

# **"And no one wants the nice guy because just like a slut, he gives his love to anyone who will take it"**

September 14, 2014 | 728 upvotes | by [\[deleted\]](#)

---

Long time lurker. Saw this pop up on my twitter feed and it just really resonated with me.

....I don't really know where this post is going. I just felt the power of this quote and wanted to share it with the community. It makes sense on so many levels.

---

Archived from [theredarchive.com](http://theredarchive.com)

---

## Comments

---

trpSenator • 134 points • 14 September, 2014 06:20 PM

I'm a bit tipsy for The Lord's Sunday Football, so excuse me if I am incoherent.

Every slut, EVERY -- NO EXCEPTIONS -- Every single slut I've ever met or fucked is the product some fucked up shit in their past. There is absolutely no exception to this law. They were either abused sexually, physically, mentally, neglected, and so on... There is NO exception to this law. Every slut has a ton of psychological baggage. To this day, I've never met a girl that sleeps around with a ton of men that doesn't have some issue that roots back to some paternal figure. It just doesn't happen if they had a decent upbringing.

Sure, women get horny and want dick all the time. Especially the quality women, they love getting fucked for all the right reasons. The quality women tend to find a guy, even a FWB, and stick to them. They don't go around looking for new men to fuck to validate themselves.

I much rather get with a girl who got fucked 20 times in the past 10 days by one guy, than a girl who got fucked 5 times in the past 10 days by 5 different guys. I don't give a shit about what sort of political feminists spin they try and throw on it, the reality is, bitches that fuck multiple dudes at such a high frequency, are nothing more than an airport terminal loaded with baggage.

sumdumguy-throwaway • 26 points • 15 September, 2014 01:38 AM [\[recovered\]](#)

so... nice guys have some fucked up shit in their past, too?

[deleted] • 71 points • 15 September, 2014 02:08 AM [\[recovered\]](#)

As a reformed nice guy, yes, they don't value themselves enough as people and they feel that they have to shower people in grandiose kindness and compliments in order to be accepted, often they do this because they want more than anything for someone to do that for them, but it doesn't work like that, some of them learn and become men, some of them don't and become like Elliot Rodgers. We need to do a much better and more honest and pragmatic job of teaching boys how the world works.

pirateted • 12 points • 15 September, 2014 03:28 PM

Former "nice guy" here and I did it for that exact reason.

I\_HaveAHat • 0 points • 16 September, 2014 11:26 PM

My old friend was a real nice guy. His family treated him like dirt. His older sister would party come home late shower then go to her own room, while he, a teenager, had to share his room with his younger brother.

JazzerciseMaster • 2 points • 26 September, 2014 01:24 AM

Where does an older sister coming home and showering fit into this?

I\_HaveAHat • 0 points • 26 September, 2014 01:28 AM

Well she showered presumably to wash the smell of alcohol and whatever else she was stinking off herself. She was partying and his parents didn't care and wouldn't even let my friend stay out past 9

[deleted] • 1 point • 17 September, 2014 04:58 AM

This is why I try to give every younger man in my life who's straying towards niceguy/blue pill behaviours hints of red pill without it being obvious as such, as stated here many times before most people agree with many principles of the red pill but aren't willing to show it in public or act on it.

Ob1Kn00b • 18 points • 15 September, 2014 02:55 AM

Yes, actually. Nice guys are men that have had their masculinity derided and devalued for their entire lives. They are told that things that make them men are less then worthless, and thus build themselves around avoiding those things.

cntthnko1 • 12 points • 15 September, 2014 08:31 AM

As a guy who doesn't get any, my problem is not having any sort of social or cultural guidance whatsoever.

[deleted] • 4 points • 15 September, 2014 11:13 AM

[permanently deleted]

cntthnko1 • 3 points • 15 September, 2014 11:18 AM

Thats interesting... They really arent repelled by shit like that?

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 September, 2014 12:07 PM

[permanently deleted]

cntthnko1 • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 01:45 PM

Im going to blame my lack of results on lack of trying. The thing that would stop me is being "new" to the whole thing and literally not having ANYTHING to fall back on. What you said does give me hope to at least try, thanks.

Most of the time when someone thinks they are autistic, they usually aren't; it's usually just a lack of proper experience in certain social scenarios that is the cause of awkward behavior.

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 05:31 PM

Being able to not give a fuck IS a social skill, and it had seemed to work for you

Seasons\_In\_The\_Abyss • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 06:20 PM

You can't fuck me with social skills.

pimpy543 • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 09:49 AM

same here, learning is the fun part though!

trpSenator • 4 points • 16 September, 2014 04:51 PM

Most likely.... I don't have any data on it other than personal life experience, but every nice guy I have ever met has been the product of some fucked up shit rooting back to some demasuculating experience.

JazzerciseMaster • 1 point • 26 September, 2014 01:26 AM

Just curious - aren't there in fact less powerful males out there who actually have less testosterone,

and thus don't get laid regardless of being raised by women, etc.?

trpSenator • 1 point • 26 September, 2014 05:56 AM

Of course, but that's extremely rare and extremely exceptional. Even the guys that seem to have perfect upbringings, after looking into it you find out they had a lot of neglect, or some shit. Also, I don't think testosterone has a whole lot to do it. I knew plenty of weak low test guys that got laid on the regular. Heck, my buddy growing up was a bean pole and borderline anorexic looking, but pulled in women.

Not being able to get with women roots back to nervousness' outlet through social anxiety for one reason or another. If you aren't nervous, you'll be able to get with a chick one way or another.

johnnight • 11 points • 15 September, 2014 07:13 AM

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fathers\\_as\\_attachment\\_figures#Absent\\_Father.2FNo\\_Attachment](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fathers_as_attachment_figures#Absent_Father.2FNo_Attachment)

<http://uncabob.blogspot.com/2013/11/promiscuity-as-self-multilation.html>

In the area I grew up in I knew girls who were having sex at 13, 14, 15. All of them were promiscuous and as far as I could tell, had not-so-good relationships with their fathers. I do remember the 14-year-old ended up in some sort of home for wayward girls. My gut, even then, told me it had something to do with the parents. Studies have confirmed my intuition

If excessive promiscuity is usually due to a poor relationship with a father, and is a search for love, then the break-up of marriages (or their failure to form) is going to lead to promiscuous girls who are unable to sustain a successful relationship with a man. This is the main reason I refer to women who purposely have have children without being married as "monsters."

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/femail/article-2340431/Do-absent-dads-make-promiscuous-daughters-Study-find-s-lack-father-figure-triggers-risky-sexual-behavior-young-girls.html>

Do absent dads make for promiscuous daughters? Study finds lack of father figure triggers risky sexual behavior among young girls

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2939716/>

Associations Between Father Absence and Age of First Sexual Intercourse

<http://library.wcsu.edu/dspace/bitstream/0/527/1/Final+Thesis.pdf>

As the divorce rate in the United States climbs to nearly 50 percent, fathers seem to be disappearing from their daughters' lives. Research shows that girls and young women who have an unstable father figure are more liable to unplanned pregnancy, low self-esteem, high school and college drop-out, poverty, divorce and sexually promiscuous behavior. This thesis examines the research linking father absence to daughter problems.

[http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/dr-raj-persaud/fathers-days-best-kept-secret\\_b\\_3441392.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/dr-raj-persaud/fathers-days-best-kept-secret_b_3441392.html)

During harsh conditions, the evolutionary imperative of 'survival of the fittest' favours a shortened 'reproductive timetable'. This ensures passing on genes to future generations before perishing.

DelPriore and Hill point out that previous research indeed confirms this evolutionary theory by finding that girls growing up in father-absent homes - or in homes characterized by low-quality paternal investment - experience accelerated pubertal development, initiation of sexual intercourse and becoming pregnant earlier. They also have a greater number of sexual partners, and are more likely to get divorced;

relative to girls growing up in households with two 'investing' parents.

<http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/co-parenting-after-divorce/201205/father-absence-father-deficit-father-hunger>

Father Absence, Father Deficit, Father Hunger

<http://www.personal.psu.edu/afr3/blogs/siowfa13/2013/12/why-are-girls-with-fathers-less-likely-to-be-promiscuous.html>

Clearly, the reason girls without fathers are more likely to be sexually promiscuous than girls with fathers is because they often have low self-esteem, lack confidence, lack of independence, lack the ability to form long lasting relationships with men, and crave the male attention that they have lost. So even today when we see the supermom, who thinks that she can be both parents, we now know that it is still better for girls to have an active father in their life than supermom.

<http://www.donotlink.com/framed?542573>

Not everyone agrees. "Absent Fathers Create Slutty Thoughts, Says Idiotic Study" say the whores at Jezebel.

Poor\_cReddit • 3 points • 15 September, 2014 09:04 AM

Thank you for providing the actual research to my feelings all along! Yup, after sleeping with countless women I've come to the conclusion that "Daddy issues" is a real thing. These women are batshit crazy and clingy. Never again.

Lt\_Muffintoes • 3 points • 15 September, 2014 06:21 PM

Of course, the mother's shitty, irresponsible choice in father is the father's fault.

NaughtyAudio • 6 points • 15 September, 2014 02:45 AM

I think you mean an airport filled with baggage and seamen.

Rougepellet • 7 points • 15 September, 2014 04:32 AM

What would seamen be doing at an airport? They belong at sea... ooh i sea what you did there

RedPill115 • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 05:31 AM

Every slut, EVERY -- NO EXCEPTIONS -- Every single slut I've ever met or fucked is the product some fucked up shit in their past. There is absolutely no exception to this law. They were either abused sexually, physically, mentally, neglected, and so on... There is NO exception to this law. ... I don't give a shit about what sort of political feminists spin they try and throw on it,

Look at the history of feminism, and you'll find that most of the main figures in feminism had that exact past - abused, neglected, etc...

[deleted] • 5 points • 15 September, 2014 08:13 AM

The original supporters of feminism were bratty rich white girls saying they were gay so they didn't have to marry the guy their father wanted them to. They knew marriage requires real work and they wanted to remain spoiled by their fathers so they said they wanted to work instead knowing they would be too old to actually have to by the time it happened.

RedPill115 • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 06:23 PM

Eh, I don't know about that. The real original authors of feminism seemed to be rich men who wanted to double their work force. After that, it seemed like it was run by disgruntled women who did what people do and promote their way of thinking onto everyone else.

Feminism has increased female power, but decreased female happiness. Is this something women would actually do to themselves if they knew what they were getting into?

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 September, 2014 12:06 AM

I didn't mean the authors who engineered it, I just meant the original group of girls the supported and followed it.

waynebradysworld • 1 point • 17 November, 2014 09:57 PM

I'd argue feminism was created by extremely low value women who were jealous of people above them in the social hierarchy.

In terms of social privilege... Hot women > average women > hot men > average men > bottom of barrel guys > bottom of barrel women.

Classic feminists fall into bottom of barrel women category. Green with envy and steamed up because they can't cash in on a pussy pass since they are just too stank

Can't compete? Change the game. Feminism is for uggos by uggos.

Lt\_Muffintoes • 0 points • 15 September, 2014 06:22 PM

Rich kids can still be neglected.

Humankeg • 7 points • 14 September, 2014 09:02 PM

I get what you are saying, but there is ALWAYS an exception to the rule.

But yea, when I hear about a traumatic child hood, daddy issues, or see the girls on /r/gonewild, all I think is "slut, easy to fuck".

WordsNotToLiveBy • 11 points • 15 September, 2014 12:31 AM

I don't think girls on GW are necessarily easy to fuck. I'm sure there are some on there that are, but being an exhibitionist goes much deeper. You'd have to break down the desire of a woman to want to "show off" her goods.

For instance, if they have pretty pussies, they'll want to show it off. NAWALT, but if they know their snatch is not as nice as some of the others, then they'll definitely be self conscience of it. Same goes for breasts and their entire body.

It comes down to validation. They like having strangers tell them they look good. It's the reason why they love having friendzones around to shower them with praise.

pctomm • 7 points • 15 September, 2014 01:04 AM

Man, you're bang on. In my life, every slut I've known was going through some shit. It's important to define slut by chick who nails a ton of people. I dated this chick that was so sexual, she'd wear see through tops, have sex shows at clubs, turns out she was with very few people. Other girls I've known with a high count always had something that explained it. Absentee parents, abuse etc. Or generally just a rough time at that particular stage in life. Anyway, I learned there is a BIG difference between a slut who sleeps around, and a sexy lady who isn't afraid of using her body, but they have less partners than you would imagine.

Jaereth • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 05:53 PM

I don't think girls on GW are necessarily easy to fuck.

Probably not. That's why they get their validation from straight up exposing themselves. If they fucked all the time they wouldn't need that.

Humankeg • 0 points • 15 September, 2014 01:08 AM

Eh, anecdotal evidence on my part. In my experience they all seem easy enough.

WordsNotToLiveBy • 4 points • 15 September, 2014 01:41 AM

Could be because your RP game is strong.

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 September, 2014 01:46 AM

In my BP days I went on a date with a slut. Knew of her promiscuous past but still living in ignorance we went out for a couple drinks. She told me that her and her dad bumped heads a lot. Biggest red flag in the world. She doesn't respect authority. This women also disobeyed a cop and was in court for it. If she won't obey someone who's armed....why the fuck would I think she would listen to me?! Jesus...thank god I'm here now.

trpSenator • 1 point • 16 September, 2014 05:17 PM

Of course there are always exceptions to the rule. But we aren't talking about outliers here, we are talking about the bulk of the bell curve.

mindscribler26 • -12 points • 14 September, 2014 08:20 PM

what about women who are emotionally detached, and can separate sex from emotion like most men can? I mean I think I'm a nice guy, but emotionally detached and would LOVE the opportunity to have an attractive slutty friend, as I like the concept of mixing sexuality with a social life in some cool way. And also I think that the majority of people in general, have some kind of issues/baggage.

Iramohs • 11 points • 14 September, 2014 09:59 PM

You're on the wrong subreddit buddy.

Honor2None • 10 points • 14 September, 2014 10:23 PM

I think he's on the perfect sub

Iramohs • 4 points • 14 September, 2014 11:51 PM

To learn yes, but what he's talking about is irrelevant.

mindscribler26 • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 07:57 PM

then where's the right one?

abcd\_z • -14 points • 14 September, 2014 11:19 PM

I much rather get with a girl who got fucked 20 times in the past 10 days by one guy, than a girl who got fucked 5 times in the past 10 days by 5 different guys.

Yes, but that's only if you eventually want a long-term monogamous relationship with the woman. I practice

PUA Polyamory, which means I get to fuck both of them without worrying about their sexual history.

[deleted] • 6 points • 15 September, 2014 12:31 AM

So, how many STDs do you have?

abcd\_z • 2 points • 15 September, 2014 12:33 AM

Why does everybody assume that because I sleep around I automatically have unprotected sex? I wear a condom. I am promiscuous, but that doesn't mean I'm *stupid* about it.

And I haven't been tested for a while, but AFAIK I'm clean.

[deleted] • 2 points • 15 September, 2014 01:19 AM

You can get STDs even if you wear a condom. Vaginal fluids touching your scrotum, stomach, and legs, can all give you STDs. In terms of preventing STDs, condoms are more effective for women than they are for men.

[deleted] • 2 points • 15 September, 2014 03:29 AM

If that shit doesn't get inside your body, you'll be fine (unless it is herpes sores).

abcd\_z • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 01:39 AM

...and the only absolutely certain way to prevent pregnancy is to be abstinent, but we still have sex. It's not about avoiding all risk, it's about balancing risk with reward and personal safety.

Besides, the only STDs that can't be easily cleared up and isn't otherwise harmless (\*cough\* herpes \*cough\*) is HIV, which is far lower risk than you might think, and condoms provide a high degree of protection against it.

Your Honest-To-God Guide to STDs

[deleted] • 7 points • 15 September, 2014 12:35 AM

Things happen. I'm just being a dick, though, don't worry about it. Good luck with your fun degeneracy.

BluepillProfessor • 14 points • 14 September, 2014 09:00 PM

I think this post was from an RP-woman explaining the facts of life to a nice guy.

The full quote from the thread as I recall (paraphrasing) is:

No one likes a slut because a slut gives away for free what she is supposed to be guarding and no one wants the nice guy because like the slut he gives his affection and love away freely to anyone who will take it. He is an emotional slut to be bled on and taken advantage of for his emotional love just like the slut is pumped and dumped for her sexual love.

Solonzzo • 145 points • 14 September, 2014 02:29 PM

The problem is that the nice guy gives without taking, the badboy takes without giving. Women crave being in the position of being taken advantage of, because it will always be by the badboys initiative, and as he is the one who started, ultimately if anything goes wrong it's his fault. As for the nice guy, he is passionate and passive, if anything goes wrong with him it will be her fault, because she in a sense has to take the initiative. Nice guy means work for women. Badboys stand for fun and pleasure, guilty free.



RedPope • 219 points • 14 September, 2014 03:53 PM

Everything you said is correct, but change your outlook from this:

Women crave being in the position of being taken advantage of

To this:

Women crave being taken

No one is being taken advantage of. The badboy is giving her exactly what she wants. Pleasure, attention, excitement, etc. Girls are not victims, they are willing and eager participants in this exchange. Take them off the pedestal.

frasfralla • 59 points • 14 September, 2014 04:11 PM\*

So much this. Im so tired of the bitchy whining about 'alphas' take advantage of women etc. If you think like that you have understood nothing

ilike2partyhowaboutu • 33 points • 14 September, 2014 07:23 PM

"And then we were alone and SOMEHOW THROUGH THE POWER OF MAGIC we started fucking"

Um.. lady. you shaved your twat, plucked your eyebrows, slapped on a skimpy outfit and did shots while grinding on guys at the club until one took the hint and brought you home to fuck... that's not magic.

[deleted] • 38 points • 14 September, 2014 05:48 PM

Lack of strong male role models has pussified our generation. It's very hard to break free of the brainwashing.

TaylorWolf • 0 points • 15 September, 2014 01:52 AM

So true. The first male role model of today that came to mind is Seth Macfarlane... (Since everyone loves family guy and now he is on the oscars/etc.)

And he is so effeminate he could easily be mistaken for gay.

chakravanti • 6 points • 14 September, 2014 05:00 PM

But how else will she manipulate your dumbass "friends" into white knightng you?

Always save the proof if your dudes teeter like that. Serves as great awakening material.

AKnightAlone • 6 points • 14 September, 2014 10:05 PM\*

Well stated. I got banned from /r/offmychest for vaguely defending Red Pill theory despite the fact that I consider myself all the equality-based "isms." Apparently TRP is "a hate group." lel

LaidBackStrat • 6 points • 14 September, 2014 11:45 PM

Same with me really. The thread was called "TRP is such bullshit" or something like that, the OP was bashing TRP without justification and the commenters were all nodding. Keep in mind that sub rule #4 is "Do not mention other subreddits or users in posts, for you will seen as enticing brigading and will get banned". But that post was fine, apparently.

All I said was something "To an outsider, that sub might seem a bit harsh, but it's got a some truth in its core". Boom, banned, labelled as a misogynist and, when asking the mods for a reason, the answer

was "You don't get it". Nice...

AKnightAlone • 7 points • 15 September, 2014 02:18 AM

Yeah, I'd never seriously used the term femnazi before that day, but that's all I could think of after how quickly I got banned for a generally positive statement. The entire thread looked like an SRS circlejerk, and our bannings confirmed it.

teeelo • 3 points • 15 September, 2014 07:56 PM

Holy hell that pisses me off.

Thinkcali • 0 points • 15 September, 2014 07:47 AM\*

No one really has the desire to feel used/taken. They have the desire to feel useful. Badboys are not the only type of man capable of making a woman feel useful. Thinkers, alphas, daredevils, leaders pretty much any man who lives by his own rules.

Pushovers whom are easily influenced always love others more than they love their self. Men can't expect anyone to learn to love them, if they don't know how love their self. Why should a woman show a man attention, if he doesn't even show his self attention?

RedPope • 2 points • 16 September, 2014 12:07 AM

You added the word "used" to the conversation. That is your bullshit belief, not mine. My message was that women are **not** being taken advantage of. Desiring sex does not make a woman a victim or weak person.

You white knights are the true misogynists. Never treating women as adults. Acting like they're frail children needing your gallant protection. Pure bullshit.

Dreadnark • 25 points • 14 September, 2014 02:35 PM

It's funny because this is the principle that women deny the most on reddit. Whenever they criticise TRP it's on the grounds that they actually hate "bad boys" who will treat them like dirt.

Yet time and time again, they let themselves be taken advantage of. To be honest, they probably know that they're being treated like dirt but try to rationalise that away.

[deleted] • 40 points • 14 September, 2014 03:28 PM

You also have to understand that unattractive women behave very differently than attractive women. Game is not as effective since their self esteem is pretty low. So telling them they are beautiful may have the opposite effect. The type of women who go on reddit are in large part not attractive. So of course to them this sub will not work.

I know just about everyone everyone has seen that picture of a reddit meetup in Baltimore floating around.

thegayrabbit • 17 points • 14 September, 2014 08:11 PM

the picture for anyone curious

Jar\_of\_apples • 11 points • 14 September, 2014 09:19 PM

Be warned this is one of those things you cannot unsee.

Iramohs • 9 points • 14 September, 2014 09:57 PM

NSFL. By that I mean you'll probably stab yourself in the eyes.

Razgriz16 • 4 points • 14 September, 2014 11:36 PM

Oh man that girl in the back right looks so uncomfortable lol

XXXmormon • 13 points • 14 September, 2014 03:41 PM

Here's a really accurate cross-section of the kind of redditors you find in Portland at least.

[https://www.facebook.com/dicedrinks/photos\\_stream](https://www.facebook.com/dicedrinks/photos_stream)

IllimitableMan • 10 points • 14 September, 2014 04:04 PM

[https://fbcdn-sphotos-f-a.akamaihd.net/hphotos-ak-xpa1/v/t1.0-9/10432484\\_744847442238226\\_453684860905206480\\_n.jpg?oh=345e0e89101f050b8238875200a60898&oe=54C96E05&\\_\\_gda\\_\\_=1422567736\\_eae9f5b4bbd9b22f794108ea4ac0629b](https://fbcdn-sphotos-f-a.akamaihd.net/hphotos-ak-xpa1/v/t1.0-9/10432484_744847442238226_453684860905206480_n.jpg?oh=345e0e89101f050b8238875200a60898&oe=54C96E05&__gda__=1422567736_eae9f5b4bbd9b22f794108ea4ac0629b)

The blonde would get it.

LaidBackStrat • 4 points • 14 September, 2014 11:48 PM

Most of those are not that bad to be honest, they seem like fairly normal people.

XXXmormon • 5 points • 15 September, 2014 01:53 PM

That was part of the reason why I shared the photo set.

ilphae • 8 points • 14 September, 2014 03:41 PM

This is a serious life lesson right here boys.

uututhrwa • 6 points • 14 September, 2014 08:22 PM\*

Maybe this is a cultural thing (I'm not from the US, but I still didn't get to see it happening irl whenever I was there), but where do all those people that are "trying to get girls by being nice" or "treat women like dirt" actually exist? In like 98% of the cases they are all moderate and far from those extremes.

I know of a few couples where the guy treats his partner bad, but they don't come off as "le irresistible alpha leader not being nice guy" they come off like dumbasses or as some sort of comic relief.

And I don't understand how you are supposed to get a girl by "being nice"? I am nice to my sick elderly relative, or the disabled person that needs help getting on the bus, or the homeless person asking for money. Wtf would a woman need me to be so nice about? Is she disabled too? It's like some kind of fantasy about them being damsels in distress.

I've seen this nice guy fables on the internet for years, I mean I dont get it. And I like how there isn't a "normal" or "neutral" stereotype it's either nice or "douchebag". Like some other posters probably hinted it must have to do with people on reddit having low self esteem about their image and trying to attribute things to a "moral compass" or something.

edit: oh and the one thing I have the most trouble believing, is this fabled scene, where the nice guy is sitting by his love interest, and she's crying, tears eveywhere, and she is telling the stories of the ways her bf treated her bad and hurt her. And the nice guy is supposed to offer support by this, like a shrink. This scene literally doesn't even happen in rom-coms. Only in the corniest rom com of the decade maybe. I'd probably die of a heart attack laughing if this ever happened in front of my eyes. Why the fuck would that kind of thing even happen in real life?

Solonzzo • 7 points • 14 September, 2014 09:35 PM

Nice guy stands for passive male behavior. It's the guy who clearly wants the girl but is afraid of rejection, so much, that he prefers to play a facade where he is not desiring her but just wants to be "friends". He fools no one but himself. The female used to being sexually desired by other males, see in this "pretend sexless friend", which to her is an aberration!! See, she is used be disered for her sexuality, but this phony friend is so passive that he is no threat at all to her, both physically and emotionally, and there goes the excitement and all the fun!!. This kind of man do exist, he is despised by the other males for he is weak and cant stand for himself, and cannot belong to the group. So he runs to orbit his female friends, and that's it, the nice guy is no more than a modern eunuch.

uututhrwa • 2 points • 14 September, 2014 09:45 PM

I see, I can't say I know many people like that irl though. Well except this one guy who ended up giving car rides to the girl that repetedly rejected and crushed him mentally, AND her fiance. Yeah he probably fitted that stereotype a lot.

truchisoft • 7 points • 14 September, 2014 09:28 PM

I live in south America and this happened to me. Not anymore but its a real scene. Maybe you never had the nice guy frame so you never got into that situation. Lucky guy.

uututhrwa • 0 points • 14 September, 2014 09:39 PM

You mean the whole thing with her telling about her boyfriends etc.? If that ever happened to me (or anyone) it's all up to you, it is very easy to come off neutral or ambiguous about it. Trying to validate her for being right or a victim etc. is pointless, you are more like validating her bf than herself.

truchisoft • 5 points • 14 September, 2014 10:23 PM

Old history now, but you imply that all of that is not even possible in the frame of a novel, and i can tell you first hand it does happen.

[deleted] • 7 points • 14 September, 2014 05:50 PM

[permanently deleted]

Humankeg • 4 points • 14 September, 2014 09:05 PM

The times I have heard "just something about you; hate you are an asshole but... xxxx".  
Delusion is my friend.

[deleted] • 0 points • 14 September, 2014 06:39 PM

They're raped when that happens shitlord

exit\_sandman • 6 points • 14 September, 2014 07:11 PM

As for the nice guy, he is passionate and passive, if anything goes wrong with him it will be her fault, because she in a sense has to take the initiative.

Yeah, that's probably it - the nice guy means accepting responsibility.

He's more likely to be the one who won't give you a reason to break up (responsibility if things go south), he's more likely to leave every decision to her (responsibility for her present actions), he's also more likely to

be intimidated by preexisting sexual experience (responsibility for her past actions).

Solonzzo • 8 points • 14 September, 2014 10:57 PM

Exactly, and you can add that the bad boy, or should I say "bad boy?" is perceived as more authentic and honest since he puts his raw masculine nature upfront instead of a facade of friendliness like the nice guy would.

According to this thought, it will always be the male responsibility for the relationship to work. It has to be, since the female is the passive polarity. So even if the bad boy doesn't always get the girls he wants, at least he will always be respected as a man for trying, he will never be seen as less of a man. While the nice guy.. well, he is not the kind of "man" who would try to bed his girlfriends, after all he is too nice for that, see? Niceness is a polite way to call the female dual characteristics of vulnerability/weakness, nice is not a characteristic of a man. And here lies the problem, sexual relationships have nothing to do with comfort, they are based on arousal, or in other words, tension. Any perceived "niceness" is a put off, as it intended to build comfort rather than that healthy tension called arousal.

If you're a boy, you shalt not play nice. Leave the niceness facade where it belongs, with the girls, and they will love you for letting them play their favorite role, the nice little princess who always falls for the troubled jerk.

exit\_sandman • 3 points • 15 September, 2014 07:48 AM

is perceived as more authentic and honest since he puts his raw masculine nature upfront instead of a facade of friendliness like the nice guy would.

You're falling for the same fallacy as feminists, i.e. believing that the guys' niceness isn't genuine. However, odds are that they're not using "beta game" because they're vindictive or intentionally misleading, but because that's how they're wired and it comes more naturally to them than standard alpha game: they're playing nice because they actually *are* that way and because they feel compelled to treat their prospective love interest especially friendly and be supportive and helpful towards her. Of course, they'd probably behave differently if they *knew* that it doesn't get them anywhere, but it would be a more of an act to them.

dallz\_beep • 14 points • 14 September, 2014 08:18 PM

Imagine taking a girl behind a dumpster. You pull down her pants, turn her around, bend her over, put your dick in, dump a load in her, then carelessly shove her to the ground and leave her there, just walking away while her pants are around her ankles and cum is leaking out and she's all cut up on the gravel she landed on. That's essentially what's happening to nice guys. They get bent over and fucked, female style. They are simply used by women. It's the female version of being used as a bitch.

Yet, society conditions us from birth to accept this as normal. It's almost as if the whole thing is a scam... an illusion... some sort of... Matrix.

A\_White\_Male\_LOL • 4 points • 14 September, 2014 09:16 PM [recovered]

I find this a bit extreme. How do girls abuse nice guys to this extent? Not marry them the instant you open a door for them?

LukesLikeIt • 2 points • 15 September, 2014 07:32 AM [recovered]

He talking about the women that act like they're interested, lead a guy along until his emotional investment isn't worth the attention or whatever else they get from him and then dump him. Men do

they same of course however in many of those situations both parties physical needs are (at least) met, while with a beta guy its all a one way street.

JazzerciseMaster • 1 point • 26 September, 2014 01:13 AM

Yeah. A little over the top here.

[deleted] • 3 points • 14 September, 2014 03:08 PM

We will know women have no work ethic.

oldredder • 1 point • 16 September, 2014 06:22 AM

I think honestly women really want men to initiate so any blame subconsciously, emotionally, is on him. She has the power to reject his moves (at any stage of escalation), giving her a sense of emotional security. She has the opportunity to be (approvingly) overwhelmed, feeding her fantasy-need to be desired in a way she feels is powerful. She wants to be surprised, to feel the whole thing is interesting & if she initiates/plans everything it's all on her & she'll get bored and/or won't even have the creativity (depending) to make initiating flirting, sex, hookup places just enough fun.

When you think about it, really, male approach anxiety is irrational. Women want & need men to approach for reasons that aren't just selfish. It makes everything better for her & that means she'll make it better for him when she's DTF. Take the risk because you're doing yourself and her a favour at the same time.

That being said I think there's multiple levels of "nice guy". There's the supplicating ass who has no desire to be of real value & is just faking it best way he can. Then there's the increasingly brainwashed, woman-only-raised, lied-to, fully-in-the-Matrix male who would be just fine on instinct if he hadn't been lied to constantly from birth about what women want, lied to by feminists. For that "nice guy" I think there's a lot more opportunity, a lot less struggle to get things right.

Killigraphy • 13 points • 14 September, 2014 06:27 PM

It's a bit short sighted but I see what its getting at. Ultimately, you have to act like you don't want pussy to get pussy. Nice guys think "courting" still works...it doesn't, your job is to either get her drunk or get her interested enough to want to know more. Funny enough being upfront has hindered not helped, a man get laid.

Nice guys put all their cards on the table, and they're cordial about it...forgetting that trying to hook up is a long game of texas hold'em.

The problem with the quote, is that people love sluts, give a guy a loose slimmy at any situation and he's going to crush that pussy with zero problems. The rephrasing should be; No one wants to marry a slut.

procrasturbationst • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 07:48 PM

When I like a girl, I tell her in no uncertain terms: "Hey, I like you and I'm attracted to you." Something like that.

A few years ago, I went on a few dates with someone who, for whatever reason, saw me as a "nice guy" – no real romantic interest in me, but enjoyed my company. Taking this approach, I wasted no more romantic time on her.

Trying to figure out clues would have been impossible – I still don't know whether she wanted to fuck me when she invited me over after we had been drinking on a night out (I had showed up with two other girls who I had to take home, so I declined), and I really don't care.

Instead, I had a clear answer ("not interested") and tossed her hook right back into her boat. Only wasted 2 or 3 weeks pursuing that. In retrospect, I'm really glad that panned out the way it did – her insecurities would

have made me insane and I would've dumped her. Props to her now boyfriend (who's actually a really awesome guy). And we're still friends – she's just kept at arm's length.

Point is that if your goal is something more than meaningless hookups, you may be better served by just being honest about your feelings, instead of "you have to act like you don't want pussy to get pussy." Girls love that shit. Though, I guess if meaningless hookups are all you want, then you'll probably need to be coy bordering on douche.

Killigraphy • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 08:35 PM

Unfortunately, women will hamster regardless of a one night hook up or a long lasting relationship. It's a dreaded game of "find out what I'm thinking" till you're both dead...one of the many reasons marriage fails, and why people get divorced. Women, regardless of who they're with, will always have something to hide, and will always provide shit tests.

I'd like to believe that all women aren't like that...then again I'm not in a utopia where everyone lives forever and there's no crime. The truth is a sad one, manipulation is key in every relationship.

procrasturbationst • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 10:38 PM

It's a dreaded game of "find out what I'm thinking" till you're both dead

My ex was like that. That was a big part of the reason I was terribly unhappy in the relationship – if your happiness depends on me being good at guessing what you want from me, you're in for a pretty miserable time (and you'll make me miserable in the process).

They aren't all like that, though. My present girlfriend doesn't do this.

As for shit tests, *everybody* does "shit tests." Men and women. I did, without even realizing what I was doing or why I was doing it. It was just "well, my needs and thoughts come first! always!" Now I realize that I behaved that way because I need an assertive woman with strong boundaries – if you let me walk all over you my attraction will fade. There's probably a reason for this. Over time, though, both my girlfriend and I have grown to trust and respect each other. Our boundaries have made each other stronger, better, kinder people.

Nobody worth dating does that shit intentionally; it's just a process of figuring out how to understand your own needs and communicate respectfully with each other, and *it's fucking hard*.

oldredder • 1 point • 16 September, 2014 06:32 AM

Depends. Now and then the guy astutely looks at his hand like it's maybe good, maybe not, turns one card around to face her & on it is written "back room. Let's fuck. Now" followed by smirk. Game's won then :)

the\_optional • 0 points • 14 September, 2014 09:34 PM

Oh, courting works alright. Courting alone is not enough though

Dreadnark • 42 points • 14 September, 2014 02:32 PM

The more abundant something is, the less demand there is for it. This applies to almost everything in life.

The problem with this generation is that we're being raised not to have a fucking damn sliver of self respect and a sense of well being. We wouldn't even need the red pill if guys treated themselves half as well as they treated women.

[deleted] • 12 points • 14 September, 2014 04:08 PM



The self-respect has been replaced with narcissism, or at the very least, egocentrism.

[deleted] • 0 points • 17 September, 2014 06:33 AM

Rather the value decreases. Demand will not change.

ThePrince\_ • 1 point • 20 September, 2014 01:29 AM

I think from an economic standpoint, if you consider women a luxury good - then yes, it would.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 September, 2014 02:43 AM

Not just an economic standpoint. Masses of horny attractive women would not result in less chicks getting fucked.

whatsazipper • 17 points • 14 September, 2014 02:46 PM

The nice guy is unattractive because it's not something women are attracted to. They don't care for nice. They want push/pull. They want to be teased. They want someone to take the lead. They want boundaries, and want them to be enforced.

A guy who gives attractive behavior to numerous women, can bang them all, and then use the pre-selection to sleep with many more. So no, nice is not analgous to slut. It's analogous to being a landwhale.

[deleted] • 13 points • 14 September, 2014 05:22 PM\*

Being "nice" is a bare minimum requirement for a partner or even just being friends with someone. It's like passing an exam with a D+, sadly a lot of my generation (20-25) have that "everyone gets a trophy" mentality. These "nice guys" who have no balls whatsoever, poor diet + health, no career prospects, no talents, NOTHING. think they deserve a hot girlfriend just because they're "nice". Then when they don't get what they want they spout off on how all women are sluts and shit like that when they're jealous they're not the one fucking them.

Dude, are you gonna fuck that land whale who has a boring personality, no sense of fashion, no goals or aspirations etc? Because she's the female equivalent of YOU at the moment. You see what I'm saying? You don't want to settle for that!

To be frank, they're "player-haters".

I'm sorry, but I don't blame hot girls at all for not wanting to fuck your cheeto-eating fedora-tipping ass. If someone offers you a choice of one car or the other for free, and your options are a 2014 Lambo or a 1991 honda accord... What are you going to go for? Get motivated, and build your personality up to that metaphorical 2014 Lambo and you won't have to worry about a thing with women.

exit\_sandman • 10 points • 14 September, 2014 07:15 PM

No, the problem is that excessive niceness in itself is an anti-quality regardless of all other traits. Being ok-looking, doing well at college and having a stable, reasonably well-paid job don't help you if you're a nice doormat; but will be a huge bonus if you're assertive.

procrasturbationst • 2 points • 15 September, 2014 07:52 PM

Well I really can't afford the insurance on the metaphorical Lambo. Bring me the accord!

[deleted] • 5 points • 15 September, 2014 03:24 PM

In the words of the great Patrice O'neal: "You are a Time Ho".



You are a Time Ho. You are a Time Ho. YOU ARE A TIME HO. You give your time away so cheaply to anyone who gives you any attention. You're a ho and women use and abuse you like men do sluts. You're a Ho. You're a Ho. You are a fucking ho.

[deleted] • 26 points • 14 September, 2014 03:55 PM

But this isn't true.

Girls don't want the nice guy because the "nice guy" thing has nothing to do with niceness and everything to do with being submissive and not assertive. Girls want a leader usually.

But the slut. Lots of guys want the slut. I actually prefer slutty girls because they are way more fun even when you aren't having sex. They're just more adventurous. But many people still cling to older more puritanical views about sex.

joncho • 28 points • 14 September, 2014 04:07 PM

This has been said here a lot, women are the gatekeepers of sex, men of commitment. Most guys want to fuck a slut, but not commit to her, so she is falling. Same with the 'nice guy' but switched because he is off the oposit gender.

[deleted] • -5 points • 14 September, 2014 07:02 PM

Except that this is a false duality. This is what the brainwashing of society wants the situation to be.

But sans puritanial christian bullshit humans, in their natural habitat, never commit. Marriage doesn't exist. People live in polyamorous communities and the kids are raised mostly by the women, but everyone is provided for by the men, who work together for food. Nobody gives a fuck who's kid is who's, because the kids still need to be raised well regardless of *who's* they are.

Of course, the alphas in the situation get laid a lot more, but that's not the alpha's problem.

joncho • 8 points • 14 September, 2014 07:09 PM

Marriage exists before Christianity. But regardless I'm not sold at all on the sociologist theories about communal living. If those were so great they would be prevalent today. There has to be a good reason why they did not develop. If they even existed more than anecdotically. Sociologists are highly ideological.

[deleted] • 6 points • 14 September, 2014 07:26 PM

They're closer to proven fact than baseless theories from the records we have. But what you are saying has a logical hole. You are saying that if they were better then we would have them now, that's not necessarily true. Sociological norms don't work the same way that darwinian biological evolution does. Sociological norms have a lot more to do with how the alphas of society decide to shape it than it does with what is objectively better.

Marriage can be a very useful tool for society because it is a more fundamentally simple form of organization than communitarian forms. Therefore it is easier in a disorganized system with people who don't know shit to use it to build a society. But that doesn't mean it is the most ideal situation for an individual's happiness. Case in point? Marriage causes depression

The same is true for capitalism. Capitalism is very useful because by being highly individualistic it is very easy to assure the growth of society as a whole. But the same thing that makes capitalism a good system when you have no central controls is the same thing that makes capitalism a really shitty situation for personal happiness. It causes individuals to alienate

themselves from one another and to be extremely selfish and mistrustful. It causes them to place all of their motivation and happiness in getting more money, instead of in developing a good community around them.

Things are more complicated. Things like marriage and individualism were useful for bringing about the technological evolution, but if we want to become happier as individuals it is time to use that technology and philosophy to try to figure out how to structure things in the way that will create the most individual happiness.

And I can tell you right now, from my experience, the experiences of many people I know, and from science: Marriages don't last because marriage is a system that goes against mankind's natural instincts. We need to either genetically modify those instincts, or align ourselves closer to them. That or deal with the crazy bullshit drama, anger, and depression that marriage creates.

joncho • 2 points • 14 September, 2014 07:36 PM

Thanks for confirming that sociology is highly ideological and low on science so it's not too be trusted.

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 September, 2014 07:53 PM

It is, but what we know about how societies worked in the past isn't sociology. It's just history. It's based on writings and records that we find.

The difference is that with sociology you have someone taking an incredibly complex system and doing an overly simplistic experiment with no control group.

But with the history stuff what we have is the equivalent of some greek farmer's journal talking about how at last weeks congregation of the sacred feminine he and his buddy banged four chicks but two weeks before three of those girls banged his neighbor joe instead.

It's just historical accounts, not sociology. And it's fact, not theory, because we have the records and we can date them using scientifically proven methods of dating shit.

[deleted] • 2 points • 14 September, 2014 10:26 PM

"But with the history stuff what we have is the equivalent of some greek farmer's journal talking about how at last weeks congregation of the sacred feminine he and his buddy banged four chicks but two weeks before three of those girls banged his neighbor joe instead."

Yeah those things existed sure, but that doesn't mean marriage didn't exist. Or that people lived in "polyamorous communities". It's just like today people go to bars and clubs and have one night stands etc. Attitude towards sex was not exactly the same in pagan societies than after christianity took over but it wasn't some hippie utopia either. Personally I also think that left-wing sociologists tend to talk a lot of bullshit about these things ("Sex at Dawn" for example). Society was always a "patriarchy", the notion that people lived in a "matriarchy" at ancient times is just a legend. Of course a hunter gatherer tribe is different than a sedantary farming society but neither was lead by women ever.

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 September, 2014 10:30 PM

So I just gave you a fictitious example. But the point is that we have enough evidence to establish that it was not just some people. Before a certain point many

religions were centered around feminine icons and society was a lot more polyamorous. Marriage does predate christianity, but marriage is not the first form of sociological organization within humanity. It is likely that neither was a more feminine oriented set of things either. Most likely we started off in social groups that are similar to the ones chimpanzees and gorillas engage in. Which is still communitarian, but both sexes have alphas and there isnt a clear distinction as to which sex is seen as superior.

[deleted] • 6 points • 14 September, 2014 05:16 PM

Same page here. Hanging out with sluts and doing shit is usually pretty fun cause they're not too uptight or boring. Plus you can fuck without it "leading to something".

That being said, I would never commit to a slutty girl. Been there done that. No thank you.

I guess that makes me no different from the girl who banged the bad boy who cheated on her, now she wants a nice guy.. But deep down she still wants to fuck that bad boy.

Like everyone else, I'm just another person who wants what they can't really have (or haven't found yet). An adventurous badass woman who fucks like some BPD psycho with the morals and personality of a good girl.

procrasturbationst • 2 points • 15 September, 2014 07:57 PM

An adventurous badass woman who fucks like some BPD psycho with the morals and personality of a good girl.

Hold out hope. I have that, and she's awesome. And her family, with whom she has a great relationship, is also awesome.

Just screen out the people that have families you wouldn't want to marry into, and then from that pool find the fun exciting ones.

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 September, 2014 06:58 PM

What you need is not a good girl. You just need a fun girl who is ready to settle down.

Or, you could be true to your human biology and just have an open relationship when you do settle down.

oldredder • 0 points • 16 September, 2014 06:46 AM

That's flat out against my biology. Open relationships are poison to me. It's one thing to be fucking with no exclusivity, it's another to claim emotional bonding of a boyfriend-girlfriend type or marriage-type. That's a pair-bond & there's no room for a 3rd. Ever.

My core truest human biology is if I'm committed in a pair-bonding relationship I'll stab the guy who gets in the way of that. Period.

No 3rd, not ever, never open.

Don't get me wrong, I've learned a lot here & I might just leave it as a sting & if she gave in to him, buy *him* a beer for helping me see the light, cut her to the curb, and then move on. But the pair-bond relationship is the *only* emotional goal of actually having an emotional relationship. I can be realistic & say "Women will not so I won't seek the impossible. Sex-only it is". That's fine by me. That's me relating to real terms of life & picking my path.

I'm not going to fall for the stupidity of loving a woman who claims to love me and her other boyfriend equally. That's nonsense bullshit & it doesn't belong in my life. It's so wrong it's like

stealing food off my plate.

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 September, 2014 04:54 PM

I don't think you understand how biology works

oldredder • 1 point • 17 September, 2014 05:33 AM

I do very much indeed.

I think you like to tell people they don't understand when you know very well my understanding is robust. If I am committed to a woman & expect it of her I have an immediate violent need to do harm to a man who interferes with that. No words can describe it: it's as natural as breathing. He interferes, I snap his arm. Just like that. No hesitation. It's normal biological activity for a male. Males of many mammal species are just like this.

You know this. You are in verbal denial but your own mind knows you've seen this and felt it. My solution to the chain-reaction of problems that will result is that I refuse to commit. Men will interfere, women will invite it because they have no loyalty and I will be smart enough to avoid the conditions that *force* me to violence as per the required hormonal reactions of male human biology.

[deleted] • 0 points • 17 September, 2014 05:35 AM

Again, you clearly don't understand how biology works. You also clearly don't even understand your own psychology.

Go see a therapist. Trust me. I'm not being mean btw, I see a therapist too. It's not bad to admit you don't know what you're talking about. It's good. Keeping yourself in a state of knowing that you know nothing is how you truly learn and become wise.

oldredder • 1 point • 17 September, 2014 08:12 AM

Again, I clearly understand beyond what you could ever dream of understanding.

Therapists are frauds. Only an idiot pays 100+ per hour to be lied to.

It's bad to agree with the nonsense you spew: the day I agree with you is the day I'm hit in the head with a sledge-hammer and don't even remember my own name. It would take that much damage for me to drop to your level.

What I know is easily decades of pure knowledge ahead of you. I am core wisdom. You are foolish denial.

[deleted] • 2 points • 17 September, 2014 10:33 AM

therapists are frauds

Okay L. Ron Hubbard.

I think we're done here.

oldredder • 1 point • 18 September, 2014 02:35 AM

A therapist is about as honest as a lawyer or a politician. It's fine-level detail to argue case by case which one tells more lies for more money.

I'd throw the same book at all the scientologists too. As for those of religious cults/orders/vatican/etc. I consider them just as scandalous but some of them a)

really believe the bullshit and/or b) actually get little/no personal financial gain, which puts them as less douchey than a therapist, lawyer or politician because they *all* get their payday (as do the scientologists).

lemonparty • 7 points • 14 September, 2014 05:26 PM

Huh? Analogy still holds. Girls want the beta orbiter / nice guy when they need a shoulder to cry on. Guys want the slut when they want fun.

Girls don't want the nice guy for anything else, guys don't want the slut for a wife/mother of his children.

[deleted] • -10 points • 14 September, 2014 06:57 PM

You're not understanding. I would rather marry a slut. I don't want *anything* to do with judgemental boring good girls.

You're still just bought into the idea that sexual promiscuity is inversely correlated to responsibility and maturity. That's not the case in the real world, they are independent variables.

Girls don't like nice guys because nice guys are losers. It's not a societal brainwashing thing, they really are losers, objectively. But sluts are just on the wrong side of a lot of puritanical brainwashing and jealousy.

[deleted] • 10 points • 14 September, 2014 07:11 PM

You need to read more. This sub is objective on the reality of relationships and there have been numerous studies that would tell you marrying a girl with a high partner count is the worst thing you could do. Like 90% unhappy marriages and high rate of infidelity. If you don't want to look into it go ahead and find out for yourself.

[deleted] • -3 points • 14 September, 2014 07:16 PM

I've been reading this sub for like 4 years dude.

You guys put way too much stock in studies and too little stock in your own real world experience. Sociological studies are bullshit by definition because it's impossible to account for all of the variables.

[deleted] • 7 points • 14 September, 2014 09:16 PM

Like I said go ahead and find out for yourself.

[deleted] • -2 points • 14 September, 2014 10:03 PM

Again, I have. I've been around the block more than half of this sub combined. That's exactly why I have the opinions I do.

lemonparty • 3 points • 15 September, 2014 01:52 AM

Obvious that your mind is made up, if reading this sub for years hasn't convinced you. So, more power to you if you marry a slut. Best of luck, and honestly "thanks."

I like the sluts, but the marriage-minded sluts I can do without -- thanks for taking one out of the pool.

phaed • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 01:27 AM

This is either a rationalization you just made up to be "not-wrong" or a pretty dumb thing to

say, you cannot discount all sociological studies in the way you just did and then pretend you are having a rational argument.

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 01:57 AM

You can. You can because science does. In order to have a scientific test you have to be able to isolate variables. You can't do that with sociological experiments, so they experiments never render data that is accurate. We have the same problem with economics. It doesn't mean that you can't come to conclusions about sociology, it just means that you can't use the same kinds of studies you would to test whether a drug worked, for example.

oldredder • 0 points • 16 September, 2014 06:49 AM

My real-world experience matches the studies. High partner count=low ability to bond emotionally or to be trusted. Betrayal is inevitable. It's a waste of time, maybe even years, to go that path. Total waste.

[deleted] • 2 points • 14 September, 2014 04:16 PM

I completely agree with you about your first point. It's not about being nice, but all about being the benevolent yet firm leader in the relationship.

As for wanting sluts, yes we all want to bang sluts, but we don't want them for *anything* other than sex. I think that's what the quote is referring to. And I learned a long time ago not to equate sluttiness with better sex. Some of the biggest hoes I've been with were dead-fish in bed.

[deleted] • 3 points • 14 September, 2014 07:00 PM

Your misunderstandings. I am saying that sluttiness has nothing to do with maturity or responsibility or fun in bed.

Because of how our society works a lot of those variables occur in the same place, but that's just because of societal brainwashing. Girls get the fun girl beat out of them by a judgemental society, and the fun girls get sucked up to by all the losers so their personalities are not always as great.

But not everyone is controlled by that. It's possible to find a fun girl who is also mature and who is a hard worker.

ReflektorFilm • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 07:44 AM

Ding Ding Ding. Person actually living in reality here. ^ You guys keep enjoying your woman bashing Matrix.

korewarp • 6 points • 14 September, 2014 04:08 PM

I was waiting for a reply like this. I agree - I'd totally want a slut. But women do not want nice guys at all. Don't get me wrong, being a nice guy = No fucking way José. But you can't say that 'Nice guy' = 'Slut'. Simply can't. Men still want sluts.

jmottram08 • 29 points • 14 September, 2014 05:13 PM

Men still want sluts.

Men want sexual slut females.

Women want emotional slut males... because they give them what they want, commitment, for free.

You are forgetting that the currency isn't the same. Men want sex, women want commitment. Being a slut is giving whichever away for free.

Women love having betas around. They can use them for whatever they want. They get the commitment without giving the sex.... or put another way, the "slut" beta male gives away the commitment without getting the sex, much like the female slut gives the sex without getting the commitment.

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 September, 2014 12:53 AM

And that my friends is the male equivalent of a slut. As the slut gives every guy what she is the gatekeeper of (sex), so to does the beta orbiter give what he is gate keeper of (commitment) to every girl he sees.

anonymouse • 4 points • 14 September, 2014 02:42 PM

It certainly won't make her feel special if he treats everyone as well as he treats her.

Wesleykin • 2 points • 14 September, 2014 10:44 PM

Good quote. Immediately made sense.

TheEntgineer • 2 points • 15 September, 2014 02:00 AM

Thank you for not writing a book about something that only needed to be said in one line. Good on you dude.

mobilus • 7 points • 14 September, 2014 02:39 PM **[recovered]**

She rejects him because she knows he's been socially engineered and is not in his natural state.

itsarusko • 16 points • 14 September, 2014 05:23 PM **[recovered]**

Literally every existing person in this earth is socially engineered. This is how humans learn. Even the smallest tribe in Africa socially engineers their members. You are socially engineered by this sub

powder1 • 1 point • 14 September, 2014 08:25 PM

Wow I never thought of it like that. Good point.

TigersMaw • 1 point • 15 September, 2014 01:09 AM

Agreed. The nice guy, like a slut, is a leach .. latching onto any girl that will give him the light of day. His neediness eliminates any chance he had.

JulKash • -1 points • 14 September, 2014 06:15 PM

I feel like this is befitting, [http://youtu.be/p37\\_Ux1G\\_BI](http://youtu.be/p37_Ux1G_BI)