

A woman cannot tell you how you must proceed. She can only tell you what she wants to experience.

January 14, 2014 | 503 upvotes | by [Whisper](#)

It's well known that women give incredibly poor seduction and relationship advice. It's also well known that they are completely unaware of this.

But what if we were to ask ourselves "why"? What is the common thread in all bad female advice that makes them think it's good? How does it look good advice from their perspective?

The answer is **female solipsism**.

When you ask a woman for dating advice (not that you should, unless you could use a laugh), *she is incapable of imagining how the world must look through your eyes*. Therefore, she can only tell you what she wants it to look like from hers.

A woman who says you should do X or Y, therefore, isn't talking crazy talk. Just self-centered narcissism talk. She's giving you good information... IF you insert words like "I want it to look/feel like" or "I want people to think" in front of every statement.

Try it as a mental exercise.

"Just be yourself" == "I want to look like you're just being yourself."

"Act natural, don't force it" == "I want it to feel natural, not forced."

"Love will just happen when you meet the right person." == "I want it to look like it just happened without effort, because he was the right person."

"Be honest" == "Sound honest."

All the quotes on the left are bullshit non-advice. But the ones on the right describe the seduction magic we work to create.

Does it work on other statements women make, too? You bet it does.

"I want to be independent." == "I want to look independent." (I don't, however, want to actually take responsibility for myself. That's hard work.)

"I would never do that." == "I wouldn't want anyone knowing I did that."

"I am a good person." == "I want you to think I am a good person."

"I am spiritual, but not religious." == "I want you to think I am deep, but I do not want you to think I am dogmatic."

We can see that pretty much every a woman says makes perfect sense if you proceed from the assumption that she is the center of the universe, and hers is the only perspective there is. If we think about, we can even start to have ideas about where female solipsism comes from.

Women are both evolved and raised to deal with people, not things. In the world of things, there is one true set of circumstances, the way things really are. Fail to grasp it, and you can't get anything done. Your machines don't work, your bridges collapse, your software crashes and brings down the New York Stock Exchange. But in the world of people, what's important isn't what's really there, but what you can convince other people of.

To a woman, truth == consensus. It isn't important what's true. It's important what you can make people believe. And telling any literal truth just weakens her ability to sell the story she wants to sell.

So when a woman tells you something, she isn't stupidly unable to know she's bullshitting you. Nor is she

maliciously trying to pull your leg. It's just that, to her, communication consists solely of people trying to bullshit each other. Any other possible way of communicating doesn't enter into her awareness. That's why you can stand ten feet from a woman and scream "What I mean is the literal content of the words I just said!", and she will look for the hidden meaning in both that statement and the one before.

Someone steeped in that environment has no incentive to imagine what the world looks like from someone else's point of view. To attempt to do so would be a great weakness, because it would spoil her ability to push her own point of view.

Just remember that almost anytime a woman says "this is" or "do this", she is actually saying "this is the illusion I desire".

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

[deleted] 15 January, 2014 01:19 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 15 January, 2014 06:14 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 15 January, 2014 01:59 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 69 points • 15 January, 2014 08:15 AM

One of the best posts I've read here in a long time. I think a lot of people are using the term solipsism interchangeably with hamster on this subreddit, and that's not accurate. They are different. Like you said, female solipsism is the idea that what exists in her mind is applicable to the world simply because it exists in her head. Truth is whatever is in her mind - and whatever is in her mind is a direct function of what society, her emotions, her tingles, her friends, etc shove into her head.

It doesn't mean women are bad. It just means their advice is aimed internally. When they tell you how to make a woman happy, they are telling you how they want to think of themselves. They will tell you to make a woman happy by doing sweet things and giving her the power in a relationship, because they want to be able to think of themselves as the type of woman who deserves those things. So when women tell you things, they do reveal deep insights. They are, however, incapable of revealing insights about anyone but themselves.

I enjoy hearing what women have to say. It's amusing, and not even in a mean way. I think it's cool how they can exist only in the moment, as if the past and future don't exist. It's amazing that they can make their minds believe things with no hard proof. It's amazing that they can gobble up and devour cold reading, tarot, supernatural bullshit, romance lit, and consumerist culture, but they choke and vomit if you try to get them to digest an idea like honor, true loyalty, objectivity, logic, or truth.

Basically when women speak, learn to enjoy it like listening to a nice song. There is beauty there, there is plenty to wonder at. Get caught up in that, fully just enjoy her feminine ideas. Just don't treat them like actual logical ideas, and I think you can find that women do offer their own type of value when they give advice / monologues / speak in general.

HeadingRed • 4 points • 15 January, 2014 03:43 PM

Spot on on the internal aiming- it not simple selfishness or self absorbing, it's just the default setting.

TRPsubmitter • 94 points • 15 January, 2014 05:12 AM

Nominated for "paradigm changing post of 2014" right here.

Women are both evolved and raised to deal with people, not things. In the world of things, there is one true set of circumstances, the way things really are. Fail to grasp it, and you can't get anything done. Your machines don't work, your bridges collapse, your software crashes and brings down the New York Stock Exchange. But in the world of people, what's important isn't what's really there, but what you can convince other people of.

Incredible insight here.

HeadingRed • 26 points • 15 January, 2014 03:29 PM

Agreed- I was trying to explain this a couple of days ago. Women and men view "why" differently, even more so when with members of the same sex.

Women will answer the why with a motivational response- I did this because I love you, because I wanted everyone to have a good time, I was feeling sad etc. Men will answer with mechanics- it's was the best car for the money, the restaurant was reasonable and has good food, I didn't want to make two trips.

I spent years trying to get the women I was with to answer questions in my way. I have since given up. Now that I expect the request for an emotional rationalization for mundane mechanical tasks I don't get as pissed and keep my frame better.

reedrichardsstretch5 points 17 January, 2014 10:21 PM [recovered]

Women are both evolved and raised to deal with people, not things. In the world of things, there is one true set of circumstances, the way things really are. Fail to grasp it, and you can't get anything done. Your machines don't work, your bridges collapse, your software crashes and brings down the New York Stock Exchange. But in the world of people, what's important isn't what's really there, but what you can convince other people of.

This young Chinese student that was staying with me through Couchsurfing was the perfect example of this truth.

She's majoring in some sociological field that I forget. She asks what I majored in and I tell her (Computer Information Systems with a Business Minor). Her response is state how she hated math class and instead of taking responsibility for not doing the work, not having natural aptitude or whatever, she blamed all of her math teachers for being boring (hamstering).

She then says, to paraphrase, "Also, I didn't like that there was a right and a wrong answer." LOL. I said to her, in all seriousness, "You just don't like being told that you're wrong." She even tried to tell me that $1 + 1 \neq 2$.

Real life, sometimes you can't make this shit up.

TRPsubmitter • 5 points • 18 January, 2014 05:24 AM

"Also, I didn't like that there was a right and a wrong answer."

LOL. Better go for the humanities: where everyone is "right" or "more right" and no one can be wrong, so they just passively aggressively hate on each other

kinderofen • 5 points • 18 January, 2014 07:44 PM

Humanities weren't always this one sided. Epistemology is a complex and interesting subject. Unfortunately it's been hijacked by postmodern shallowpates.

through_a_ways • -3 points • 15 January, 2014 09:18 AM

Well, the NYSE can be brought down to "people errors" as well, since the market is controlled by social beings

still_very_alive • 13 points • 15 January, 2014 04:08 PM

True but irrelevant.

FugitiveAlpha • 0 points • 15 January, 2014 03:10 PM

Must have been a female squirrel :)

<http://www.nytimes.com/1987/12/10/business/stray-squirrel-shuts-down-nasdaq-system.html>

[deleted] • 71 points • 15 January, 2014 02:56 AM

I think I touched on this on a previous post I made.

There's a reason women will hate this sub forever, hate seduction, pick-up artists, and game in general. It's not because they are pure and honest creatures that have a distaste for deception in general, it's because they hate deception where you aren't actually as high value as you presented yourself.

If they give you advice, they have to tread carefully. They need to be able to say "Have high sexual value" without touching on societal taboos that make them seem selfish or even whoreish, so they come up with very safe advice from a woman's standpoint and tell you to simply **be** the things they want, with no actual set of steps on how to get there (to be fair to women, there's no actual reason they need to know what it takes for a man to be confident, honest, and "natural").

So yes, no matter how you approach it, never take dating advice from a woman ever. Their mating strategy is **far** more simple than mens', and any real advice they give you would immediately make that individual look bad, and why would someone incriminate themselves just to help you out?

I've read somewhere on a blog a while ago that Girl Game is simply 1) be pretty 2) be available, and I agree with that assertion.

RPGoon • 12 points • 15 January, 2014 02:17 PM

I was listening to Patrice's podcast the other day and he mentioned the same thing regarding Girl Game. He had his girl go try to find a second girl for a threesome. Patrice said she was extremely frustrated because she had no idea how to do it. She thought should could just walk up to a girl and say something along the lines of "come have sex with me and my guy".

Of course Patrice's girl had shitty Girl Game so it didn't work (even though girls don't have a bitch shield for other women). Game should be easier for women but they still fail at it!

I've had the same experience in my life - both of my last girlfriends I told to get another girl for a threesome and they both failed miserably everytime they tried.

[deleted] • 19 points • 15 January, 2014 03:53 PM

I have a lady friend that is bisexual, and I absolutely love hearing her stories about trying (and mostly failing) to hit on other women.

Lesbian dating is like watching two shy, introverted, rejection-fearing AFCs attempt to get each other's attention through every indirect method possible, and hoping someone ELSE makes a move or hopes their intentions are picked up on.

theVet • 3 points • 15 January, 2014 01:00 PM

The secret impresses no one. The trick you use it for is everything.

cray-cray-cray • -5 points • 15 January, 2014 04:28 AM

There's a reason women will hate this sub forever, hate seduction, pick-up artists, and game in general.

Like a lot of things, it depends on your frame.

[deleted] • 5 points • 15 January, 2014 03:36 PM

No, they hate PUA stuff, game tactics, and all of that as a concept. I'm not talking about the application of it.

[deleted] 15 January, 2014 12:57 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 15 January, 2014 04:07 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 15 January, 2014 04:29 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 15 January, 2014 04:39 AM

[permanently deleted]

jethreezy • 20 points • 15 January, 2014 05:11 AM

Honesty always makes a difference.

[deleted] • 13 points • 15 January, 2014 11:39 AM

Do the following experiment, fuck an ugly/fat girl, start a relationship with her. Then evaluate if all the shit you have to put through is worth the effort.

All girls shit test, the difference is that if she is smoking hot you won't mind as much as if she is ugly.

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 January, 2014 06:49 AM

Sex is amoral

[deleted] • 0 points • 15 January, 2014 11:35 AM

Almost all women have a phase of their life where they will be sexually attractive to all men if they take care to stay reasonably healthy. And even the exception can have sex if they actively pursue it.

Kharn0 • 2 points • 15 January, 2014 05:03 PM

Who do you want performing surgery on your heart, the medical prodigy that's a dick or the first day intern with a heart of gold? Being "nice" doesn't mean squat without value behind it.

Noolaw • 25 points • 15 January, 2014 01:33 AM

Womanese is a language every man must learn to up his GAME. Great post!

Peoria3 • 34 points • 15 January, 2014 01:51 AM

Absolutely brilliant insights: "I want to be independent." == "I want to look independent." (I don't, however, want to actually take responsibility for myself. That's hard work.)

"I would never do that." == "I wouldn't want anyone knowing I did that."

"I am a good person." == "I want you to think I am a good person."

[deleted] • 20 points • 15 January, 2014 04:08 AM

This is phenomenal.

Should be top post instead of that wannabe seinfeld observational crap

[deleted] • 4 points • 15 January, 2014 03:25 PM

What is the deal with shopping? I just shopped! You wanna shop?! Let's shop! Shop!!!

[deleted] • 0 points • 16 January, 2014 01:53 AM

seriously i make the worst posts sometimes

stemgang • 18 points • 15 January, 2014 04:50 AM

So when a woman tells you something, she isn't stupidly unable to know she's bullshitting you. Nor is she maliciously trying to pull your leg. It's just that, to her, communication consists solely of people trying to bullshit each other.

AKA "There is no truth; there is only the agenda I am pushing."

Powerful insights. Thank you.

Raggos • 9 points • 15 January, 2014 02:09 PM

There is no spoon, it is only you that bends. ;)

LastRevision • 15 points • 15 January, 2014 12:38 PM

Your post is an example of why I love this subreddit, haters be damned. Only on TRP can I be taking a shit at the gym at 7:30am and have massive life revelations.

p3ndulum • 15 points • 15 January, 2014 10:47 PM

By request (to increase visibility), my response to /u/ThePragmatist42's downvoted reply to OP:

Neither you or OP are necessarily wrong, but what I think what you're missing is the fact that men come from an **active** and **strategic** world view and women from a **passive** and **responsive** world view.

So, for example, when a guy asks a woman for relationship advice, what he's really asking is "what are the things that I can *do* so that I can (effectively) [have sex with you]?"

Because a woman is passive and responsive, having almost no idea what it's like to have a strategic mind, her experience tells her that all a person needs to do is just *be themselves* and a relationship will just *happen* to them - because that is generally how relationships happen to *them*.

When a woman is approached by a man she is attracted to, to her it just feels like the a Hollywood, reached-for-the-taxi-door-handle-at-the-same-time moment, where this Prince Charming just popped up out of nowhere and *boom*, there's chemistry - and a great romantic story to tell her friends. That's why they hate "creeps" - because they're not capable of giving her a fairy tale love story encounter. And that's why she hates pick-up artists and Red Pillers, because - at least in her mind - they/we're not "being [ourselves]" or being "natural".

When a woman is giving a man relationship advice, she is effectively trying to tell him "just have the universe align you in a completely organic and natural 'romantic' situation with a woman whose friends will think you're the perfect guy", because that's what *she* wants to experience (solipsism).

Because her worldview is *passive* and *receptive*, she doesn't understand that a man is looking for step-by-

step owner's-manual-like instructions on how to get a woman to fuck him. To her, either a man is just *plugged in* or he isn't - and if he's looking for instructions, he must be undeserving of it or broken in some way (a "creep"). She would say "just be yourself" because, d'uh, that's what all the guys she dated did and it worked out fine for *them*. (More solipsism.)

From OP's title: "A woman can not tell you how to proceed." **That's strategy, and women are followers by nature and don't know how to lead/can't wrap their minds around the concept from a strategic perspective.** "She can only tell you what she want to experience." **That's because of her passive/receptive worldview. She can't tell you how to create the experience she wants to experience, she can only tell you what she wants it to look or feel like for HERSELF.**

This is why women become irrational/passive-aggressive. When their realities don't match what they want it to look or feel like, they begin to play the role of the victim - because they only see the world from a passive/receptive point of view, which what OP's translations are trying to illustrate.

To build on what OP said about when she says "I'm a good person", what she's (not) saying is "I want you to *think* that I'm a good person because 'good' people are treated better and people like them, and that's how I want *you* to deal with *me* so then that may become my reality."

She very well could be a *terrible* person, but because (again) she is passive/receptive, she can only follow your lead, not having any real clue how she might act in the future (good or bad) because she won't know until she has actually responded and then had a chance to reflect. (Even though her "hamster" will always rationalize that she didn't do anything wrong/it wasn't her fault/she was just the passive victim who was taken advantage of.

In the case of "I want to be independent", what she is really (not) saying is "I want to be *thought as*, as well as *spoken to* as if I'm independent, even though I actually rely on the state/other men - whether it be financial aide or just by them playing along/not suggesting otherwise."

Women basically spend their entire lives in fairy tale/make believe mode - it's like everything is a game of dress-up, with the hair and make-up, always "pretending" on some level, but don't really know it.

"Pretend" is their reality.

"Women and men are equal."

"If men can do it, we can, too."

High heels, push-up bras, breast implants, fake eyelashes, often being referred to - and even regularly referring to themselves as "princesses".

So when they are communicating with men, especially, it's always from a place of "I want you to play along."

And as soon as you're *not* playing along, they *feel* like you're no fun, or a "loser", or a "creep", or a misogynist.

They are a princess, after all, there'd *have* to be something wrong with *you* if you didn't like her or agree with her or validate her for some reason or in some way.

And therein lies the difference between men and women.

Men mean what they say, and women say what they want to feel or experience, ala OP's post.

"You must be a woman-hating misogynist if you don't agree with feminism, because women are passive/receptive, so anything that you don't like about them must be because of something you or (probably) other men have done. So it's *you* who needs to change, not women."

It's why just about everything men say and do is "sexist" or why they don't like it when men have an opinion about women - it's because it's often out of line with the fairy tale they want you to create for them.

It's also why they enjoy flirting so much. Flirting is always suggestive and vague and indirect.

Anyway, this has just turned into a stream of consciousness because I keep having epiphanies while I write this, so I'll just end it here.

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 February, 2014 12:07 AM

this is the best post I've seen on here so far, I'm in awe

wurding • 18 points • 15 January, 2014 10:50 AM

paraphrasing Nietzsche:

"Show a woman truth and she will seek vengeance against you"

[deleted] 15 January, 2014 01:58 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 0 points • 15 January, 2014 06:55 AM

This explains my next conquest's behavior to a T.

HeadingRed • 6 points • 15 January, 2014 03:40 PM

We should be working on a translation dictionary\glossary of women\mens terms. Example-

"What do you want to do" = "Think of something I like that you would not mind doing"

"Anything would be OK" = "Think of something I don't mind doing that much"

"She and I just hit it off it's like we have been best friends forever" = "I just met her and we have not had the time to disappoint\piss each other off"

"Can't we just compromise" = "Half the time I get what I want, half the time let's discuss\talk about what you want"

"You always _____" = "You do this on occasion and it's pissing me off today because my boss was mean to me"

FloranHunter • 5 points • 16 January, 2014 12:07 AM

"You always blank" in my experience is "blank made me feel bad". I literally only once did some action in my life and a girl said that to me.

Or maybe, better: attribution error. Her experience of me was brief enough that my single act colored her entire perception of my character.

zirzo • 1 point • 13 May, 2014 07:35 PM

That last one is fking annoying

anotherthrowawaybiff • 5 points • 17 January, 2014 09:27 PM

How did I miss this post? Great write-up. I was particularly laughing about the "Looking for the hidden meaning in your statement" line. I've definitely lived that one more than a few times. The most ridiculous was in recent years, when I was being hit on by a woman online, a member of a forum I frequented. I am happily married, never made any secret of this, and told her so. She was certain that I was secretly attracted to her. It's true that I am flirty with women online, but it's just play and a bit of light game-honing, never serious, and I talk about my wife too so they'll know I'm not seriously pursuing them.

In this case, she was *certain* I was interested in her. This translated into some of the most insane behavior I've seen. Work would take me away from the forum for a couple of days and when I came back, she'd claim I was avoiding her because I couldn't handle my "feelings" for her. I was like, "No, I was working and didn't have time to log in." She would hyper-analyze this shit and a day later she'd be completely furious with me from out of the blue because she'd decided all on her own that I was lying to her to hide my feelings and make her crazy.

It was fucking ridiculous. After a little while of this, I eventually told her, "None of this is real. You are writing an entire story IN YOUR HEAD and the problem is, you are using me as a character in it and assigning feelings and motivations to my character that do not exist. When I tell you something, it's the literal truth, not wordplay." She would then proceed to try and figure out what I "really meant" from that statement. I eventually had to ban & block her.

The punchline? She was married.

tcotr • 8 points • 14 January, 2014 11:55 PM

awesome observation!

Archwinger • 7 points • 15 January, 2014 09:54 PM

This post really made me think. I couldn't help smiling to myself when I spoke with my wife an hour after reading it, and she kept asking what the hell I was laughing about.

Everything she said suddenly seemed a lot more honest when I translated it.

Women aren't the only ones who lie, but whoever you're speaking with, there's one thing you can always count on to be true: when somebody says something, the one thing she is always truthfully conveying is what she wants you to think. It doesn't matter if what she says is true or if what she says is what she thinks - what she says is what she wants *you* to think. Every time she says something, even if you can't trust what she's saying and can't trust what she's thinking, you can always trust what she's inadvertently telling you by listening to what she wants you to think.

BlackTarnishWatchman • 8 points • 15 January, 2014 03:43 AM

What women want, even with this translation you give, isn't the same as what will make her attracted to you.

beeker629 • 4 points • 15 January, 2014 10:59 AM

i've never heard my ex-wife explained so well.

[deleted] • 4 points • 15 January, 2014 01:48 AM

Fantastic post skillfully linking several concepts (emotional needs, functional role, seduction as building a narrative). Very nice.

HeadingRed • 2 points • 15 January, 2014 03:44 PM

Women don't tell you what they want, what they want to be like. They tell you what they wish they wanted or want to be like.

When a woman says "I wish" what they mean is "I don't really want this- I just wish I wanted this"

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 January, 2014 04:21 AM

Wow. we can read about subjective perspective differentiation, or go talk to girls and see what works better. I'm not harping on your logical theory, this is constructive criticism that I see more men taking the approach to preparation over experience. I feel it should be balanced. Also I get really good results from not trying very hard,

and trying reeeeeeeaaaalllly hard and redbull vodka, but nothing in-between really works for me.

Ceekoe • 1 point • 20 January, 2014 05:16 AM

It's gonna take many re-reads and cogitation to truly process this. Loaded with insight. Tip o' the hat to you, good sir.

patrissimo42 • 1 point • 26 January, 2014 05:10 AM

Also, this is why it's hard to talk about TRP (or other unpopular issues) with the feminine. At the objective level, it's interesting, but in terms of what other people think about it, whether it's a good illusion, whether it is something you can convince other people of (and look good doing it)...it's a steaming turd sandwich.

[deleted] • 1 point • 1 February, 2014 07:45 PM

Here is a thought, why do diet programs such as jenny craig work? It is consensus based. Why do most Asian girls think that working out with give you as much muscle as a bodybuilder? Consensus. While I might not agree with everything on this subreddit, this post really is an amazing post and I think women need to at least appreciate posts like this because they go beyond the red pill, they emphasize the basics of communication. Definitely worth the read.

troubadour1492 • 1 point • 15 January, 2014 02:05 PM

This advice is spot on.

I just went around the "be yourself" bush last week. I got a fish on the hook and just about ready to bite my worm, and then I allowed a female friend to psych me out with the "be yourself" bullshit. So now I have a cute girl who will never see me seriously as a sexual prospect again.

It wasn't all bad though, honestly. I do need to be myself a lot more than I was with that girl. I can play psycho crazy Manson kind of shit, but do I even want girls who respond to that kind of game? If a girl and I are talking about butchering a dead hooker together, is that a piece of ass I really want? (Well, yes, it was, actually. It was like sledding down a hill with jagged rocks at the bottom, seeing if you can jump off in time. Dangerous, stupid, but very exciting!)

I ended up settling on somebody more myself than that guy. Then I went out and approached a much cuter, **much** more normal girl, and got her number. I'm myself, just **informed**.

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 January, 2014 02:54 PM

Nomination for thread of the year right here

I give you an A+ for women's studies

spicy_fries • 1 point • 15 January, 2014 08:20 PM

Thank you for this post.

specter504 • 1 point • 15 January, 2014 09:00 PM

Gold this.

ThePragmatist42 • -14 points • 15 January, 2014 03:08 AM

This might be a very hard pill for you to swallow but what you've listed is exciting or shocking. Nothing from the left is untruths or have hidden meaning.

Of course you should be yourself. And of course she wants you to be yourself. This, however, doesn't mean she

has to LIKE yourself. You don't get an automatic green light to vagina land just because you were being yourself.

"Be Honest." Why shouldn't you be honest? Again, she doesn't have to like you for being honest. There is no hidden meaning in this.

What exactly is the difference between these two "Act natural, don't force it" == "I want it to feel natural, not forced."? She's obviously asking you to act natural because she wants it to feel natural.

"I am a good person." == "I want you to think I am a good person." This is another confusing comparison. She told you she was a good person because she wants you to think she's a good person, or else she wouldn't of said anything. People typically communicate using words. They use these words to help you form opinions about them. Yes, people also take action to help you form opinions.

"I am spiritual, but not religious." == "I want you to think I am deep, but I do not want you to think I am dogmatic." Yes another obvious translation. This is exactly why she said it. There is no hidden meaning in this.

This post acts like there is some hidden translation matrix to interpret what this fictitious woman is saying. A guy could of said almost all of these things to another guy friend and they would have the exact same meaning . It really seems like this post is trying to justify why you've been rejected by finding hidden meaning in certain phrases or topics of conversation.

Just to really hammer this home.. This is what a proper translation matrix should of looked like for your simple conversations:

"Be Honest." - "I really like you, please don't say anything that is going to turn me off. Make me believe all the wonderful things you are saying to me so I can sleep with you without a guilty conscious."

"I am a good person." - "Many of my decisions and actions in life have been seen as poor and disgusting by others. But in reality they are all wrong and I am really a good person, you'll see."

"Just be yourself" - "I hope you are the type of person I am really attracted to and stop trying so hard to impress me. It's obvious you don't have a real french accent."

"I would never do that." - "I don't quite know you well enough so I took a conservative stand point on this particular topic and lied."

Can you see how these are different than yours? With yours you just reworded and substituted words from the left to the right...



p3ndulum • 42 points • 15 January, 2014 06:35 AM*

Neither you or OP are necessarily wrong, but what I think what you're missing is the fact that men come from an **active** and **strategic** world view and women from a **passive** and **responsive** world view.

So, for example, when a guy asks a woman for relationship advice, what he's really asking is "what are the things that I can *do* so that I can (effectively) [have sex with you]?"

Because a woman is passive and responsive, having almost no idea what it's like to have a strategic mind, her experience tells her that all a person needs to do is just *be themselves* and a relationship will just *happen* to them - because that is generally how relationships happen to *them*.

When a woman is approached by a man she is attracted to, to her it just feels like the a Hollywood, reached-for-the-taxi-door-handle-at-the-same-time moment, where this Prince Charming just popped up out of nowhere and *boom*, there's chemistry - and a great romantic story to tell her friends. That's why they hate "creeps" - because they're not capable of giving her a fairy tale love story encounter. And that's why she

hates pick-up artists and Red Pillers, because - at least in her mind - they/we're not "being [ourselves]" or being "natural".

When a woman is giving a man relationship advice, she is effectively trying to tell him "just have the universe align you in a completely organic and natural 'romantic' situation with a woman whose friends will think you're the perfect guy", because that's what *she* wants to experience (solipsism). Because her worldview is *passive* and *receptive*, she doesn't understand that a man is looking for step-by-step owner's-manual-like instructions on how to get a woman to fuck him. To her, either a man is just *plugged in* or he isn't - and if he's looking for instructions, he must be undeserving of it or broken in some way (a "creep"). She would say "just be yourself" because, d'uh, that's what all the guys she dated did and it worked out fine for *them*. (More solipsism.)

From OP's title: "A woman can not tell you how to proceed." **That's strategy, and women are followers by nature and don't know how to lead/can't wrap their minds around the concept from a strategic perspective.** "She can only tell you what she wants to experience." **That's because of her passive/receptive worldview. She can't tell you how to create the experience she wants to experience, she can only tell you what she wants it to look or feel like for HERSELF.**

This is why women become irrational/passive-aggressive. When their realities don't match what they want it to look or feel like, they begin to play the role of the victim - because they only see the world from a passive/receptive point of view, which what OP's translations are trying to illustrate.

To build on what OP said about when she says "I'm a good person", what she's (not) saying is "I want you to *think* that I'm a good person because 'good' people are treated better and people like them, and that's how I want *you* to deal with *me* so then that may become my reality."

She very well could be a *terrible* person, but because (again) she is passive/receptive, she can only follow your lead, not having any real clue how she might act in the future (good or bad) because she won't know until she has actually responded and then had a chance to reflect. (Even though her "hamster" will always rationalize that she didn't do anything wrong/it wasn't her fault/she was just the passive victim who was taken advantage of.

In the case of "I want to be independent", what she is really (not) saying is "I want to be *thought as*, as well as *spoken to* as if I'm independent, even though I actually rely on the state/other men - whether it be financial aide or just by them playing along/not suggesting otherwise."

Women basically spend their entire lives in fairy tale/make believe mode - it's like everything is a game of dress-up, with the hair and make-up, always "pretending" on some level, but don't really know it.

"Pretend" is their reality.

"Women and men are equal."

"If men can do it, we can, too."

High heels, push-up bras, breast implants, fake eyelashes, often being referred to - and even regularly referring to themselves as "princesses".

So when they are communicating with men, especially, it's always from a place of "I want you to play along."

And as soon as you're *not* playing along, they *feel* like you're no fun, or a "loser", or a "creep", or a misogynist.

They are a princess, after all, there'd *have* to be something wrong with *you* if you didn't like her or agree with her or validate her for some reason or in some way.

And therein lies the difference between men and women.

Men mean what they say, and women say what they want to feel or experience, ala OP's post.

"You must be a woman-hating misogynist if you don't agree with feminism, because women are passive/receptive, so anything that you don't like about them must be because of something you or (probably) other men have done. So it's *you* who needs to change, not women."

It's why just about everything men say and do is "sexist" or why they don't like it when men have an opinion about women - it's because it's often out of line with the fairy tale they want you to create for them.

It's also why they enjoy flirting so much. Flirting is always suggestive and vague and indirect.

Anyway, this has just turned into a stream of consciousness because I keep having epiphanies while I write this, so I'll just end it here.

Edit thank you for the gold.

Whisper[S] • 14 points • 15 January, 2014 07:10 AM

You have grasped my message precisely. And explained it eloquently.

p3ndulum • 1 point • 15 January, 2014 01:21 PM

It was a brilliant post on your behalf. I might have wrote it in a tone that maybe suggested that this was something that I've understood all my life, but something just went *click* after reading your OP.

Awesome contribution, man, thanks for sharing.

[deleted] • 3 points • 23 January, 2014 11:39 AM

You see it close to the explanation of what I saw happening through history. 500, 1000, or 3000 years ago when people were talking morals, ethics, politics or philosophy it was generally active "Do this, don't do that." I.e. politics was laws that forbidden things. Ethics was rules for living. Philosophy like Marcus Aurelius was a manual on how to live the good life.

Fast forward today. Now it is the passive voice. Politics is about how people "should be treated" not what they should do. Ethics and politics is about how the world should be and what people should get, not what people should do. If in the past they said it actively "do not kill" today they see it passively "you have a right to not be killed".

Everything changes from active to passive, from "do" to "get". Back then racism meant someone is doing something crappy to a person of color. Today it is people of color "getting" marginalized by "society". No active actor.

Even language changes. Back then it was "Don't behave like a jerk!" and today it is "Stop being an asshole!" See? From "doing" it goes to "being"? Today people are not behaving or doing things, they are being a something. Today people are not *doing* gay sex, they are *being* gay. Today I don't simply like a given kind of music, I am being a raver, rocker, or whatever. Action turned into identity, action into state of being.

I thought this is because of ideology. I think I was wrong. I think it is more like the women's voice is becoming stronger.

p3ndulum • 1 point • 23 January, 2014 03:02 PM*

Have you seen /u/veggie_girl's "Divorce Rates: Just 1 Reason Why Women Should Have Never Been Allowed to Vote" or Stephen Molyneux's video "Women, Beauty, Voting and Tyranny"?

Here's a paper titled "Did Women's Suffrage Change the Size and Scope of Government?" (TRP discussion)

Here's a discussion titled "Women's suffrage is the worst thing to happen to Western civilization: Allowing women voting privileges. We were warned."

And a discussion about a video of a guy who gets a bunch of students at an all girls' school to sign a petition to stop women's suffrage.

I agree with you that it has definitely less to do with political ideology and almost everything to do with *tone*.

Think about how we censor ourselves, as men, around women. With the exception of, maybe, our very closest of friends. The way we speak to men and women is very different.

We are generally very overt and to the point with men, but with women, we often feel obligated to switch to a much softer tone; always worrying about how they are feeling (or how we might have sex with them or their fiends).

As soon as women entered politics, the whole country began speaking as if women are always listening. Who knows, now one of them one day might become powerful enough to end your career just because she doesn't *feel* comfortable around you.

Women, as inherently selfish as they are, surely noticed how easily it was for them to influence politics through little more than showing up in their Sunday bests and crying "oppression". From there, if they didn't benefit from it in a direct way, any man who had a vote and also had a wife or a girlfriend at home was frozen out of the bedroom.

Everything has rolled downhill since.

Marriages are held together by tape, children are growing up without fathers and being raised by child gardeners, and our elderly are dying alone in nursing homes all so that women can be "empowered" and "independent". (Read: "fuck a lot and never feel responsible for anything.")

Like a bunch of spoiled little kids.

It's our fault though. We've treated girls and women too favourably over the millennia. Protected them and adorned them with gifts. Treated their pussies like a bag of diamonds. Once you take the leash off, they are going to continue to behave (for the most part) like spoiled little children who believe that their pussies are as valuable as a bag of diamonds.

For so long women and girls needed to do nothing more than look good and keep a tidy house.

Whether that's fair or not, you still end up flooding the dance floor with all kinds of people who've never danced before, and then given them full control over the turntables.

They play what they want, when they want. They deny anybody they want from dancing with them. And even if none of them want to dance themselves, nobody else is allowed on the floor (unless they are a cute frat boy who comes from money).

When you've spent thousands of years playing with dolls, make-believing a world where everybody is a princess and drinks tea, what value can you be expected to bring to the world of politics? *"Treat everybody like a princess and make sure everybody gets tea! ...except for the creepy guys and that girl who kissed my ex boyfriend."*

It's unlikely that women's suffrage will ever end, so it looks like we're in for (possibly) decades (or even longer) of women trying to figure out how to politic objectively. But are they self-aware enough to be able to recognize when things are off course, and then have the capacity to admit that they were wrong and then have the strength to right the ship?

[deleted] 15 January, 2014 12:40 PM

[permanently deleted]

p3ndulum • 2 points • 15 January, 2014 01:30 PM*

I can't take all of the credit. I would have never been able to formulate all of that content without first reading OP's post.

It was ~~light~~ like a light went on for me.

But thank you for your kind words and feedback. And I agree with you; this realization has definitely taken the sting out of TRP, because now I have a better understanding of where they (women) are coming from.

Edit: auto correct

halfevilnick • 1 point • 15 January, 2014 08:23 AM

They are a princess, after all, there'd have to be something wrong with you if you didn't like her or agree with her or validate her for some reason or in some way.

Not that I disagree but, how is this congruent with alpha game? Isn't the basis of game lowering her value while raising your own?

rapreaper • 3 points • 15 January, 2014 11:07 AM

Again, it's not lowering her value, it's making her think that you don't see her as high(er) value. So, in order to complete her fairy tale of her being high value, she will be nice to you so that you validate that for her.

p3ndulum • 3 points • 15 January, 2014 01:18 PM

What I was trying to emphasizing/highlight was your average woman's *mindset*, not put them on a pedestal.

You know how fathers will often refer to their daughters as "princess" or "my little princess", and how they (girls) like to put on frilly pink dresses and wear tiaras when they are young (heck, even when they are fully grown)?

From a peripheral perspective, we know that these girls' fathers are just trying to be cute, if not just trying to establish their (king-like) authority in a soft way, but think about how that might affect the psyche after years and years of being *treated* like you're a perfect little "princess" - always being spoken to in a softer tone than most boys get to hear, always being spoiled, always getting your way, always being told "shh, don't cry - it's not your fault", etc, while in a society that is always mindful of how girls are feeling, bending to their every (feminist indoctrinated) whims.

We're rarely ever direct, blunt or honest with girls. Like when they ask us if their jeans make their asses look fat, even when it's true we soften the blow or just flat out lie to them and just tell them whatever it is we think that they want to hear.

Think about that; *we're (society/the "matrix") is always just telling girls whatever it is we think they want to hear.*

And so that's how they learn to communicate with the world, by speaking in a way that both *suggests* as well as *expects* **the fulfillment of fantasy**.

To tie it back to OP's theme, when you ask a girl for advice, she can only tell you what she wants *her* fantasy to look like and what it might feel like to her. Which is why they can't differentiate between what it is they want (the fantasy) and what they are actually attracted to and turns them on (game).

ThePragmatist42 • 1 point • 15 January, 2014 11:26 PM

It's unfortunate your post is eclipsed by the rampant down voting of my post. I stick to what I've said about the OP's content.

Your post is what the original post should of said. You've added and expounded upon a vast array of information and strategy, something the OP didn't accomplish in the slightest.

I fear this subreddit will devolve into a circle jerk of men patting each other on the back for bashing women. The OP's comparisons are illogical and do not add any value. Your post on the other hand does have substance even if you were sparked to write it because of what the OP wrote.

Here is an example of what I felt the OP did:

A woman says: "I want a man to be funny" she really means: "I want to laugh and be happy" Argh.. why can't women say what they mean!

No amount of down voting will change the fact that everyone high-fived each other about a post that provided no value outside of bashing women.

If everyone wants to be the Alpha that is talked about so much in this sub reddit, they should take some pride in their works and provide relevant and useful content.

p3ndulum • -1 points • 16 January, 2014 12:13 AM

In the grand scheme of things, this community is still in its infancy having only been established, what, twelve months ago?

It's like the damn is breaking and water is beginning to rush in in terms of they level of consciousness among the men who come here.

This is a huge group full of frustrated people who are just starting to figure things out - the percentage of those who *get it* is only fractional compared to those who don't fully understand yet - so those who are making contributions are still trying to refine their craft, so to speak.

I'm sure that if you left the community and came back in 3-5 years, the percentages will have polarized, where you would see fewer and fewer frustrations being expressed and, instead, much more civil discourse.

All of this "woman hating" is nothing more than growing pains.

What I think often gets lost in all of this is the fact that each and every one of us really truly wishes we had better relationships with women - and so we've come here, either serendipitously or because we've searched it out, because the information and advice we've received our whole lives has worked against us. And part of the process of learning how to walk again starts with a painful rehabbing process.

Also, in OP's defense (in repsect to *your* perspective), very few of us ever actually have the whole story - and even when we have most of it, things can get lost in the translation from what we think we know and being able to express it in a communicable way. Which is why it can sometimes take more than one person, and even sometimes more than one attempt, to communicate any specific concept or idea.

Consider that I didn't really understand the things that I initially responded to you with until *after* I read OP's post. Information is funny like that, and that's why we form communities, so that we can all throw our pieces into the pot, and then build the moasaic as a collective.

So as far as the members who expression their frustration with women go, it's not the point of the community to come here and complain, it's just an early part of a maturation process. And as far as

the contributors go, they are all pioneers and martyrs in some ways, trying to break new ground for a generation of boys and men to come - so that they might grow up in a world where they don't have to deal with so much of their own frustration.

ThePragmatist42 • 1 point • 16 January, 2014 01:31 AM

Fair enough. I appreciate the rational and level headed responses you've replied with on my posts. I hope your posts can be a good example of how to debate with logic and reason while still showing a bit of empathy and emotion.

I accept the growing pains and will chalk up my original post being down voted into oblivion as similar frustration. My post was not close to being Blue Pill thinking but rather thoughts that challenged what others were accepting.

I'm not so concerned about negative votes but more about the overall success of this subreddit. We have to be willing to look deeper than the thin veil of popular "truths"

If this subreddit has more people like you in it, I think it'll do just fine.

p3ndulum • -1 points • 16 January, 2014 03:42 AM

I went back to your original reply to see if I could pick up on why people might be downvoting you, and one of the things I felt was that some of the language you used sounds a little bit like how a woman or a blue piller might make a case for the friendzone, i.e. "she doesn't owe you (her affections) just because you're nice to her." (You said 'she doesnt have to like you because you're honest.') So there's a little bit that has to do with the tone of the content, and the reason why *I* felt compelled to respond to you - I had a feeling you were misinterpreting OP's message, and so your challenges were a little bit out of alignment with what was being discussed. It seemed as though you were focusing on the *what* (what she means), where I, at least - I can't speak for everyone - thought OP was talking about the *why* (why her advice doesn't translate into practical results).

I think that if you went back and read what you wrote, you might be able to see for yourself what I'm referring to.

Most of your other contributions seem to have been received pretty well, I just think something got lost in translation this time.

ThePragmatist42 • 2 points • 16 January, 2014 02:02 PM

Ah great points. I see what you mean. I should of sat on my reply for a day before I wrote it, then reread it. I was acting out of emotion and not rational thought. You're correct, I was sounding blue pill with my posts. My intent wasn't to defend women in the post, but rather provoke a more detailed "why" from the OP. I failed to do that. However, your posts made up for any of my misguidance and I appreciate that.

[deleted] 15 January, 2014 09:33 PM*

[permanently deleted]

p3ndulum • 0 points • 15 January, 2014 10:48 PM

Done.

charlie_bodango • 0 points • 15 January, 2014 04:29 PM

pontifx • -2 points • 15 January, 2014 10:03 PM

"Love will just happen when you meet the right person." == "I want it to look like it just happened without effort, because he was the right person."

This is a good read into a lazy bitch. Shit man Whisper you might be onto something theres probably a plethora of sneaky shit women hide into their "authentic" dating advice. Ima ask some girls tonight whatfor and if anything is juicy ill post

Babylegs_O_Houlihan • -18 points • 15 January, 2014 06:34 AM

You seem to be making large leaps in logic and jumping to conclusions. What makes you think everything a woman says has some hidden meaning to it, purposeful or not? Do you have a credible source that actually studies this using the scientific method? If not, I don't think you can safely say ALL women do this unconsciously.

Mooshaq • 8 points • 15 January, 2014 11:16 AM

If not, I don't think you can safely say ALL women do this unconsciously.

But, but...NAWALT! You clearly don't understand generalizations.

Babylegs_O_Houlihan • -4 points • 15 January, 2014 02:00 PM*

And you don't seem to understand how logic works. In an argument, if someone makes a generalization and you can find just one example of where that generalization fails, their argument/point fails.

If you want to generalize you usually use the words 'generally', 'most', or some other word to note that you're generalizing. Just saying 'women do x' is not a generalization, but a sweeping statement.

johnnight • 2 points • 15 January, 2014 02:11 PM

And you make the mistake of invalidating a statement, because it has not been validated by academia (yet).

Just assume that everything we write here is a hypothesis, OK?

Babylegs_O_Houlihan • -5 points • 15 January, 2014 04:13 PM

You guys are the ones making claims without proof, not me. I'm just saying people won't believe you because you've not met the burden of proof.

johnnight • 1 point • 15 January, 2014 06:36 PM

Fair enough. It's not science and people do not have to agree with it.

This is opinion/advice on how to understand womanese. Let the guys go out and test this empirically in field and see the results. If the advice fails, they will come back and give OP a hard time.

With regard to proof, this post gives none. But a few fundamentals of TRP or PUA got already confirmed by empirical experiments. We get a lot of confirmation from case studies (these of course can have confirmation bias).

Furthermore, TRP advice does not have to work on all women. It just has to work for most women to be useful advice.