

Never Listen To A Woman

January 9, 2013 | 11 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

<http://www.rooshv.com/never-listen-to-a-woman>

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

Witriol • 12 points • 9 January, 2013 09:13 PM

Damn down-votes...so much for rediquette guys, seriously. I'm an epidemiologist, I work on clinical trials, I study biases and hypotheses testing on a daily basis. Even if we overlook the fact that this is all anecdotal evidence, what roosh did in the article can be called a differential misclassification of the outcome. It is a kind of Information bias. If we model gender as a risk factor or exposure (so female is the exposed group and male is the control group) and spouting bullshit as the outcome or disease, when roosh fails to consider a vast majority of males who spout bullshit (i.e. diseased males) he is essentially overestimating the odds ratio. In simple terms, this basically exaggerates the probability that if a female is talking to you she is spouting bullshit vis-a-vis if a male was talking to you. I don't care about upholding the bluepill but you must not blindly follow people just because they are good at getting women... (appeal to authority and all that). Note again I am not saying this phenomenon does not exist OR that it is perfectly equal between the two genders, merely that its influence at a real world population level is being exaggerated. That is just mathematical fact. I think people should be allowed to critique articles without hearing the muffled screams of "BETA" with people who have roosh's cock in their mouth.

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 9 January, 2013 09:21 PM

Here's the issue- almost everything we have in the red pill is either evolutionary psychology or anecdotal.

We find the information presented here incredibly good at predicting behavior, and there's a pretty good consensus as to what works.

Some of us, such as Roosh who has met and fucked thousands, or someone like me whose count is much smaller but still not small by any standards, see enough of it with little variation, that it becomes part of our world view.

The problem with anecdote shame is that as a marginalized group, that's all we have.

Witriol • 5 points • 9 January, 2013 09:31 PM

Don't get me wrong, this subreddit is incredibly important. People need to wake up. But since a lot of the theories are derived from reverse engineering success or personal experiences, we need to be very careful. The problem is not in recognizing patterns because they do exist in plenty. The problem is in determining causality, association, and the strength of the association and then coming up with a protocol that is repeatable no matter who the actor/agent is. It's like trying to figure out what's in a black box. It's difficult and we need a conservative approach when it comes to making claims because people's lives are at stake. Trust me, I do this for a living, and I have seen some really obvious "conclusions" that were common knowledge fall apart when you test it. You don't have to agree with a quantitative/math-based approach (a lot of doctors don't either when it comes to medicine), but I do not think dismissing everything as beta/bluepill is warranted.

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 9 January, 2013 09:35 PM

That's fine, keep your pragmatic approach. Just make sure you don't swing the other way and discard data that upsets your sensibilities. It happens both ways, I know.

Sometimes I don't always write out the entire path I use to reach my conclusions. I've studied quite a bit on these topics, and draw upon knowledge not everybody has.

I'm welcome to discuss mechanisms that cause observed behavior. I'm not as willing to operate under

the premise that my observations themselves are wrong. That's how I ended up plugged in for so many years.

Witriol • 1 point • 9 January, 2013 09:38 PM

Fair enough. I don't know if you've read this but tell me what you think :

http://lesswrong.com/lw/63i/rational_romantic_relationships_part_1/

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 9 January, 2013 09:46 PM

It's an interesting analysis, but not a strategy.

itsmehobnob • 0 points • 10 January, 2013 03:08 PM

In your previous post you scold us for appealing to authority. Now, you tell us you do this for a living and we should trust you. Your occupation is completely irrelevant to your argument. The argument should stand on its own.

You also claim our analysis is not rigorous enough, we rely too much on anecdotal evidence. Then you claim Roosh's analysis was exaggerated. How did you come to this conclusion other than by using your own anecdotal evidence.

Either appeals to authority are ok, or they are not. Either anecdotal evidence is ok, or it is not.

Witriol • 1 point • 10 January, 2013 05:59 PM

Well I'm not asking you to trust me blindly , I did provide an analysis in the first post which has everything to do with my area of expertise but nevertheless since I cannot prove that any consensus exists w.r.t my views I will withdraw that statement and ask that you do not trust me at all. Also , I never claimed anywhere that you rely too much on anecdotal evidence I clearly said that I was overlooking the fact that it was anecdotal evidence.I did this because if someone has a count of women in the thousands - its enough anecdotes to be considered. A bigger problem is selection bias , which again I clearly stated. Finally Roosh's claim is exaggerated not because it is anecdotal evidence, but because his article had a distinctly comparative tone in saying that women are less qualified or bullshit more.But when he fails to count the number of males who also bullshit (I think we can agree that this is a non-zero number)he inflates the perceived prevalence of the flaw in women. This is not anecdotal, this is just mathematical fact . See Odds Ratio.The problem with the exaggeration is that people may selectively modify their behavior towards women if they think this is a uniquely female affliction which will have consequences in their personal lives. Think of it as you adjusting the left /right balance of your speakers based on what someone else is hearing. They have to be precise in their hearing as well as communicating the experience of that hearing to you.

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 10 January, 2013 06:11 PM

I want to make sure you don't miss this enlightened comment:

http://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/1695i4/never_listen_to_a_woman/c7u8l3k

Witriol • 2 points • 10 January, 2013 06:49 PM

I didn't miss it .What he said is true, we need to analyze motivations. My argument is not in opposition to what he said but rather in addition to what he said. English is not my native language so maybe I haven't been very clear. Or maybe because I'm criticizing roosh people are assuming that I'm saying it is ok to listen to a woman.I am not.I am only

saying that this was a weak article because when it comes to this specific topic, the line should be unbiased skepticism, irrespective of who is telling you what. I think my main problem with redpill is not that I think it's misogynistic, but rather this implicit or explicit glorifying of males or maledom in an effort to pander to the demographic. Anyway I'm going to stick around on this subreddit for a while and I'm sure eventually my views will be better understood.

Witriol • 4 points • 9 January, 2013 10:16 PM

A side note: You mentioned anecdote shaming. Thousands of women or even hundreds is not really an anecdote, it's significant. So I wouldn't focus too much on that. I think a bigger problem is selection bias which is basically is your sample of women variable enough to be generalized to the whole world? the whole of US? City girls? Girls with tons of issues? I think a lot of the backlash in this subreddit is centered around the claim that the women you date are substandard girls with low self esteem and that it is no wonder that you view women the way you do. Now I don't know if that's true or not and it's very difficult to be truly random in picking women to go after, but perhaps if you have information on the nature of variability or lack thereof amongst women you should share it. I mean intuitively I feel that women are not all that different from one another. But is that because I'm selecting the same kind of woman subconsciously or they are truly all the same is something I cannot know for sure.

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 9 January, 2013 10:25 PM

Here's how I see it. I don't "select" women. I approach every damn woman I meet.

Now, certainly, my experience has been women in my particular area are bitchier than women in other areas I've visited, but the basic consensus among men in the manosphere is doing some confirmation that the problems we describe here are more widespread than just one-offs or selection bias.

zionController • 11 points • 9 January, 2013 07:35 PM

I don't relish in relying on anecdotal evidence but I went out with a hot blonde this summer. Smoking hot. Most of the blue pill readers won't even have wet dreams about this girl hot. Anyway, she was so full of her own bullshit. "My last two boyfriends were a lawyer and a plastic surgeon" - her lips were clearly "done". I was a financial analyst, so not as high calibre as she was used to money wise, but still, she obviously couldn't keep a man like that so she was reigning her hypergamy back a level. Anyway, she starts talking about the recession in the states. Talking about banks and corporations and governments as if there is no difference between them. Starts trying to explain what happened to me. AND SHE'S DOING IT AS IF SHE HAS AUTHORITY ON THE MATTER. Please remember, I am a well educated trained professional. I'm *so good* at this stuff that I get *paid a lot of money* to do it for a living. Anyway... It was like a child trying to explain rocket science to me and firmly believing all the crap they're saying like it's gospel.

Her occupation? Assistant manager of a middle class clothing store. But she talks the talk like she was the expert and I was the unschooled twit.

This is what Roosh is talking about.

The naysayers in this post either don't have any experience with women, or are women. Because if you have any experience in the field, you *know* this is truth.

God damn. Betas in this thread...

[deleted] • 8 points • 9 January, 2013 08:06 PM

I would argue that men are just as bad about talking about things they know nothing about. That's not a singularly female trait, that's just a "dumbass knowitall" trait. Surely you know men who do this?

Women may do it a bit more, but enough men do it that I don't think you can point to it as being a feminine trait.

redpillschool[S] • 3 points • 9 January, 2013 08:17 PM

Well consider this- what's the motivation for a woman to know things?

Obviously for both men and women, knowledge is a means to a job, for a career. Sure.

But it extends slightly further than that.

For men, knowledge is about sexual selection. Hobbies, conversation topics and skills, accomplishments, these are all things that attract women.

For women, knowledge can likewise exist, but without the same motivator. Which is to say men are not specifically attracted to women because they are more knowledgeable than others. Women, themselves, are rarely attracted to men they perceive to be less knowledgeable.

From these two factors alone, you can see that there is a difference in motivation for attaining knowledge.

Neither gender is prohibited, and many girls we'd call nerds happen to do a lot of general reading and study. But for the woman who is attractive, knowledge is neither necessary nor advantageous for her goals.

[deleted] • 4 points • 9 January, 2013 09:05 PM

Which is to say men are not specifically attracted to women because they are more knowledgeable than others.

Wouldn't this go against the evolutionary imperative that our lizard brains are attracted to that which is best for our potential offspring? Intelligence is a big thing to pass on to your kids.

I asked my guy if intelligence is attractive out of curiosity. His response:

Can be. Depends on a man's turn ons. It is for me. Stupidity is definitely a turn off. Too smart is threatening though.

So yeah, he basically just agreed with both of us without me describing what we were debating. You want smart to pass on to your kids, but not so smart that she's a threat to your social dominance.

Sound about right?

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 9 January, 2013 09:14 PM

You want smart to pass on to your kids, but not so smart that she's a threat to your social dominance. Sound about right?

Honestly, men have shown they couldn't give half a shit about social dominance. Which is why we've got so many betas, running around with out a clue, with dominant wives who hate them and divorce.

It is women that demand social dominance. They simply do not find less intelligent men attractive. Men, competing for the top women, invested in intelligence.

This presents a dichotomy.

If women prefer smarter men, simply put, men cannot have a preference for smarter women. Oh,

they can, but they get ruled out of the evolutionary chain.

There's a great book about it called "The Mating Mind: How Sexual Choice Shaped the Evolution of Human Nature" - Miller, Geoffrey

I'm afraid a lot of the knowledge I draw upon for this sub reddit is based on a huge amount of reading I've dedicated myself to recently. I wish I had more free unbook resources to share..

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 January, 2013 09:25 PM

If women prefer smarter men, simply put, men cannot have a preference for smarter women. Oh, they can, but they get ruled out of the evolutionary chain.

I'm not saying men are attracted to women more intelligent than they are, just intelligence in general.

What I meant is that women want men smarter than them, I agree with that. Men want women smarter than *other women*, but not smarter than themselves.

I mean, would you really be ok with an unintelligent woman being the mother of your children?

I may be way off base here. I'm thinking logically about the lizard brain, but lizard brain ain't really logical at times I suppose.

redpillschool[S] • 0 points • 9 January, 2013 09:30 PM

What I meant is that women want men smarter than them, I agree with that. Men want women smarter than other women, but not smarter than themselves.

I would be fine dating a woman smarter than me, though I know full well it wouldn't work (she would have no respect for me, not the other way around). That said, I do not select for intelligence. Most men do not.

If everything else was equal between two women, I would select the more intelligent of the two. But physical beauty ranks much higher in the list for men. So high, that they put up with dumber-than-average chicks all the time. That's why the stereotype of hot models and sexy women is that they're completely air headed. (Because they get selected no matter what- no need to work on brains)

Women who lack hot-qualities may engage men on an intelligent level as a backup approach, but they will not compete in the market place well, nor will their knowledge improve their attractiveness level nearly as much as a good pair of breasts.

I mean, would you really be ok with an unintelligent woman being the mother of your children?

Based on the caliber of ladies I've met in my life, I've already come to the realization that if I have children, their mother won't be a source of knowledge for my kids.

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 January, 2013 09:54 PM

You know, my dude just brought up a good point.

I think intelligence is mostly a girl beta skill. You can fuck a stupid hot chick but you can't live with her or enjoy dinner.

Which makes sense, because for men it's somewhat of an alpha trait, so exactly what

you said.

BAH!! I hate being wrong. :P Sometimes all it takes is a little rewording for it to click.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 January, 2013 09:39 PM

Hmm. I'm not totally convinced that MOST men don't consider mates based on intelligence, but I also have no evidence save for anecdotal.

Based on the caliber of ladies I've met in my life, I've already come to the realization that if I have children, their mother won't be a source of knowledge for my kids.

And that blows. :(

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 9 January, 2013 09:40 PM

Quick thought experiment.

Take a fat chick.

She is alone.

Now give her books.

She is still alone.

zionController • 2 points • 10 January, 2013 02:57 PM

This is hilarious.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 January, 2013 09:44 PM

Haha. True. But a guy can only stand so much stupidity from a dumb woman before bailing, right?

zionController • 2 points • 10 January, 2013 02:57 PM

Which is why we've got so many betas, running around with out a clue, with dominant wives who hate them

I can think of some sad sad real life examples of this

Witriol • 0 points • 9 January, 2013 08:32 PM*

Well at first glance this seems like a reasonable assumption. I will let you know if I think of something. I just have stricter criteria , personally which is- don't listen to anyone unless they have demonstrable expertise in what they're talking about. There are so many conflicting factors so its hard to determine the level of influence of each factor. From an evo-psych point of view , you are right..but feminism tells women they should be smart..so there is that internal struggle. Which is why they feel the need to appear smart even when the drive isn't there. And similarly with men, we still are expected to uphold the traditional ideals of being intelligent and excellent but that is hard work so men also appear to be smart because theyre too soft to actually do the hard work of executing on their drive for excellence. It's a nice yin and yang of shameful mediocrity.

zionController • 0 points • 9 January, 2013 08:13 PM

Women may do it a bit more

They do. And in much more embarrassing ways. And are encouraged to do it. "Speak your mind, girl!!!"

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 January, 2013 08:15 PM

LOL. There is a lot of YOU GO GRRRRL crap. Point taken on that.

But my point still stands, there are enough men that do it that I consider it a dumbass trait vs a female trait.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 January, 2013 08:21 PM

Exactly. The difference between men doing it and women doing it is that men do not typically frame their conversations with empathy. We are *by far* the more objective and logic based gender and this allows us to call out bullshit much more quickly and effectively. On top of that, our self-worth does not rely on our feelings, so as men we instinctively know that someone with a conflicting opinion isn't necessarily attacking us, merely our viewpoint. I don't think anyone in here is going to underestimate the innate ability of a woman to take *everything* as a personal attack.

RojoPillar • 3 points • 10 January, 2013 03:57 AM

I want to address some of the discord that had been raised by this article. I think its good that we keep a critical mind about all things. Lord knows this is a title that will set almost any one on edge, but I think the counter arguments have been missing the mark.

Our big problem is knowledge. We don't *know* whether these things are true because each of us only has a limited perspective. We also like to point out the exceptions to test the theory.

But this article rests on more than just experience or bias, it rests on the physics laid out by the red pill.

What we should be asking is **what causes a person to be knowledgeable?** Be it career, personal ambition, or sexual drive, there is always a reason for a person to invest the time it take to learn about something.

The difference between men and women then must be the pressure to learn. I think based on what we know men are under greater pressure to cultivate knowledge than women are. Men have expectations placed on them that women do not.

The personal experiences of many on here back up this line of reasoning, but it is most important to interrogate the mechanics first. Otherwise we devolve into an exceptions war.

redpillschool[S] • 0 points • 9 January, 2013 07:01 PM

I'm going to pre-emptively stop the negative train here.

Women like smarter, faster, stronger, richer, better men.

If that's what they like in men, then how would men find them?

Dumber, slower, weaker, poorer, and worse. (at least compared to men).

I understand there's a drug being distributed called the blue pill, but fuck no we're not modifying this message.

Not only shouldn't you listen to a women, but it's in their interest not to be smarter. They don't want to date dumber men. Its a trait that women cultivate.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 January, 2013 07:16 PM

I understand the logic, but it still sort of rubs me the wrong way. I may be biased, lol.

I generally come from a marriage perspective, so bear with me... If my husband never listens to what I say, our marriage wouldn't last long. I much prefer Athol's Captain/First Officer model, in which the Captain accepts the input of the First Officer, considers it, and decides accordingly. I have a voice in our marriage,

but he is ultimately the decider, and I trust him to make decisions that are beneficial to our family, whether I like his decisions or not.

And there has to be a limit to how much less intelligent of a woman you want, right? For a lifelong partner, you NEED someone who can hold a conversation. I know guys who have married way below their education level, and it did not end well. My parents, for example... After I was born and the years dragged on, they literally had nothing to talk about. They were miserable and seemed to live in two completely different worlds (my dad being college educated and continued his self-education afterward, my mother not finishing high school nor really caring to go back).

I also acknowledge that women aren't really qualified to give men dating advice. I try to catch myself when I get all solipsistic, and I try to temper my blog towards the red pill ladies. But at the same time, I'd like to hope that my self awareness give guys something to think about when it comes to their own women. Sometimes it's good to look at things from another perspective (just as looking at the male perspective has been infinitely helpful to me).

Would it not be better advice to take a woman's advice with a grain of salt, bearing in mind how the hamster works?

Though this all supposes long term relationships. If you're looking short term, I don't suppose it matters much.

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 9 January, 2013 07:21 PM

You're not off. I agree with you. It's not that I'd treat a woman like her opinion didn't matter, it's that I'd give her opinion the respect it deserves. At least in areas of expertise that men find useful. (Which is to say that intelligence isn't just an apples to apples comparison, different sexes find different things important).

For instance, if I dated a nurse, and she gave me medical advice, I'd take it seriously.

If I dated a waitress, and she opened up one of her little advice chestnuts like "you can't say those things to your dad, you need to apologize" I will not respect that opinion.

When it comes to crucial life skills, I simply have not heard good advice from a woman.

That said, I sincerely believe that women are mentally capable. I believe it to be more a matter of necessity. There's a reason most women don't know how to fix cars- they never **needed** to learn.

I have met one or two women who I'd consider to be very intelligent (in man oriented things). And they have two very distinct markers- 1. They were old and single, unable to find a mate, and 2. They volunteered the least amount of advice of all the women I know.

Dialed • 3 points • 9 January, 2013 07:18 PM

sorry, still not buying it. I know plenty of women who are far more knowledgeable than I am on plenty of topics. This man's assertion is that a woman will not have anything of value to say to me on any topic aside from "maybe fashion", and that's really just not the case.

itsmehobnob • 1 point • 10 January, 2013 02:51 PM

Averages man! The post is based on averages. Of course you can cherry pick certain women that know more than you on their field of expertise (as said in the article).

Dialed • 1 point • 11 January, 2013 03:13 AM

okay, who's to say it's me cherry picking knowledgeable women, as opposed to the author cherry picking the women he's talking about? What makes his personal experience reality, and mine

confirmation bias?

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 11 January, 2013 02:22 PM

I think it's important to note that most red pill wisdom is based on logical mechanisms. It's not that I just happened to meet ten women named Jill- that would certainly make me start thinking all women are named Jill. Instead, it's about looking at society, how it functions, and what pressures are put onto men and women. For instance, a safer bet is to say women are not named Mark. And that's not because I met 10 people not named mark. It's because I understand Mark is not a woman's name.

*Disclaimer: Obviously if somebody replies that they know some girl named mark, that does not change the meaning of this post.

Dialed • 1 point • 15 January, 2013 08:53 PM

okay, so in this instance, the theory is that women are not pressured by society to become intelligent?

redpillschool[S] • 0 points • 9 January, 2013 07:29 PM

I think maybe a good read for you is this book: The manipulated man.

I'm going to save you the trouble of looking for it:

http://dontmarry.files.wordpress.com/2008/08/the_manipulated_man.pdf

Dialed • 3 points • 9 January, 2013 07:45 PM

is there something in this 69-page ebook that somehow disproves the idea that there are women that are more knowledgeable than I am? Because there are. I know a bunch.

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 9 January, 2013 07:49 PM

This isn't an e-book. This is a real book. Published in 1971, featured on television, shook up feminism, and widely controversial.

<http://www.amazon.com/Manipulated-Man-Esther-Vilar/dp/1905177178>

Which would give you some serious insight into the red pill.

I'm giving you some easy homework here. I'm going to ask you to read it. You know in your heart something's wrong here.

Dialed • 8 points • 9 January, 2013 07:55 PM

I'll read the book, really. But I'm asking you: are you telling me that the women in my life who know more than I do on science, literature, history, etc. actually don't? Because that's what this article you've linked is saying to me. That if she's a woman, I automatically know more than she does.

redpillschool[S] • 0 points • 9 January, 2013 08:04 PM

From Roosh's article:

She is probably familiar with dieting, fashion, and whatever subject she majored in college, and then she's unqualified on everything else. Therefore if she's trying to assert herself on those other topics, you can safely ignore every word that comes out of her mouth.

I'm not sure what you're disagreeing with, unless you didn't read the article.

Dialed • 2 points • 11 January, 2013 03:12 AM

no, I read it. But aside from the tired stereotypes (the dieting and fashion bit), why would I assume a woman only is qualified on what she majored in in college?

redpillschool[S] • -1 points • 11 January, 2013 02:28 PM

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UkBmhM0R2A0>

[deleted] • 3 points • 12 January, 2013 08:06 PM

Wow, dude, talk about selection bias.

Dialed • 1 point • 15 January, 2013 08:50 PM

could you explain your point in linking this to me, please, so I can properly respond?

[deleted] • -1 points • 9 January, 2013 08:17 PM*

The combination of an overly generalizing article title and your reading comprehension difficulties are creating your Blue Pill reassimilation. Never never actually means never, it means the *vast* majority of the time. Treat every conversation with a woman as if you were speaking with a toddler. Almost every conversation is in no way going to enrich your world knowledge, mostly it is going to simply entertain you, but every once in a while they will surprise you. Be surprised.

Dialed • 4 points • 11 January, 2013 03:17 AM

Why should I assume that half the people I meet are on intellectual grounds with a child?

[deleted] • 0 points • 11 January, 2013 03:32 AM

Because when the ship sinks and there's only room for two in the lifeboat, guess which one of the trio gets the privilege of drowning?

Dialed • 6 points • 11 January, 2013 03:52 AM

I'm not really seeing how that equates to "women are stupid."

[deleted] • 0 points • 9 January, 2013 08:04 PM

I plan on reading this too, but I want to point out the irony that its a red pill book written by a woman. ;)

redpillschool[S] • 0 points • 9 January, 2013 08:06 PM

In her area of expertise, I will listen to every word she says! :D

lastflowers89 • 2 points • 9 January, 2013 05:06 PM

Holy shit, this is embarrassing.

Witriol • 5 points • 9 January, 2013 05:56 PM

I agree. This one was bad. He's shoe-horning an us vs. them narrative where it isn't really appropriate. Superficial knowledge and lack of depth is an epidemic that is plaguing the entire world not just women. In fact it would be a lot more apt to say that you should only listen to people about things they're good at, either through real world experience or dedicated study. This is just common sense. I mean you shouldn't listen to bluepill guys for relationship advice either. And if you come across a redpill woman you might want to hear what she has to say. But then again I'm no expert in autodidacticism so what do I know.

redpillschool[S] • 3 points • 9 January, 2013 07:35 PM

You need to let go of the desire to keep a pretty face on this. The red pill isn't pretty.

Witriol • 7 points • 9 January, 2013 07:57 PM

Dude what the fuck are you talking about? What pretty face? I actually read this subreddit everyday but by blindly stomping out any dissent you're actually alienating people who believe in the red pill and that there's something really wrong. A lot of people make a lot of good points but this article wasn't one of them. Now how about you actually respond with a rational argument instead of reacting emotionally like a typical woman.

redpillschool[S] • -2 points • 9 January, 2013 08:02 PM

Ignoring a very big difference between values women and men put on practical knowledge is either very blue-pill or attempting to redress redpill to be easily swallowed by the feminist collective.

The book I sent you isn't a dissection of intelligence, it's a dissection of motivation.

Instead of assuming that this insults women, it may help to come from the direction that understands women simply have different motives and goals. Men might find it insulting to say to a woman that she doesn't know how to change a tire, but that's because that's crucial information men need to know. Women have no such need for that knowledge. How could they take insult when access to that information is as readily accessible? They make value assessments on what knowledge to attain.

Recognizing that women will not have information that you find important is a big step towards taking the red pill. Especially when you consider that women will still readily give advice. Like their dating advice "if you like her, just tell her how you feel!"

Witriol • 4 points • 9 January, 2013 08:14 PM

I think there is a misunderstanding here because what you just said doesn't seem to be related to my original point. I don't have any problems with "insulting" women if the "insult" is true and deserved. My point is that roosh in this article kind of contorted a universal phenomenon to fit the red pill narrative. My point was that when it comes to unsolicited bullshit opinions...men truly are just as guilty...and it behooves us to warn readers to guard themselves against the bullshit PEOPLE in general throw around. There are windbags everywhere. The reason a woman's windbagery is more tolerated is purely because people want to get into their pants but that should not be confused with the fact that the tendency to spout out unsubstantiated bullshit is equally present in both genders and one must always tread with caution. Sorry for the wall of text.

redpillschool[S] • -1 points • 9 January, 2013 08:19 PM

Here, I just responded to that-

http://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/1695i4/never_listen_to_a_woman/c7tzkua

Witriol • 4 points • 9 January, 2013 09:21 PM

Hi, I'm not targetting you or anything but since you're a mod you should read this -

http://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/1695i4/never_listen_to_a_woman/c7u0slg

redpillschool[S] • 0 points • 9 January, 2013 05:09 PM

Care to elaborate?

Dialed • 3 points • 9 January, 2013 06:51 PM

Probably because the author's point seems to be that you can safely assume that a woman will have no knowledge on any topic except "maybe fashion".

redpillschool[S] • 0 points • 9 January, 2013 07:01 PM

Read my reply above.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 January, 2013 04:31 PM

Just wanted to say a quick thank you for posting this, because the conversation has been enlightening, and it's given me a lot to think about the last few days.

redpillschool[S] • 0 points • 10 January, 2013 04:33 PM

You're welcome!