

Women Talk, Men Do

March 7, 2014 | 206 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

<http://therationalmale.com/2014/03/03/women-talk-men-do/>

Some really good stuff in this article:

We get frustrated because women communicate differently than we do. Women communicate covertly, men communicate overtly. Men convey information, women convey feeling. Men prioritize content, women prioritize context. One of the great obfuscations fostered by feminization in the last quarter-century is this expectation that women are every bit as rational and inclined to analytical problem solving as men. It's result of an equalist mentality that misguides men into believing that women communicate no differently than men. That's not to discount women as problem solvers in their own right, but it flies in the face how women set about a specifically feminine form of communication. Scientific study after study illustrating the natural capacity women have for exceptionally complex forms of communication (to the point of proving their neural pathways are wired differently) are proudly waved in by a feminized media as proof of women's innate merits, yet as men, we're expected to accept that she "means what she says, and she says what she means."

A common recognition in the manosphere is women's predisposition toward collectivism and/or a more socialist bent to thinking about resource distribution. Whereas men tend to distribute rewards and resources primarily on merit, women have a tendency to spread resources collectively irrespective of merit. Again this predispositions is likely due to how women's 'hard-wiring' evolved as part of the circumstances of their tribal roles.

This is part of boys-men's earliest feminine conditioning; a calculated effort by the Feminine Imperative to train men to communicate as women do. I call this men's "sensitivity training", but in essence it's a social effort to force men to rewire their brains to better accommodate a feminine-primary society. "Get in touch with your feminine side", is really a plea for men to contort their natural ways of communicating into a feminine aligned mode of communicating.

This is seen on [/r/purplepilldebate](#), with trolls, and pretty well everywhere on reddit these days: People will typically agree with red pill information as long as you don't word it in a red pill way. Our communication styles are different- and as our feminized society has normalized feminine communication (sensitivity training), they can use our lack of sensitive communication as something to attack- how dare we violate the norm!

This is also why we concentrate so heavily - as mods, and as a group- in *not* modifying our speech.

I'd say 99% of disagreements between red pill and others stems from a difference in communication or debate styles. They get so wrapped up in the language that they miss the point-

Is seduction manipulation?

The question is, what social interactions aren't a form of "manipulation?" The very usage of the term manipulation is manipulative, adding a negative context via it's commonly accepted connotation- that evil can change minds, so if a mind is changed it must be evil.

Why don't you treat women like people?

Getting caught up in the particulars of language, and assuming that somehow in the minds of men there exists a way to truly treat the object of your affection as something inhuman is an error in translation- and a massive projection to boot. The very phrase is emotionally based and carries little logic. How does one treat somebody else "like a person," or fail to do so? The problem isn't the interactions between two people, which could follow red pill advice and theory to a T and be very successful and pleasant for both parties, but instead the thoughts in the minds of men when engaging in the interaction. The very concept is thought crime, and a startling revelation and look into the minds of women: they assume malice because they know precisely how they lie when they attempt to manipulate others.

Are women really children?

Why all the hatred, anger and misogyny?

These are all tone questions, ones of emotion. They are not there to discuss the merits of our arguments, they are there to control the tone, to feminize our speech, and ensure that we get in line.

People regularly accuse me of banning people who "dissent" or bring alternative theories into the red pill. The reality is, I enjoy seeing ways our theories can be challenged, and I enjoy the discussion and debates that can take place. What we ban has a subtle difference- it's a thinly-clad attempt at shame and modification of tone that we remove. Myself and the other mods can spot it miles away. It doesn't approach the questions we ask, it doesn't look for answers- it appeals only to emotion and tries to temper our speech. Not on my fucking watch.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

bsutansalt • 53 points • 7 March, 2014 10:27 PM

Case in point:

<http://judgybitch.com/2014/03/05/crisis-in-the-ukraine-hey-up-where-you-at-ladies-i-thought-you-run-the-world/>

alphathujone • 21 points • 7 March, 2014 11:56 PM

Actually, in the more violent times, specifically in the Kiev protests(I dont know too much about the other ones) there were guards among the protesters whose jobs were to keep women and children off the front line. The women were mostly behind the lines making molotov cocktails.

theubercuber • 3 points • 8 March, 2014 05:46 PM

Source?

Who appointed these literal white knights? Wasn't the whole riot deal that people were fighting for what they wanted without being held down?

moltar • 2 points • 8 March, 2014 04:06 AM

That is correct.

robesta • 8 points • 7 March, 2014 11:06 PM

Awesome link! Very valid point.

atleastitsnotaids • 2 points • 8 March, 2014 05:40 PM

It must be the patriarchy keeping them down.

swampshooter • 1 point • 10 March, 2014 01:07 AM

Case and point, isn't it?

ilike2partyhowaboutu • 37 points • 7 March, 2014 09:59 PM

We get frustrated because women communicate differently than we do. Women communicate covertly, men communicate overtly. Men convey information, women convey feeling.

"I feel like you are a stupid cunt because your SQL script fucked up the production server"

stemgang • 14 points • 8 March, 2014 03:01 AM

Why so many feels? Just say, "Your SQL script fucked up the production server."

Or if you wish to assert authority, you can add, "Quit fucking up."

FloranHunter • 2 points • 9 March, 2014 12:28 AM

I thought that was the point of his statement...

stemgang • -3 points • 9 March, 2014 12:49 AM

But he specifically starts by using the word, "feel," after criticizing women for doing the same thing just 2 words previously.

That choice of words conveys inconsistency. He could perhaps have said "think" instead of "feel."

FloranHunter • 4 points • 9 March, 2014 04:24 AM

That's what I mean. He was mocking people who communicate by conveying feeling by framing his statement with the *facade* of "I feel" but actually conveying information (you're incompetent at writing SQL).

stemgang • -2 points • 9 March, 2014 04:35 AM

Ah. That was not clear to me, and the comment did not have a "/s" sarcasm tag or other indicator.

But you may be right.

[deleted] 9 March, 2014 01:07 AM*

[permanently deleted]

stemgang • 0 points • 9 March, 2014 01:21 AM

Well, obviously she should have been fired for that behavior. But without evidence, it's he said/she said.

So as to how to treat women: like children. Their feelings are far too sensitive to handle the truth. Likewise, that is why they should not be trusted with excessive responsibility.

Also, have you switched accounts? You are writing as if you were the poster that I previously replied to, but with a different username...

[deleted] 9 March, 2014 01:40 AM*

[permanently deleted]

stemgang • 1 point • 9 March, 2014 01:49 AM

Anecdotally, at my last job, my female supervisor, who previously liked me, became enraged when I snarkily criticized a slow vendor, who it later turned out went to church with her.

She bad-mouthed me within the company and to her boss and eventually forced my transfer to another division.

Surely NAWALT, but at that company, the women were about feelings, and the men were about getting shit done.

veggie_girl • 11 points • 7 March, 2014 11:30 PM*

Case in point: This exists.

autowikibot • 9 points • 7 March, 2014 11:30 PM

The View (U.S. TV series):

The View is an American talk show and (entertainment/infotainment) program that has aired debuting on

ABC since August 11, 1997, as part of its daytime programming block. Its concept was conceived by Barbara Walters and Bill Geddie, who additionally serve as its executive producers, and Barbara Walters as co-host.

The View has aired seventeen seasons so far and focuses on a panel of five female co-hosts, who discuss a variety of social and political issues. The original panel consisted of Walters, Joy Behar, Star Jones, Debbie Matenopoulos, and Meredith Vieira; the current panel consists of Walters, Whoopi Goldberg (who additionally serves as the moderator), Jenny McCarthy, and Sherri Shepherd. In between said panels, the series has also employed Elisabeth Hasselbeck, Lisa Ling, and Rosie O'Donnell.

International versions of the program are aired in several countries. As of the 2012-13 season, its 16th, The View is the fourth-longest running national daytime talk show in history, behind Live! with Kelly and Michael (26), The Phil Donahue Show (26), and The Oprah Winfrey Show (25).

Image ⁱ

Interesting: Batcave | Shwayze | Star Wars: The Clone Wars (2008 TV series) | Oh My Goddess!

Parent commenter can toggle NSFW or delete. Will also delete on comment score of -1 or less. | FAQs | Mods | Magic Words

loveofnotes • 9 points • 8 March, 2014 01:24 AM

From the "Critical Reception" section of the Wikipedia page: "Vieira, Walters, et al., have confessed to a lot of things on the show that women *are supposed to feel guilty about*: forgetting to vote, **being too lazy to exercise, hating skinny models**, letting the kids watch too much TV, admiring Hollywood's latest hunk."

I just keep imagining the fat bitch going, "I hate those skinny models, but exercise isn't as fun as eating donuts so..."

The_Determinator • 1 point • 8 March, 2014 10:16 AM

That is true though. Technically. Is eating even considered a "fun" thing?

atleastitsnotaids • 4 points • 8 March, 2014 05:44 PM

Are you kidding? When you are hungry after working very hard all day there is probably not a better feeling than getting home and eating.

FearlessBurrito • 3 points • 8 March, 2014 05:46 PM

To people with an addiction to sugar, probably?

loveofnotes • 3 points • 9 March, 2014 01:22 AM

Yeah, tbh as much as I love working out, eating is right up there in terms of fun. It's stimulating, easy, and delicious!

lucifa • 36 points • 7 March, 2014 10:47 PM*

Just entered the corporate world and it frustrates me how passive-aggressive women colleagues are. Men more or less co-operate, of course you have certain egos that try to assert their dominance by pulling rank, but generally they work towards a mutually beneficial solution. However the women will constantly shirk

responsibility, or get take any challenge or query as a personal affront. Office politics are the worst, I just want to do my job and then go home.

[deleted] • 8 March, 2014 12:18 AM

[permanently deleted]

lucifa • 14 points • 8 March, 2014 12:21 AM

It's the falseness that riles me. They can be all sweetness one minute, then one leaves the room and suddenly the knives come out.

[deleted] • 16 points • 8 March, 2014 02:26 AM

I swear this is a universal trait that women share. They will be super nice to someone's face then as soon as they're gone it's relentless backstabbing. I've seen it so many times.

AEther_Flux • 11 points • 8 March, 2014 04:33 AM

I see it in beta males too, it's hilarious to watch but also infuriating at the same time.

[deleted] • 14 points • 8 March, 2014 01:03 AM

Women can rarely accept constructive criticism. They only appreciate that something was said about them, and attempt to decide whether it was nice or mean.

_social_caterpillar • 28 points • 8 March, 2014 01:37 AM

A conversation I had with my sister once:

Me: "I've noticed that you have a hard time accepting constructive feedback."

Her: "Shut up! No I don't!!!"

colovick[] • 5 points • 8 March, 2014 02:09 AM

This is why my favorite way to shut one up is to sweetly tell them to smile and be pretty... About 95% of them get giddy, even if they know I mean for them to stop talking...

watersign • 14 points • 8 March, 2014 02:52 AM

This is why I am starting to reconsider my options as far as a career goes and remove myself from corporate America. There are certain fields like Finance and Engineering which are male dominated but they are very competitive to get into. I am seriously considering going blue collar because I cannot stand working with women. At my last job, all the women I worked with did nothing but gossip and bicker.

ScannerSloppy • 19 points • 8 March, 2014 03:59 AM

"I don't want any broads in this department. Broads in a machine shop are nothing but trouble." -my blue collar boss, bless his soul

AEther_Flux • 3 points • 8 March, 2014 04:34 AM

Sounds like my grandfather. I wonder why all 3 of his sons are so bluepilled.

watersign • 4 points • 8 March, 2014 04:40 AM

He's 100% right. This is why im really against women in the work place, most of them are a liability.

ScannerSloppy • 14 points • 8 March, 2014 05:21 AM

The only good thing about female coworkers is that they bitch and moan so much, it acts as a safeguard against a legitimately over-demanding work environment. But yeah, the worst supervisors I have ever had were women. A major reason for this, besides their emotional reasoning, is their tendency to take EVERYTHING personally. Men seem to be better at focusing on work goals; with women, everything is about them. I have male co-workers who get slightly pissy when their mistakes are brought to their attention, but not like women! Suggest to a woman that she did a less-than-perfect job, and she will despise you forever. Also, I have noticed that female supervisors are much more likely to abuse their power to punish their perceived enemies. A male boss might say, "Yeah, Frank's a real jerkoff, but he does a good job." But if a female boss dislikes you personally, she will hit you with everything she has.

watersign • -1 points • 8 March, 2014 05:34 AM

Yup..I lost a job over an angry lesbian who I rubbed the wrong way, not literally but I would've had no problem making her straight..LOL.

PaulRivers10 • 0 points • 8 March, 2014 05:08 PM

The only good thing about female coworkers is that they bitch and moan so much, it acts as a safeguard against a legitimately over-demanding work environment.

Yeah, I'm torn, but I've found this to be true - while there are an overwhelmingly large number of aggravating factors with women, you have different ones with men. Namely - burnout. Women have trouble focussing on goals, but men can focus goals so much that your job will eat you alive.

ScannerSloppy • 2 points • 8 March, 2014 05:26 PM

I saw this in sharp relief at two separate machine shops where there was literally not a single female employee on the floor. There may have been a few HR/administrative types in the office, but the production floor was 100% male. There weren't even women's restrooms in the plant (funny how no women complained about equal access to *that* type of employment). Those jobs taught me a lot about the differences between men and women. They would work us like dogs, to the point of illegally denying people lunch breaks, and the men would rarely complain. They'd just shrug and say, "we've got to get that shipment out by Friday" and do whatever it took to make that happen.

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 March, 2014 04:31 PM

the natural resources industry is also incredibly male dominated

[deleted] 8 March, 2014 05:48 PM

[permanently deleted]

fakepizza • 1 point • 8 March, 2014 07:15 PM

Absolutely. I had an internship where a 50 year old woman was my direct supervisor and I had a desk right next to her. I started to slowly go insane, being surrounded by a constant cloud of decaying estrogen. I resolved that day to never work in an office with women.

USmellFunny • 2 points • 8 March, 2014 12:40 PM

One good thing about being a blue-collar worker: you're good at the job, you are recognized and treated with respect. And there's no hiring women for the sake of diversity, the last time my boss hired a woman she was tired after half a day, she was asked not to come anymore.

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 March, 2014 03:04 AM

This is the exact reason why I would not survive in a corporate environment. I've definitely got an appreciation for blue collar workers like none other.

I'm more so inclined to work in grey collar fields (i.e light industrial work, 18 wheeler transport, material handlers) due to my lanky skinny frame.

I'd surely go overboard with saying something that could get me fired if I had to wear a suit and tie.

I respect the women as co-workers that can handle these blue collar jobs and don't complain and try to do these jobs near as much as men can.

dancingwithcats • 3 points • 8 March, 2014 02:37 AM

I walked away from a high paying job because the CIO, a woman and my direct supervisor, was so passive aggressive that I found it impossible to do my job properly. She wound up being fired a few months later too. Most (not all) women are just not suited for management roles.

RedPope • 2 points • 9 March, 2014 07:27 AM

Women can do management roles. Leadership roles are a different story.

rico_montoya • 5 points • 8 March, 2014 04:57 AM

Perfectly said.

Yet another shit test that falls under the umbrella of 'feminism as a shit test.' How many male feminists do you know? How many of them are glaring omega, white knight manginas that can't get laid?

Women inherently like to be lead. We know this. So when omega males start spouting off rhetoric in line with feminine thought, they inherently relegate themselves as nothing more than 'just one of the girls' at best and, comically, on the lower end of the totem pole to boot.

It doesn't approach the questions we ask, it doesn't look for answers- it appeals only to emotion and tries to temper our speech. Not on my fucking watch

Alpha frame defined. Embody this tactfully IRL and the gina tingles moisten the cotton.

_social_caterpillar • 20 points • 8 March, 2014 01:54 AM

This is how most conversations play out.

You say: "The blue sky looks good today."

They say:

"How can you say that! That's such a generalization. The sky changes color all the time."

"Uh, NO. It's clearly light blue, not blue. You don't even know what you're talking about."

"Wow. Just wow."

"You're an idiot. So color is the only thing that matters? I bet you're probably racist too."

"The sky isn't technically all blue. There's that one wisp of a cloud there that makes it partially white. That means your whole statement is invalid."

"Ohh woowoow. The sky is so la dee da perfect! Everything should just be blue! Then everything would be perfect!"

All these feminists do is misinterpret everything you say. They change the topic, cite that one exception they think they saw that one time, argue semantics instead of content, misinterpret your words purposefully, jump to extremes, make emotionally charged accusations, put words in your mouth, and make any claims they want to rationalize their emotions.

It's the worst discussion you can ever take part in. Take part in a couple of them and you'll learn to never do it again. This is why I also have a strict policy of never discussing religion/spirituality or politics or TRP with anyone in real life.

ScannerSloppy • 3 points • 8 March, 2014 04:15 AM

But isn't "jumping to extremes" similar to what we call "agree and amplify"?

[deleted] • 9 points • 8 March, 2014 02:05 PM

No, because they're 100% serious about it.

_social_caterpillar • 4 points • 8 March, 2014 02:28 PM

RE: Is Seduction Manipulation?

When we were born, we cried until our parents came over to hold us. We were born manipulators.

MUSIC_FUCKED_ME • 28 points • 7 March, 2014 08:49 PM

Treat women like people, by that I mean like teenagers. Don't let them know you treat them like a child, they want to feel like a "big girl".

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 March, 2014 03:18 AM

Another simple but great takeaway from that article you linked is that as a male, you shouldn't change your communication preferences (i.e. how you reach out to people, if you even do), just for the sake of chasing a female. If you aren't the texting type, you can make an exception for a woman every once in a while just so you can get in touch with her (to make plans and whatnot, or do some quick and light banter). But don't indulge too much in instant communications. Nowadays there are far too many ways to communicate with complete strangers, what with facebook and online dating sites plus a plethora of instant messaging apps like Whatsapp, kik, and Viber. I realized recently that perusing the lot of these things is not only time consuming but also detrimental to your overall success if you're trying to pull a new chick (or several). I decided to uninstall the apps, stop responding to texts, and lo and behold, some of the girls I tried getting at first with but ended up ignoring started to initiate contact with me one by one. This again reaffirms the idea that women want attention, so keep it close at hand.

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 March, 2014 07:03 AM

This is one of the best posts in the redpill sub with regards to content and understanding of the differences between men and women.

[deleted] 9 March, 2014 06:33 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 March, 2014 07:25 AM

Fucking both Sergey Brin and Larry Page doesn't make you a superstar.

willdernesss • 3 points • 7 March, 2014 10:42 PM

Nice summary of the article. The bolded sections addressing RP language are important distinctions for people to understand.

MartialWay • 1 point • 10 March, 2014 01:59 AM

It doesn't approach the questions we ask, it doesn't look for answers- it appeals only to emotion and tries to temper our speech. Not on my fucking watch.

FTMFW!

TheBereavedBanana • 1 point • 10 March, 2014 04:53 AM

Yay men :D

[deleted] 7 March, 2014 09:56 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 12 points • 7 March, 2014 10:58 PM*

With all due respect, it sounds as if you are assuming that the female form of communication is superior with your last paragraph. What you are terming "extra information" is actually information that is purposefully hidden so that you can attempt to convey your message while minimizing the potential social repercussions you think could occur if you were just open and honest with your mode of speech. This is unnecessary and only exists to give you plausible deniability of your actions. What many women seem to fail to realize is that many men respect open honesty in an individual's speech and perceive this so called "subtlety" you are praising as deceptive and not worthy of respect. After all, why can you not just simply state how you feel? Why all the cloak and dagger? Simply put, so you can maximize your social leverage.

MachiavellianRed[M] • 5 points • 9 March, 2014 01:35 AM

you can attempt to convey your message while minimizing the potential social repercussions you think could occur if you were just open and honest with your mode of speech. This is unnecessary and only exists to give you plausible deniability of your actions. What many women seem to fail to realize is that many men respect open honesty in an individual's speech and perceive this so called "subtlety" you are praising as deceptive and not worthy of respect.

Quoted because it's important and needs to stick out among the wall of comments here, distinguished my post to bring attention to it.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 March, 2014 09:50 AM

Glad to help. Feel free to quote it anywhere you'd like.

[deleted] • 12 points • 7 March, 2014 10:45 PM

Manipulation is defined as the attempt to change behavior through deceptive, underhanded, or abusive tactics.

Semantics. Psychologists have chosen to define "psychological manipulation" as the types of Social Influence that necessarily cause harm to the target.

RPS seems to be using the term "manipulation" in a broader sense. As one would manipulate others through covert communication. According to psychologists this type of behavior seems to be covered under Social

Influence but that term may be unnecessarily technical and broadly defined for our discussion.

I personally think it's unfortunate that men's brains don't work this way. It's really useful to have that extra information about what's actually happening in any interaction.

Our brains are really good at other things like for example, spatial awareness. That works out great because while we may have trouble communicating with each other, men and women appear to cover the spread. We are strong where you are weak and you are strong where we are weak. We make a great team. I mean, until feminism came along.

kick6 • 9 points • 7 March, 2014 11:00 PM

I know from personal experience that women instinctively understand more of the implied content of speech than men do. There are emotional nuances (yes emotion contains important conversational information) that men either don't care about or don't understand.

This is the solipsism at work that we always talk about here: my speech has implied content and emotional nuance, therefore all speech has implied content and emotional nuance. Men's speech DOES NOT. The environs we were bred to excel in (the hunt, combat, or in modern times teams and corporations) has no use or time to compile implied content. Someone barks orders, and you follow them. Period.

So when a woman is using language intended to be understood by people who understand more subtleties of communication but actually isn't men can become very frustrated and there's even a belief among some men that women have a secret code. Really it's nothing more than understanding and communicating in nuance. I firmly believe this is one of the major problems with communication between the sexes that doesn't arise simply from inherently different life experiences. So you have women who believe they are communicating their thoughts to men and the men just aren't understanding the implications. That's one of the reasons males so very often miss signs that a woman is attracted to him. They don't get the subtleties of communication that to other women are a giant neon sign showing attraction. I personally can't count the number of times I've had to inform a male friend of mine that a girl he likes has been throwing up all kinds of signals he's missing. Obviously this girl has every intention of being understood but she doesn't understand that guys aren't designed to communicate that way. When we make the first move it's way more subtle because we're used to talking to other women who actually understand these interactions.

And somehow, despite our perceived equality, it's men's responsibility to understand the nuance as opposed to women's responsibility to stop using it. What you're suggesting is akin to you going to a foreign country, and expecting everyone to understand English because potato.

[deleted] 7 March, 2014 11:30 PM*

[permanently deleted]

catofillomens • 4 points • 8 March, 2014 02:43 AM

First of all, I never claimed that anyone was at fault. Communication is the responsibility of the speaker and listener. Poor listening skills are just as detrimental to communication as poor speaking. Since everyone has the same opportunity to understand these nuances a better analogy is going to a foreign country and not understanding what is being said and then getting angry when someone uses words you don't understand. Wouldn't a better solution be to improve yourself instead of changing the world? I know it would be helpful to many guys in their interactions with women. This seems like something TRP would be all over.

If there's one thing being on TRP has taught me, it's that women don't want man to bend over backwards for them. Women want men who act like men. And that in this context means talking straight without any bullshit or layers of meaning or emotional nuances or anything like that, or even caring about such things.

Krackor • 4 points • 8 March, 2014 02:19 AM

Actually you are failing to understand. Men's speech certainly does have implied content and emotional nuance.

This is both setting up a claim which is impossible to verify or falsify, and also gaslighting kick6. No matter what evidence kick6 might provide to indicate his true intentions in communication, you can simply reply "you don't understand your own intentions".

MachiavellianRed • 3 points • 9 March, 2014 01:33 AM

This is a really great post, I don't know why you've been down voted so much.

I don't agree with everything you've said, specifically that subtext is an effective means of communication or indeed superior to overt information, despite how entertaining it can be, however, I do value your insight here.

Dr_Iroh • 4 points • 7 March, 2014 10:50 PM*

that men either don't care about or don't understand

My money is on the former. Its no secret, its not a "code." Males are submerged in a culture of political correctness and feelings, and its draining. Unfortunately your friends can't understand it and use it to their advantage in the sexual marketplace. If they could, would you see them as manipulative? Food for thought

Demonspawn • 8 points • 7 March, 2014 11:13 PM

It's really useful to have that extra information about what's actually happening in any interaction.

Not when your goal is to get shit done. Then you want to communicate necessary information in the most concise way possible.

Again: women talk; men do.

[deleted] 7 March, 2014 11:56 PM*

[permanently deleted]

Demonspawn • 5 points • 8 March, 2014 12:00 AM

Maybe for strictly scientific papers or academic contexts.

Or building a house, or defending an area, or fixing a car, or assigning tasks to subordinates, or reporting to a superior, or... pretty much everything of consequence.

Perhaps you might want to read this over to understand.

redpilldude • 3 points • 8 March, 2014 07:14 PM

I personally think it's unfortunate that men's brains don't work this way. It's really useful to have that extra information about what's actually happening in any interaction.

You were making interesting points until you said this. Stop being gynocentric. Effective communication requires the speaker to communicate the information in a manner that the listener will easily comprehend. Many women are simply incapable to understanding that effective communication is also their responsibility, and they should alter the communication habits based upon the listener's communication style.

Fuckyourfeels_ • 4 points • 7 March, 2014 11:17 PM

It's really useful to not be clouded by feeling and incapable of being rational. I think it's unfortunate women's brains don't work this way.

[deleted] 7 March, 2014 11:56 PM

[permanently deleted]

Fuckyourfeels_ • 1 point • 8 March, 2014 12:01 AM

lol as if

Aaron565 • 1 point • 7 March, 2014 11:11 PM

Thats the problem. Women dont want to admit that they cant control their ability to rationalize things nor their emotions because they dont really *care*.

Brambleshire • 1 point • 8 March, 2014 11:19 AM

You sir, are a gentleman and a scholar.

Edit: or lady lol

[deleted] 8 March, 2014 12:09 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 March, 2014 12:30 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 March, 2014 12:35 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 March, 2014 09:36 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 March, 2014 09:59 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 March, 2014 12:39 AM

[permanently deleted]