

# All Girls Are Spoiled Children

April 5, 2013 | 19 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

---

<http://www.returnofkings.com/8704/all-girls-are-spoiled-children>

---

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

---

## Comments

---

Sybarith • 0 points • 6 April, 2013 02:00 AM [\[recovered\]](#)

Well, "girls" does refer to children... otherwise, complete bullshit. Plenty of quality people out there, they're just rarer in this day and age, but definitely not completely gone.

[deleted] • 18 points • 6 April, 2013 03:14 AM

Take your NAWALT elsewhere. I've never met an attractive woman that hasn't displayed that kind of behaviour, even if it is subtle. Looking for "the one" that isn't like that isn't the point, the point is just to be aware of this behavior.

zionController • 21 points • 6 April, 2013 04:06 AM

someone discovers this subreddit every ten minutes and they always feel the need to tell us that nawalt, as if it adds anything of value to the discussion.

95% of women behave like x. "yeah but nawalt, mmmkay?" every single thread

AlwaysLateToThreads • 5 points • 6 April, 2013 03:54 AM

TIL NAWALT means not all women are like that.

[deleted] • 8 points • 6 April, 2013 04:05 AM

TYL AWALT with degrees.

[deleted] • 2 points • 6 April, 2013 07:45 AM

I think, that is really the best way to describe it. I feel as though masculine and feminine characteristics are expressed in individuals much the same way as heterosexual and homosexual tendencies are expressed on the kinsey scale.

AlwaysLateToThreads • 1 point • 6 April, 2013 04:07 AM

My eyes have been opened.

Sybarith • -6 points • 6 April, 2013 09:26 PM [\[recovered\]](#)

Bullshit mindless abbreviation repetition aside, I don't give a fuck about what you think you've experienced in your delusional lifetime, nor do I care about what tiny corner of the world you're limited by, the point is I'm stating this generalization does not apply to everyone. And it does not.

Travis\_McGee • 6 points • 6 April, 2013 10:37 PM [\[recovered\]](#)

Why are you here? If you're trying to argue a point be civil and grown up about it. Discrediting him and "not giving a fuck" about his point of view simply because you have a different opinion is juvenile.

Sybarith • -8 points • 6 April, 2013 10:39 PM [\[recovered\]](#)

If you're worried about being "civil" on an internet forum, I think you need to reconsider which age defines juvenile.

Travis\_McGee • 6 points • 6 April, 2013 10:45 PM [\[recovered\]](#)

TheRedPill is a civil subreddit. If you don't want to discuss a topic like an adult then I don't think you'll find much here for you.

Travis\_McGee • 6 points • 6 April, 2013 04:43 AM [recovered]

By calling "complete bullshit" are you trying to discredit the entirety of the article simply because it generalized "all girls"? Are you trying to imply that because there are the rare few quality women the article is complete trash? If so I'd suggest you rethink.

Sybarith • -1 points • 6 April, 2013 08:19 PM [recovered]

No, I'm "implying" (you know, by outright stating) that "All girls are spoiled children" is an incredibly stupid and naive thing to say. The article's correct about a certain *type* of individual, common though they may be, but the sheer blindness of insisting everyone's like this comes from poor anecdotal experience only.

Travis\_McGee • 3 points • 6 April, 2013 10:42 PM [recovered]

I think you are wrong. Generalizations exist for a reason. These women do exist. And there are many of them. It's not poor experiences by one person who then wrote an article. It's a common encounter. Don't discredit an entire article because you haven't seen the people the article is trying to address.

chipperpip • 1 point • 9 April, 2013 03:32 AM [recovered] [recovered] [recovered] [recovered]

If they were trying to make a statistical argument, they should have replaced the word "all" with "most", or "a lot", but then I guess that would ruin the glorious simplistic stupidity of their claims.

chowder138 • 3 points • 6 April, 2013 06:00 AM

Yes, not all are like this. Only most.

[deleted] • 3 points • 6 April, 2013 03:23 AM\*

I was about to say...when I was a teenager, my parents would not have tolerated the behavior this article claims is universal.

redpillschool[S] • 4 points • 6 April, 2013 01:17 PM

Red Pill theory is probabilistic, not deterministic.

RedSunBlue • 6 points • 6 April, 2013 05:03 AM

I like that you post here. You're cordial when expressing your opinion and it's very important that we have dissenting opinions here so that discussions do not devolve into variations of "Hamsters gon hamst" circlejerking.

However, what you're suggesting here, i.e., that the generalizations of the OP are invalid because of your personal experience, demonstrates the red pill theory that women have a tendency for solipsism.

From the linked article, because Tomassi is a far better writer than I:

Men tend to draw upon the larger, rational, more empirical meta-observations whether they agree or not, but a woman will almost universally rely upon her isolated personal experience and cling to it as gospel. If it's true for her, it's true for everyone, and experience and data that contradict her self-estimations? Those have no bearing because 'she's' not like that.

[deleted] • 5 points • 6 April, 2013 05:11 AM

From a formal logic perspective, a single counterexample is considered sufficient to disprove a theory.

And yet, this brings us to a question I rarely see asked here: where did the author of this article get his points from? Did he garner it from his own experience? Did he take surveys? Is he making assumptions based on social axioms? Did he look at consumer data (for instance, about women always wanting the latest, most popular gadgets)? The answer might be fascinating.

RedSunBlue • 5 points • 6 April, 2013 06:31 AM\*

It's always important to consider the intent of any piece of writing. We can assume that when the author titles his article "All women are spoiled children" he doesn't literally mean "every single women on the face of the planet earth." It's a blog and it's a common practice to make hyperbolic titles in an effort to garner page views. We can also safely assume that the "girls" he's referring to are Western women. By "all", he most certainly intends to mean "most". And for the sake of someone who's username is "I'm too literal", let's assume that "are" means "behave like". So let's rephrase the title to "Most Western Women Behave Like Spoiled Children."

From a formal logic perspective, a single counterexample is considered sufficient to disprove a theory.

An example:

I say, "Everyone has two arms and two legs."

You say, "No, I know someone who was born with a birth defect that left him without arms or legs. Your theory is false."

Yes, technically my theory is false if taken literally. It does not mean it is without merit. If the OP was posted in a scientific journal, you would have every responsibility to disprove the conclusions that the author is drawing. But again, this is a posting in a medium that is akin to a digital magazine. Dismissing the observations of the author based on hyperbole of the author is throwing the baby out with the bathwater in my opinion.

Further more, most theories here are not absolute. Any theory dealing with something as fluid as human behavior is going to be a matter of degrees.

where did the author of this article get his points from?

The first claim, "Trying to be up in everything", can be observed merely by looking back through history. One glaring example is the military. Jack Donovan has written at length about it Also consider videogames: women wouldn't touch videogames with a 10 foot pole back in the 80's, now we have Anita Sakrisian raising thousands of dollars on kickstarter to produce videos about how games are being sexist.

The next two claims I assume are observations made by Thumosis and many other "PUAs" like him who have noted this behavior in the multitude of women that they have interacted with.

The claim, "Are copy-cats" can be verified by just going to your local starbucks, having a seat near the sidewalk, and people watching.

The last claim is most likely a specific dig at feminists who, despite claiming "strength" equal to that of a man, in the end utilize males or male institutions -- instead of mano-a-mano, the manliest means of conflict resolution -- to enforce their agendas.

ss\_camaro • 1 point • 6 April, 2013 06:28 AM\*

From a formal logic perspective, a single counterexample is considered sufficient to disprove a theory.

LoL

Even logic is no longer safe. AWALT

[permalink](#)