you say.
It's irrelevant what class she is. She may even be technically aristocratic by origin but this isn't capturing my point. She's certainly not an aristocrat of the soul. This has nothing to do with moralizing or prudery, and everything to do with the fact that aristocrats of the soul tend to engage in complex, multidimensional endeavors of some depth - moral or not.

There's no complexity here. Just a ton of stupidity and primitive energy. What kind of immoral virtue, great exertion, or power is there in lying back for others to do work on you and ending up with an abundance of well-diversified semen on your face?
There's more power in slathering this stuff and leaving it on for two more minutes than what the instructions specify.

https://www.sephora.com/product/aha-30-bha-2-peeling-solution-P442563?country_switch=us&lang=en&skuId=2210607&om_mmc=ppc-GG_20700118067___2210607__9010798_c&gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQiA4L67BhDUARIsADWrl7Fk4kqoLddBRZbZH4m3Nzw1A9SDnJb7Y_10e-YSCtFnhNsMJuU2SVAaAraqEALw_wcB&gclsrc=aw.ds

People condemn this woman for the wrong reasons. I never condemned her if only because condemning consumes precious energy. I just assessed her as boring and bland - coincidentally, the things you fear.

Moral choices are relevant, but not all morality has been created equal or popular.

1 Reply Share ›

Yngve-Frey ➜ Diana de Poitiers
20 days ago edited

Every caste/social class will be turned R-selective if exposed to trauma. "I might die tomorrow, so my energy must be expended right now." Much of what we call evil is R-selective, and the only way human existence can be somewhat dignified is if it is K-selective, at least that's how I see it. Latin America is always evil, because they rape, steal and shoot each other with Uzis. Norway will always be good, as long as there is a Norway, because we never rape and steal, and only shoot at people as part of an organized campaign. Well, we should have more of that, of course. Thing is, you can't become something you are not. Even the serpent needs a new skin to grow into. Change ... is rare.

But I see something else too. I believe you are so directed towards the Apollonian (the world as form) by nature, that you can never acknowledge, accept or approve of the Dionysian (the world as formlessness). Therefore, you call any great expenditure of energy "stupid," require some sort of virtue even in immorality, and even demand the complex and multidimensional, just like the Apollonian person would, as described by Nietzsche in his "Birth of Tragedy." So, if a woman sleeps with a thousand men, as this woman probably will, or if Countess Bathory bathes in the blood of hundreds of virgins, or if Olympia has sex with snakes in the Dionysian festival, as she was said to do, and gives birth to Alexander the Great, it will never be enough for you to approve of, because you require something else, and therefore you miss the point, because the Dionysian has it's place in the world too. The Dionysian is about excess, breaking through whatever was there before. The world record in the number of sex partners in an orgy? That is excess, that is force, and it broke some boundaries (and many minds). Feelings are indifferent. I just register it has happened, and that a new step has been made.

If I were to go outside right now and smash the hoods of hundreds of cars with a sledgehammer, and then end up in a fistfight with twenty people, it would be a great expenditure of force. And the strongest kinds of forcefulness cannot be under a plan or happen within a human made structure or context. The thing is, when the societal order has become evil, it must be destroyed, and you don't do that through more order. The world alternates between form and formlessness, and now has come the time for our great conflageration. The advanced being understands the need for that.

If you want to know what an advanced Dionysian looks like, well, that would be me. How so? Because I also have access to the Apollonian. What the woman in question is, I cannot say. I know very little about her and haven't got OF or whatever installed. She's probably a pure Dionysian, an extreme end point, and a testimony of the Spirit of the Age. She probably had to appear for us to move onward, as the world is born upon violence, chaos, depravity, and endless amounts of suffering. Why would I shed a tear? If anything, take joy in the destruction. But a pure Apollonian will always cling to certain forms of imagination. Like that of dignity and meaning.

Said in a deeper way, I must acknowledge the inherent meaninglessness of the world before I build any meaning, lest I lie to myself. The same with what you call morality.

sacrifice scene apocalypto
Watch later
Share

I say we are strong. Why fear the loss of dignity? Shame is for the shameful.

2 Reply Share ›

Diana de Poitiers ➜ Yngve-Frey
20 days ago

I am fine with the Dionysian and of course it has its place in the world.
I am not fine *only* with the Dionysian. By itself it's unbearable.
Some types require the multidimensional. If that's what you call Apollonian, then it's the best I can do.
The good news is this woman doesn't need my approval. We operate in different energetic spheres.

Now here's where you shine:

"*The thing is, when the societal order has become evil, it must be destroyed, and you don't do that through more order.*"

0 Reply Share ›

Yngve-Frey ➜ Diana de Poitiers — ⚑
19 days ago edited

Each force has its place in the world, but it's the Dionysian which has been persecuted in this day and age, as it isn't allowed to be recognized, even in thought, and even as a presence. Every denomination, christian moralists, platonists, communists, globalists, only recognize the apollonian, some sort of logic and rationalism, and with that, they amputated themselves, and the world. They were too cowardly to admit that formless energy exists.

In my country we have this expression "High on the pear," which is closely related to "Keeping up Appearances," and the comedy series of that name. You suffer from that condition and comedy. Namely, let me bring fourth the statement, all women are dogs, and all men pigs. Any consideration of history will show the same. Your rage and dismissal of that whore, is just because you recognize something of yourself in it. If you didn't have that recognition, it would be indifferent. All women want to be carried on a silver platter to a room of drooling, alpha men. You just fled from this realization with the falsehood of "morality," and sophistication, another form of weakness.

We must admit that we are like that, and be more advanced with that. Then we can move onward. As is said in "Fight Club", you're nothing special, you're just a part of the same decaying flesh, and the same monkey, as everything else. But the apollonian is about denial.

Recognize dogdom, recognize pigdom, then move onward. Otherwise, you cannot, because then you're trapped in the illusion, and the terms and limitations it brings.

1 Reply Share ›

Diana de Poitiers ➜ Yngve-Frey — ⚑
16 days ago

My "*rage and dismissal of the whore*."
Where's the rage?

"*If you didn't have that recognition, it would be indifferent*."
I AM indifferent. That doesn't mean I am incapable of assessment.

"*All women want to be carried on a silver platter to a room of drooling, alpha men*."
Not a room. Some women want one alpha man only and they reserve the liberty to define alpha. Such as not drooling, because when he isn't, he's hotter.

"*You just fled from this realization with the falsehood of "morality," and sophistication, another form of weakness.*"
Wrong again. Just a romantic through and through.

"*You're nothing special, you're just a part of the same decaying flesh, and the same monkey, as everything else.*"
Never claimed otherwise. There are many like me and I feel at home in their company. It's just that Lady Whore here and I would have virtually zero in common and would bore each other to death in 10 minutes flat.

Ultimately, I think what you're trying to say is that you've had too much *Winner Takes It All* and could use a bit more *Dancando Lambada*. Alas, Dionysus also says one ethnic group (and penchant) per nation. Stay in alignment, Yngve!

a
Ivan Cabrera Lambada
Watch later
Share
Watch on YouTube

0 Reply Share ›

Yngve-Frey ➜ Diana de Poitiers — ⚑
13 days ago

Hm, to cut to the point here, I think our disagreement stems from our differing views and value system. I don't like arrogance, any kind of arrogance, even class arrogance. I see it as a protective instinct, in itself a sort of low grade narcissism. In short, I think your apollonianism and romanticism, and the constant setting yourself apart constitutes such a arrogance. You don't want to admit the real truth, which is Dionysos. You must also remember I'm Chaotic Neutral, if we allow ourselves to use such terminology. I'm the trubadur who hates the king, but would fight against the mongols. I'm fascinated by pleasure girls, but want my wife to be a virgin. And there's no hypocrisy there.

Stevens himself once showed a movie clip, where an old man playing golf talked to a younger man about his future prospects. The oldling didn't like what was being said, so he retorted "Well, the world needs more ditch diggers." That's what I mean by class arrogance. For Norwegians, such arrogance is taboo. Guess I'm Norwegian after all. We never had a class society as the British had. If someone said something like that to me, and I had the power, I'd make him dig the ditch. I'm just different from the lower classes, because my atoms are put together a little different, and more blood runs through my brain.

Back in the day I wrote a philosophical journal. I wrote something which fascinated one of my friends, because of the intense red pilling. It went something like this: "I'll have to accept that a woman, any woman, would rather chose Jupiter instead of me. Fine. But then she has to accept that I want to sleep with every woman in the world, on principle." And that is the red pilled and Dionysian reality. It doesn't mean I WILL do something like that, even if I had the power. I would chose not to, because of various other concerns, mainly the children. My reader there considered dating an Indian woman, for instance, but found it impossible, because any sex carries the potential for children. Good man.

About the Lambada stuff you showed me ... Those latin rythms is beyond the circumference of my soul and my ancestors the last ten thousand years. It doesn't give me much. Perhaps try with boobs the next time? But I agree. "The Winner Takes it All" is harsh and terrible, especially if it's the only song around.

1 Reply Share ›

Diana de Poitiers ➦ Yngve-Frey — ⚑
13 days ago edited

I'm afraid you see arrogance where something different is at play. I don't have to "set myself apart" because people are "set apart" by nature, and women are people too. You appear to suggest I hold myself superior to the Lady Whore here, but I think you're missing the point. Much as you'd like to default to the primal AWALT, women can be spectacularly different from each other with virtually nothing in common. In fact, this is a routine and fatal mistakes men tend to make - to see all women as more or less "the same" due to the *reductio al uterus & Co.* Many pay dearly for this error.

Nothing unusual about the concomitant fascination with pleasure girls and virginity, in fact that's quite normie of you - but you'd be better off fascinated with the relationship goodness of fit. Ultimate test: imagine the female prospect as a member of the opposite sex (that is same sex as you). Would she-as-he be your best friend? If not, keep walking.

The world was never in want of Ditch Diggers. Those are easy to find. The world is always in want of Builders of a more evolved world with higher levels of consciousness. Maybe the Nordics can handle egalitarianism better than other ethnicities and races, but I wouldn't count on it.

So your woman will get with you when what she really wants is Jupiter, and you will get with her when what you really want is all women in the world. Sounds like the perfect recipe for co-dependency and reciprocal use which the world continues to tout as "wisdom" while the cultural lag is eating people alive. In reality - this should be filed under Cross-Generational Misery Loves Company.

A romantic would say you should be HER Jupiter (as far away from that as you may be objectively) and she should be the Miss of YOUR Universe, even if she's no Miss Universe.

You would choose "not to" for 100 reasons except the only one that flies, it seems. If you'd skip promiscuity "for the children," not for her, no...I take that back, for you! - well ... then just a thumbs down from this romantic. You'd serve the children much better by focusing on the viability of your couple than by creating contortionist theories in their name.

That guy and the Indian woman come from groups with dramatic cultural distance. It doesn't take virtue to see it's a bad and superficial idea. Huge odds are there would be little substance in that relationship. Not that deep.

The Lambada? My point exactly. Stick with *Winner Takes All* and be the Winner.

I don't post with Boobs. Inverting the value hierarchy, we might say my inferiority and powerlessness prevent me from stepping up to your Dyonisian standards.

0 Reply Share ›

Yngve-Frey ➦ Diana de Poitiers — ⚑
13 days ago

It's a sign of higher culture to be able to endure contradiction. And the Dionysian truth (Jupiter for her, Miss Universes for me) contradicts the Apollonian truth, where such parts of your bodiliness and reptile brain have to be curtailed, and you may even have to invent romance. But both these aspects exist at the same time, in me and others, and it's good to be aware of them. Sometimes I lean in one direction, others, the other. I don't care. Why would I? And the contradiction mirrors reality. We're all Schrödinger's cat. Dead already, alive someday.

Interesting thought experiment with imagining a potential partner as the other gender, but doesn't that ... miss something? Most people aren't gay, are they, but then again, what you propose is an Apollonian form of love only ... and that is pretty gay. I probably want something not like me in a partner. So, what I'm saying is that I would be frustrated in the Apollonian illusion of meaning and fake Jupiterdom, or exclusivity in affection, of all things.

Nordics are kinder than most. A flaw, probably. But that prevents us from trampling upon those beneath us. This kindness should give rise to another contradiction. Swift killing, when necessary. We have it in us. The quality itself points to its opposite. It's below the dignity of a Norwegian to sneer at ditch diggers.

It's interesting that I bade an Apollonian force to procure boobs for me. It's my way of trying to help, I guess. But I full well understand that the illusion is very strong with you, and you must live with it until the end. If you were to let go of it, you'd probably die, faced with a horrible and unbearable reality. Only certain geniuses and madmen can stand in it all. I lean towards the latter.

1 Reply Share ›

Diana de Poitiers ➦ Yngve-Frey — ⚑
13 days ago edited

Don't try to invent romance. You make plans, Gods/Nature laughs. Keep the Apollonian where it belongs, which is not in the relationship sphere. Don't believe everything history teaches you here, you're not condemned to repeat it. You don't need to get with some unpalatable "princess" for the good of the state or equivalent. Leave this mindset back in history, which doesn't mean you shouldn't apply your Apollonian filters and parameters and chase some Indian in F-Land.

The thought experiment I mentioned doesn't involve gayness in the slightest; and it's a lot more Dionysian than it is Apollonian. It involves stripping the woman of her outwardly, material traits you've already approved of (those get vetted first) and focus on her mind and soul and the goodness of fit with yours. That's Schrödinger's cat eternally alive.
Finding something "not like you" in a partner is easy-peasy. There will always be something. At the most basic level, every penis fits every vagina, so you can make a pair out of virtually any man with any woman. It's the intangible parts that are difficult to nail.

Reproduction plans, gender roles, "opposites attract" and the like are all fine and also necessary - until associated goals are reached and the job is largely done. Then what? Continue to play roles? As a great relationship expert says: you don't keep paying the plumber after the toiled is fixed, do you. You pay him once then you want him to leave. It's a deep one, sleep on it.

Still don't get why you associate romanticism with the Apollonian force. Romanticism aligns with the Dionysian.

What illusion? Realists work towards having none left. To me reality is nihilistic. If it is horrible, I remind myself it is horrible just to me. Some humans have the ability to shape it into something bearable. After all, faith (in life and afterlife) is about bearability. You are doing it too because hey, look: you're here.
But you're enamored with the madman. What if the madman may not be able to face a bearable reality so he makes it unbearable because at some level he...well, loves it this way?

Yes on the Nordics.

1 Reply Share ›

Yngve-Frey ➦ Diana de Poitiers — ⚑
12 days ago

This discussion is interesting, but I have to end it, because of my attention being sorely needed elsewhere, and I'm in winter hibernation as well as chaos/pain, as usual. How about we make a final summary of our points on this matter? Here's mine:

My claim is that you live in an Apollonian, illusory world, being blind to the underlying Dionysian reality. You claim to be a realist, but your stances on certain matters, especially the romantic, contradicts this.

An example of this is that you for relationships wants the pairing to be 'special.' For the woman, the man should be the strongest in the world (Jupiter). For the man, the woman should be the most desireable in the world. But reality dictates this isn't so, and they will, on some level, know that. The man won't be the wealthiest, and even the physically strongest. This is easily observable, even in daily life. The same with the woman and her beauty. There are, well, many competitors behind every bush (especially if you're a bush-man, heh)

Him being Jupiter, and her being the most beautiful, is thus a self-imposed illusion, typical of Apollonian discipline and delusion (the same).

Tolkien said that when you marry someone, your partner will most likely not be the most ideal one for you. This is correct, and just a matter of mathematical probability. Most marriages will not be with the

see more

0 Reply Share ›

Diana de Poitiers ↪ Yngve-Frey

11 days ago edited

Here's the retort. I don't think we disagree that much really, it's just a matter of nuance and chiseling the consensus. There's some gender stuff too probably: you get a bit rigid and categorical, including on notions like romanticism, I'm more fluid, but it's all the same.

"*You claim to be a realist, but your stances on certain matters, especially the romantic, contradicts this*."

You don't believe realists can be romantic. Sure they can. Whatever happened to enduring contradiction? Realists understand how Romanticism actually plays out in real life as opposed to Shakespeare, Flaubert and Hollywood. People get bogged down in semantics, ideologies and moralizing and forget to count the ducks in front of them.

You know those old couples who talk about how beautiful it was when they met, and how well they got along their entire life, and how wonderful things have been, and how they couldn't imagine life without the other...and on and on...and you can tell they are not lying and all of it is true.

But then the stupid self-righteousness kicks in and they can't refrain from moralizing and telling others how people should not "believe in romanticism" but in "respect, commitment, and working hard on the relationship" and the rest of the mantra.

You want to slap palm to head since the suckers can't even realize that what they've had IS exactly the phenomenon of real-life romanticism, which is founded on compatibility and an excellent match. It's not the "hard work" that caused Einstein (or less J-ish genius of your choice) to produce those results. It's mostly the foundation he started with (his IQ). Romanticism develops from a high dyadic IQ which allows the supposed "hard work" (which isn't that hard) to produce joyous results. Even the associated troubles are rooted in joy.

It doesn't mean these two oldies never had disagreements. But anyone who can't tell the difference between the disagreements and frictions of a true romantic couple and the Sisyphean 'hard work' required of a questionable match - would probably not be capable of Romanticism anyway, so they might as well hug the bolder.

Romanticism brings mostly joy. A questionable match that must be "made" to work, brings mostly internal frustration, even if on the outside the two DO "make it work."

"An example of this is that you for relationships wants the pairing to be 'special.'

No, I don't. The romantic expects it to make sense. To be symbiotic and to bring consistent fulfillment and joy. This is actual romanticism, not the popular interpretations. It's not 'special,' as in "no one else has this." This is silliness.
It's a couple with as much sense and functionality as possible. Nietzsche saw them as erotic best-friends, more or less. Anything less is disjointed stuff.

Relationships are on a continuum from disastrous to joyous and a lot of "bare-bones, meh, and 'make do' in between. It is up to you to decide where you need to be on that continuum, based on how you are wired; just be careful to match it up with the prospective partner's aspirations. If you want bare-bones and the partner wants to get to high-Maslow joy, you will be in trouble sooner or later. You will end up pontificating to the partner about how bare-bones with "commitment" is the "right thing," when this is not what she's wired to be. Or the other way around.

So grab both Apollo and Dionysus by the hand and get your match right to begin with. Don't rationalize and rely on "make work" propaganda.

For the woman, the man should be the strongest in the world (Jupiter). For the man, the woman should be the most desireable in the world.

Key words: For the woman. For the man. And not "the strongest." Just the overall person must feel irreplaceable. This "feels" so even if she knows full well, by Apollo's grace, that he is NOT the strongest or the Anything-est. Same for him.

Subjectivity reigns when it comes to the quality and high-functioning of a relationship. Romanticism (and the implicit emotional bond) runs on subjectivity which is exactly what makes it so functional. If it "feels" like that to him, if it "feels" like that to her - it's nailed. An excellent antidote to male promiscuity and female hypergamy.

If you run on Apollonian objectivity, you're right: there's always someone else out there who will score higher on various dimensions. Subjective bonding works better than objective commitment.

Him being Jupiter, and her being the most beautiful, is thus a self-imposed illusion, typical of Apollonian discipline and delusion (the same).

But that's just the thing, mon ami. It's not self-imposed. It's not Apollonian discipline, and they're under no illusion. Once again, contrary to popular understanding, romantics know very well that the other is not THE most of anything. In fact, they see clearly they are not, but it feels as if they are - and this is the glorious part.

The joy comes naturally and has nothing to do with self-imposed Apollonian discipline. It isn't that different from a parent's love for their child. The mother KNOWS her little girl is not THE prettiest. Her eyes can see, she's not deluded. But her heart melts at her sight, and not at the sight of someone else's clearly much prettier girl, and Apollo can go do self-care for all the mom cares.
The phenomenon is in fact very Dyonisian.

Tolkien said that when you marry someone, your partner will most likely not be the most ideal one for you. This is correct, and just a matter of mathematical probability. Most marriages will not be with the ideal partner.

Tolkien needs to shut up. I love him and his lit beauties, even his statistical acumen, but I don't need to hear him talk on this topic. He's one of those "do as I say, not as I do" types, the kind I mentioned above, so don't mind him, really. He'll talk your ear off on this topic as he "soul-mated" his way trough life.

https://aleteia.org/2015/07/20/tolkien-speaks-the-secret-to-a-happy-marriage

IDEAL itself has a range - and people know when they are in that range. Just because a lot of people (as in most) step into rushed or rationalized relationships to meet fertility deadlines does not mean it must be that way and that humans cannot raise the bar in mate selection.

Maturity will be to accept less than ideal, less than perfect, and still making it work.

May I rain a few more drops on your parade and at least partially disagree, if not altogether?

Maturity is not to accept "less than Ideal." This too is manipulative propaganda - rationalization sold as "maturity" by previous generations who know a thing or two about quasi-misery and wouldn't mind some historical company.

Maturity is to refuse what does not make sense TO YOU. It is also to separate what makes sense TO YOU, from what might makes sense to the Generalized Other, especially when Peak Bell-Curve is not exactly the place you call home.
It is to know when to reject standardized advice. Firmly. What you invoke is standardized advice.

Otherwise, no sane person would insist on a manic IDEAL, as in Supermodel Looks, Marie Curie brains, Virgin Mary behavior, Discussion-Starter Lady over here in the sheets (minus the other 99), and generally willing to please like Wonder-W.I.F.E 6.0.
Oh, Pagan Jesus!

However: that "less than Ideal" person (or A LOT less), must feel pretty darn close to ideal TO YOU, as in "I wouldn't have it any other way."
Unwillingness to compromise on this crucial criteria is the real maturity.

When I spoke of romantics, I didn't really speak of the period...

I know.
On the "Period x Relationships" cross-tabulation, humanity has been on a trajectory: BARE-BONES PRAGMATIC (for most of history), made reasonable by highly homogeneous mating pools (how wrong could most people go, really?) --> EROTIC-CHAOTIC confused with Romanticism (the past 100 hundred years+), and with any luck it's heading to ROMANTIC SENSE, at least for those capable of it.

Everyone else will continue to play the game of musical chairs but the trick is for romantic cultures to insulate themselves from low-bar over-breeders.

"But here your female intuition is striking."

Oh, stooop! You're making me blush. ...

Wait! Are you saying my Apollonian performance is not OK?

(Test of authenticity of femaleness, sometimes recommended for trannies: if you want to prove you are a woman, demonstrate you can turn a compliment into an argument)

"*I would rather have a relationship where I didn't have to be Jupiter, and where I needn't lie and say to my partner she was the most beautiful woman in the world.*"

Then follow the above. As a romantic, you wouldn't have to be. If she's a romantic too, she would know you don't think she is THE most, objectively ... and the beauty of it is that both could not care less. And when you see that objectively drop-dead gorgeous woman, many undeniable miles above yours in attractiveness, you still could not care less. And neither could she.

It's final. :)

0 Reply Share ›

Brett Stevens Mod ➜ Yngve-Frey
13 days ago

In other news: dogdom and pigdom both have their places as evolutionary strategies. Women need to be willing to do job #1 -- reproduce -- with whatever nature hands them. Men want to do the same, but from an aggressive instead of well-rounded perspective.

1 Reply Share ›

Brett Stevens Mod ➜ Diana de Poitiers
13 days ago

I don't think societal orders get destroyed. They merely degrade further. We shoot for the stars, speak honestly, and stop manipulating people because in the course of manipulation we change our own goals. Dionysian and Apollonian are two parts to a cycle, like man and woman, and the interplay makes them functional.

1 Reply Share ›

Brett Stevens Mod ➜ Yngve-Frey
13 days ago

Survival is a tautological meaning. The meaning of life is to do life. That means thriving, which means K-strats at a certain level of evolution. The poor fuckers in the tropics never get a chance at this, carrying high microbe load and therefore breeding young which intensifies mute load and inbreeding. In my view, we in the West should stick with our higher standards and stop trying to change to adapt to this world; we must oppose it by creating something better in its stead, and this requires shooting straight and speaking plainly.

2 Reply Share ›

fish
23 days ago

"Go boldly gals, where no hoe has gone before!"

Nietzsche would love this.

1 Reply Share ›

Diana de Poitiers ➜ fish
23 days ago edited

So would Aristotle, maybe even Plato: aspiring to Ideal Whoredom.

She sounds like an honest and transparent one. Much more pernicious are those of similar ilk who operate under respectable institutional pretenses to maximize climbing or personal advantages in the "Open Society." True whores (with a calling) have always had a candid reputation among (certain) men: often seen as honest women, with a good heart.

1 Reply Share ›

South Texas
18 days ago

Remember horny young men, women are more mature! LMAO!!!

0 Reply Share ›

Brett Stevens Mod ➜ South Texas
13 days ago

Also Uncle Sam has an offer for you... go fight for Christ and democracy somewhere forgettable.

0 Reply Share ›

Fata Libellorum
18 days ago

hoes dont need your sympathy. you didnt even pass the shit test from this one

0 Reply Share ›

Subscribe Privacy Do Not Sell My Data DISQUS

Copyright © 1988-2020 Amerika | Site Map