

Hypergamy 101 - Women See Men the Way Men See Jobs

May 8, 2015 | 893 upvotes | by [Garl_Vinland](#)

Imagine this: You have spent the better part of your life learning the skills necessary for your career. You've landed a job at a decent company, and over several years you have proven your value at what you do. Now that you are in your prime, even more opportunities are opening up. Better companies are courting you, with better packages than you are getting now. Left and right you get offers to work elsewhere. You are told how valuable you are. Your skills are exactly what they're looking for. You're wined and dined by all the big players in the industry, validated at every turn.

Do you stay with your current company out of loyalty?

Fuck no. You make the proper business decision and go with the best offer, because that's all it is; a business decision. Your friends don't berate you for leaving your old company. You found a better deal, of course you took it.

Should you take a low offer from a company that is barely surviving, that would be entirely dependent on you to do more than you would enjoy, for little to no extra compensation?

Fuck no. You go with the one that benefits you the most. You have what they want, and they will compensate you generously for it.

Should you have quit your old job before entertaining the idea of taking a new one?

Fuck no. You've been told your whole life that you don't quit a job until you've got another one lined up. What if you can't find one right away?

These are basic examples of the way most men view their jobs. You make the best decision for yourself. Morality has little to nothing to do with it.

Different people want different experiences. Some people want to go with the established company, where they will feel safe and secure in their future. Some people want to joining a startup, where they have more flexibility and a prospect for even better future. Again, these are just business decisions you will make, often dependent on where you are at in life.

Most women have spent their majority of their lives learning one skill above all others: How to attract and manage men. Their hypergamous nature leads them to the same conclusions about men as I described above regarding jobs. They show little to no remorse about it because it really is just a business decision to them. Which company do I attach myself to? The best one of course!

The main difference is secrecy. In business, this is all universally understood. Business is transactional by nature. Nobody argues that. But suggest that interpersonal relations are transactional by nature as well and you are labeled a sociopath.

By convincing men that relationships are not transactional, women hold more power. You should just love her for who she is. After all, she's different than *those* girls anyways.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

awakenedmale • 124 points • 8 May, 2015 05:26 PM

Good analysis. You forgot to use yet another apt analogy - those that jump from job to job too quickly become unemployable very quickly.

The message for the men, especially those who aren't millionaires, is to be a fulfilling startup company, or an NGO with lofty goals. A certain demographic of women will go for them, regardless. It will be a very small demographic, but those are the one's worth admitting into your lives.

DRMMR76 • 8 points • 8 May, 2015 11:41 PM

This is a very important point, and just as apt and spot on as the rest of the metaphor.

RedBigMan • 8 points • 9 May, 2015 11:43 AM

Also forgotten in this metaphor is the dudes who start their own business and don't need a job from someone else anymore. When his need for a job drops to nil then he doesn't bother looking for a job anymore. Just like women when their ability to attract a man drops to nil, they suddenly don't need a man. Am I right?

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 May, 2015 04:28 PM

Also forgotten in this metaphor is the dudes who start their own business and don't need ~~a job from someone else~~ *other employees* anymore.

I think that's more accurate. We're the ones running the business. If you're running a business where you wouldn't benefit from hiring any additional employees, you're running lean and efficient and it would simply be an additional labor expense rather than fill a necessary position or expand operations, that's what you're going for I think. It's not the men who are looking for the job in the metaphor.

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 May, 2015 06:13 AM

Those that jump from job to job become unemployable very quickly

Unless you have high market value. Then you get another job. It's not too different than consulting. Don't forget the consultants - high value, high performing, injection of a solution that some companies need and are willing to pay for.

In this analogy, that can be a woman with high sexual market value. She can go from man to man. But the k

[deleted] • 353 points • 8 May, 2015 05:22 PM

This is a great post. Simple, accurate, true.

This post highlights something I've realized recently: we are far from callous uncaring monsters. Actually, **empathy is the foundation of the Red Pill.**

The entirety of TRP is based on an extraordinarily empathetic view of women. The whole philosophy is based in putting yourself in a woman's shoes and trying to figure out what you would want if you were in her position.

Even the concepts of "Alphas" and "Betas" are rooted in a foundation of empathy. The Alpha/Beta concept is not very useful in life... *unless you're thinking from a woman's perspective*. These concepts are simply our best way of abstracting the principles that *women seem to operate by*.

If I were a woman, I would definitely allow submissive men to lavish me with gifts while I pursued the best

possible partners. That is exactly what they do: AF/BB. But we can only arrive at the concept of AF/BB if we first empathize with women and feel their inner drives and desires.

In fact, it's the *Blue Pillers* that lack empathy. If they ever put themselves in a woman's shoes, they would immediately realize, for example, that women universally like fit men. Then they would go lift.

But the Blue Pillers never empathize with women. They assume that women are weak retards who can be "manipulated" into having sex. Since Blue Pillers lack empathy, they never realize that women are actually real people with their own agency... And frankly, the Blue Pill idea that women are dumb enough to be "manipulated" into sex by dudes like us strikes me as downright misogynist.

The whole philosophy of The Red Pill is based on empathizing with women and trying to give them what they want.

Your post is great, with a pretty masterful use of metaphor. The linguistic devices you chose have the effect of gradually and subtly showing me how to empathize with women.

You use the metaphor of the "job" because every man is familiar with it, and then you apply this metaphor in an inventive way to describe how women view men. Your post rings true as fuck to me, because it's simple, easy to understand, and thought-provoking.

The Red Pill: Empathetic Misogyny for Articulate Douchebags.



ICanHearYouTick • 46 points • 8 May, 2015 07:25 PM

[BPs] assume that women are weak retards who can be "manipulated" into having sex. Since Blue Pillers lack empathy, they never realize that women are actually real people with their own agency...

Do they ?

I think they genuinely believe that by doing such and such (self-abnegation and shit), women will be attracted to them. They (most) aren't being disingenuous in their behavior. I know I wasn't.

[deleted] • 25 points • 9 May, 2015 01:29 AM

The BP mentality is "if I'm nice, do things for her, and buy things for her, she'll just have to reward me with sex and companionship"

Now just think of how that sounds to a women and you'll understand why they get so creeped out by friend zoned betas who admit their desire to be intimate.

What women think is "OMG he expects sex just for being my friend?! That is so fucked up!"

Ultimately women despise anything which decreases their sexual agency and limits their hypergamous nature. The BP mentality implies that sex can be bought through favors, gifts and friendships much like you'd expect the guy at best buy to hand you an Xbox one when you give him \$300. When BP guys (especially friend zoned ones) get rejected they get pissed and confused just like you would if the guy at best buy refused to give you an Xbox One despite having the money for it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 May, 2015 12:25 AM

So...you're saying that women like the challenge of fucking hot dudes, just like men like the challenge of fucking hot chicks?

sex_neutral_pronoun • 17 points • 8 May, 2015 07:49 PM

I think it's a mix of both. The admixture of nicety with deception. When I was a BP, I did mental

backflips at once thinking that women enjoyed truly respectful men and avoided overtly "asshole" behavior. But my attitude was based in the idea that they couldn't see me for what I really was, a wolf in sheep's clothing. I felt them to be stupid because they couldn't see me for that. So yea, it was never wholly one thing or the other.

RedPillDad • 25 points • 8 May, 2015 08:55 PM

they couldn't see me for what I really was, a wolf in sheep's clothing.

They wanted the carnivore. You fucked it up by faking a "nice" herbivore. Acting feminine to get closer - what is that... Ninja Gay Game?

On the scale of Nice versus Nasty, there's no need to move the needle from neutral. It's the scale of Confidence versus Wimpy that a woman is more interested in. And ramping up the Nice can be easily misinterpreted as Wimpy.

sex_neutral_pronoun • 8 points • 8 May, 2015 09:31 PM

Acting feminine to get closer - what is that... Ninja Gay Game?

Not feminine. Interested. Interested in what they say, think, etc. It didn't work. That was then. But I take your point.

RedPillDad • 9 points • 8 May, 2015 09:44 PM

Glad you're past it... There's an epidemic of Nice Guy contortions going on - guys desperately trying to weasel their way into pussy. Women hate that shit in a guy. They lose all trust and respect.

WS6Grumbles • 5 points • 9 May, 2015 02:13 AM

Yeah that was me. Had to have it beat out of me.

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 May, 2015 09:29 PM

Ninja Gay Game

10/10 turn of phrase. These Betas are black-belt Ninja Gays.

--Edog-- • 1 point • 9 May, 2015 04:34 PM

This. Blue Pill = Wolf in Sheep's Clothing.

RPthrowaway123 • 7 points • 8 May, 2015 06:31 PM

That's a pretty good way of putting it. I think we put ourselves in their shoes and then try to logically understand their actions - we try to follow the hamster and see why it is doing what it's doing.

fap_the_pain_away • 9 points • 8 May, 2015 09:43 PM

That's what any good hunter does.

tompanz • 2 points • 9 May, 2015 11:49 AM

Whenever a man is trying to figure out women, there are women telling him he's wrong no matter how right he is. They pride themselves in cultivating an air of "mystery". There's nothing worse than a man figuring out that women are just irrational and emotional people, and not the unpredictable goddess they try so hard to

appear as.

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 May, 2015 08:57 PM

Having empathy for and an understanding of women is a key to success with them.

oldredder • 2 points • 8 May, 2015 10:42 PM

success in spite of them. We provide the value, the work, the guidance, the strategy while they provide ovaries and a pretty face while young. We need offspring, we need entertaining good sex, but other than that most women contribute no added value. SOME do of course but taking them all in we can write off most of them in that role.

Quite likely we'll see a race to the bottom for the majority of men too but it's taking longer since men have no choice but to work harder to get anything like a meal or a place to live.

rprando • 13 points • 9 May, 2015 03:30 AM

Depends on how you look at it. The man provides for the majority of life's necessities, absolutely. But certain young women do provide charm and can make social gatherings much more enjoyable.

Mothers and wives can also be extremely good care-givers. Just today I went in to get some wounds redressed from a motorcycle accident and the old lady treating me was a sweetheart. It really cheered me up. I recently lost both my mother and grandmother and I've gotta say that it made a substantial impact. Yes, my dad still brings home the money to pay for my school, but my mother was the one who organized all the family gatherings, kept me in touch with other relatives, would take care of errands and other hassles in our lives, and generally just made things more enjoyable.

Had it been my Dad, however, I imagine things would be much worse. So yes, men provide more overall for society and their families, but women, especially the right women, *can* have more utility than just birthing children. Unfortunately, girls today are being taught that they don't have to provide anything, which is validated by blue/purple pill guys who never demand anything of women. This way of thinking is basically institutionalized at this point. Even if you find a girl that was raised well you have to take some time to condition her and make it known that she *will* do her share and do it with a fucking smile on her face.

Viewing women as completely useless could actually prevent you from getting utility from them, although I completely understand that sentiment.

oldredder • 1 point • 15 May, 2015 07:49 AM

Honestly women given every chance to be useful have shown me pretty much just one use: being a hot girl with a wet hole. If not hot or not wet then no use.

Even if you find a girl that was raised well you have to take some time to condition her and make it known that she will do her share and do it with a fucking smile on her face.

NO, being raised well includes that from birth. That's how women used to be raised. The ones who are 60+ today were raised that way FROM BIRTH. Their parents taught them so husbands DIDN'T need to.

But certain young women do provide charm and can make social gatherings much more enjoyable.

Ya... the kind where they dance wearing nothing or nearly nothing.

rprando • 2 points • 20 May, 2015 01:08 AM

I like hot and wet and the cherry on top too.

User-31f64a4e • 28 points • 8 May, 2015 05:19 PM

Most women have spent their majority of their lives learning one skill above all others: How to attract and manage men.

At one point true. It seems there is a counter trend now though; women don't even feel as though they should have to work at it any more.

From what I read, this can be seen in the youngest ones now in college; it is certainly true in the post wall crowd.

Fat shaming, short (and/or wildly colored) hair on women, aggressive unfeminine women - all outgrowth of women's abandoning the idea that they should work to be attractive.

I think this is hilarious; absent attraction, women will also become unable to manage men. Without the carrot of desire, they will have no leverage. Well, voting, but to the extent it is observed the constitution puts limits on what they can do.

SwallowRP • 14 points • 8 May, 2015 08:58 PM [recovered]

It's like women my age (college) are just trashy as shit and are collectively not trying anymore. Even the obese ones think they're hot shit.

ProveItWasMe • 6 points • 8 May, 2015 08:00 PM [recovered]

voting

Aye no leverage except what can be gained via the ultimate provider of the government ;) I wonder how long it'll be till the Bachelor Tax rears its head again.

JG60 • 15 points • 8 May, 2015 09:51 PM [recovered]

They already exist. They're simply re-branded as tax-breaks. Think about it, a tax break is essentially increased tax on anyone not receiving the break. These tax breaks include the deduction system, head of household, and dozens of others.

A tax break for single moms is equivalent to saying "we would like single men to pay for services provided to single moms"

WS6Grumbles • 4 points • 9 May, 2015 02:43 AM

EIC only helps people with kids. I make less now than I did married and no longer qualify.

Shiningknight12 • 0 points • 10 May, 2015 06:07 AM

They're simply re-branded as tax-breaks.

That's somewhat of a myth though. There aren't any straight tax breaks for being married. You might benefit depending on your finances and work related benefits, but there are downsides as well.

For instance, if you have kids and your wife doesn't earn much, she loses out on the Earned Income Tax Credit which she could qualify for if you weren't married.

JG60 • 2 points • 17 May, 2015 05:42 AM

No, it's not a myth. The earned income credit is a perfect example because it only affects people with kids. So if a woman fails to secure or maintain her Beta Bux then were going to impose a tax

on everyone else to give her money. Your argument that it would not affect a married woman is irrelevant. She kept her beta bux.

TL/DR Your counterpoint is equivalent to arguing that a corvette isn't fast because many airplanes are faster.

oldredder • 5 points • 8 May, 2015 10:45 PM

already did: tax everyone near-equally at the base level then offer credits/rebates that only women can get. That's still a bachelor tax. It's more lines of tax code but I've never met a government that didn't love adding more lines of tax code to get the same financial result.

oldredder • 7 points • 8 May, 2015 10:44 PM

Women may portray to you & a group of men they don't have to work for it but they all admit to each other they *do* have to work for it. Men have needs, emotions, habits, expectations and value from work or potential for it and how a woman manages all those things controls how well she gets her man to be *her* man rather than *a* man free to wander to any woman.

Shiningknight12 • 2 points • 10 May, 2015 06:05 AM

Fat shaming, short (and/or wildly colored) hair on women, aggressive unfeminine women -

Eh this is bigger on the internet than it is IRL. You do see those women but most of them are still pretty normal. The main issue is lack of hobbies and being glued to their phone, but that's true of guys as well.

[deleted] • 68 points • 8 May, 2015 05:13 PM

A lot of new subscribers read this kind of shit and think it's depressing. For any newbies reading this, I'd just like to remind you that corporation you work for is worth a lot more money than the workers they hire and the CEO will live way better than you do. Consider yourself lucky that you're a man.

tuxedoburrito • 6 points • 8 May, 2015 08:00 PM

Could you explain what you mean by this?

cosmicartery • 41 points • 8 May, 2015 08:29 PM **[recovered]**

He's continuing the OP's metaphor by saying the corporation (man) and the CEO (again, man) are worth more than the workers (women who are seeing man as a job), so be lucky you are the man (the corporation/CEO) and not the woman (the worker/the person seeking a job).

Edit: a word

[deleted] • -31 points • 8 May, 2015 10:11 PM

[permanently deleted]

LukesLikeIt • 19 points • 8 May, 2015 11:46 PM **[recovered]**

We aren't afraid of the victim police here, grow a pair.

[deleted] • -15 points • 9 May, 2015 12:34 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 8 points • 9 May, 2015 01:49 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 May, 2015 03:26 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 May, 2015 06:29 PM

Why bother with the detractors? Policing your own language only serves to weaken your point. Those who actively oppose TRP will not be convinced by soft flowery language. Speak your mind, speak fully and openly, and ignore their bullshit. Hell, have some fun with the haters.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 May, 2015 03:57 PM

[permanently deleted]

Freiling • 2 points • 9 May, 2015 06:58 PM

This is the best answer so far, but don't you think it runs the risk of misleading more naive readers? I think there's a lot of great stuff to learn here, but we're also educating people who are younger and far less developed to stand up for themselves. If all the positive stuff comes packaged with a sly reference to women's abject inferiority, they might just swallow that with all the valid points. I can't say I like that, or it's fun.

[deleted] • 21 points • 8 May, 2015 09:45 PM

It's harder to be a man/CEO/corporation but you can rise to far greater heights and live a much more rewarding life.

systemshock869 • 15 points • 8 May, 2015 08:38 PM [recovered]

You're not the one desperate for a 'job,' you're the one hiring.

Merwebb • 3 points • 9 May, 2015 02:20 AM [recovered]

Yeah. Also the level and capacity of your workers are directly related to your company drive and goals

[deleted] • 21 points • 8 May, 2015 07:05 PM

[permanently deleted]

seattleron • 57 points • 8 May, 2015 04:12 PM

Very good example. Spot on. The only thing I would say in this example is that you should think of it like an actress taking job offers. When she is young and pretty, the offers flood in from everywhere and she jumps from one movie to the next for 20 million a flick, then as she ages (see almost any hot actress from the 90's), the offers start to dry up from the lead roles in blockbusters, and move to the supporting/older woman roles in the indie flicks or low budget movies.

By the end, the actress either embraces that she is the older woman now and takes those roles, settles down with a TV show, or takes starring roles in cheap movies that no one cares about, just to hold onto her last bit of fame and relevance.

Good analogy above none the less.

RPthrowaway123 • 29 points • 8 May, 2015 06:32 PM

Or she goes full Madonna, and waves her tits around while everyone is screaming PUT THAT SHIT AWAY!

[deleted] • 11 points • 9 May, 2015 01:35 AM

Voice acting is the mark of the falling actress.

A recent actress that followed this path is Zooey Deschanel. When was the last you heard of her?

She really got a lot of movies from 2005-2009, 25-29, and then really began to pitter out, so New Girl starts at 31 in 2011, which apparently she's leaving, but, to what? Some movie you've never heard of called "The Driftless Area".

No one has cared about Jessica Alba since 2007

Jennifer Anniston was at her height during Friends, but didn't have a career after it besides in mid-budget comedies that were pumped out by studios to turn a profit during summer and christmas seasons. Friends started when she was 25.

Angelina Jolie gets roles that are directly related to her age like Maleficent. Maleficent was 2014, and the last thing she did before that was Kung Fu Panda in 2011, voice acting, and then in 2010 for The Tourist, which was with Johnny Depp, so it wasn't a nothing movie, and Salt in 2010, which was a big budget movie that she was supposed to carry, but that no one really cared about, and no one remembers. Jolie is always touted as a talented actress, and used to be in contention for the #1 actress, and reputation, looks, surgery, being married to Brad Pitt, all carried her to 35, in 2010, but she hasn't done anything on the same level since.

Changeling (2008) - plays a mother

Beowulf (2007) - Is CGI

I think you have to go back to 2005 and Mr. & Mrs. Smith to get to something where she was really in an A-List, top of the line movie where no one thought we need a woman who is a little older to pull this off.

So, they get some roles, but they are really clerally running out of gas by the time they get to 30, and have one or two last hurrahs by getting roles based of what people remember them being in their 20s.

CliffordTheBigRedPil • 18 points • 8 May, 2015 07:50 PM

Amy Schumer had a skit about this, actresses reaching their unfuckable day and settling for mom roles. It's funny how digestible redpill concepts are when it's presented as comedy.

seattleron • 18 points • 8 May, 2015 07:52 PM

It's true. Look at Julia Roberts, Meg Ryan, Demi Moore, etc. The wall is undefeated, brahs.

LukesLikeIt • 7 points • 8 May, 2015 11:45 PM

And that's when the actress you've been waiting years for finally gets her tits out because she has to forgo her morals for respect. They are average but your mind perks them right up again like you remember. And all is well in those moments.

Prattler26 • 81 points • 8 May, 2015 03:42 PM*

All true, you just forgot one aspect: women's beauty and fertility starts declining very early. They have a limited amount of time to get their best job.

[deleted] • 41 points • 8 May, 2015 05:56 PM

Holy shit I finally understand why girls like older guys. They are the best job offers while they are young (income, social status, DGAF, stability).

Older women like younger men because *they* are the best job offers at that point (more energy, less commitment, more OK with pump and dump). Many older women have it made by the time they are older so social status, income, and stability in a man matter less.

Am I onto something here or am I off base?

rpscrote • 14 points • 8 May, 2015 06:31 PM

and the veil lifts further...

I love the manosphere

aguy01 • 14 points • 8 May, 2015 08:08 PM

Up until their 50's, women are interested in men older than they are. About 4-5 years older is the sweet spot. Most cougars don't really prefer younger guys, it's just that they are still driven by their desire for fit dudes, which are few and far between at their age. One OkCupid graph showed this age preference, and beyond 50 years old women prefer a guy in his 50s, regardless of her age.

BrunoOh • 13 points • 8 May, 2015 11:22 PM

Fifty year old fit dudes won't bother with fifty year old women. There are more than enough okay looking thirty and some forty year olds to go around.

[deleted] • 9 points • 8 May, 2015 09:35 PM

You missed that older women go for younger men because they're (The men) not aware of their future options.

Older women don't have their own status. Women acquire status from men old or young, you don't see an alpha 40 year old settling with a 40 year old woman so she has to look down the age scale.

[deleted] • 2 points • 14 May, 2015 06:20 AM

You're onto something there. But don't forget another reason younger women like older men - the older man has done enough self-work to shed his sheep skin (Blue Pill quality) and is more comfortable with himself, with putting himself out in the world, to regularly see the wolf that he is (Red Pill quality).

Invalidity • 79 points • 8 May, 2015 04:00 PM

Except for the fact that they do not see that. They see that they are getting overly compensated in their prime years, and with society telling them that they can have it all, they feed on to that notion. It fuels their emotions and makes them feel good.

We see and know they are going to go through a decline, but they don't, not until they hit the wall.

waitfor_ittt • 29 points • 8 May, 2015 07:25 PM*

We see and know they are going to go through a decline, but they don't, not until they hit the wall.

Coming this summer...

We see and know they are going through a decline...

(Sirens blasting, helicopters scan over desolate city.) **Wahhhhh**

But they don't...

(Crashing noises, group of 35 year old women huddles, then dead silence.) "What the fuck was that?"
"SHUT UP GYNA ITS NOT REAL!"

Not until they hit...

"Oh my god... What the... It's coming right at us. HOLY SHIT RUNNNN!"

The Wall.

In theatres June 21st. You can run but you can't hide.

Nicholas_ • 23 points • 8 May, 2015 08:27 PM

I've seen girls hit the wall at 23 (serious) because of their horrible diets, smoking since they were 17 and drinking excessively every single weekend. It's pretty depressing tbh.

GC0W30 • 10 points • 8 May, 2015 08:48 PM

According to the literature that this community basically accepts as gospel, the wall is usually AT 23.

Saying it's 30 or more is accounting for outliers.

Nicholas_ • 16 points • 8 May, 2015 08:59 PM

the wall varies. I personally know a woman who is 36 and has yet to hit the wall. Actually looks stunning if that's the word.

Depends a lot on their lifestyle day in and day out.

GC0W30 • 13 points • 8 May, 2015 10:53 PM*

The term seems to have two definitions. One is "the age at which she's absolutely never going to get any hotter" and the other is "the threshold at which most women realize their lessened capacity to sexually compete with the next generation of women in their 'actualized' sexual peak (22-24)" [credits to Rational Male for this definition].

And, yeah, under either definition, the wall varies. Could this 36-year-old really fight with her 23-year-old self over a man and win?

Nicholas_ • 3 points • 8 May, 2015 11:44 PM

Unsure about that since I've only known her since she was around 28 or so but she hasn't changed one bit since then. She has the case of the Pharrel Williams going on.

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 May, 2015 06:42 PM

Lindsey Lohan is a good example of this. I have no idea how old she is/was but she looks way better in her 2007 mugshots than her 2011 one. Then she looks way better in her 2013 one than her 2011, presumably because she did rehab and probably lives a healthier lifestyle (or at least not a completely destructive one anymore)

Ovadox • 1 point • 9 May, 2015 02:46 PM

Ooh, I saw a hot bar-wench do this over the last year and half. Blazing hot to wouldn't even think about it. Couldn't believe a girl could be so stupid as to piss away her most valuable asset so casually.

Hrodrik • 3 points • 8 May, 2015 08:44 PM

Isn't it more "you can hide but you can't run"? You use makeup and attitude to conceal yourself but in the end it catches up to you.

103342 • 24 points • 8 May, 2015 04:04 PM

Most of them don't see it that way until around the age of 25-27 when their friends start having kids and getting married.

After 28 *most* of them start to get desperate and can be annoying as fuck do deal with those.

tuxedoburrito • 6 points • 8 May, 2015 08:03 PM

The girl I've been interested in is 28, and has hinted at marriage and wants children.

I'm 24.

Think this is a bad idea? That I may just be "filling a Role?"

GC0W30 • 27 points • 8 May, 2015 08:53 PM

Unless you're already a multimillionaire who has seen dozens of countries and had hundreds of awesome adventures, a woman (LTR or wife) will just hold you back at this point in life.

Do not get into an LTR until you are already the man you want to be. It is very, very rare for you to be that man at age 24.

Right now, you're likely showing "LTR potential" to women for the first time... you're done with training/college and you're taking home grown-up paychecks, and maybe benefits, for the first time.

I got married close to your age instead of just spinning plates. Big mistake. Stalled my career, and kept me from a ton of adventures.

Don't even CONSIDER a wife until you're 30.

tuxedoburrito • 5 points • 8 May, 2015 08:59 PM

I'm listening

Why's that?

All my friends are beta blue pullers who are married already for years at my age. I'm considering just getting all new friends. They're cool dudes but really aren't going anywhere in their lives. Not all of them, but a lot of the ones I hangout with.

Reddthrown • 13 points • 8 May, 2015 09:21 PM

Because a woman will want safety and your time. At 28, she'll also want kids, whom you'll want to give safety and time to.

This means less time to do other things, such as work (and excel at your job), go to the gym, or otherwise develop yourself.

GC0W30 • 8 points • 8 May, 2015 11:03 PM

tuxedoburrito, this guy just wrote half your answer for me.

I'll also add that on top of what he wrote, if you're TOO successful she may ACTIVELY try to fuck your career up. She will do this because she fears the very real chance that you'll replace her with better.

Another I'll add is that a good girlfriend or wife can just dump such a huge load of

happiness on you that it's hard for you to strive... I'm sure there's an evolutionary psychology phrase that covers this, but that's not my bag so someone else will have to fill us in.

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 May, 2015 11:48 PM

This complacency is rarely spoken of on trp, but I find it frequently on mrp. It'd be great for you to take the time and do up a thread on this for many of those swallowing who need another cup of water to help.

I would, but I've done my posting here and I'm only interested in commentary.

GCOW30 • 1 point • 10 May, 2015 11:01 PM

It'd be great for you to take the time and do up a thread on this for many of those swallowing who need another cup of water to help.

I don't plan on writing articles for years, if ever.

I have swallowed the pill, I accept AWALT (including my mom), but I have a ton of learning to do.

Haven't read half of the sidebar material (some of those are LONG, and some blogs linked have been going on for years) and I still want to lift, lose weight, increase income and improve or replace my LTR before I claim to be an expert.

When I post, I'm not posting as a subject-matter expert; I'm posting as just a middle-aged divorced guy with a little experience who has listened to his friends tell their tales. I am sharing stories, and pointing guys in the direction of good resources. Half of the guys on here have problems so simple that ANY man over 25 who has read TRP for a week and is willing to accept AWALT can figure out the problem and solution.

There are way too many jerks on the Internet claiming to be gurus when they're failures at what they are "experts" in. I guarantee you there are PUA authors/Youtubers who couldn't get laid if you dropped them off in Bangkok with \$5000, and "finance gurus" who claim to have a private jet but in reality just got their cars repoed...

InfectdProlapsedAnus • 3 points • 9 May, 2015 04:07 AM **[recovered]**

You should list some of what you think are the benefits of marriage. What can you gain with marriage that you cannot gain with cohabitation? I bet you can't come up with anything. Even if you can list a single benefit, would this one benefit outweigh the near guarantee that you will lose half your shit?

tuxedoburrito • 1 point • 9 May, 2015 04:56 AM **[recovered]**

Well, sex for one. I'm a Christian and the whole premarital sex thing is forbade.

How would I lose my shit? I'm not arguing I'm genuinely wondering

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 May, 2015 06:42 AM

The divorce rate in the church is greater than outside the church. Something to consider.

tuxedoburrito • 1 point • 9 May, 2015 08:14 AM

Is it? I've always heard the opposite actually

Shiningknight12 • 6 points • 10 May, 2015 05:59 AM

Is it?

Here are the actual stats showing born again Christians have much higher divorce rates.

http://www.religioustolerance.org/chr_dira.htm

I have found that these churches tacitly support divorce by praising single mothers and putting all the pressure on men to make sure the relationship works. Women are twice as likely to initiate divorce as men and the churches provide them with moral cover to do so.

InfectdProlapsedAnus • 3 points • 9 May, 2015 12:52 PM [recovered]

Sex. You can't come up with any other reason? That is no reason to get married.

tuxedoburrito • 2 points • 9 May, 2015 02:22 PM [recovered]

I mean cohabitation. Companionship. Support for one another. Maybe it's just a southern American thing but man, marriage is drilled into our culture hard.

Literally all of my friends are married.

Hypnot0ad • 2 points • 9 May, 2015 03:08 AM

Just give it a few years. Most of my friends at work got married a few years out of college, around 23-24 years old. Almost all got divorced after 5 or 6 years.

Ovadox • 3 points • 9 May, 2015 02:51 PM

You shouldn't be interested in a girl. You should make your intentions known early so you don't waste your time if she decides she isn't interested. Also, women want men who know what they want and go after it. If you're waiting around you're 90% of the way to failure right off the bat. Do you want marriage and children? If your answer is not 100% yes without hesitation, then you should not consider this woman for a serious relationship.

Reddthrown • 5 points • 8 May, 2015 08:35 PM

It depends but based solely on the age gap it sounds like a really bad idea.

tuxedoburrito • 1 point • 8 May, 2015 08:57 PM

Is four years that big a difference?

Reddthrown • 12 points • 8 May, 2015 09:00 PM

The problem is that your SMV will keep increasing while hers will lower. In 10 years you will be able to date women younger and more attractive than she is right now. She'll be 38 and ugly. What do you think will happen?

Also, she may just be looking for someone to "fill a role" as you put it.

renegade • 4 points • 8 May, 2015 10:58 PM

Yes, you'll really resent her being older than you *at all* as you get older. My ex wife was 2.5 years older. GF is 5 years younger. Very happy improvement.

tuxedoburrito • 1 point • 9 May, 2015 02:41 AM

Why is that? Does she resent you?

rprando • 4 points • 9 May, 2015 03:56 AM

Because, assuming you're in shape, don't look like you were dropped as a baby, and not a social outcast, you will have *many* more opportunities to hook up with younger hotter girls. Your gf/wife will definitely notice and start to get bitchy and resentful, even if you make it 100% clear you're hers. That bitchyness will eventually get to you and you will lose attraction to her. Basically you're doomed, unless she's a supermodel that will be smoking into her 40s.

I'm 23 and a lot of my friends are settling into ltrs too. But fuck that noise. I'm currently seeing a girl that's 19 and have been for a while. Even though she's young, hot, sweet, good upbringing, and hasn't raised any red flags, I don't see it lasting past my graduation because I want to travel and she will be in school. I have previously dated 2 other girls who fit the bill wonderfully, one while I was studying in Sweden. And then all the plates. What I'm getting at is there are plenty of suitable matches out there. If you're afraid to leave this chick you should try to raise your smv and cure your oneitis. You *will* find a younger, hotter girl and be just as happy if not happier.

tuxedoburrito • 0 points • 9 May, 2015 04:58 AM

Yeah. I've been reading and swallowing the red pill for a few weeks so some terminology is new to me. Currently reading through models and rational male, but what is SMV? And if you say read the side bar that doesn't help. There's just so much information that I'm not there yet

Shiningknight12 • 2 points • 10 May, 2015 06:02 AM

but what is SMV?

Sexual Marketplace Value. Its how valuable women will perceive you and how you perceive them based on commonly desired characteristics.

tuxedoburrito • -1 points • 9 May, 2015 05:01 AM

I'm definitely in shape and do modeling for a few fashion lines. I don't have problem getting girls. But it's definitely been mentioned "why are you such a ladies man?" Before. So maybe this is a blind sided problem I didn't see before

I've almost got my whole body tattood. I mean everything that can be covered by a business suit. Only thing left is my tummy and my back. But I'm afraid getting into a relationship will hurt that. And I want a Harley. And I want to live. Man; why am I thinking about a LTR? I just want to live and travel and get tattood.

Shiningknight12 • 1 point • 10 May, 2015 05:54 AM

I will provide an alternate view.

Its completely natural for a woman at her age to want kids. Thats not inherently a bad thing. The bad part is that this drive can lead to her deceiving you to get what she wants. She may not actually be attracted to you or downplaying her own flaws to get what she wants.

If you are certain she is head over heels for you *and* you are certain you want kids, than go for it. Otherwise, no.

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 May, 2015 06:30 AM

FILLING A ROLE.

[deleted] • 39 points • 8 May, 2015 05:46 PM

Words of wisdom from Arthur Schopenhauer:

"In the girl nature has had in view what could in theatrical terms be called a stage-effect: it has provided her with super-abundant beauty and charm for a few years at the expense of the whole remainder of her life, so that during these years she may so capture the imagination of a man that he is carried away into undertaking to support her honorably in some form or another for the rest of her life, a step he would seem hardly likely to take for purely rational considerations. Thus nature has equipped women, as it has all creatures, with the tools and weapons she needs for securing her existence, and at just the time she needs them; in doing which nature has acted with its usual economy. For just the female ant loses its wings after mating, since they are then superfluous, indeed harmful to the business of raising the family, so the woman usually loses her beauty after one or two childbeds, and probably for the same reason."

"One needs only to see the way she is built to realize that woman is not intended for great mental or for great physical labour."

"Because fundamentally women exist solely for the propagation of the race and find in this their entire vocation,..."

"Only a male intellect clouded by the sexual drive could call the stunted, narrow-shouldered, broad-hipped and short-legged sex the fair sex: for it is with this drive that all its beauty is bound up."

"Thus it lies in the nature of women to regard everything simply as a means of capturing a man."

All taken from Essays and Aphorisms.

[deleted] • 7 points • 8 May, 2015 08:34 PM

All taken from Essays and Aphorisms.

<https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/s/schopenhauer/arthur/essays/chapter5.html>

An erudite RP manifesto that should be read by all men at least once.

IllimitableMan • 1 point • 10 May, 2015 04:17 PM

All taken from Essays and Aphorisms.

I ordered this the other week. It's resting with the other books at the moment. Schopenhauer and Nietzsche are among some of my favourite philosophers. Both are a very significant contribution to the field of philosophy from the Germans.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 May, 2015 04:29 PM

I agree. Schopenhauer is my favorite German philosopher because of his Eastern-influenced thought. Nietzsche was good too.

I've tried to get through Hegel and Kant and just haven't been able to.

IllimitableMan • 1 point • 10 May, 2015 04:43 PM

I think Schopenhauer is well-liked not just for his quality of thinking, but likewise for his quality of prose. He was a good writer. A lot of philosophers are apt logicians, but don't write good prose. The logic is so raw and devoid of any artistic flair, which means it doesn't make for an enjoyable read. I get the feeling Kant's Critique of Pure Reason is going to be like that, although I may just be talking out of my ass because I haven't read it yet. (I was told to read Kant first to understand Schopenhauer's the world as will and representation.)

Effectively, even for the intelligent, it is a slog to get through - like an academic paper, it is knowledge dense. The best way to communicate a way of thinking, IMO, necessitates an engaging if not aesthetically pleasing form of prose. Of course if you use rhetorical devices such as hyperbole and sarcasm for entertainment purposes, someone somewhere down the line is going to misinterpret what you're saying, and the knowledge of what you were trying to communicate is lost/vitiated by the passage of time and the re-interpretations that come with that.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 May, 2015 04:54 PM

Schopenhauer is an easy read...no reading of Kant beforehand is necessary. World as Will and Representation and Essays and Aphorisms are great books. I've made it about 119 pgs. through Critique of Pure Reason and roughly 84 pages of Phenomenology of Spirit. I just keep finding reasons to read other things. It becomes difficult to follow especially when a dictionary is necessary every page.

I picked up Being and Nothingness and read a few pages. Ugh. One day I'll make it through all of them.

GunsGermsAndSteel • 13 points • 9 May, 2015 12:45 AM

This is exactly why I keep women in what I think of as "job interview mode". As long as I refuse to give full commitment, they dress nice, talk nice, do nice things for me. As soon as I commit myself fully to a relationship, a lot of that nice stuff goes in the can and their real nature comes out.

stevredpill • 86 points • 8 May, 2015 05:00 PM

TL;DR

Men are Hoes in the Working World.

Women are Hoes.

ManOfGrapes • 12 points • 8 May, 2015 08:54 PM

God this is gold. I laughed, but such a perfect way to describe it.

eaton80 • 10 points • 8 May, 2015 08:02 PM

Spot on explanation for how quickly women seem to leave husbands who have run into hard times financially or health wise.

This analogy must be incorporated into sidebar knowledge.

scarletspider3 • 10 points • 8 May, 2015 03:57 PM

It is how women view relationships. They just don't realize that they accumulate mileage/baggage along the way.

Most of them have such a surplus of validation growing up that it takes them awhile after the wall for all the reserves to dry up and that's when they start thinking about retirement with a BB.

cariboo_j • 10 points • 8 May, 2015 11:28 PM

So true. The maddening part is that most men don't realize this is how women operate. If men truly internalized this idea oneitis would disappear.

I wish I knew this in my younger days.

reph • 8 points • 8 May, 2015 07:10 PM*

The comparison works in the other direction too: wise employers often pretend to love their employees, providing dinner, laundry services, etc, because BB often work harder in response to that.

balancespec2 • 13 points • 9 May, 2015 12:33 AM

Ehh. I view relationships as transactional and I'm a guy.

Women are cars to me, college girls are the brand new models and the only reason I'd drive one over 30 is for stability and low maintenance. I'll probably keep a 30 year old as a daily driver and rent 20 year olds on the weekends and film myself with them at the drag strip.

FrameWalker • 5 points • 8 May, 2015 06:22 PM

In the way of the superior man a central point of emphasis is that the essence of masculinity is mission oriented while the feminine essence is love oriented.

A man who is aligned with his goals and mission is at ease, regardless of how his ltr/plates are. A woman achieves that state when she is externally validated by her lover, even if work is going poorly.

Even though we love work, we are skillfully opportunistic, we must be because it's our life. Same goes for women regarding men.

cariboo_j • 2 points • 9 May, 2015 02:39 AM

That is evolutionary baggage left over from prehistoric times.

In 2015 it is a maladaptation and serves mostly to harm men (except the few of us fortunate enough to be aware of it).

DawnoftheShred • 6 points • 8 May, 2015 06:34 PM

I was thinking the other day about how back in hunter gatherer days the man in the tribe who was the strongest, or best hunter and warrior, was probably the most sought after male in the tribe. Would this be correct?

If so, it totally makes sense that the most fit man with highest earning potential (ability to bring home food and provide protection) would always be sought after.

But then you have a split in modern society bc you don't need to be fit to make good money, and if you make good money, even if you're a fat slob, that money can buy protection in the form of living in a safe neighborhood, providing a big safe/new car, etc., for the woman and children.

But that still leaves the woman with desire for an alpha warrior...so is this where we've ended up as a society?

Tqbfjotlds • 8 points • 8 May, 2015 06:55 PM [recovered]

I think society evolved into a stable environment where everyone could get some basic needs met - like food, clothing and sex. In the old tribal system, the alpha male was only so powerful, till a group of non-alphas banded together and killed him. The 20% alpha males soon learnt that being in constant open competition

with the remaining 80% is a losing proposition, so a treaty evolved, where every man could get some basic food, clothing and the right to have a wife. This structure benefited everyone. Societies grew strong because young men were devoted to their families. These men believed they had something to live for and even die for if they had to go to war. While women were happy that they could get a husband easily, they felt angry that they were not allowed to upgrade their man whenever they felt like it.

[deleted] • 5 points • 8 May, 2015 09:16 PM [\[recovered\]](#)

There is no scientific evidence whatsoever that tribes acted this way.

laserdicks • 3 points • 8 May, 2015 11:37 PM

I think he means that tribes are *now* acting in this way.

NormanoSilurian • 1 point • 9 May, 2015 05:56 AM*

Think of a Mafia family. Do the soldiers get some of the goodies? - hell yeah, its part of what makes a functioning team.

Hrodrik • 1 point • 8 May, 2015 09:29 PM

I think that the new wave of untouchable powerful men, resistant to violent revolution, may be behind the increasingly worse female behavior. As it is harder and harder for a simple hard working man to sustain a family, women are more and more eager to jump ship.

It kind of goes against a view that is often shared in this sub, that social democracy is why women are the way they are (makes no sense if you ask me).

oldredder • 3 points • 8 May, 2015 10:40 PM

It is one of many intentional chain-reactions: taxes, feminism, inane laws to jail or potential jail people for normal activities, theft directly by banks from employees, employers, random citizens, even feeding the homeless is now a crime in many places - all for control. Government top-side control of the masses requires many points of leverage. Feminism is one of them. It's a means, not a goal.

reddiforlove • 1 point • 10 May, 2015 01:39 AM

Yes, this is exactly why with the rise of third wave feminism and the collapse of marriage, we have arrived at Alpha Fucks Beta Bucks.

And just as aggression and strength (or cunning and intellect) were traits that males needed to survive and procreate in those days, it would follow that the women who passed on their genes were the ones who were best able to adapt to being "taken" by the alphas. This is why nice guys have literally no chance with women. Something to consider...

skoobled • 3 points • 8 May, 2015 11:15 PM

I posted about the exact same thing awhile ago. It's a great analogy. Sex is to women what work is to men, in every way

[deleted] • 8 points • 8 May, 2015 07:09 PM*

Great post. A good friend of mine was ranting about his girlfriend the other day and I told him something similar to this post without using the business analogy. This guy is really insecure, emotional, low-wage job as a bank teller, no prospects or goals for the future, he's pretty much your textbook beta. Decently good looking

physically and dresses well too.

What I said it really comes down to is "happiness" whatever that may be for the individual. I said to him "If you're dating someone and you're not happy or having your needs met, and someone comes along that makes you happy and fulfills your needs, it would be wrong NOT TO CHEAT ON YOUR PARTNER." The new chick has pretty much solved all (or if not at least a few) of the problems you have with your girlfriend, she's clearly a better candidate and it would be wrong to not give her the time of day. Plus, the dread might wake your current girlfriend up to get her shit together and start making her man happy or he's gonna bounce.

Why? Well they clearly don't give a fuck about you if your needs aren't being met (I'm talking basic stuff like regular sex, emotional fulfillment, respect etc..) not things that are ridiculous like expecting your wife to do anal 5 times a day with you for the rest of your marriage.

My last girlfriend left me because I was a beta loser who lived with his mom and really had no goals or aspirations kind of like my friend (although, my girlfriend didn't either; hence "equality" (rolls eyes)). She met some guy who was physically better looking than me, made more money, had his own place, and had "cooler" friends. I don't blame her for leaving me at all, she made a good decision on her part, despite me being heartbroken. Good things will always come at a cost.

That being said; later on I swallowed the pill and learned how things really work. I put the pieces together and it all made sense why she left me even though she said how much she loved me and how I was "the one". She said all of that stuff in the beginning stages of the relationship when I was happy and fairly successful. Toward the end of the relationship, I had let myself slide a lot and was near rock bottom because I put off all of my interests and passions to spend time with her due to my blue pill conditioning-what are you going to do? get on a life-boat or stay on the ship while it sinks?

newls • 0 points • 9 May, 2015 09:24 AM

I see what you're saying but your friend is an omega, not a beta. A beta is a provider, someone who is insecure, emotional, and thirsty but makes money. Women see them for the resource they can provide.

An omega is a complete loser who provides neither alpha fucks nor beta bucks.

Nicolay77 • 2 points • 9 May, 2015 03:50 PM

Omega is too nice a letter to be wasted in that definition. It also conflicts with its meaning in computational mathematics.

What about Epsilon?

It matches with its mathematical usual meaning, as an arbitrarily small quantity.

"Ohh, that dude is so Epsilon. I have Lambda friends."

fap_the_pain_away • 6 points • 8 May, 2015 07:11 PM

A theory is better than a fact. A theory is an explanation that incorporates many facts. It unites seemingly unrelated events and puts them into a single story.

A good theory is a simple explanation that unites a lot of facts together at once. It has a strong explanation: fact ratio.

This right here is a damn good theory.

[deleted] • 12 points • 8 May, 2015 07:27 PM

man this place is depressing

Hrodrik • 24 points • 8 May, 2015 09:24 PM

Reality usually is. It's known that ignorance is bliss.

[deleted] • 9 points • 8 May, 2015 10:40 PM

I think that's the first stage.

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 May, 2015 11:54 PM

It's commonly known that too much perspective can be a downer. (Randall Munroe)

One_friendship_plz • 4 points • 8 May, 2015 08:03 PM

It's *because* it's depressing that it sticks. Things that are more emotionally stimulating stick harder to our conscious, that's why women have a better memory than men, because they find things more emotionally stimulating, and a lot more frequently.

We can't be neutral about our opinions, we need to be blunt regardless of how people feel about the situation.

TRP cleverly words the truth in such a fashion that you're going to think long and hard about what comes from here whether you want to or not.

laserdicks • 2 points • 8 May, 2015 11:36 PM

At first. But it's liberating. And once you learn to live in the freedom the cheap bliss of ignorance turns into a lasting satisfaction which in my opinion is unmatched. And I'm applying this to everything, not just the red pill.

Merwebb • 2 points • 9 May, 2015 02:26 AM

Embrace it or go back to the darkness of ignorance

favours_of_the_moon • 3 points • 9 May, 2015 12:53 PM

Most women have spent their majority of their lives learning one skill above all others: How to attract and manage men. Their hypergamous nature leads them to the same conclusions about men as I described above regarding jobs. They show little to no remorse about it because it really is just a business decision to them. Which company do I attach myself to? The best one of course!

The main difference is secrecy. In business, this is all universally understood. Business is transactional by nature. Nobody argues that. But suggest that interpersonal relations are transactional by nature as well and you are labeled a sociopath.

By convincing men that relationships are not transactional, women hold more power. You should just love her for who she is. After all, she's different than those girls anyways.

In other words, we are constantly lied to straight to our faces for our entire lives. And we're supposed to just agree that there's nothing wrong with that.

648262 • 2 points • 8 May, 2015 07:03 PM

Great post, +A!

I remember someone here saying "*men conquer the world, women conquer men*", which aligns neatly with this.

It's interesting that there are women who excel in business, and there are men who excel in the female world - but these people don't really get any respect for it.

wearnocrowns • 2 points • 8 May, 2015 07:22 PM

Nicely put. Nothing inherently bad about it. Perceiving surrounding reality as a job market is a challenge. Once you accept it as such you're naturally compelled to build yourself up to being a noteworthy company.

You need to become a functioning company in the first place in order to employ people. And you will not tolerate a sponger or someone who doesn't contribute something you deem valuable or welcome.

Venkas • 2 points • 8 May, 2015 08:52 PM

Dude im so saving this post. Great write up.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 May, 2015 09:46 PM

Great post, if I still were on my past beta ways, this post would force the pill right into my bloodstream in a second, excellent analogy.

Stand_Your_Ground_ • 2 points • 9 May, 2015 02:38 AM

The only reason you would ever stay as a manager of a not very successful workplace is if you thought you could drag it up to being amazing because you thought it had potential. Employess that can do this/workplaces with potential like this are incredibly rare.

This metaphor carries over. Girls who want to make you improve, and guys that have the willingness to improve - both rare, and that's why you must always self improve, to be the best YOU you can be.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 May, 2015 12:01 PM

This helps explain why women want to married so bad. Wouldn't you want to sign a contract with a company in which you don't even have to show up anymore and still get paid?

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 May, 2015 05:57 AM

Don't men sometimes do this with women too? Yes, AWALT, but men aren't perfect either. Be realistic gentlemen.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 May, 2015 06:14 PM*

[deleted]

This comment was edited by /u/spez #ImWithHer What is this?

DEVi4TION • 2 points • 9 May, 2015 02:40 AM

I do the same shit with my women. I upgrade when possible.

plentyoffishes • 1 point • 9 May, 2015 01:24 AM

If a relationship is not transactional, what is it?

Women not recognizing this is why they have so many problems.

To the OP: Do you think this means guys should always be trading up? As she hits the wall, move on to someone younger?

pencilpusher13 • 1 point • 9 May, 2015 02:28 AM

Oh man, i don't agree worth this at all. Most women stay with the guy even if they can get something better. At least in my experience. We're so afford of being alone that we settle. I'm sorry, maybe I'm reading this won't but this is so opposite.

Again, in my experience, 80% of the time, my girlfriends were left by their boyfriends. 80% of those were from women who knew the relationship sucked, or the guy doesn't really like her. Yet they never had the balls to dump them because they had this idea that they needed to get married asap and have babies asap to the hot guy asap. Mind you, we are ages 27-30, worth all of this happening in that age period.

Idk. Maybe not what you meant, but o took this post as a thought that women make business decisions about their relationship BUT (important) based on what's best for them. But what i see in real life is women making choices based on what they are jealous of.

evoblade • 1 point • 9 May, 2015 03:22 AM

This is a great point. I'll be saving this for future reference.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 May, 2015 03:59 AM

Women acknowledge this amongst themselves while these simps still hold out hope that what they believe about women isn't a lie.

thermality • 1 point • 9 May, 2015 06:08 AM*

As valid as many of these points may be, I find it difficult to reconcile them with humanism.

bitches_be_crazy86 • 1 point • 9 May, 2015 07:00 AM

Overall good analysis but there is one problem. It describes betas and traditional relationships.

TreePlusTree • 1 point • 9 May, 2015 10:08 AM

And BB have such a nice retirement package

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 May, 2015 06:45 PM

The Gervais Principle comes to mind. Men are the Clueless. The poor, poor bastards. Competent, Passionate about their role etc.

Women are Losers and Psychos. Both enter and leave relationships at a whim, both are typically incompetent. The Self aware female loser tries to as little work as possible to avoid being fired. The Psycho is manipulative and cross dealing.

[deleted] • 0 points • 9 May, 2015 02:31 PM

That's the main difference of the way we raise the prime genders. One is taught to find fulfillment in another person (finding her prince charming) and the other is taught to find fulfillment through the intent of his deeds (the knight that saves her).

These differences are just a consequence of that.