

Respect is earned

871 upvotes | 1 October, 2014 | by Archwinger

There's a post floating around today from 4chan, containing a story as old as time: A guy gets dumped by his girl because she found someone better. I guess I can elaborate with a little more detail. A guy and his girl move into a new apartment, the girl starts hanging out with some of the people there, doesn't come home one night, and the next day dumps her boyfriend. She explains that she met someone else, is really attracted to him, and was with him last night. The guy asks, "Did you fuck him?" and she responds, "No, but I'm going to." She explains, essentially, that she didn't want to cheat on him, so she waited to break up with him first.

Honestly, that little factoid doesn't matter. The part where she spends all night with this other guy talking about how they're going to fuck, making sure she has sure thing lined up before dumping her boyfriend – that's cheating, too. Just as much as fucking the guy would be. If you ask me, she might as well have fucked him.

Our Red Pill brethren predictably flood this thread with comments about how annoying women are. How can she be so callously disrespectful, people ask. I actually find it interesting how much more direct and honest women are toward men that they don't respect. Once she doesn't need you any more, she doesn't need to lie to you any more. I'd give it decent odds that this girl was telling her guy the truth, and she hadn't fucked the other man yet. She's breaking up with him anyway, she clearly doesn't respect him, and she gains very little by lying to him. It's not like she seriously expects this guy to remain her friend or admire her for not actually cheating. That's stuff she's telling him for his benefit to let him down easy. She doesn't benefit from that.

But anyway, TRP predictably complains. Women have no honor, no respect, yada yada. But there's something our fathers told us, or should have, that really applies here. Something society tells us daily, actually: Respect is earned.

Think about what we're asking of this girl, or of women in general, if we expect loyalty. We're asking that if a woman meets another man who's better than you – be it better looking, higher status, more wealth/security, better social acumen, more interesting skills and hobbies and shit to talk about, whatever – that she pass on this better opportunity **solely because you came along first**. Essentially, we're asking women to only commit to a relationship with you if she expects to be with you forever. She can never cheat, never dump you for a better offer. Just stick around forever, or until you dump her. Because apparently, it's a race and you came along first, so anyone who comes along later must be ignored.

That's not a fair thing to ask of women. It's not her responsibility to stay with you on principle alone. It's your responsibility to be the kind of man who doesn't get dumped or cheated on. It's your responsibility to earn her respect, every minute of every day. If she passes on a better offer just on principle, she'll spend the rest of your soon-to-be-very-short-lived relationship resenting you, finding fault in everything about you, suddenly "realizing" how unhappy she is.

Society's message – "respect is earned" – is a true one. Where society fails us is in the shitty advice we're given on how to earn respect. You'd think that being a loyal boyfriend, having an established history with a woman, moving in together, doing shit for her, planning on a future together – that all of this would lead to her respecting you, such that when she meets another guy she's attracted to, she can shrug it off. Sure, the new guy is hot and fun, but she has history with you, right? You've done so much for her over the years, right? Tough shit. That's not how you earn respect.

You do not earn respect by respecting others. You earn respect by respecting you. It's counter-intuitive.

By being a selfish ass who puts himself first and does what he wants, even at the expense of others sometimes, the whole world bends at the knee and chases after you, trying to win your validation. Everyone else is so fucking polite and respectful by default, while you're busy respecting yourself instead. That rubs everyone funny, not just women. That makes people try harder around you.

Your job is to be powerful. Important. Successful. You don't have to be a dick if you don't want to, but being nice and doing shit for your girlfriend? That's the path to being replaced. Your job is to do shit for you, that as a side-effect, benefits your girlfriend. Your job is to be a man that raises others up. That raises the value of everyone in the room just by being there. To be the man that every woman wants to fuck and every man wants to be.

You don't avoid getting cheated on and dumped by being a nicer boyfriend. You avoid getting cheated on and dumped by becoming a man that nobody in her right mind would ever risk fucking things up with.

I, for one, don't want women to be loyal, principled, and honorable. That would just encourage me to get lazy. Reward the stupid and lucky. The right-place, right-time guys who just happened to get there first. I'd rather earn respect.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

Bearhardy • 111 points • 1 October, 2014 04:22 PM

there is always going to be someone better than you

JP_Whoregan • 77 points • 1 October, 2014 05:37 PM

Sure there will. But if you are good enough in her eyes, if you are running tight game, holding a proper frame, and being a man she respects, it significantly reduces the likelihood that she will swing to new branches.

Women love, cherish, and adore stability and normalcy. Only the sluttiest of all sluts will throw away a high-tier man for the whim of a man who "might be a *little* better". Women are risk-averse by nature, it's what makes them good mothers.

However, if she's looking for other, better options, it's not **only** because a slightly better looking man than you shot her fuck-me eyes at Starbucks. It'll be that **and** the fact that you are failing to be the man she was attracted to when she first met you and decided to start fucking you.

Bearhardy • 20 points • 1 October, 2014 08:22 PM

What if what you must do to be a better man for yourself is not the same that makes you a better man in her eyes, she might not branch swing if your SMV is high but she will cheat with the pool boy, like in the movies the super alpha with the mansion, forget about getting cheated on, they can cheat with anybody, in anymoment, if they "feel" like it in 5 minutes, I have seen it and increasing your SMV until you have the confidence of king kong is not gonna stop them fucking a confident enough bum with good game, shit they will do it just to get a reaction out of you, make you mad, you are not there, you are doing something more important, confidence boost specially if she has a much lower SMV than you, w/e. The only way to win is not to care if you get cheated on.

[deleted] • 3 points • 2 October, 2014 07:57 AM

She could at least not sign a year long commitment and then break it within two weeks.

JP_Whoregan • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 03:17 PM

She didn't break SHIT in her eyes. She signed a one year lease on an apartment with her "friend". If he's not OK with that arrangement while she fucks the neighbor's brother across the hall, well then that's just OP's problem and he has to deal with it.

See what w mean when we say "women have no agency"?

bluedrygrass • 4 points • 2 October, 2014 01:36 PM

Women love, cherish, and adore stability and normalcy. Only the sluttiest of all sluts will throw away a high-tier man for the whim of a man who "might be a little better". Women are risk-averse by nature, it's what makes them good mothers.

This is really the opposite of what happens in reality. In fact, it can be argued that the exactly opposite of that is true, that women are constantly searching for excitement and novelty. Men are the stable, regular ones. People puts too much thinking behind the fact of being potential mothers. In fact, 90% of females aren't good mothers, and at least half of them are outright terrible ones.

garlicextract • 7 points • 1 October, 2014 06:34 PM

The problem is if you're in that 5'5"-5'7" range, to a hypergamous female, there are going to be a **lot** of men better than you (to her). It's a shitty situation without a solution.

[deleted] • 10 points • 1 October, 2014 10:20 PM

Well, then it's a good thing I'm 5'3", right?

markasstrick123 • 4 points • 2 October, 2014 06:52 AM

One of my guys is 5'0" and is engaged to a Latina whose a half foot taller than him. You can just see her tingle when she's with him. You mad manmores?

garlicextract • 3 points • 1 October, 2014 10:34 PM

I should've said "5'7" and shorter".

legitworkaccount • 22 points • 1 October, 2014 08:25 PM

TRP is about bettering/changing yourself until your idols become your competition.

You can't change height. So why worry about how it's "holding you back"? Fuck that mentality. You're awesome and if you don't think you are then make yourself awesome.

markasstrick123 • 5 points • 2 October, 2014 01:24 AM

Look at 5'6" Darren Sproles in the NFL. The reason being is that shorter guys generally have less strength. But when you work out hard that all changes. He can squat 600# and if you've ever watched him play, he can knock people twice his size on their ass'. When women see that, you are just as hot as a tall guy to her because you are just as dominant as the big guys.

And don't give me no 'he's just an exception' excuse. Anyone can be a part of that if you lift heavy.

el_Technico • 5 points • 2 October, 2014 05:10 AM

won't really help the shorter guys, because unless your an athlete, knocking over big men on the street is considered uncivilized and a crime. As a result the short guy on the street gets stereotyped by most women and ignored.

markasstrick123 • -2 points • 2 October, 2014 06:48 AM

Someone's delusional.

So you're saying it's a crime to defend your girl and yourself from a thug on a night out? Then you call the defendant uncivilized?

And actually, as a result, your woman goes from being somewhat attracted to you, to extremely attracted to you. Including any other women that was a witness, which makes her even more attracted to you, cause preselection.

Stop worrying about height. The girls that care about height are unattractive/insecure/club rats/landwhales/sub 5'2". They need a stereotypical attractive man to compensate for their lack of attraction.

You're spit balling, I'm speaking from experience. So think what you want, little ol' inferior me will be watching Netflix with my gorgeous Colombian girlfriend tonight. 5'5" manlet that pulls mad tail you mad bro?

el_Technico • 4 points • 2 October, 2014 12:13 PM

Bro, you should work on your reading comprehension. I'm writing about everyday life, not the ONLY SCENARIO where it is acceptable to physically hit someone.

It is unacceptable in civilized society to just go around knocking people over. Yes, if you are being attacked it is acceptable, but the odds of that happening on a daily basis and around women you find attractive are minute. And if you are JUST walking around doing that you're probably an asshole.

The someone you're referring to as delusional is you.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

garlicextract • 2 points • 1 October, 2014 11:54 PM

Dude, I've been going to the gym, eating right, all that shit. I'm not giving up but am seeing no results. It's frustrating as shit, so yes, it makes it easy to have a height complex.

Marsupian • 4 points • 2 October, 2014 07:32 AM

Getting more attractive is the easy part. Going out and actually making shit happen is the hard part. Once you approach a lot of women and stick to it escalating towards sex with a clear and easy logistical plan than you will know how much height is holding you back. Approaching, escalating and getting those bitches to a place you can fuck is the hard part.

Marsupian • 0 points • 2 October, 2014 07:32 AM

Getting more attractive is the easy part. Going out and actually making shit happen is the hard part. Once you approach a lot of women and stick to it escalating towards sex with a clear and easy logistical plan than you will know how much height is holding you back. Approaching, escalating and getting those bitches to a place you can fuck is the hard part.

oldredder • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 07:54 AM

Depends on other factors. I'm 5'3". I never had a problem keeping a girl interested with my other measurements. The problem is a society that brought up this generation of women to show so little value to respect, self-respect, to long-term thinking and following feelz & vagina tingles *at any cost*. It wasn't always this way. AWALT is universal even to the deep ancients but this variation is new.

itizwhatitizz • -2 points • 2 October, 2014 01:08 AM [recovered]

Tom Cruise is 5'7". Height is only a limiting belief.

markasstrick123 • 8 points • 2 October, 2014 01:26 AM

Shut the fuck up with that celeb talk. Bring up athletes or friends. If he is rich, looks are nothing.

On a better note, Cruise could still pull without celeb status because he's really good looking facially.

oldredder • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 07:57 AM

And before he was a celeb he became one because?

markasstrick123 • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 08:36 AM

A guy with acting talent that was in the right place at the right time? I don't know dodo

oldredder • 1 point • 3 October, 2014 02:50 AM

Acting talent is never enough for hollywood. Looks have to be there first otherwise the roles you're cast for are the ugly villains or bit-parts only.

markasstrick123 • 2 points • 3 October, 2014 03:09 AM

Well Tom Cruise is also good looking.

fap_the_pain_away • 13 points • 2 October, 2014 01:26 AM

sure, every short guy should become rich and famous like tom fucking cruise. great practical advice youre giving them

Silverbacked • 6 points • 2 October, 2014 05:16 AM

Fine. Neil "Style" Strauss is 5'6" and looks like someone shaved a weasel and he was crushing it *before* he became an NYT bestselling author.

fap_the_pain_away • 1 point • 3 October, 2014 02:00 AM

Oh I See. So instead of being a world famous filthy rich movie star, I can be a world famous, professional, full time pickup artist - one of the best in the world, one of the best disciples of Mystery himself and colleague/equal to Tyler Durden. That's so much simpler.

Silverbacked • 1 point • 3 October, 2014 03:11 PM

And again, he was successful before the fame. It is way simpler than becoming an 'A' list movie star. The biggest advantage is, it is totally dependent on you, not some casting director giving you your big break.

Most actors spend the better part of a decade training and learning their craft. It took Style a couple of years to become a top PUA. It's still vey hard and you have to devote a tremendous amount of time and effort to it, but if you want to bang 9/10's on the regular, you put the hours in.

pizza_tron • 0 points • 2 October, 2014 06:44 AM

Height really isn't that big of a deal if you have your shit together. Girls say they care but lets be real, girls are constantly saying one thing and doing another.

I knew a guy who was 5'5" and he was getting 9s-10s on a regular basis. He was always the first one the girls looked to and the leader of his group.

Stop making excuses pussy.

Bearhardy • 10 points • 1 October, 2014 08:38 PM*

If you think you have to

earn her respect

you are way off, I suggest you read the side bar, but I'm gonna help you, she has to earn yours, if that girl wants to spend all night with other man go ahead but don't expect to come back and find the door open.

Work on yourself, bitch that gets out of line bitch that is nexted, you don't have to earn nobodys respect

except your own, it's called self respect, it's called being a man, and most times is not making money, not looking like a ck model, or any of that shit, sometimes it just mean living like you want to live and being happy with it.

MahlersFifthOfVodka • 3 points • 2 October, 2014 07:06 AM

You may hear the words 'earn' and 'respect' and immediately associate them with supplication, but I think he's got a solid point here.

If I could elucidate further: A woman's respect is not the *goal*. You're right about that. Ideally, you shouldn't *need* her respect, but respect is necessary to maintain loyalty in an LTR.

Also, as ridiculous as women are, and as disrespectful they can be, I don't think anyone on this sub would throw out the old adage, *respect is a two way street*.

LittleCraze • 19 points • 1 October, 2014 05:44 PM

That was my thought. There will always be someone better both for her and for you. Doesn't matter how awesome either of you are.

Is it unreasonable to expect someone to pass over a possible something better over a sure good thing? Maybe, if you don't want to be constantly starting over or paying child support to an ex or whatever other consequences come from branch swinging.

berluch • 18 points • 1 October, 2014 06:58 PM

You can want that, there's nothing wrong with wishing things were different. But TRP is about understanding, not bitching.

LittleCraze • 1 point • 8 October, 2014 03:19 AM

Wasn't honestly complaining, more just musing that someone with even a small modicum of intelligence could see the possible downfalls inherent in branch swinging from someone who for arguments sake is a strong, attractive, loyal, and successful person whom they have a long and rich history with. Especially if they have kids with that person.

The old saying of one in the hand is worth 2 in the bush doesn't apply to sexual desire apparently and for the life of me I can't understand it. Sex is great but it is after all, just sex. I don't think it's ever worth breaking up a marriage, household, children, etc., over. It just does not, and will never, compute for me.

[deleted] • 16 points • 1 October, 2014 08:01 PM

Most women won't risk a high value man for the possibility of a *slightly* higher value man.

But regarding your point: there's something to be said for "settling" in a LTR. Pick a woman who you know you outrank so that you won't ever have to worry about her trying to swing up to a higher branch - there's no higher branch that will support her. Or if you're already in a LTR, just raise your SMV until you're clearly the more valuable partner. There will be better men, just none that your partner can swing. No need to worry about Brad Pitt when your partner could never swing Brad Pitt anyways, and she knows it.

bluedrygrass • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 01:32 PM

There's always the one time cheating out of boredom, and in that situation you can happen to hit people normally unhittable for your standards. Hence, SMV is useless for loyalty in a relationship, if that relationship isn't based on loyalty.

markasstrick123 • 3 points • 2 October, 2014 01:19 AM

That's why I don't believe in relationships.

bobbydrake69 • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 07:58 AM

kind of a leap, but that's is cool.

markasstrick123 • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 08:39 AM

It's true. What a waste of time and effort. Why get in a relationship when you know she hands out sex in the past like it's candy. Chumps.

bobbydrake69 • 0 points • 2 October, 2014 08:45 AM

What kind of candy? I like rolos.

depthrill • 2 points • 1 October, 2014 06:53 PM

Keep in mind that if you are at the peak of your game, *she* will not want to throw away a relationship with a man like you for the risk that another one will be a chump pretending to be a man.

Sure, there can theoretically be someone slightly better than you. But if you and this other "better" man are close enough, she'll take the sure thing.

You just have to be too close to tell apart, even though the other guy may technically have a higher SMV.

[deleted] • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 01:03 AM

There's always going to be someone better than her, and you're always going to be better than someone else

[deleted] • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 10:59 AM

there is competition for mates amongst woman too

markasstrick123 • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 11:19 AM

I went through this in middle school a lot and boy is it entertaining



IllimitableMan • 40 points • 2 October, 2014 12:16 AM*

The part where she spends all night with this other guy talking about how they're going to fuck, making sure she has sure thing lined up before dumping her boyfriend – that's cheating, too. Just as much as fucking the guy would be.

Hypergamous branch swing upgrade. Emotional cheating setting a precedent for sexual cheating.

Once she doesn't need you any more, she doesn't need to lie to you any more.

Because she's on that fucking lease. Bitches be sneaky.

That's stuff she's telling him for his benefit to let him down easy. She doesn't benefit from that.

True but for your average guy aka beta aka clueless chump - this is a fucking ball stomping. Small potatoes to you and I is a **huge fucking deal** for johnny average out there. Remember TRP stacks the deck heavily in your favour, IMO, TRP = the social equivalent of insider trading.

Think about what we're asking of this girl, or of women in general, if we expect loyalty

Loyalty? Oh ma GAWD MUH TRIGGER. UhhhhHHhHhHhHhHhH these hoes ain't LOYYYY-ALLLL. Fuck sake. Chris Brown keeps possessing me spontaneously despite my lack of enthusiastic consent.

That's not a fair thing to ask of women. It's not her responsibility to stay with you on principle alone. It's your responsibility to be the kind of man who doesn't get dumped or cheated on. It's your responsibility to earn her respect, every minute of every day. If she passes on a better offer just on principle, she'll spend the rest of your soon-to-be-very-short-lived relationship resenting you, finding fault in everything about you, suddenly "realizing" how unhappy she is.

Even though I don't take too well to this kind of passive "you're the man so it's all your fault" kind of language, I have to agree with the general premise. If you CAN'T COMMAND RESPECT, or INSPIRE IT - you won't get it. With men/or women. Obviously women are more pragmatic and less honourable generally speaking, plus they're who you want to fuck - so the chances of getting burned are higher with them. Don't think a guy who doesn't respect you won't burn you either though. It's that simple. Women are relentless with this shit. Their love is entirely based on adoration stemming from respect for your superiority. That's superiority relative to her. If a better option comes along, the comparison becomes a three way (no pun intended) and if he trumps you, she'll be tempted to branch swing. If they don't respect you as being THE SHIT then they can't [truly] love you. So yes despite "fairness" (female nature isn't fucking fair, but it is what it is) this is quite right. If she's ditching your ass it doesn't mean she's not a cunt, but it means she's got better options. Bitches be pragmatic. Cut your losses and if it's your style, get revenge.

I, for one, don't want women to be loyal, principled, and honorable. That would just encourage me to get lazy.

Disagree. Women would be a lot more fucking likeable with these traits. As it stands you're on shaky ground. Her loyalty being directly chained to your power, unless you're quite the head-fucker (why do you think so many guys care about the DT) average alpha gets circumstantial loyalty. Mr "I own your mind and blow you away with 50 shades of grey style fucking" owns her body and soul, and will alpha widow her for fucking eternity, effectively making her a "toxic asset" on the dating market.

In relation to the previous paragraph: Law 41 is a fucking bitch. If you translate it into the "48 laws of TRP" law 41 (don't step into a "great" man's shoes) would be "don't date a bitch who used to fuck with a dark triad alpha" so that's your drug dealers, your murderers, your sadistic types, convicts, those really IDGAF to the core kinds of people who really aren't right in the head but had all the charm and cunning to get her enthralled. If she had a relationship with a guy like that just run for the fucking hills you will never have more of an emotional effect on her than he did. Which means over in solipsistic girl world, over in their little head of hers, you're inferior to him, you're not the "best she ever had" because "you don't make her feel as passionately as CLIVE the Cocaine Connect." You could be a billionaire ripped famous motherfucker with all the game in the world and you'd still be the fucking beta bux to her in spite of your SMV. You won't even put a dent into what that guy did to her. She's fucking spoilt. Fucked up. Deflowered mentally. Cut and run.

Women could be all these things, and you know, not wanting to starve to death, my material desires, and having intellectual passion would inspire me to NOT BE lazy. I guess you're right some guys wouldn't do shit over-sexed, but plenty of guys have passions aside from sex. Some people think the only reason we have passions is because we hope we'll get laid from having them. But I disagree. You have passion for the sake of passion. A mission for liking the fuck out of something and finding it interesting - not because you think "hey, neurology might get me laid so IMMA DO THAT!" it's not like doing gender studies, is it? Haha.

I think the constant dread of "If I'm not on top of my shit, I'm gonna lose everything" is not a strong place to be coming from. It's true, it's the nature of the game, but being aware of it AND BEING SIGNIFICANTLY INVESTED AKA MARRIED/LTR is a losers game. I understand guys want companionship, a lot of you are

romantics and you're scared of being lonely as you get older - but you're losing when you give her the commitment jackpot.

You're in a perpetual war known as "a relationship" or "marriage" hoping that you can keep this war between husband and wife in a fucking limbo so she doesn't cash out into government/judicial sanctioned victory. Can't slip too much. Can't lose your job. Better not get sick for too long. Can't fail too many shit tests or catch a mother fucking break. Because what happens if you cave? Your world crumbles around you. Relationships are TRP on hard mode because IMO, in a culture where society isn't stacking the deck in the man's favour, the FICKLENESS of women pre-disposes them to cut and run on your ass. When you treat men and women as legal equals, due to how women love, you make monogamy merely possible rather than probable. They are fickle, briffaults law whoring motherfuckers. If you're not close to perfect in your game, health, money, and one other guy interested in her trumps you in most of those fields - you're fucked. Royally. On that point, don't LTR anything over a 7 if you want a crack at love, the hot bitches have too much power and you have less room for error. If you want to fuck hot girls, plate 'em.

I can definitely understand the angle I think you were getting at, which is that an over-sexed and well-fed man is a lazy man, but I think it's weak reasoning for justifying the fickleness of female nature, and even, condoning it. Female nature is pretty fucking shit. Yeah it's possible to come to terms with it, but justifying FICKLENESS as a positive or even acceptable trait is an escapade in hamstering. Realising and accepting aren't the same shit. I realise bitches are fickle, but I don't accept their fickleness. Just because I realise they are like this, I don't have to like it (Accept it.) You can love women all you like, but what you love is inherently shitty on a morbidly profound level of significance. And I can see why a guy craving to love wants to fucking reconcile his need to love with the nature of women. I get that, I do. I really do. It's so shit your love has to delude you, and I see it seep into how guys "in-love" or trying to make an LTR work, think. I'm here to cut through that impairment. As long as you realise that, but choose to love regardless, for your own sake/happiness, then cool. But let's not get shit twisted. You LTR guys mellow the fuck out and get really rose-tinted. Careful.

emptyform • 4 points • 2 October, 2014 10:38 PM

In relation to the previous paragraph: Law 41 is a fucking bitch. If you translate it into the "48 laws of TRP" law 41 (don't step into a "great" man's shoes) would be "don't date a bitch who used to fuck with a dark triad alpha" so that's your drug dealers, your murderers, your sadistic types, convicts, those really IDGAF to the core kinds of people who really aren't right in the head but had all the charm and cunning to get her enthralled. If she had a relationship with a guy like that just run for the fucking hills you will never have more of an emotional effect on her than he did. Which means over in solipsistic girl world, over in their little head of hers, you're inferior to him, you're not the "best she ever had" because "you don't make her feel as passionately as CLIVE the Cocaine Connect." You could be a billionaire ripped famous motherfucker with all the game in the world and you'd still be the fucking beta bux to her in spite of your SMV. You won't even put a dent into what that guy did to her. She's fucking spoilt. Fucked up. Deflowered mentally. Cut and run.

Highlighting this paragraph in particular for those scanning the thread.

VoyPerdiendo1 • -1 points • 2 October, 2014 10:48 AM

You seem high on the Dark Triad spectre so perhaps what works for you doesn't work for people who aren't on the same place on that spectre as you are.

IllimitableMan • 6 points • 2 October, 2014 11:41 AM

The rules of the game are the same for everybody.

VoyPerdiendo1 • 0 points • 2 October, 2014 02:42 PM

I agree but... oh well I'm fucked.

BrunoOh • 37 points • 1 October, 2014 04:08 PM

We disrespect her because all she's doing is swinging branches. Despite happily sitting on a branch, she sees a fancier branch, she jumps to the higher branch, falls down after a couple of fucks and comes back crying to the boyfriend.

It's all 'maturing', 'exploring her sexuality', 'finding herself'. Euphemisms for hypergamy.

TheOnlyBliebervik • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 03:07 PM

Who knows how their relationship was prior to this?

BrunoOh • 4 points • 2 October, 2014 03:40 PM

They were moving in together. Do the math.

PersianDj • 15 points • 1 October, 2014 09:33 PM*

Suppose Zac Efron moved next door, expressed interest in your GF and she broke up with you in order to be with him.

My question is could she control her lust? Could anyone for that matter?

This is how fragile relationships are. A richer sexier person approaches her and maybe she denies because she is taken, but deep inside she really wants him.

She'll vent out all her frustration on you because *you* cost her a chance at a greater relationship.

& This is why traditions matter. Religion matters. When you are trained since childhood that doing something is wrong, feeling something is wrong, you are able to suppress your wild nature over a long time with a lot of success.

Human beings are fucked up and if they are not disciplined, everything will run riot.

[deleted] • -1 points • 2 October, 2014 04:22 AM

Spot on with everything you say. Except the religion part. Understanding Hypergamy and women's sexual tendencies is much more closely linked to the scientific method than it is some fairy tale. No, religion does not matter.

twinyix • 6 points • 2 October, 2014 05:02 AM

I argue to say that religion plays a part in terms of training a lot of societies to suppress wild natures and follow accepted guidelines. In some way the reason these guidelines were developed was through anecdotal evidence from our ancestors that can be understood using the scientific method.

oldredder • 4 points • 2 October, 2014 07:12 AM

tradition matters & it happens that most places that controlling tradition was *religion*.

ss_camaro • 5 points • 1 October, 2014 09:55 PM*

nobody in her right mind

The idea that respect is "earned" or "logical" with women is absolutely ludicrous (Briffault's Law). The best you can do is leverage and dread them. If those two don't hold, you have to cut your unexpected (emotional?) losses

as cleanly as you can by never having gotten entangled in financial or legal obligations in the first place. Game uses attraction triggers, but those same triggers can work for someone else. Attraction and respect are two entirely different concepts.

Archwinger[S] • 4 points • 1 October, 2014 10:13 PM

Earned isn't really the best word. More like demonstrated, maybe? If a woman recognizes you're respected, she'll usually follow suit. Being with a respected guy benefits her here and now.

I figure a new guy's novelty gets cancelled out (roughly) by the fact that you're the incumbent, you have history, and there are possible social ramifications for trading boyfriends.

ss_camaro • 4 points • 1 October, 2014 10:43 PM*

novelty gets cancelled out (roughly) by the fact that you're the incumbent

Doesn't hold true in the automotive or fashion industries. *Novelty* has the tingles.

Men prefer stability, "the sure bet", often times to their own detriment; viz. any LTR with a women past the age of 27-35.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 04:36 AM

That's a good question. I think it would be easy to blame the wife for making such a despicable decision. With that being said, we know marriage does not insulate us from the SMP and that hypergamy doesn't care. You know these risks going into a marriage, so you must take the responsibility to ensure that such a thing does not happen.

I'm not trying to white-knight, just saying that it's a two way street. Hope for the best. Plan for the worst.

RejectionEquality • 130 points • 1 October, 2014 04:51 PM [recovered]

This post is sidebar material. Right at the top of the required reading list.



jaqrmeister721 • 94 points • 1 October, 2014 07:10 PM*

If it's sidebar material, we've taken a turn for the worse. The notion that we should be uncritical of a woman's extreme hypergamy (made worse by feminism eroding traditionalism) and all it entails is simply folly. Sure, we can accept the "new rules" of the game and accept the heightened importance of dominance, of game, of maintaining frame above all else. We can acknowledge that qualities that were sought after in a male partner in the past (during long era of traditionalism)- honesty and decency - are no longer valued. We can do all this and bang as much as we can.

But to go a step further and claim that what women are doing by over-valuing cro-magnon era qualities in men and if they have a cessation of them for a short period of time, it's a-ok for them to fuck the neighbor, is going *way too far* in my opinion.

It'd be like bidding on a project, and all of a sudden the buyer going - "Instead of the best deal, I am going to select bids based on alphabetical order.". You could have worked six months on that deal and now the rules are arbitrary and frankly, asinine. I would get with the program and change my company name to Aardvark Unlimited but under no circumstances would I PRAISE THE BUYER and think they are doing me a favor.

Women are doing what's natural? Killing people is natural and so is rape. We don't praise or condone people for simply following what comes natural.

What we are comparing modern female behavior with is the past compact between men and women which was based on mutualism. Which means past good deeds do accrue to the present; you're playing the long-game, not vine-swinging the minute the Tingles subside or Guy B gives you more Tingles.

We can adapt and win at this corrupt game with frankly outmoded and somewhat ridiculous rules. But I'll be damned if I sit here and say the people creating the new rules (hypergamous twats) are somehow justified and righteous for constructing the new system. Nor do I think everytime some twat cheats on her BF that it's "the guy's fault for not holding frame, being dominant enough, etc.". There is a continuum of hypergamous behavior that women belong to; and when they're on the extreme end, you could hold frame like Russell Brand, and still have a chick vine-swing. The idea of "earning respect" is immaterial in a world where there is always a man with higher SMV than you and with the wrong chick, that means she's gone.

I, for one, don't want women to be loyal, principled, and honorable. That would just encourage me to get lazy.

It's actually not easy being those things. I've lifted for 10 years and being principled, esp. in cases where I could have benefitted at someone else's expense, is much harder than anything i've done in the weight room.

caleb675 • 12 points • 2 October, 2014 05:56 AM

This sub isn't feminism for dudes. It's focus should be on improving ourselves. The focus isn't on women but on ourselves - the men who visit the sub. We shouldn't be sitting around bitching about things we can't change like they do over at twox. I think it would make decent side bar material because it tells us how to actually cope with the world that all these other shitposts bring attention to.

We_Are_Legion • 18 points • 1 October, 2014 07:31 PM*

I agree with the gist of your post but I don't like how you're underplaying the importance of what it actually **is** that she is chasing. Its a bit disingenuous to compare it with picking bids alphabetically. What she wanted never actually changed.

But to go a step further and claim that what women are doing by over-valuing cro-magnon era qualities in men and if they have a cessation of them for a short period of time, it's a-ok for them to fuck the neighbor, is going way too far in my opinion.

So I'm going to stop you right there and ask you something very simple: Why does one, in fact, get into relationships at all?

The fact is, marriage and in fact, **any relationship** at all in itself is a very irrational thing. Let's say for argument's sake you're married, Jagermeister. If an alien swooped down and asked you why you are doing this, you probably wouldn't be able to rationally explain yourself(lets disregard the old functions of marriage, we must speak to the alien in terms of now and OURSELVES).

"Its a human thing..." you might start. Aaand... you're right. The fact is, we're not reallly doing it for the tax benefits. We're not doing this because socially cooperation is advantageous or because some of our friends seem really worthwhile life-long *live-in* companions.... no. No, that's not it at all. Usually we're doing this to satisfy animal feelings. "I'm lonely", "I get feelings in the pit of my stomach from being with her", "He gives me a happy", "I'm horny and I want him in me", "She has BREASTS", etc. It goes on and on. Those are your reasons.

We're really only following the cues of our feelings. That's it. We can rationalize to ourselves after the fact all we want but that's how you explain it to the alien. And that's all that's really going on. When those

feelings fade, no amount of compatibility will hold two people together indefinitely. They'll wonder why they're there at all. You are not a non-hormonal rational being. You are a being who rationally pursues the whims of your instincts.

Same deal with her.

So my point is, **when you stop providing your SO with a reason to be with you (Attraction/Feelings/Tingles/Love) why the fuck do you think your relationship has a reason from her POV to exist at all?**

jagrmeister721 • 28 points • 1 October, 2014 08:14 PM*

The basis of your point I accept. We are with people to get something out of it. What I am pointing out is that what that "something" is has changed.

I think the basis of it is that women are filling their list of wants from their instinct as opposed to a more comprehensive view that comes from reasoning. Here's a metaphor. I'm in great shape. Really- you'll just have to take my word for it- but I've hit the gym 4x a week for about 10 years. Now, Cinnabons are something that people are drawn to. They taste good. People love them. If I didn't have any future orientation, I would eat them, but because I do, I know it would wreck everything I worked for. But you see the fat-asses who eat them anyway. They are happy in the short-term but miserable in the long run. They are abiding by age-old instinctual triggers that compel their behavior and they can't override it with reasoning. A person who indulges their sweet tooth with no regard for themselves or others (ie: setting a bad example for their children) is someone who cannot be trusted; their judgment or preferences cannot even be a reliable indicator for their own well being.

In relationships, I see us moving from long-term mutualism where we satisfy one another based on real, long-term needs and replacing it with short-term instinctual triggers. Yes, people can act regularly in a way that he thinks benefits him, but he is actually dooming his own happiness long-term. Organized religion knew this about man for a long time, and constructed traditionalism to orient man towards higher behavior, because it knew that it took work to get man to act in a way that would actually benefit him and cause him to be happy over years, not just seconds.

We know that what women instinctually crave today doesn't make them or us happy over the long haul just like raiding Cinnabon doesn't either. I think there's a continuum of behavior (instinct/hypergamy) that women belong to and my point was that if a woman is too far to the extreme end of that, all the game in the world won't protect you from her vine-swinging. It sounded like the OP was talking about a guy's GF; if it was a plate, who cares. But for a GF/LTR, I would think would make sense to understand early on just how prone she is to surrendering to her instinct. If so, whatever she wants will likely lead to your unhappiness if not her own (just look at Rihanna chasing Chris Brown to give him BJ's AFTER he knocked her lights out, only to get rejected by him and be miserable).

the_red_scimitar • 5 points • 1 October, 2014 10:06 PM

I think there's a continuum of behavior (instinct/hypergamy) that women belong to and my point was that if a woman is too far to the extreme end of that, all the game in the world won't protect you from her vine-swinging.

This is true. In polyamorous circles, the term "New Relationship Energy" (NRE) is used to describe that whole wrapped-up-in-another thing that happens at the start of meeting somebody new. It is rarely long lived (a few months to a year at most).

Some people (men, too) basically crave NRE. If that's the type of person you are with, they are

going to need to get that vine swinging, regardless of how alpha, powerful and high-SMV'd one is.

We_Are_Legion • 5 points • 2 October, 2014 02:47 AM*

Solid counter-points. And well-argued. In this and other posts. ♂

I gather we don't really disagree at all. The "feelings" I alluded to in the last post can be explained like this: There are generally three accepted core brain systems for mating and reproduction(as shown by chemical activity in people who are currently in monogamous pair-bonds):

lust - the sex drive or libido

attraction/infatuation - early stage intense romantic love.

attachment - deep feelings of union with a long term partner.

From what you say about the outcomes of relationships having changed, I gathered you mean the last two. From a sexual strategy perspective, I do think trying to nurture them all is a good strategy(as I outlined in the reply to Cyralea), but I never meant to disagree finding a girl who's stable and compatible in her choices to you shouldn't also be a priority.

I do however think though its unproductive to focus on blaming the woman. Wasting energy on factors you can't control... seems pointless.

trpbot[M] • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 03:11 AM

Confirmed: 1 point awarded to /u/jagmeister721 by We_Are_Legion. ^[History]

[This is an Automated Message]

Cyralea • 14 points • 1 October, 2014 08:54 PM

So my point is, when you stop providing your SO with a reason to be with you(Attraction/Feelings/Tingles/Love) why the fuck do you think your relationship has a reason from her POV to exist at all?

That statement is a bit loaded. Women, irrespective of the man in question, lose feelings/attraction over time. The neurochemistry of love is varied in every individual, but scientists have gotten pretty good at pinning it down to 1-4 years. So what's one to do in that situation? Would you advise anyone in a 5+ year relationship that it's futile to demand that the relationship continue?

Monogamy is not a natural construct in humans. The only way it has ever been enforced on a large is by demanding, vis-a-vis social engineering, that one stay committed to a partner even once the feelings of love naturally disappear.

Without such a system, you're basically saying a woman is free to walk the second someone of higher SMV gets in her arms length. Of course this is what women are naturally programmed to do, but why the fuck would you encourage that behaviour?

We_Are_Legion • 6 points • 1 October, 2014 10:48 PM*

That statement is a bit loaded. Women, irrespective of the man in question, lose feelings/attraction over time. The neurochemistry of love is varied in every individual, but scientists have gotten pretty good at pinning it down to 1-4 years. So what's one to do in that situation? Would you advise anyone in a 5+ year relationship that it's futile to demand that the relationship continue?

Absolutely not. That's not the extent of the romantic system in place in humans. You are giving the mechanisms guiding and keeping even you yourself involved in your path far too little credit. Monogamy can and often is natural, just as much as the urge for short-term mating strategy is. Let me explain.

Love romantically is a vague and meaningless word speaking in terms of our motivations. A split into three more meaningful ones should make it clearer (as categorized by researchers studying these phenomena).

lust - the **sex drive** or libido

attraction/infatuation - early stage intense **romantic love**.

attachment - deep feelings of union with a long term partner.

Sex drive does not care for who. You could be driving along in your car, and you can feel that need for sex. You don't need anyone particular in mind. It could just as easily be for that stranger jogging along in her running shorts in front of you. Or it could be that girl on a billboard, or that chick in porn you remember. Its a mindless need, that pangs continuously unless satisfied. Like hunger.

Romantic drive is an evolutionary system designed to focus your sexual energies and time onto one specific partner in order to maximize your success. Romantic drive is what makes a ONSs different from an LTR. You become sexually attached and possessive of your LTR partner (notice how irrational this need is too) in a way you really don't for just a sexual one. Romantic drive inspires all sorts of complicated chemistry in our brains and bodies. Don't ask me for technical terms but I've been there. Butterflies in your stomach when hopeful, stones in your heart when disappointed. *This* ebullience is the one that fades over 2-4 years.

The last one though is pertinent too. And the one you're ignoring. Attachment. Take this experiment as an example: If you inject a female vole with dopamine in the presence of a specific male vole... later on, she will almost always pick that male out of a group of others. Even more fit ones. Its like training a dog. And the effect has a very real parallel in humans. It is extremely natural-feeling and imperceptible as a bias. Furthermore, 2-4 years is well-enough time to solidify it if you use that time right (instead of using it to negate friction).

The point you make about social engineering **is** a good one. But its an additional system that augments whats already there. It is a handicap given to beta males who cannot fulfill this path of sexual strategy as is normal, for the benefit of society. Fine, mourn its death if you like. But that's not productive. One **can** survive without the handicap.

Pick the right girl. Give each drive of hers some reason to choose you. Be sexually at your best. Inspire romantic feelings (don't laugh, its as real as depression) in her like nothing else. Make her **attached** to you. Give her reason to depend on you (leadership). Make her value you. **Have her own biological mechanisms of mating down her in reasons to pick you.**

Hypergamy has its place... but its a part of the puzzle. And her vagina doesn't have a detector for value. It doesn't sniff out millionaires. Hypergamy seeks those who give her more "tingles", but only swings to those men she can reliably score (attachment). i.e. You can compete with Tom Cruise if she doesn't have a chance with Tom Cruise.

In our 4chan story (assuming it was real), she chose a man who was better. Sexually. Romantically. One she **could** score (she talked with him all night). The man she left was beta and indecisive enough to ask what to do when he had already been cucked and his heart ripped out. She relied on him for nothing. That apartment was half hers anyway.

What did he expect?

Cyralea • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 01:35 PM

Monogamy is short-lived due to the neurochemistry involved. Intense pair-bonding and single-mate pairing is strongest in the first 4 years, at which time they have nearly reverted to basal levels. Men tend to have a biological affinity for loyalty and honour beyond that, whereas women do not. **At this stage in the relationship the only thing keeping a woman from leaving is social limitations.** If society deems it perfectly acceptable to leave your long-term mate after 5 years, you can bet most able-bodied women would do just that.

Being alpha works because it fires up the neurochemicals in women responsible for attraction. It's a drug that she becomes addicted to. Like most drugs however, there is a point of diminishing returns.

You need social engineering to build on this. We literally would not have progressed further than tribal groups with harem structures without it.

I get where you're coming from with respect to the 4Chan user. You can't demand that a woman not find a better partner attractive. You can't control her behaviour.

But you don't have to encourage it. And by shaming such behaviour you improve the life of the average beta, who are needed to support society. For a top 20% to exist, you need the bottom 80% to be more or less okay with their situation in life.

the_red_scimitar • 3 points • 1 October, 2014 10:16 PM

I'm very curious, as a polyamorous/non-monogamous man, in these studies you mention. Any pointer would do. Just looking for "relationship longevity studies" doesn't really show studies about the neurochemistry.

Monogamy may not be natural, but it isn't clear that ANY type of committed relationship is. It's definitely a socio/evolutionary positive, at least insofar as the raising of children goes, but other methods of raising them than the atomic family have been shown to be effective. Some poly groups are basically group parenting, and truly share the entire experience, each "parent" covering as needed.

It's a bit radical, and undoubtedly those kids aren't "normal" (and I use that in the pejorative sense, since there's nothing all that great about normal, in case anybody hasn't actually looked at that huge inevitable "average" that is our society). I don't think a "normal" person ever causes anything truly meaningful.

We are all "programmed" for things that would, if generally unchecked, basically unravel civilization. We have our reasoning abilities as a foil to what are mostly base, unproductive, and even self-destructive tendencies.

Cyralea • 3 points • 2 October, 2014 01:24 PM

Here's a pubmed article discussing the spiking of oxytocin at the onset of a relationship. I can't find the specific study I once saw that narrowed down the average duration of peak oxytocin/vasopressin activity. Their conclusions were that after 4 years most couples had reverted to initial levels.

As far as our biology is concerned, this was enough to ensure the optimal level of pair-bonding needed to raise a child. Excessive pair-bonding means fewer potential mates, too little pair-bonding means little security and provision for a child. The oxytocin regulation

pathway came about to optimize the balance between K and R-selection mating strategies.

the_red_scimitar • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 05:47 PM

Thanks very much!

oldredder • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 07:45 AM

"Monogamy is not a natural construct in humans"

It is for me. I just don't do it because I know it's pointless. My base instinct is always to seek monogamy, nothing else. My base instinct tells me to do a lot of stupid things :) Thankfully since I'm one of those hairless monkeys instead of the more primitive kind I can learn from my mistakes and realize that I've met very few women who actually appear to want monogamy. I've met **none** who are single. Not one.

the_red_scimitar • -1 points • 1 October, 2014 10:03 PM

You totally get it. Have you noticed that there are a lot of people now in this subreddit who have simply fitted some very thin slice of RP onto their beta personalities (a sort of confirmation bias, really), maybe even have had some success with game, but basically can't grasp anything that doesn't work with their bias?

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

jagrmeister721 • 55 points • 1 October, 2014 07:56 PM

It's not about MGTOW, Men's Rights, or whatever else. Nor is it about criticizing women. It's about being objective when assessing women and interpersonal dynamics. You can't clearly discuss sexual strategy when you're flubbing those two.

For example- the woman the OP described screwed someone else in the apartment building. What do we learn from this? If you assume the rest of the post is accurate, that means that the man didn't earn enough respect, it was his fault. But if you are objective about it, and recognize that her actions were also responsible, you might come away saying, "Hey, if I want an LTR or even a plate that lasts, maybe I should avoid tell-tale signs of extreme hypergamy in a chick". That's why being even-handed in understanding who/what was involved allows you to handle the situation in a better way.

I would say it is better sexual strategy to see the whole picture, and not just begin with the view that "whatever the woman did is justified (women are women)....". Sometimes there are things we can learn about *our selection process* of women not just about our behavior in the relationship.

legitworkaccount • 35 points • 1 October, 2014 08:20 PM

Thank you for everything you've said.

In terms of philosophy, I'm more on OP's boat, but I'm also guilty of having being swept up in OP's Braveheart-esque-fuck-yeah! post. That's why your post had a fantastic grounding effect where it kinda forced me to be a bit more objective.

If we don't hold women to higher standards, who else will?

I've said this before and I'll say it again: this subreddit's ability to handle different ideas and question everything is amazing.

M_rafay • 19 points • 1 October, 2014 08:30 PM*

I've said this before and I'll say it again: this subreddit's ability to handle different ideas and question everything is amazing.

Ditto. Discussions like these make me not miss "freer" communities. When there's debate (and there always is), it's of a higher quality. Solid props to literally every last commentator so far, in this and other threads. Both arguing for OP's point and those against (I'm biased towards the former though). You rarely come in TRP and not learn something new

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

oldredder • 9 points • 2 October, 2014 07:41 AM

"Women do not have any innate, outward sense of responsibility, accountability, consequence, loyalty, or honor. They cannot and should not be held to male standards. The only realistic thing anyone can expect from a woman is bad behavior. That's not women's fault. That's not men's fault. That's not even feminism's fault. It's nobody's fault because their biological imperative drives them to apply these traits only to themselves."

And that I can not agree with.

It's one thing to expect a woman's sexual strategy to be different than a man's. That's what we're about.

To however classify all women as a lesser gender in non-sexual terms, in terms of integrity, honesty, intellect, forever is both inaccurate and self-fulfilling because any lack of attempt we show today will reflect in *our daughters 20 years from now* and bring society down far, far faster.

If I have a daughter I know I can't teach her to not suck dicks, suck dicks for money or suck Bobby's dick when her boyfriend is Fred. I can't. No one can. Because, AWALT. But what I can do is teach her it's wrong to get maximum commitment like sharing a mortgage, a lease, lots of property, insisting Fred the boyfriend be loyally monogamous, and THEN go suck Bobby's dick. I can teach the girl to back down from being a betraying evil bitch and let her be free to make the adult decision to be the usual AWALT we all (here) know is a real truthful fact of reality.

If we don't hold them to some form of human decency it's not genetics that will make them super-bitches, it's our own lack of passing on character in a social manner (e.g. parenting).

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

oldredder • 0 points • 4 October, 2014 01:07 AM

Men behave in exactly the same way even to adulthood but the way men respond to a need to grow up is different than a woman.

To place men automatically above women is to dismiss the gigantic number of beta-pussy-manchild men who haven't grown up, the kind who most badly need this place yet can't handle even seeing it because it breaks their brains.

the_red_scimitar • -1 points • 1 October, 2014 10:41 PM

Very nice analysis.

You've really understood the whole point about women's nature not being something to just rail against and decry. Women are women partly because men are men. Except when they aren't.

[deleted] • 4 points • 2 October, 2014 02:48 PM

Fight the good fight if you want, but the reality is this: the game is over and feminism has won. We are past the point of no return and there is no hope.

Feminism is pure unadulterated insanity. It's a dystopian nightmare of doublethink, thoughtcrime and totalitarianism.

Check out this lunacy

If you are complacent and capitulate the conversation to feminists you won't be enjoying the decline, you'll be thrown in jail for calling a someone a "sissy".

I usually agree with /u/Archwinger, but in this instance I can't agree with him on all points.

While I totally side with him on the point that respect is something you give yourself, I absolutely disagree that shrugging off hypergamy as something completely inevitable, if not logical, is something we should all just accept.

If respect is something you give yourself, then you start by establishing some relationship parameters and holding your SO to account for her behavior.

If your live-in GF is hanging out with "people" (read: dudes) commonly outside your presence/inclusion then you have not set the proper boundaries in your relationship. Your GF does not respect you to begin with. That's because you failed to check her the multiple times she tested you previously. You have shown her you are not a person worthy of respect because you have repeatedly failed to protect your own interests.

Your troubles were already in place before she met said dude and fucked him. Yes she did fuck him. WTF do you think she did all night? Played paddy cakes? The *I didn't fuck him* line is a hamster slut denial lie. Of course she fucked him. 1000% she fucked him. Not only that, she's probably been fucking him for little while now. The staying out all night was the just the break. She has a living arrangement at stake here and she knows she can totally work over the BF on the apartment situation.

The story as old as time is, the BF was a beta faggot and the GF walked all over him. It was only a matter of time before some dude's cock ended up in her various orifices.

If it's me and my live-in GF is out at night, while I'm at home - I'm calling and/or texting her saying *You either get your ass home right now, or find somewhere else to live. Not putting up with your shit.*

Furthermore, after being out all night and coming home the next morning, my first response would be *So when you moving your shit out? Cause you're not living with me anymore. You might as well go right back to where you were.* It certainly wouldn't be <whiny voice>Did you fuck him?</whiny voice> I'd be like *Oh you met some other dude? OK pack you shit up right now and go live at his house. GTFO whore.* No fucking way I would tolerate that shit for a fucking second.

Are you kidding me? I wouldn't shrug and say *Oh well, she met someone else better. This is normal. My fault for having low SMV.*

I'd be like *GTFO you fucking whore.*

Stepping out on your live-in BF is shitty, disrespectful behavior. If you live with somebody - yes absolutely you need to have some level of commitment to that relationship. If things aren't good you work on it to make it better - or break it off before you pull some classless bullshit like this sloop pulled. This is not an unreasonable expectation to have on women.

Lets get real here. Feminism is a giant shit test and as a society, we are all failing catastrophically. Call bullshit out when you see it - especially if it's happening in your own fucking home. You never let people walk on you. Feminism is walking all over men right now - just like this chick walked all over beta dude.

Archwinger[S] • 4 points • 2 October, 2014 02:57 PM

If you have to tell your girlfriend not to go out clubbing in her best tight dress and get free drinks and flirt with other men all night, you've already lost. Women know the rules. They know the boundaries. They don't need to be told not to cheat and not to fish for better offers. They know.

If a woman really and truly respects and admires you, she doesn't need to be told a thing. She behaves wonderfully, because she doesn't want to risk losing you.

If you spend a bunch of time laying out rules for her, that just tells her what she needs to hide better and lie about. If she doesn't respect you, she's doing whatever the hell she wants, whether you expressed boundaries or not.

Never will you find a woman that truly respects you, who goes out and messes around fishing for other guys because she didn't know any better and you never told her not to be a pre-cheating slut. If you have to tell a woman not to cheat or go fishing, you already know the score.

[deleted] • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 03:35 PM*

It doesn't usually start out that way - with her actively trolling drinks and dudes as soon as she gets out of the BF's sight. If it does, then you just next her or spin her as a plate.

Usually many things have happened prior to this behavior being exhibited. It starts out in subtle ways before it snowballs into something so shitty.

Also, don't always expect women to act in a logical way, always doing things what would otherwise be in her best interest. Sometimes that carousel beckons.

I've totally seen women who had absolutely no business acting the fool and the dudes they were with nipped that shit in the bud before it ever became a problem. Usually in those situations, she sees her man put his foot down and that masculine assertiveness works in his favor. Then you see the wonderful behavior. It's not totally out of the question for a woman to put their man to the test to gauge his limit. Remember, solipsism.

If you spend a bunch of time laying out rules for her, that just tells her what she needs to hide better and lie about. If she doesn't respect you, she's doing whatever the hell she wants, whether you expressed boundaries or not.

It doesn't matter if she lies or not, you judge her by her actions (not by her words) and react accordingly. If she can't act right, you NEXT her. Either she learns or she doesn't. Either way, you remain independent of her behavior and you never end up in 4chan dude's situation.

They don't always worship you right from jumpstreet, especially if they are used to getting all kinds of attention from multiple sources. Most dudes don't have such high SMV that women don't dare fuck up from the get-go. Sometimes it's a feeling out process and precedents need to be set as shit unfolds.

EDIT: /u/Archwinger, very few men are such princes that they don't ever get shit tested. Shit, even Brad Pitt right after he made Fight Club got shit tested. We all get shit tested, most of us every single day - AWALT. If you fail them, the little shit tests become big shit tests. Once you fail the big shit tests, then you eat a giant shit burger like 4chan dude.

qwerty622 • 0 points • 3 October, 2014 10:22 AM

They know the boundaries

No, they don't. That's why shit tests exist. They are constantly evaluating their relative standing.

Archwinger[S] • 3 points • 3 October, 2014 12:04 PM

They still know the boundaries. They're just checking if it's worth keeping them with you, or if you're too much of a low value pussy to initiate any consequences.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 11:54 PM

Well you know how the old saying goes...

Never let them see you sweat

But respecting oneself above all others is NOT the same as saying it's okay to fuck the postman. It's separating myself from the perceived control over women that I think I have. Sloots gonna sloot. Hamsters gonna hamst. Hypergamy gonna hypergamy. Woman gonna woman.

Setting the proper boundaries with bitches is not control. It's just a matter of choices and consequences. Establishing the parameters doesn't always need to be so literal. Your woman knows who you are, mostly, and she'll know intrinsically what you will and will not put up with. You do not have control over her, but what you do have is control over yourself. You can choose to be places and do things or you can choose not to be places and not to do things. It's just as simple as that.

How you handle shit tests tells a woman much about you. It's been said on this board many times before, women are not going to ask you about yourself - what your strengths, weaknesses and limits of tolerance are. She's going to shit test you, make her own judgements and act accordingly.

On occasion, as the man, you need deploy some extra awareness. Sometimes, even though you pass the shit tests, they're still going to sloot, hamst and hypergamy. I think it's proper to give them fair warning. *Action X will bring Y consequence.* and be consistent. There are no empty threats. This is basically what dread game is all about.

Yes AWALT, but some are definitely worse than others. Sometimes when you check them it works, sometimes it doesn't. Most men I know have come to a point with some woman he's dated along his journey and raised an eyebrow before coming to the realization *Yeah, this one isn't going to make it. She's gotta go. It's time to Ramble On.*

oldredder • 4 points • 2 October, 2014 07:35 AM

then the whole damn post is off topic except for the part where she goes to fuck the other guy, saying she will do so.

The rest is how he's betrayed entirely in a non-sexual manner because of the cohabitation, the lease, shared apartment has who knows what of shared property, and all the commitment she's garnered from him. Had she been honest from the start, or he been more aware, all that could have been devoted purely to his benefit (and should be) instead of a shared benefit.

That's a betrayal that's not part of sexual strategy.

If I fuck a girl tomorrow who fucks another guy the next night I'm OK with this. A-OK.

If she commits to me, gets a key to my place, brings the other guy into my bed and fucks him there, I'll cut his balls off and kick her in the cunt. That's the betrayal. You don't fuck with commitment to make a betrayal as big and evil as possible. Hence: I know better than to let any woman have access to what matters most to me - what I work for & keep safe for my own benefit.

That way I'm only at risk of what might happen to my dick in the moment I let her at it and if I still think that's not a good idea I'm sure it won't let me co-operate. Ya... in the past not always the most reliable indicator (oh noes) but over time I think both heads have learned to co-operate to agree when it's time to go the other way.

guymanthing • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 02:24 AM

You nailed it right on the head.

bluedrygrass • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 01:50 PM

Thanks. At least someone who haven't lost his mind, in this thread.

[deleted] • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 01:03 AM

Someone told you to head over to MGTOW if you're going to be critical of women, but the real place to go is over to DarkEnlightenment. The neoreactionaries are the only game in town when it comes to valuing tradition and moral values in a modern, redpilled sense.

gekkozorz • 1 point • 3 October, 2014 03:17 PM



You should be endorsed.

Women seeking short term thrills by neurotically leaping to the next best alpha are not acting in her longterm best interest. I see nothing admirable about that sort of behavior.

trpbot[M] • 0 points • 3 October, 2014 03:18 PM

Confirmed: 1 point awarded to /u/jagrmeister721 by gekkozorz. ^[History]

[This is an Automated Message]

kick6 • 22 points • 1 October, 2014 06:47 PM

Think about what we're asking of this girl, or of women in general, if we expect loyalty. We're asking that if a woman meets another man who's better than you – be it better looking, higher status, more wealth/security, better social acumen, more interesting skills and hobbies and shit to talk about, whatever – that she pass on this better opportunity solely because you came along first. Essentially, we're asking women to only commit to a relationship with you if she expects to be with you forever. She can never cheat, never dump you for a

better offer. Just stick around forever, or until you dump her. Because apparently, it's a race and you came along first, so anyone who comes along later must be ignored.

It's not about coming first, it's about relationship equity. The short is "I put in a lot of fucking work putting up with your shit, you 'owe' me an equal amount in return instead of hitting eject for the next thing that comes by."

Yes, it *doesn't* exist because of women's nature, but it's NOT an unreasonable thing to request, really. We as men give our longest friends the benefit of the doubt when they've fucked up *exactly for* the same relational equity you're saying we can't expect from women. Once again, it's not reality...but in a time of purported equality, it's certainly not unreasonable.

deephthrill • 5 points • 1 October, 2014 06:57 PM

but in a time of purported equality, it's certainly not unreasonable.

Dat blue pill doctrine society has instilled within you shining through.

I think the flawed idea that the world should be fair, and that you can expect the world to be fair, is a very difficult red pill to face.

Despite our creature comforts these days, and the push for equality (well, equality of outcomes is being pushed rather than equality of opportunity, but that's a completely other rant I'd rather not get started with...), it's an illusion.

The world isn't fair, and you shouldn't expect it to be, or else you're going to live your life perpetually disappointed.

kick6 • 6 points • 1 October, 2014 08:31 PM

Fairness and reasonability aren't the same thing.

deephthrill • 0 points • 1 October, 2014 09:03 PM

At the risk of getting too pedantic, why do you consider a fair world as a "reasonable" desire?

kick6 • 5 points • 1 October, 2014 09:06 PM

I never said I did. You're just over eager to paint me with "dat blue pill doctrine" so you made that up for me.

TheLazyLibertarian • 3 points • 1 October, 2014 10:00 PM

I'm a little confused. I get that the world ISN'T fair but that doesn't imply it SHOULD'N'T be. The world isn't covered with trees that produce ice cold beer but it totally should be. I've noticed the naturalistic fallacy (this is how things are ergo this is how things should be) crop up a lot around here, although to be fair sometimes it's just people not giving all the evidence in support of a commonly refuted claim.

joncho • 1 point • 3 October, 2014 04:28 AM

I find this line of thinking not useless but worse, damaging. There are things in the world that can be improved, others that can not be and should just be accepted. Saying that something that can not be improved should happen is the pinnacle of stupidity.

[deleted] • 0 points • 1 October, 2014 07:53 PM

It's unreasonable to request something that doesn't exist.

kick6 • 3 points • 1 October, 2014 08:29 PM

It does exist...just between men only. If you've been gaslighted on equality your whole life, the assumption that it exists between men and women is an obvious one.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

kick6 • 9 points • 1 October, 2014 08:44 PM

Neither of those is reasonable, though.

Reasonable is walking into a best buy, looking at 2 laptops with manufacturer's warranties, and assuming the 3rd also has a warranty.

Unreasonable is expecting to get a real rolex from that nice gentleman in a trench coat on 43rd.

Because relational equity DOES exist half the time (between men) it is not unreasonable to assume that it exists across sexes. It's innacurate, but certainly not unreasonable.

GC0W30 • 3 points • 1 October, 2014 08:51 PM

We can agree on all of what you have said in this post.

[deleted] • 0 points • 1 October, 2014 09:03 PM

[permanently deleted]

kick6 • 5 points • 1 October, 2014 09:07 PM

Alternatively, you could have good male firends to fulfill some aspects of that desire, and fuck stanky bitches.

Just consider it the male version of AFBB.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

oldredder • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 07:17 AM

Ya and a lottery ticket pays my bills far better, if a winner, than earning my wage but then again, which one am I going to find?

Marsupian • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 07:42 AM

No but spinning plates sure helps.

bluedrygrass • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 01:48 PM

After having seen a bunch of gay relationships failing miserably and spectacularly, i'm fairly certain gay relationships aren't what heterosexual people thinks.

It's not just two dudes haning out together and having fun.

nosesandsight • 32 points • 1 October, 2014 04:09 PM

Yes! These are the kinda posts that keep me coming back to TRP. Hypergamy is actually a wonderful thing, the more I improve myself, the higher my SMV gets, the hotter the girls that I can choose from. This same structure doesn't apply to women, no amount of knowledge, career advance or new skill sets is gonna make a mediocre girl attractive.

ITRPer • 16 points • 1 October, 2014 10:07 PM

Even girls can improve their SMV by 2-5 (if she's fat, losing weight alone does a lot) points just by dressing better, staying fit (squats all the way!), and not having a bitchy attitude overall.

the_red_scimitar • 7 points • 1 October, 2014 10:53 PM

I'm a guy with moderate looks, decent fitness, good (bad) sense of humor, and a good talker without much social anxiety. But I also have a long established career and decent success.

I've had a number of dates, particularly younger ones (let's say under 27 - I am possibly one of the older people posting here) tell me that I'm not like other people they date. I take them to parties that are better (duh, it's not a frat party) -- that was actually a very recent one from a 23 year old.

I can offer hope to the younger RP-ers here. I had a lot of the SMV points in, but was very, very beta in personality. I was entirely monogamous, and dedicated to that. Women's failure to recognize my "contributions" was mystifying.

Since then, I've also become openly non-monogamous, and RP has allowed me to be at peace with the proclivities of women. I completely lost my one-itis. I pretty much go on as many dates as I want to (dating a lovely 20 year old tonight, had a pretty good one with a cute 36 year old last night, and a serious session with a very attractive multi-orgasmic squirter on Sunday). The point in all this: you will find your SMV goes up just by being a man, and being more and more successful and good at it.

Now, when I talk about this, somebody is bound to get their panties in a bunch and complain about my "humble bragging". You can just stuff that right up your ass. There is nothing more beta than essentially slut shaming an alpha. Get over it.

Azrael_Manatheren • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 01:47 AM*

That just isnt true.

Prowess is attractive.

Compare a 7 to an 8. Physically the 8 is better than the 7. But start talking to them. If they can only hold physical value... or if that is all you **can** appreciate then thats all there is to it. But if they can hold a conversation, keep you interested, hopefully even be witty and intelligent... Well I will just say that a 7 that can do that is worth more than an 8 physically is.

SenorPuff • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 07:08 AM

I disagree. There's two measures of attractiveness for women: physical attractiveness and companionship. Her T&A may get her in the door, but her womanliness is what earns her seat at the table.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

whatsazipper • 3 points • 2 October, 2014 02:06 AM

However we've repeatedly seen that your 50-0 record is forgotten during a short slump in your life.

And if you pick it back up and prosper they'll randomly drop by again and pretend no disrespect occurred.

It's a strong reminder of how to treat them, and prioritize your life so that they aren't a focal point. They're along for a ride at best.

[deleted] • 5 points • 1 October, 2014 11:12 PM

It's hilarious how beta men get shit on by both sides. Red pill guys say it's his fault for not leading and building a sense of respect in his girlfriend. Feminists say stuff like "it's because men socialized her to like assholes" or "she's only exploring her sexuality."

tl;dr don't be a blue pill guy

vengefully_yours • 3 points • 2 October, 2014 05:49 AM

Sure thing, except women are absolutely shit at being able to tell what is better, who is better, and what the best choice would be. There is a reason that every one of my ex girlfriends, and honestly both wives, wish they had me back. One wants me again and its been thirty fucking years. They make shitty choices think the grass is greener, and jump the fence to find out its purple AstroTurf painted green with lead based paint.

Sure if you are a loser, don't earn respect, and let her run over you, then yeah you fucked up and why should she stay? However when she leaves for a jobless tool that isn't alpha, isn't dominant, he is simply an asshole with no real value, they deserve what they get. They make incredibly bad choices based on very poor observations, and then claim their ex is abusive, raped her, was controlling, and every other bullshit justification. The hamster tells them its not their fault, but they made the bad choice, they simply want to blame you for it.

12090205182025 • 9 points • 1 October, 2014 03:55 PM

The other guy is going to fuck her and next her, because statistically speaking alphas are not looking for ltr and she probably is not a 10 anyway. So she's trading down, and that's disrespectful and disloyal.

Unless she doesnt want ltr, in which case the story premise makes no sense, why are they a couple to begin with.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

12090205182025 • 1 point • 1 October, 2014 07:12 PM

She's always free to leave him for a perceived higher alpha.

[deleted] • 6 points • 1 October, 2014 04:37 PM

Another great post.

If your woman respects you then she won't give her number out or meet a new guy for a drink.

oldredder • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 07:51 AM

addendum: if she respects herself.

JP_Whoregan • 16 points • 1 October, 2014 05:28 PM

Gonna copy one of my comments from that thread here, as it's relevant:

It's mystifying that men will reject the notion that their woman is hypergamous (basically "but my GF is special and she's a NAWALT"), then be surprised/shocked/angry that her woman is indeed hypergamous. Loyalty isn't a female virtue, it' a male virtue. **If the 4chan OP wanted loyalty, he should've bought a dog.** If he wants a woman, he better be the best man in her life.

Remember that stupid line from Talladega Nights where Ricky Bobby says

"If you're not first, you're last?"

Well, ironically, that satirical bullshit actually has some truth to it. When it comes to women, if you aren't a top tier man in her eyes, you're literally invisible. You don't exist.

"Why can women be so harsh and cold when they break up with me?", men ask? Easy. It's hard to have guilty feelings about hurting a person that doesn't exist.

These bitter/judgmental comments are coming from a lot of guys still in their anger phase. Listen guys:

Disloyalty is NOT a character flaw of women. It's in their nature and their biology. Women seeking the best genes is how the human race has evolved to the state it is in today. It's evolution at work, just on a micro scale. Shaming them for it is an effort in futility that will only damage your own psyche. Stop complaining that the rules of the game are not balanced in your favor, and learn to start playing by the rules that are actually in place.

tl;dr, - Don't hate the player, hate the game. Learn to play it, or STFU with the whining.

Cyralea • 22 points • 1 October, 2014 09:00 PM

Women seeking the best genes is how the human race has evolved to the state it is in today. It's evolution at work, just on a micro scale.

Actually, shaming hypergamy is precisely how we've gotten this far, as a society. Large societies aren't naturally forming. You need a lot of productive, satisfied men (betas) to have any hope of accomplishing this. This has only been made possible by social limiters on hypergamy -- chiefly religion.

It's in male biology to take what they can by force, but that's not in society's best interest. Many things that were advantageous to the individual, i.e. selected for by evolution, are *not* beneficial to the formation of large civilizations.

JP_Whoregan • 11 points • 1 October, 2014 09:28 PM

You make a very valid point. I guess I should clarify a bit. What I was sort of getting at was that, until feminism and the sexual revolution, the men with the "best genes" not only were the most physically fit, but also the ones most suited to protectorship, providership, as well as the combination of inventiveness and brute strength to build society.

In other words, women could easily satisfy both sides of her dualistic sexual strategy (AFBB) in one singular man. Because it was a time when most men were genuinely **men**, and genuine men were far more plentiful in number than there are today (just like there were more "ladies" back in those days than there are today).

But thanks to modern feminism, the vast majority of both sexes have sort of "morphed" into some sort of androgynous mess of unidentifiable shit. The Old Guard of second-wave feminists from the 60's are now running our daycares, our schools, and our children's sports leagues. And they've succeeded in beating the Alpha out of the vast majority of boys by the time they graduate high school.

So what we have left is a small number of fringe Alpha men.

Here's a rhetorical question:

Isn't it ironic that, as today's feminist-indoctrinated, millennial, "sexually empowered" women wonder where all the "good men" (read: fuckable Alpha men) have gone, it's actually the generation of feminists PRIOR to them that are responsible for turning THEIR generation of men into pussified, over-medicated, wimpy men with no backbone?

These women's feminist mothers are the ones directly responsible for creating a pool of men that these very same young women despise.

LRW34 • 5 points • 1 October, 2014 09:14 PM

As much as i initially disagreed with ops premise, you are correct... Its the reality of it all.

I found the line about shaming women being damaging to the male psyche most interesting and would love to hear you touch on that a little bit more, as thats something ive been dealing with personally

JP_Whoregan • 10 points • 1 October, 2014 09:47 PM

What I mean by "damaging to the male psyche" is this:

We are men. Men are logical. Women are women. Women are emotional. A woman can accept something as a FACT if she "feels" it's the way things ought to be. How many times have you heard a woman say "but I don't feel that's right." Then you bash her over the head with logic, and she simply repeats, "I still don't feel it's right". **FEEL** being the operative term. The logic of a concept doesn't matter to a woman if it offends her emotional sensibilities.

Back to men. And back to logic. When a man can logically deduce or induce a line of thought to explain why something is the way it is, this is what releases his dopamine response in his brain. He is at ease, he is calm.

So when a man tries to use his **logic** to explain a concept (like a woman's hypergamous, sometimes devious behavior) that is being driven by **emotion**, it leads to your synapses in your brain literally misfiring.

"WTF is wrong with this woman?!?! Can't she see how good I've been to her?!?! I've devoted all of my time, effort, and money to her and her happiness!!! How can she leave me?!?!?"

Those are all very logic-driven questions and arguments. The man is trying to apply **LOGIC** to explain his woman's behavior, and it literally doesn't compute. He is left lost, confounded, and dumbstruck as he tries to figure out why his girlfriend left him so suddenly after a life-changing event (like moving in together, for example). Logic says "she must be happy with me, she just moved in with me."

So when she decides to fuck the neighbor two weeks later and dump him, he fails to grasp the bigger picture and face the fact that women are emotional and "in the moment". He's applying the male virtue of **LOYALTY** to a gender that does not harbor loyalty as a defining characteristic.

So how is it damaging? Look what these men are doing to themselves. They are being **SOLIPSISTIC**, as they cannot view the situation from any perspective other than their own. And the reason they can't understand the situation is because they (either willfully or ignorantly) do not understand the true nature of women.

And the more and more a man repeats this cycle, over and over again, failing LTR after LTR, his bitterness and frustration literally starts emanating from him like a foul-smelling odor that women can smell from a mile away. Before long, he can't even score a 4 or 5 for a one night stand.

The **shaming** is the sign of a man at his rope's end. He's tried everything his mind can muster, and he's having less and less success. In the long term, he becomes depressed, introverted, and bitter, a man who lashes out because it literally soothes the pain. The shaming becomes the new dopamine trigger; it literally feels good for him to shame women for a behavior that he has failed to understand all along.

LRW34 • 4 points • 1 October, 2014 10:03 PM

Wow great explanation...

I used to have that principal, but dropped it in hopes of targeting women who actually do understand loyalty and dont sleep around. I come from a home where my mother is strong and loyal, my dad was incarcerated for 12 years and she remained patient and faithful the entire time but when he came

home and cheated she left him so fast. I admire her discipline and strength for those things, and maybe it warped my thinking that there were other women like that.

When i started dating, i was optimistic so after meeting dozens and dozens of moralesless sluts, it didnt bother me. Id date em, treat them how they deserve to be treated (from my perspective) and keep it koving. After meeting 1 girl who morally put my mother to shame, and me and her relationship ending, i have yet to meet another girl like that and i became frustrated and began shaming. I was an extremrly successful alpha who exceeded even my own wildest expectations on terms of getting girls and having sex, but iveost both my swagger and motivation +(libido) since ive been shaming.

Any tips to cope and get through this?

[deleted] • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 01:47 AM

I've had a question about this for awhile now. From an evolutionary standpoint, why would men have the biological tendency to be loyal to women? Aren't they driven to sleep with as many women as possible?

oldredder • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 07:22 AM

That's highly unstable in a pure non-technological world because of disease and also very unstable in society because men get angry at other men fucking the women they fuck, especially who mothered his children.

Therefore a good reason can exist for wanting loyalty, for seeking it.

And the disloyalty women seem to universally show today is far, far worse than it was in the past. Culture *can constrain* it but today's culture is intent on *glorifying* behaviour we all know is immoral.

It's one thing to cheat, it's another to do so serially, or to get married, nearly married, signed on to a lease/mortgage together as a couple, and then cheat. Already other steps of commitment have been taken & this is an utter betrayal that will cause far-reaching damage, far worse than a woman you never lived with, dated 6 months, had feelz for, and then she fucks the other guy in front of you and say "tuff, I like his dick better".

Far, far worse.

[deleted] • 1 point • 3 October, 2014 03:42 AM

What are the statistics on spousal cheating? Are women more likely to cheat in a marriage?

Azrael_Manatheren • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 01:50 AM

Agreed. Men are the same way and I have never understood why TRP thinks that women cant have plates...

Either you are at the level to command betas attention or you arent. It wont matter if someone is prone to hypergamy if you have enough competence to keep someones attention.

Basically if you arent fucking man enough of course she is going to be "swinging to another branch" damn right she is. You would be too. She sees that you are a 7 and that she can get an 8. Why do you think she would be going for you?

[deleted] • 3 points • 1 October, 2014 06:15 PM

If you don't work on yourself, don't expect to be in demand.

Thanks OP, many believe that they are the only ones entitled to spin plates.

Who in their right mind would stay with a 4, if you can get an 8?

selfsufficientnigga • 3 points • 1 October, 2014 10:00 PM

The most confusing thing for men like that is that they are simply blind to the fact that women don't see other people like men do.

Men see other people as peers. Women see other people as resources.

They will keep trying to fit women's behavior into their own paradigm/interpretation of the world, but it won't work until they realize this.

lloopy • 3 points • 2 October, 2014 12:19 AM

It's not a case of "she should pick me because I found her first". It's a case of "she committed to me, and she should honor that commitment". It was an engagement-we're-living-together deal, not a gf/bf deal.

She's not going to get a good deal on this one. The new guy's going to have fun with her, and then move on. When she gets to the point where she'd like him to meet her family, or where she wants a commitment from him, he'll decline, because he knows she won't honor any commitment that she's made, especially the til-death-do-us-part kind.

RedPillSafe • 6 points • 1 October, 2014 07:53 PM*

Dread based "Marriage 1.0" worked great.

95% of marriages in the 1800's functioned okay and without divorce.

While I appreciate the need to adapt and endure the laws of the present we can't forget that these laws really shouldn't be this way.

"Marriage 2.0" is only sustained by the woman's fickle sense of "happiness". This is simply too weak of a contract to be taken seriously.

PlanB_pedofile • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 04:07 AM

Doing these things for men also doesn't earn respect either.

One of my mates, a great guy, we talk, hang out, I even helped him move. I'm that typical "nice guy" that is willing to make room in my schedule just to help another bro out.

anyhow... I found myself being this guy's so called orbiter. That dude that is willing to my effort forward without compensation.

I've helped him on a few business ventures. I've heard through the grapevine that he has a contact that I too wanted dibs on. Chatted and texted my eagerness to join him on this venture. Granted, I'm not interested in stealing it from him or anything, I just want an opportunity to put my work in to gain a slice of the pie. After all, i've thrown him many scraps in business. After dogging around and avoiding my advances, it came to my knowledge he let 4 other of his buddies in on the deal and left me in total dark.... What even stung worse was he gave them the opportunity without a single one of them putting in effort!

Out of all the times helping this dude out and tossing him bones, he doesn't have the courtesy to toss one back! Didn't even offer me to work for it!

No fucking loyalty.... that goes for women and men! I didn't somehow "earn" his respect.

This post is a good resonator of what people whom are respected actually do.

Brap180 • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 05:15 AM

So what happens when she leaves you for someone who has LESS value than you do? Is the man to blame for this as well? Honestly curious, would like RPs viewpoint on this.

Frozen_Tundra • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 05:42 AM

Something society tells us daily, actually: Respect is earned.

Actually I think society is telling us the exact opposite which may be leading to many of the problems we are witnessing.

Respect has become an entitlement rather than something to be earned.

oldredder • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 07:01 AM

No woman who will do that is worthy of me. That's respect. Self-respect.

Until a woman can prove she won't be like that she gets no closer than sucking my dick. I may not even let her know where I live, forget dating her.

bluedrygrass • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 01:30 PM

So, basically, what you are saying is, that every man SHOULD cheat on his girlfriend/wife as soon as he sees a better woman.

This is your reasoning, and this is what comes out reversing roles in what you wrote:

"Think about what we're asking of this guy, or of men in general, if we expect loyalty. We're asking that if a man meets another woman who's better than you – be it better looking, higher status, more wealth/security, better social acumen, more interesting skills and hobbies and shit to talk about, whatever – that he pass on this better opportunity solely because you came along first. Essentially, we're asking men to only commit to a relationship with you if he expects to be with you forever. He can never cheat, never dump you for a better offer. Just stick around forever, or until you dump him. Because apparently, it's a race and you came along first, so anyone who comes along later must be ignored.

That's not a fair thing to ask of men. It's not his responsibility to stay with you on principle alone. It's your responsibility to be the kind of woman who doesn't get dumped or cheated on. It's your responsibility to earn his respect, every minute of every day. If he passes on a better offer just on principle, he'll spend the rest of your soon-to-be-very-short-lived relationship resenting you, finding fault in everything about you, suddenly "realizing" how unhappy he is."

To me, it sounds like you're falling in the old violet mistake of taking responsibility for you female's faults too.

bluedrygrass • 1 point • 4 October, 2014 07:16 AM

Totally unsurprised OP avoided the hard questions.

It's clear his theory doesn't look so well if applied in general.

Typical blue pill self shaming and taking responsibility for other's mistakes.

cooltrip • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 03:23 PM

Be only nice to nice women. Treat women according to how women treat you. Don't be nice to a woman because she's not nice to you: this is what betas do.

mainst • 3 points • 1 October, 2014 06:30 PM

I actually find it interesting how much more direct and honest women are toward men that they don't respect.

I disagree. Women are never direct. 100% she already fucked the neighbor. This is just her way of protecting her image.

Archwinger[S] • 1 point • 1 October, 2014 06:39 PM

Bald-faced, complete 180 degree lies are uncommon. A women is a lot more likely to be vague and use trickle truth versus fucking another guy and saying she didn't.

In this particular case, did she really care about her image in the eyes of the guy she was dumping? Women don't respect unattractive guys or care what they think already, but there is a very special place of disrespect for men they used to be attracted to but no longer are.

She definitely did more than "talk all night" with the other dude, but my bet is that she didn't fuck him. Maybe the pants even stayed on entirely. She wasn't out to cheat. She was going to dump her guy and fuck the new guy tomorrow anyway.

mainst • 2 points • 1 October, 2014 06:44 PM

Sorry, I should have been more specific. I meant to protect her image with everyone else. You're right, she doesn't care what he thinks. She's trying to avoid looking like the cheating whore to their friends/family and she'll tell everyone she dumped him before hooking up with this new guy.

VegasHostTre • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 02:31 AM

My guess is that she was never attracted to him in the first place. You know, because beta bux. He was a place holder until she found something better, in which case she got rid of the old. She didn't care about her image in his eyes but she kept him because she cared about her image in other people's eyes, i.e. her friends.

favours_of_the_moon • 3 points • 1 October, 2014 07:06 PM

The problem is that women aren't brainiacs.

They're living in the moment, they don't care about the long term consequences. The bright shiny new toy seems SUPER NEATO, until the next morning when you realize it's a painted over piece of shit.

But hey, they kids will get over the breakup someday. And after all, she'll just take half your shit and half of everything you'll ever earn as a consolation prize.

[deleted] • 4 points • 1 October, 2014 07:59 PM

I think you're missing something entirely. There is no possible way that girl can judge a guy is better than her previous boyfriend in one night. The reason everyone is aghast is because this girl had decided after months and months that the original guy was *worth* sharing a lease with. In one night she threw it all away because of a supposedly *just* conversation (lol). Either she was flawed in her very long original appraisal of her boyfriend or it was a major flaw in judgement for the new guy.

I don't care how witty or intelligent you come off. I would never throw away my partner because of one sparkling night of conversation. Even in the most cold and calculated of mindsets it's just not enough information. That's abandoning your intellect for fireworks. What most TRP see when looking at this girl is a **child** whose course in life is dictated completely by her swaying emotions.

tallwheel • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 03:11 AM

Think about what we're asking of this girl, or of women in general, if we expect loyalty. We're asking that if a woman meets another man who's better than you – be it better looking, higher status, more wealth/security, better social acumen, more interesting skills and hobbies and shit to talk about, whatever – that she pass on this better opportunity solely because you came along first.

Um. Yeah. Of course we do. Women ask the very same of men. If you were living with a GF and a hotter, higher SMV woman moved in next door and you found out she was willing to hook up, would you do it? Wouldn't you feel bad about doing it? You made a promise of loyalty to your GF because she, indeed, happened to come along first and it seemed like a good deal at the time. Would you expect your GF to just accept it when you told her about it, cause hey, that's just how men are, right? You can't blame men for their base nature of wanting to bang hotter women, and have the hottest woman possible to call his own.

Archwinger[S] • 0 points • 2 October, 2014 03:30 AM

Your preferred version of the world is kind of a raw deal, isn't it?

As long as neither partner in a relationship makes a mistake, they can never break up, right? Breaking up because your partner isn't good enough or is no longer your best option isn't allowed, so in your world, going steady with someone is totally permanent, right?

tallwheel • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 03:55 AM

As long as neither partner in a relationship makes a mistake, they can never break up, right?

Of course I'm not saying that, but the GF in my above scenario is going to be fucking pissed anyway, and ask what she did wrong. Sure, these things happen, but you wouldn't expect her to just accept it and say, "Well, it was just in his nature to go for the better deal. It's my fault for not being a better woman." That's basically what OP is asking men to do in the original scenario.

I get that men and women are different. I agree that women have won the sexual marketplace and they make the rules. I'm just pointing out that asking a woman to be faithful in an LTR is asking no more than women ask of men in the exact same scenario. Is that really asking too much? Can you really blame men for demanding exactly the same faithfulness that women demand of men?

oldredder • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 07:03 AM

It's called integrity. A few of us still have it. The smart thing isn't to expect it never to exist, it's to shun those who have none.

Kaelteth • 2 points • 1 October, 2014 08:32 PM

The bottom line of it all...

(Assuming sexual theory in meeting/fucking women) - who the fuck are any of us to judge a woman for reaching for the next branch? Isn't that what we're doing every minute of every day? Isn't that what we care about too - finding a woman that's attractive, caring, and not a feminist victim of the phallic oppression...at least for a LTR? TRP isn't about *changing* women. It's about *understanding* women, and ourselves, to make us the most desirable of her choices.

I'm married. Over 20 years. And if my wife were to leave me to swing to another branch...that's MY fucking fault for failing to be a leader and provider. I failed frame, or I let myself get fat, or I lost my job and am just sitting on my fat ass at home, or any of a myriad of reasons. She's allowed to divorce me and fuck whomever she chooses...hell, as much as its "morally wrong" (bwahahahaa), if I'm a loser douchebag she's gonna fuck whomever she chooses without the divorce too.

TRP is about making sure I'm the best fucking man I can be. That I'm constantly improving myself, and by doing so am constantly reaffirming to my wife why she married me in the first place. It's taking care of her, and my family, because that's what being a fucking man is (while obviously I don't let this tread all over me either, and what we BOTH make goes to the family, none of this whats-mine-is-mine bullshit from her either).

If I wanted to whine about every time some slut jumps branches, or gets a pussypass, I got to /r/mensrights or /r/pussypass or /r/relationships, not the fucking red pill. Yeah, they're examples of what we teach is real, but is anyone really surprised anymore? Shit, we're usually the branch these whores are swinging *to*, not swinging *from*. My brother-in-law was a fucking doormat...now he's fucking anything he desires that comes his way, because he understands he's better than these beta losers that can't hold on to their women. We're the fucking winners here folks.

So fine, let the slut be a slut. (If I wasn't married) she can jump on my dick anytime she wants. Sure, I won't date her, but to get my dick wet a night? It's better that she's a slut. Like shooting fish in a fucking barrel.

oldredder • 3 points • 2 October, 2014 07:15 AM

Ya? And if an unemployed junky with really good drugs snags her away, gives her lays and heroin all day long and she loves it and never comes back, that's your fault too?

No it's not. Making yourself personally responsible for other people's fuckups isn't smart. When she fucks up it's not his fault, it's her fault.

[deleted] • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 08:02 AM

takes two to tango.

When a woman makes a commitment (like signing a lease in the OP) or a MARRIAGE, nothing wrong with holding them to it.

bluedrygrass • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 02:33 PM

Making yourself personally responsible for other people's fuckups.... is beta. And blue pill. Like OP's post.

Kaelteth • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 02:54 PM

There's a difference between being the *cause* and being *responsible*.

If I go beta loser...I am the root *cause* for her even wanting to engage the hypergamous slut. I failed to be a fucking man, so she goes and finds one.

She would still be *responsible* for her actions. She broke the commitment, she's the cheating whore.

Its simple cause and effect here people. Cause: Become a beta loser putting her over you. Effect: She leaves you for an alpha.

The key message is you can NEVER lose frame. NEVER. If you do, she's gone. AWALT.

AgentSmith27 • 1 point • 1 October, 2014 08:45 PM

I agree and disagree with different parts of what you wrote.

I wholeheartedly agree that keeping someone's interest is about more than coming along first. In order for someone to continue to be with you, you have to be someone they enjoy being around and want to be with. Amongst other things, it means staying attractive (e.g. not getting fat), and being good company.

By being a selfish ass who puts himself first and does what he wants, even at the expense of others sometimes, the whole world bends at the knee and chases after you, trying to win your validation.

Here is where I disagree a bit. Being walked over will definitely lose you respect. Being a servant to your wife, or anyone really, will lead to people expecting that from you... that essentially leads to a lack of respect.

However, going too far on the other end of the spectrum will also lose you respect. From my observation, being

entirely self centered and unaccommodating will probably work for a while, but I've noticed it often builds resentment. People realize that you are *all* about yourself, and they will most certainly take notice.

I've seen this create a lot of negativity in relationships, and lead to sort of a continually escalating hostility and unhappiness. Again, this happens over longer periods of time. The short term solution for them, as you said, is to "try harder" to avoid immediate conflict. People take the "easy way out" in the short term... but if they perceive this to be a long term problem, they will choose to leave if they are presented with the option.

In the past, I think we've seen a lot more women stay with their SO in this type of guy because of dependencies (finances, housing, etc)... but this is increasingly less the case.

I think its a fine line to walk. You can't be a pushover, and you have to assert yourself, but you still have to be fair - even if you are in "control". I think this leads to the most respect, because you aren't overtly showing yourself to be weak and passive... but by being the "maintainer of fairness", it comes off as being reasonable and not entirely self centered.

[deleted] • 1 point • 1 October, 2014 09:23 PM

Thanks for the motivation to continue studying right after I write this comment instead of continuing surfing reddit.

Ojisan1 • 1 point • 1 October, 2014 10:24 PM

You do not earn respect by respecting others. You earn respect by respecting you.

That's one worth remembering.

barmaleo • 1 point • 1 October, 2014 10:40 PM

Just adding a point.

That girl moved on and scraped her relationship much earlier than she told 4chan op about it. If it wasnt for next door guy it would have been someone else.

Perhaps she just been waiting for that particular point when all the things are settled in her favor - lease, things being moved, etc. and then get rid of her last obstacle - the no longer needed boyfriend.

It is not the respect that is the case, respect for that matter is just a coefficient that increase or reduce the probability of the drama above. It does not change the tactics and behaviour of a woman. Woman will still be playing her best card against the man. And this is what causes the shitstorm. Women can't play equally against men, so they bring the knife to a fistfight. Surprise, deceit, manipulation and cold calculation. Rollo says women communicate covertly, I'd add that their way of handling conflicts and breakups is done in exactly the same way. Because that is the only way for them that works even though it's been said and men been warned about it hundreds and hundreds of times through out the years.

Women hacked mens paternal instinct, the way they look and act makes male monkey brain shout "Protect and fuck it!" and the last thing that monkey brain expects is that this "helpless child" will act like a very rational and calculating psychopath.

This what I would take from that story. If you pull a pussy on your face so low you can no longer see, you will get fucked over because despite all irrationality, childish behaviour and sumissiveness women can act like a cold-blooded murderer if they need to, and this is their most dangerous weapon against a the man. No matter how much she respects you she will play you if she wants.

AllOrDeath • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 12:21 AM

An alternative is removing monogamy from the equation. Then no one needs to be chosen over any one else.

Azrael_Manatheren • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 01:42 AM

I have always said this.

Being an alpha is based on competence. If you are competent you will be an alpha. If you are not you wont.

Everyone sees competence whether they want to or not. Its why ~~girls~~ everyone flocks to those that have it. Its honestly as simple as two things...

Can you?

and

Do you?

If the answer to those is yes you are alpha. There is no being lazy because there is too much to master and too much to become competent at. As much as I hate to link it here this poem should be known by all If by Ruyard Kipling

MyDarkSideOfTheMoon • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 01:53 AM

Another way is to be as physically attractive as possible. I used to be fat and noticed the women I wanted to fuck wouldn't, because I was fat. And i totally respect that, why should they? So I lost weight, jogged hit the bench press and have noticed more than usual staring, hell they're coming up to me now. Ive noticed something, you see a lot of these business career women with blue collar men. And you meet them and they're strong and handsome as shit. Maybe they just want someone handsome to fuck? And some arent as concerned about wealth. it bites into their primitive cave woman mentality to go for the physically strongest cave man. Just a thought. And for me? i dont give a penny to their name, i still wont let them own me even if I have a blue collar job.

PolishHammerMK • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 04:12 AM

<http://i.imgur.com/SCiTIKd.png>

The original post from 4chan in case anyone is interested.

fhghg • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 11:12 AM

Respect comes from a body of work. Self respect allows the work to be done. That's it. Self respect as an end in itself is cargo culting. Sure respected people respect themselves, but they are really only respected by others for their achievements.

brotherjustincrowe • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 11:54 AM

Hating women for their hypergamous nature makes as much sense as hating dogs for sniffing each others' butts. It's what they do. He knew she was a woman when he signed the lease with her.

thenotorious88 • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 12:32 PM

Agree 100%, respect is earned and must be maintained (which is why holding frame is so important)

It's also 100% true that regardless of how clean you eat, how hard to train at the gym, how focused you are in your career progression there will always be someone out there who is two steps ahead of you. Could be because of their superior genetics, or born into a privileged family. Regardless of the "fairness" we have to accept the reality... the whole idea of the red pill.

Which brings me onto my next point, while comparing yourself with males is almost a natural thought its imperative you do what's best your life trajectory. It can be healthy to analyse areas where someone you perceive more "alpha" in order to help you gain understanding/plans to also make gains in those areas. But you must also be able to recognize those thoughts and not beat yourself up, especially things out of your control.

These are the times where buckle down and refocus on your goals.

Finally, my last point I'd like to make regarding the initial post and what i've typed so far is the benefits of running a captain/first mate model if you decide to offer your commitment. While hindsight is always a bitch, it's worth noting tying up your legal commitments with a relationship (in this case a lease) makes things a lot more difficult. But regardless, if you are a strong captain, youre sailing a ship destined for your own greatness and if your first mate decides to jump ship well, cya later dickhead i'll wave at you flapping around in the water should your future ships sink. No life boat here bitch. Captain a tight ship and you'll have plenty more first mate to choose from.

Overzealous_BlackGuy • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 01:20 PM

Yeah she wasn't won't for leaving but she could have approached it differently, she could've just left without those details...and atleast worked something out for the new apartment

bluedrygrass • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 02:41 PM

Women need to be subject to standards, expectations and controls like men are but because they're not (anymore) we have absolute social anarchy now.

walkingfauxpas • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 04:04 PM

Totally agree with this premise. This is exactly why I keep myself as well-rounded as possible, so (hypothetical) SO won't suffer from 'Grass is Greener' syndrome. It's fair game until marriage.

Sweetmoe • 1 point • 3 October, 2014 12:48 AM

It's your responsibility to earn her respect, every minute of every day.

This part is off. It's about respecting yourself and yes being the type of man who doesn't get dumped or cheated on, but that is for you not for her. **SHE** is along for **YOUR** ride.

ToFaceA_god • 1 point • 21 October, 2014 09:21 AM

I wish I would have read this before posting what I did yesterday. This was the idea I was trying to get across. It was poorly worded on my part. I am new to these ideas and am still processing TRP.

Rollo-Tomassi • 1 point • 1 October, 2014 10:35 PM

<http://therationalmale.com/2012/05/29/respect/>

Masculine Respect

So this is my point, women don't respect men, or rather, they don't respect the masculine – and most certainly don't have a default respect for it. They're taught to be adversarial, not cooperative. Women are taught to relinquish respect, and then only begrudgingly when a man has proven his quality beyond the reach of most men. Masculinity is popularly ridiculed in western culture as it is, but to respect a man is to compete with him, to out-masculine him. Cooperation or even recognizing that the genders could be complimentary is viewed at best as antiquated, at worst, sublimation to the male imperative.

I should also add that I don't think this dynamic is limited to the Daddy-Issues strippers or coed sluts. I've personally known very well standing, church going puritanical women, who'd cringe to be called a feminist, parroting back the very ideologies, practicing the behaviors and subscribing to the mindset (albeit in different context) of disrespecting the masculine. They were just as loud and just as obnoxious about it as any girl in Panama Beach, Florida on spring break.

Dimsm1 • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 05:39 AM

Well, what OP describes is precisely described in literature on the right, just a nice confirmation is right in the post by Rollo above mine.

In my opinion, "earning respect" is the same way as "earning love" like Nice Guys do. You either show that you will only respect people who respect you (which works in some cases and fails in others) or you tip all your respect coins in a person (a woman in that case) and wonder why they secretly despise you (in most cases it fails miserably or even explodes right in your face).

Respect yourself, your choices and your own views first, worry about others later.

Yeah, I know that's hard, I am right in the middle of RP clashing with my NG views. It's just as painful as it sounds.

The_Psychopath • 1 point • 2 October, 2014 12:08 AM

Don't slip into oneitis, you need their respect like a fish needs a bicycle.

[deleted] • 0 points • 1 October, 2014 07:55 PM

Nice post. Too many fools expecting these hoes to be loyal. They ain't. Accept that and you'll never be hurt or surprised again.

[deleted] • 0 points • 1 October, 2014 09:38 PM

"That's not a fair thing to ask of women. It's not her responsibility to stay with you on principle alone. It's your responsibility to be the kind of man who doesn't get dumped or cheated on." - The moment I liked this post.

oldredder • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 07:11 AM

ALL men will be cheated on. Because: AWALT.

Owning this as a man's fault is nonsensical. You can't stop her & she can't make a right choice about which man is better or not. Ever. In the real world women make self-defeating choices past the next 5 minutes.

AWALT. No man is immune no matter your frame, your self-respect, your resources, your skills.

The solution is not to be the one special TRP man (it isn't) that can't be dumped or cheated on so you can now feel safe to marry or cohabit. The solution is not to ever let them get that leverage over you, ever, because AWALT. They will. Period.

newlifeasredpill • 2 points • 2 October, 2014 11:11 AM

I agree. I am married with children and have been taking back this leverage successfully. Thrilled with TRP for giving me the framework to find my best self and achieve happiness. I am still confused on what an "end state" looks like. As others have mentioned: marriage means I failed the biggest shot test and now it's about damage control

Thank you all for helping me on this journey

theonlymikeonreddit • -1 points • 1 October, 2014 07:07 PM

And deeper we go. Great post!!! I like the perspective.

scholarly_pimp • 0 points • 2 October, 2014 01:05 AM

This is an awesome post man.

Continually strive to be a better man.

That's it.

ThreadPill • 0 points • 2 October, 2014 02:00 AM

I want to frame the whole second half of this post and put it on my wall. This is a mindset I'm trying desperately to hammer into myself, having grown up a very kind and respectful person. This post is full of so much truth that I hate, but truth nonetheless. Thank you.

el_Technico • 0 points • 2 October, 2014 05:04 AM

Odds are the other guys was physically more attractive and respect had little to do with it.

[deleted] • 0 points • 2 October, 2014 06:23 AM

When reading this post in context to the original 4chan post, I realized I've internalized a very important part of RP mindset; It's the man's fault when his woman acts out of line. Because he failed to demonstrate enough value, hold frame, or some other important part of LTR game.

Sure, I read some BP or Men's Rights posts about extreme hamstering or female solipsism, but in the end it's a man's fault for letting a woman degrade to this level. Be it her father, husband, or x amount of beta orbiters enabling her bad behavior.

phillip42069 • -4 points • 1 October, 2014 05:44 PM

respect should always be given off the bat because you never know what their life might be like. it is always something that should be given and your respect for someone is something that can grow. IMO Disrespect is earned, you should respect a women and a man because they are human. but once those humans display childish and deconstructive behavior, then that is where they need to be taken down a proverbial "peg or two"

pupplenupple • -1 points • 1 October, 2014 04:24 PM

Yes, there is also a very real difference between the amount of sympathy that should be extended to a man whose wife leaves to chase better and the amount of sympathy that that should be extended to a man whose live-in girlfriend leaves to chase after something better. If that formal public commitment to forever has not been made, then the rest of the world is quite reasonable in assuming that whatever you had together came with the expectation of an expiration date to it. To complain that the expiration date happened when she was ready not when you were ready is childish.

[deleted] • -1 points • 1 October, 2014 07:50 PM

This is what men need to here that are new and still swallowing TRP. I for one am still. Reading this all makes sense to me. Its a clear and easy path to understanding what this all means. Incorporating these things only makes you a better and honest man. Thanks OP. Wonderful post and I would definitely sidebar this.

[deleted] • -1 points • 1 October, 2014 08:18 PM

I will print this shit and hand it to whoever I hear complaining about their girlfriend in the future You OP deserve real gold for this. You earned my respect

the_red_scimitar • -1 points • 1 October, 2014 09:59 PM

Our Red Pill brethren predictably flood this thread with comments about how annoying women are. How can she be so callously disrespectful, people ask.

If they actually made such points, they might be in this subreddit, but they don't understand RP theory. You have totally nailed it.

Interestingly, the fake RP-ers here get very upset when anybody actually IS alpha here. Having an actual alpha personality applied toward one - i.e. not respecting THEM - gets that lovely womanly response here.

[deleted] • -1 points • 2 October, 2014 12:12 AM

Great post. Saved. My favorite part is about respecting yourself, by turning others down, by putting yourself first, and having the world chasing after your validation.