

Alpha Game: On female sympathy

September 20, 2013 | 29 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

<http://alphagameplan.blogspot.com/2013/09/on-female-sympathy.html>

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

Mooshaq • 15 points • 20 September, 2013 06:35 PM

This part of Nightengale's biography has been posted on here many times, and I am still in awe every time I read it.

It's an astounding read that reminds us how alone us men really are in the world.

thegman84 • 14 points • 20 September, 2013 06:50 PM

reminds us how alone us men really are in the world

We're not alone. We've just been trained by society to believe that we are because it makes us easier to exploit.

gmflag • 10 points • 20 September, 2013 08:09 PM

Part of that is also facilitated by their emasculating us and indirectly blocking us from forming healthy male bonds.

[deleted] • 13 points • 20 September, 2013 03:45 PM

Coming to terms with the idea that women in my life might be like this makes me quite sad...

Redpillc0re • 11 points • 20 September, 2013 07:02 PM

Au contraire, the idea that millions of young men are deluded to a hollywood mindset, refusing to look around at the real world, makes me sad.

Women spare all their sympathy for their children, i think. It's probably evolutionary.

[deleted] 20 September, 2013 05:34 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 10 points • 20 September, 2013 07:06 PM

Even then... My dad very recently told me about my mother, who told him that she would be separating a rather sizeable inheritance that she is in line for (and working to make it larger) from the marital assets, effectively sheltering her from divorce so that she wouldn't have to split it (if that arises, which sounds like it is exactly what she wants). Sheltering it from a man who dedicated his life to making money for the family, working long hours, being dedicated and caring, whom she belittles because she felt his work wasn't good enough.

When I heard that, I realized everything TRP said was right. Women are all just opportunistic. They can't really care about others, and are always working to better themselves and gain the upper hand. Maybe thats a side effect of this feminized society, or maybe its engrained, but it is a reality we need to deal with. It makes me angry, upset, and sad. I don't know how to feel.

[deleted] 20 September, 2013 09:10 PM

[permanently deleted]

Nemester • 7 points • 21 September, 2013 12:20 AM

NAWALT arguments don't belong on the red pill.

[deleted] • 2 points • 21 September, 2013 12:50 AM

She is not different if she is a woman

[deleted] • 0 points • 20 September, 2013 09:13 PM

I wish I could believe that. I mentioned a few things that I can see about my mother, but my dad, who outwardly admits he got married "for love", refuses to believe it. It's why the red pill is so hard to swallow. It is all women. Falling for one blinds you to it, and leaves you open to falling into the trap if you don't expect it. Maybe you got lucky tho...

[deleted] 20 September, 2013 05:50 PM

[permanently deleted]

I-skid-on-your-grave • 11 points • 20 September, 2013 06:29 PM

Women cannot be sympathetic. Meaning they don't truly care for you as much as they care for themselves.

[deleted] 20 September, 2013 07:06 PM

[permanently deleted]

CyricYourGod • 20 points • 20 September, 2013 08:24 PM*

Everything about a woman's biology is to protect herself and her limited offspring. Biologically everything is about *her*. *Her body, her children*. Her concern with the tribe is a question of how the tribe benefits *her* and whether another tribe is capable of providing better. She goes against biological imperative if she places anything above her wellbeing and her children's wellbeing. Any men in her life are biologically viewed as tools of survival and she is chemically bonded as long as she perceives her mate capable of fulfilling her and her children's needs.

Men, on the contrary, are not biologically restricted to the number of children they have so they have a greater drive to protect and cultivate their tribe. Most men do not abandon their tribe but instead attempt to change perceived imperfections. Men, by default, fulfill their biological purpose when they dedicate themselves to the survival of the children, their women and their tribe (order of sacrifice preference).

It would be an aberration to see a woman sacrifice herself for anyone but her children.

I-skid-on-your-grave • 11 points • 20 September, 2013 11:22 PM

I love reading stuff like this, it reminds me that we lived in tribal stage for thousands and thousand of years and thats what we evolved to follow, and then new ideas like marriage, monogamy, religion and the such only came in a relatively short time ago. And feminism... well couple decades.

Going against biological programming really is humanity's worst idea.

gmflag • 3 points • 20 September, 2013 08:11 PM

Well, one thing I am still coming to terms with is this.

No one will bother him/herself with someone else who provides little or no value to that person.

Briffault's Law, in other words.

ManiacalMango • 1 point • 21 September, 2013 02:18 AM

Except for, you know, military men and women...

I would amend your statement to "People have a general tendency"

SkarnkaiLW • 2 points • 21 September, 2013 03:53 AM

Actually it holds even for them. This is known as Psychological Egoism. In short, a person always acts based upon the most important value in their values hierarchy in a given moment. This is why males are generally raised in a certain fashion, and the extreme focus on nationalism/patriotism in education. If you can make being part of any group a large enough value in a person's psyche, they will act on that value.

ManiacalMango • 2 points • 21 September, 2013 04:13 AM

I understand what you have said, and I am tending to agree. However, would self-sacrifice to, let's say, save a civilian life by disarming a bomb still be considered a conditioned mentality? I would think that risking your life for another's for absolutely no benefit for yourself is something that cannot be conditioned in the current military. You're either willing or you're not.

SkarnkaiLW • 3 points • 21 September, 2013 04:23 AM

Well one man's conditioning is another's building of character. Generally, I don't believe living up to one's values is a sacrifice, it is moral exemplarism, from Aristotle, and thus is morally praiseworthy. The military conditioning is not primarily to get the band of brothers mentality, although it tries to enhance it. The conditioning in the military is primarily to override the moral training on killing that one receives as a normal human being. Edit: This depends on one's MOS/specialty though, as a large portion of the military is not in direct or even indirect combat roles.

ManiacalMango • 2 points • 21 September, 2013 04:35 AM

(I'm quickly realizing I'm not nearly as intellectually capable of carrying an adequate conversation on this subreddit and it's actually encouraging. I'm learning a lot.)

As for specialty, I'm in training for EOD, so for me my MOS was heavily dependent on morality as opposed to conditioning. I hope I will be deployed in a combat zone, because that's where I can do the most good, but my MO is to save and preserve life, not take it.

I guess my point is that people are generally inclined towards acting selfishly -- this is obvious. But it's a general inclination. There are those with a common, independent, inherent moral complex who are ready and willing to sacrifice life and limb for others without any expectation of restitution, simply because they value human life and its preservation above anything else.

To be clear, I am not trying to generate any sort of attention or praise. I'm just trying to express my worldview of people in general.

SkarnkaiLW • 2 points • 21 September, 2013 04:47 AM

Well, Psychological Egoism is not Ethical (or Unethical) Egoism. It merely states this is how people behave, in a basically tautological fashion. It is the reality, not ideal.

The appropriate values a person *should* hold is a subject of much more debate. Don't want to get into a summary on ethics or the like, but basically I believe some primitive "morals" exist as part of evolution (protecting one's children, mate, tribe, in roughly that order), but more developed forms require active training, or moral development.

You can look up stuff like the Monkey sphere article on Cracked, or Aristotle's ethics for more info, I suppose, depending on your interest. As a philosophy minor, this kind of stuff interested me greatly, on a personal and societal level. Sadly, it seems moral hazard is rampant in society at large, and will have its predictable effects on it.

[deleted] • 2 points • 21 September, 2013 07:57 PM

Thats a load of shit mate.

JohnPeel • 3 points • 20 September, 2013 09:34 PM

She's is arguably the most intelligent woman who has ever lived, as far as our records go. And most men, and most women, would sadly disagrees with what she says.

But you wouldn't disagree with Einstein, or Newton in their area of expertise. So why would you disagree with Ms Nightingale?

ULTIMATE_TRUTH • 8 points • 20 September, 2013 04:19 PM

this is also why no woman will ever feel weltschmerz.

[deleted] • 0 points • 20 September, 2013 11:20 PM*

(sorry i'm not fluent in english)

The most sympathetic person I know is a woman, my best friend. I would say she's is almost TOO sympathetic. Put everyone WAY before her own need and it become a real problem sometimes. I can tell you so much stories.... the most obvious is probably her being sympathetic to her rapist because he had mental issues. She gave half of her furniture to her EX because he was poor, and it's not like she was richer than him. She often work AFTER her shifts AFTER punching out and not getting paid because they are in a rush and they need help (that one piss me off everytime because she need money so bad...). I can continue like this for an hour.

I wont say that this theory is true or false, but there's clearly exceptions.

MockingDead • 4 points • 21 September, 2013 03:18 AM

And she tells you this.

I knew a woman like this, she enjoyed the feeling of being a martyr.

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 September, 2013 12:20 PM

Lol, no (well, except the part about the rapist obviously). I worked with her and I was there when she helped her ex. I saw a lot of the thing she does.

YouDislikeMyOpinion • 0 points • 21 September, 2013 06:17 AM

Agreed. Nothing special there. She was clearly deriving some benefit from her actions. Whether that was being seem as a martyr or she got something from the ex, there is definitely a reason.

