

How Pre-Selection Affects Your Online Dating Profile

July 31, 2013 | 24 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

<http://puerarchy.com/2013/07/31/how-pre-selection-affects-your-online-dating-profile/>

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

nicethingyoucanthave • 18 points • 31 July, 2013 04:26 PM

Was once hanging out with a couple of friends and one of them pointed to a guy at another table: "he's on match.com" she said. "He's messaged me, I remember him." Her friend just laughed.

Honestly, it kind of terrified me because of the disdain in her voice and the laugh. *She's* on the site, but she doesn't really want the guys that are on the site. Quality guys aren't on there (or so they believe).

So I will never put my picture on a dating website. I would hate to be recognized like that. It's not that I think it's shameful. It's that I think women are turned off by guys who do it. I'm just not going to take that chance.

[deleted] 31 July, 2013 10:36 PM*

[permanently deleted]

whynoflyingcarsyet • 1 point • 6 August, 2013 09:05 AM

Thank you. I would like to see how women respond to men posting messages that they claim as "creepy" from women on dating sites

[deleted] • 3 points • 31 July, 2013 06:07 PM

I have a friend who posts her replies on facebook to the compliments she receives on match.com.

nicethingyoucanthave • 15 points • 31 July, 2013 07:06 PM

and when it's guys being rude I get that people might make fun of them. But in my opinion, they just have a low opinion of everyone on a dating website.

Consider this one: <http://i.imgur.com/mR3aYEj.png> I got that from the 3rd post on /r/creepypms. All it says is, "I think you're [awake at this hour] looking for a big, strong, confident man. Let's chat" and she posts that on creepyPMs.

[deleted] • 5 points • 31 July, 2013 10:53 PM

A bit ironic, no. The friend I have critiques spelling and grammar mostly, but also veers into defending her spending habits, which usually have nothing to do with the comments she is offered. She's a strong, independent woman who is looking for someone to bring into her lifestyle.

I find it troubling because she derives entertainment from shooting men down firstly, and then publicizing it secondly. I keep coming back to the adage that when one sees something in someone else they despise, it is most certainly a thing in themselves they find distasteful.

Must have a low threshold for quality content in that sub.

[deleted] 1 August, 2013 07:20 PM*

[permanently deleted]

nicethingyoucanthave • 3 points • 1 August, 2013 07:40 PM

I hope some RedPillars will contribute to the 'discussion' there.

Um no. They have a rule where you're not allowed to so much as ask why someone thought a post was creepy, let alone suggest a reasonable person might not find it creepy.

[deleted] 1 August, 2013 07:50 PM

[permanently deleted]

nicethingyoucanthave • 2 points • 1 August, 2013 08:02 PM

The admins would use that as an excuse to ban this entire sub. They like SRS. Haven't you noticed that SRS isn't required to use the np links?

Nutz76 • 2 points • 31 July, 2013 08:15 PM

Depends on how you frame it, and frame control is *extremely* important. If your profile presents your purpose for being there because you're successful and simply don't have time for traditional dating, you're off to a good start. Or you can go the opposite direction and craft a profile towards short term hookups. Anything in between is a crap shoot and not likely to net you much in the long run, or worse, women recognize you like you mentioned and then look down on you because of it.

[deleted] 31 July, 2013 09:49 PM

[permanently deleted]

The_PUA_Punanny • 6 points • 31 July, 2013 10:53 PM

It's like sticking your dick in a beehive of Crazy.

[deleted] • 2 points • 1 August, 2013 02:19 AM

curious about what a typical opening message for you looks like.

[deleted] 1 August, 2013 07:24 AM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 1 August, 2013 07:59 PM

Under the assumption that they *read* your messages.

pitlord713 • 2 points • 1 August, 2013 02:47 AM

Andddd now im deleting my okcupid

[deleted] • 1 point • 1 August, 2013 08:20 AM

Well, this follows from hypergamy, doesn't it? In the sense of hypergamy meaning the top 5% guys getting the top 30% of women something like that. They don't really need online dating, the 30% knows that kinda assumes that if you are there you are not in the 5%.

orographic • 14 points • 31 July, 2013 04:37 PM

For the swole guys who are going to utilize a shirtless picture I recommend employing techniques that maximize how muscular you look. You can use gym pump, flexing, lighting, and angles to make yourself look really muscular. If you do it right the difference can be huge. Is this misleading? Maybe, but women do stuff like this everyday. Makeup, push up bras, high heels, form changing underclothes, etc.

[deleted] • 3 points • 31 July, 2013 06:53 PM

What about my long hair and pot gut? \m/

orographic • 4 points • 31 July, 2013 07:03 PM

Suck it in. Flex. Overhead lighting. Gym pump. Dehydrate yourself

[deleted] • 4 points • 31 July, 2013 07:01 PM

I've said it before about OKCupid: that green "Always replies" is a mark of shame. "Selectively replies" is a perfect way to show that you are the one setting the bar, not them. Women pursue you, not the other way around.

The_PUA_Punanny • 9 points • 31 July, 2013 08:27 PM

Online dating is a losing game for men.

Two women message you and you respond: Now you always respond.

Two hundred guys message a girl, she logs in, is overwhelmed, deletes them all without reading: *Selective*.

They don't pursue you, they don't have to. Any girl with decent pics gets approached like every single guy is in RSD. Guys who would *never* approach a girl at a bar will message her online.

On top of that, the only women who need to go on a dating site are the ones who are so messed up that they've blown their options IRL. Anyone young and attractive is just using it for extra attention and will be super flaky.

Picking them up in person means they *actually* respond.

[deleted] • 3 points • 31 July, 2013 10:33 PM

I don't disagree. I was just mentioning the impression that it gives. Online dating can also be a massive ego hit. "These girls are desperate, maybe they'll love me"... Then you get rejected by most of them, attractive or not, for unknown, random reasons. That kinda shit will fuck with a guy. Best advice, just avoid online dating if you have any other option.

gibby6385 • 1 point • 1 August, 2013 02:45 AM

I send the same mass message out to all girls, with the same 3 follow up replies. I pull in around 6 - 10 numbers a day. With 45 minutes of work.

I set up dates, just like pulling numbers when I meet girls out. Minimal conversation, meet up for a drink and fuck. If they are good, they go into the rotation.

But end of the day, you need good pics and a goofy ass profile that shows you're all about fun.

The_PUA_Punanny • 1 point • 1 August, 2013 03:00 AM

ChristianMingle?

gibby6385 • 1 point • 1 August, 2013 03:10 AM

Ok Cupid, trust me a lot of women fucked in the head from the start. I live in Chicago, so much competition for these girls in general. You land some 7's and 8's on Ok Cupid around here. A lot of bi sexual girls, looking for their introduction back to the cock.

Not for everyone, but dating sites really do depend on the area you live in.

The_PUA_Punanny • 2 points • 1 August, 2013 06:01 AM

http://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/1jfac0/how_preselection_affects_your_online_dating/cbedw7s

[deleted] 1 August, 2013 01:03 AM

[permanently deleted]

The_PUA_Punanny • 4 points • 1 August, 2013 01:30 AM

15% of men love it, the other 85% will complain.

So you're saying the advice only applies to the overwhelming majority and not everybody? Are you a female caller talking to Tom Leykis about how you're different?

Quick, you should write a book geared toward that small percentage, except wait, they don't need it.

RKG's guide for men:

lol be aesthetic

Hot, young, attractive and even intelligent girls are in abundance online.

Everyone is in abundance online, ever since Facebook.

AND they open me.

And then they flake.

[deleted] 1 August, 2013 09:36 PM*

[permanently deleted]

The_PUA_Punanny • 1 point • 1 August, 2013 09:47 PM

looks trump all besides fame

When you're operating in a domain of pictures. You aren't spitting game.

Ive never had a flake; Im much more flakey than the girls I see.

Not even by chance! It's a Christmas Miracle!

Maybe you coincidentally flaked out on a bunch of would-be flakes and didn't know they had also flaked.

You're probably also using a very narrow definition for the term.

[deleted] 1 August, 2013 09:55 PM

[permanently deleted]

The_PUA_Punanny • 3 points • 1 August, 2013 10:46 PM

It seems obvious, because *men* are attracted to appearance. Your instinctual evaluation *feels* right.

But all you know is *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*.

The one item that is well-supported is that females respond strongly to height. 6'4" is somewhere around the 98th or 99th percentile.

Even girls who filter for tall guys are surprised at how tall that is in person.

Massive size advantage automatically makes someone (male only) more dominant and attractive.

If you were a foot shorter, you'd be in about the bottom 2%, almost an exact reversal.

As for facial features, the only thing that really matters is symmetry; both gracile features and masculinized features are attractive to women, or rather, not *unattractive*. There are lots of tall guys with total beta attitude and girls lose attraction for them. Pop and fizzle.

But it's hugely profitable for a player. Mystery is 6'5", sometimes freaky skinny, looks like a scarecrow. But it's no accident an extremely tall person developed so much of what we understand as game; when you're tall, you can make *incremental* progress and get big rewards, because you get a default Dominant frame credit until you mess it up with beta-ness. Someone who looked exactly like him but was short would have to have their game *tight* from the get-go.

The_PUA_Punanny • 1 point • 2 August, 2013 01:25 AM

http://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/1fflx5/science_male_height_is_associated_with_high_mate/ca9w3db

[deleted] • 2 points • 1 August, 2013 02:22 PM

Yea, this is pretty accurate. Rule 1) Be attractive. Rule 2) Don't be unattractive. For the rest of us, it's a losing game.

[deleted] • 4 points • 31 July, 2013 06:35 PM*

Found this subreddit and was convinced I should delete all my online dating crap. But, I figure may as well attack on all fronts. Ice fishing is hardly an attack though.

I did change the text in my profile so there's no "beta" language in it and it reads more like I'm optimistic and thinking with my *johnson*.

My therapist tells me about the women she sees that do the online dating thing and the women report they're convinced all men are lazy. That nugget was just more validation of red-pill theory, whadya know?

Online dating and most "social networking" are celebrations of cognitive dissonance. The majority of internet users are engaged in loser-hood. If you took out all the beta crap that men and women are falling for online, *what* would the internet be used for?

[deleted] • 2 points • 1 August, 2013 08:19 AM

Basically a good internet would be like a huge Wikipedia.

[deleted] • 2 points • 1 August, 2013 04:19 PM

I'll buy that. Maybe it's the MGTOW's that keep wikipedia alive.

rebuildingMyself • 1 point • 1 August, 2013 09:39 AM

They said TV would be "the great educator" and look what it became. Are we forced to suffer the same fate with the internet (but this time the government gets to run reports on our activities with a simple UI form)?

[deleted] • 1 point • 1 August, 2013 10:08 AM

Well, it has several orders of magnitude more "channels" and the barrier of entry & cost to produce different content is next to zero, means very low demand is enough to awaken supply. I think there will keep being incredibly lot of incredibly diverse stuff online and most of it crap, yes, the idea is

still and will be and has been even 10 years ago is figuring out ways how to find the gems in an ocean of garbage.

On the other hand that fantastic freedom, that truly unregulated anarchy that characterized the last 20 years of the Internet, the "digital frontier" feeling, I think that is going to end now. It's incredibly sad, but did we ever really hope seriously that there can be an aspect of life that we can keep entirely free, that we can have two different sets of rules for offline and online life? I have to admit it was unrealistic to hope for.

rebuildingMyself • 1 point • 1 August, 2013 01:23 PM

I'm just glad I was a part of it almost from the beginning.