

User /u/J2501 suggests that women should be more proactive in dating, and pay on dates- is immediately torn apart and shamed repeatedly by others, without missing a beat.

May 2, 2013 | 37 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

http://np.reddit.com/r/AdviceAnimals/comments/1dc47d/my_advice_to_women/c9p11ym

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

redpillschool[S] • 43 points • 2 May, 2013 07:36 PM

BTW, When women use that argument, "you're just mad because you're not getting laid", to diffuse the point I make that women use sex as a means of empowerment, they are only proving me right. When a woman says "I disagree with you that all my power comes from sex, so I'm going to withhold sex from you and tell the whole female hivemind to do so as well", they are simply re-enforcing the idea that women's only power is sex.

Amazing.

redpillschool[S] • 22 points • 2 May, 2013 07:37 PM

All you're saying boils down to this: "If those negro slaves had been more humble and had a better attitude, things would have gone a lot better for them."

And let me ask you something: Is there ever a situation where a woman owes a man anything? Or are women just immune to owing men anything? I understand that not all women are obligated to sleep with me, so stop using a red herring to try and prove a point.

I accept the fact that a tyrannical matriarchy is fucking me in the ass, but I'm not going to smile about it. That would be retarded.

If sacrificing your independence, dignity, and self-respect is what it takes for you to get women, that's nothing to brag about. That's pathetic.

redpillschool[S] • 10 points • 2 May, 2013 07:39 PM

Everyone deserves love, but no one wants to do the lovin'.

redpillschool[S] • 21 points • 2 May, 2013 07:44 PM

The sad thing is, getting to know women and watching the way they treat men, is exactly what has made me lose respect for a lot of them.

Sarcasticus • 10 points • 2 May, 2013 08:03 PM

Bingo. Women were all special little angels until I learned game.

MrStinky • 2 points • 3 May, 2013 02:09 AM

Same here. Also learning MRA / MGTOW philosophy extinguished any fallacious beliefs I had that women were special snowflakes who were impervious to deviance, bad behavior and entitlement

redpillschool[S] • 25 points • 2 May, 2013 07:54 PM

It's worth noting that the entire thread is people shaming him and making public outcries that he can't possibly be effective in the dating world or good with girls because he's a number of different things : immature, stupid, bitter, evil, sociopathic, you name it!

Really reading these comments, you see just how violently opposed these people really are towards what

amounts to red pill theory, and even if he were wrong, these people won't even give him the option of a fair fight because they're too busy making sure to stifle his opinion with downvotes and insults..

This is our opposition, folks. This is the commoner. This is the plugged in. They are **so angry** at the information itself, they can't even take a step back, consider the idea for long enough to form a coherent argument against it. They're just so angry they can't do it!

Imagine if you told me that the sky is green. If I am so very convinced that you're wrong, I should be able to hold off my ad hominem attacks for a little to at least make a coherent point about the light spectrum and how the sky is actually observably blue a majority of the time.

Instead, these people employ an argument that amounts to little more than name calling.

http://www.reddit.com/r/AdviceAnimals/comments/1dc47d/my_advice_to_women/

dropit_sphere • 19 points • 2 May, 2013 08:37 PM*

What's notable to me is that J2501 never once uses the words "I," "me," or "my,"---yet every response is in the form of "**You**..." (with the exception of "This dude..."---passive-aggressive ftw).

This is how the feminine imperative works. There is no absolute truth. Ideas are meaningless. Before it will engage, everything absolutely must be framed with reference to a specific *person*. The political must be made to be personal, if you will.

This is why it's doubly important that "pickup is pathetic and I laugh at those guys." How do you make fun of a guy who's getting laid like tile?

A redpill-aware guy who *is* the slob described is no threat to the feminine imperative. An attractive guy who is *not* redpill-aware is no threat either. It's the *combination* that sets off Code Red Hamster.

Ethan47 • 3 points • 3 May, 2013 06:23 AM

In other words, be upset if you're NOT getting this kind of response!

[deleted] • 2 points • 3 May, 2013 09:59 AM

Is this why feminosphere cannot really draw a clear line between "doing X is not OK, not cool" and "people deserve to rot in prison for doing X" ? I have debated the blurry edge cases of rape before, and they were generally incapable of drawing this kind of line i.e. what things I personally abhor, consider not OK, and would punish by social ostracism, unfriending, and what things I consider objectively bad enough to throw people into prison for. I constantly had the impression that while they use legal terms like rape which is an objective wrong and gets people thrown into prison, their whole approach was more subjective, more like "things I consider not OK, not cool, abhorrent and would unfriend people for".

I've picked up the poker parallel somewhere. You wake up after a drunken night and find all your money gone. Your friends tell you that after you got really drunk, someone approached you and invited you to poker, of course you played shitty and lost all your money, then blacked out and now cannot remember. How do we judge the other guy. Is this a shitty thing to do with a friend? Yes. Is it fairly sleazy to do with a stranger too? Yes. Do we want to keep such "shark" people around as friends? No, and probably we would want to shame them publicly both to warn others and as a punishment. Are they thieves and deserve to be thrown into prison? No, that not. It was not a crime, just a very un-gentlemanly thing.

They are utterly incapable to understand the difference.

In_Liberty • 2 points • 3 May, 2013 01:03 PM

Is this why feminosphere cannot really draw a clear line between "doing X is not OK, not cool" and "people deserve to rot in prison for doing X" ?

You can apply this logic to nearly any illegal action which does not directly harm another individual.

[deleted] • 2 points • 3 May, 2013 01:07 PM

Harm is actually a very lousy principle. Inventing personal computers harmed typewriter producers and mechanics yet it was not a crime. There two ways to deal with it. You could say that it is OK because the total social utility was increased, but I think that would a dangerous principle that harm is acceptable if it increases social utility, it would be too easy to throw bothersome poeple under the bus. Or you can revise the idea that actually it is not harm what matters, but the violation of natural rights and this was not one. This is why subsequent authors after JS Mill's harm principle, such as Murray Rothbard, revised the criteria as a "natural rights violation" instead of "harm".

In_Liberty • 2 points • 3 May, 2013 02:20 PM

...which does not violate the non-aggression principle

We're on the same page, my first statement was a little vague.

J2501 • 13 points • 2 May, 2013 10:12 PM

Yeah, the funny thing is that most of the responders immeadiately made these assumption that I'm some kind of fat pimply loser who lives in his mom's basement and has never even held hands with a girl.

The truth is, I have a ton of female friends, I've had several intimate relationships in life, I'm a cool guy who I would say is resonably attractive, not overweight, college educated with a good salaried job in web development. I also have a really good personality, play guitar, and am far from boring. Basically, I consider myself a catch, and yet still find myself mistreated simply because I refuse to play games.

Also, a word on the concept of "game". I think it has it's roots in hunting big game. It implies that women are animals, and I find that offensive.

I feel like this has been said a million times but, yeah. The world would be a better place if women learned to take responsibility for and be proactive in their social lives instead of blaming everything on men in general, when in fact the pool of men they date is selection-biased by being composed mainly of guys who had the impetus to make all the douchey moves that lead to cheap hook-ups. A lot of women have told me that they like to be dominated, they like when a man takes control. This attitude, I believe, is an artifact of a time in human evolution when women had no choice in who they had sex with, and were forced to evolve in a way that made them appreciate being raped. It's very sad, really. They all say they want a nice guy, but unfortunately that tends to conflict with their natural instinct to be attracted to the macho alpha.

I guess I and a lot of other more passive, cerebral guys would just rather go without a woman than pull the kind of douchey maneuvers it takes to get one. What I really want is an honest reltionship with a true equal, and I accept the fact that those are rare.

BTW, I'm sorry if anyone finds my understanding of evolutionary psychology offensive. If it's any consolation, I'm horribly depressed by it. I have an education in psych and neuro and I really try to avoid the conclusion that people are animals or biological robots. I like to believe in Free Will as opposed to Determinism, but sometimes it's hard to keep the faith.

[deleted] • 10 points • 2 May, 2013 10:49 PM

In this sub, more than any other sub, you will be welcomed for following evolutionary psychology to its conclusion.

We are all about evolutionary psychology here and its implications on male - female interactions.

juchanaut • 10 points • 2 May, 2013 11:16 PM [recovered]

Also, a word on the concept of "game". I think it has its roots in hunting big game. It implies that women are animals, and I find that offensive.

Just want to put it out there that women *are* animals. Primates from the homidae family called homo sapien. Men are in fact animals, also. You'd do well to not be offended by this.

J2501 • 2 points • 2 May, 2013 11:31 PM [recovered]

In most cases you are correct. However, I consider myself in a higher cognitive class and seek the company of the same.

enticingasthatmaybe • 3 points • 3 May, 2013 02:14 PM

Humans have many more 100's of thousands of years of cognitive evolution before we can successfully, on a population-wide scale, overwrite the biological evolution that granted us sentience in the first place.

It would make much more practical sense, not to mention save everyone a lot of time and pain, to simply accept and embrace the fact that our cognitive minds are still controlled subconsciously by our base desires.

redpillschool[S] • 6 points • 3 May, 2013 01:49 PM

It's based on game theory, not hunting game.

J2501 • 0 points • 3 May, 2013 03:48 PM