

A Note on Plates

April 13, 2016 | 40 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

Since we're clarifying the focus of RPW, there have been a lot of questions about which strategies are on-topic, and which strategies should even be considered Red-Pill.

We're opening discussion beyond marriage as an end goal, including the discussion of a new Sexual Market where men are less likely to marry.

The question of becoming a plate is often raised and the false dichotomy of: "If we aren't focusing on getting married, are we then advocating becoming plates?" is inevitably asked.

I wanted to clear this up quickly before I post the new subreddit rules.

What is a Plate?

A Plate is a woman who willingly has an ongoing sexual relationship with a man with no strings attached. Any casual sex with no relationship, exclusivity, or commitment is a plate.

The conversation about the Sexual Market Place and the advantages or disadvantages of attempting to move into a relationship with a man via plate-hood is entirely on topic here, albeit a risky proposition. I want to make it clear that for women, being a plate is a poor long term strategy, and will be considered off-topic. Here's why:

If a woman wants casual sex, or no-strings-attached sex, she already knows how to get it. This takes almost no effort. Whereas when men pursue sex, they often severely sacrifice a great amount of their time and attention for a hookup. Conversely, the supply of casual sex for women is unlimited, and takes zero energy or strategy to get it.

The discussion here will hopefully highlight why casual sex in and of itself is a bad strategy for one's own happiness (for women), and will hopefully dissuade anybody from considering it as a good life goal. Most importantly, it is a core tenant of The Red Pill. Much like there is no discussion on [/r/TheRedPill](#) where men to discuss how to become beta orbiters of women, it makes little sense to discuss on [/r/RedPillWomen](#) how to get sex.

Why is this an important distinction?

Although commitment-free sex for women does not require much in the way of strategy, commitment-free sex may very well be *part of a strategy*. There should be discussion on the nuances of this strategy, all risks and/or benefits should be weighed.

This leads us to the new rules, which will be posted shortly, but I will highlight one of them here:

Sexual Strategies should be from a Red-Pill Perspective

Sexual Strategies or discussion of actionable advice requires either a thorough Red Pill rationale or must be backed by currently existing and accepted Red Pill theory.

Strategies for securing no-commitment sex from men will not be discussed. This is not only incongruent with the desires of the vast majority of women, it is also so easy to do that no "strategy" is required.

Plate theory and sexual dynamics in a new culture that is ultimately rejecting marriage 1.0 and 2.0 is on topic, provided that they are discussed as means to an end rather than an end in itself.

Archived from [theredarchive.com](#)

Comments

DebatePony • 20 points • 14 April, 2016 05:38 PM

The idea that any woman sees being a "plate" as a valid option is concerning to me. If the end goal is marriage, becoming a side dish to someone who is unable to commit (in general or to you) is the worst plan ever.

If a man is scared off by a women stating her boundaries (no casual sex) then they aren't worth the time. I am of the mind that giving up sex without a commitment will not lead to a lasting relationship. At least most of the time.

[deleted] • 4 points • 15 April, 2016 02:21 AM

The end goal for all of us isn't marriage. I'm in a LTR and I don't really care if I ever get married. In fact, I see it as a bad deal for women who have their own careers and don't want kids.

I want a LTR with a man I respect.

[deleted] • 6 points • 15 April, 2016 10:42 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 April, 2016 11:19 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 4 points • 16 April, 2016 03:55 AM

[permanently deleted]

jb_trp • 2 points • 18 April, 2016 06:43 PM

If the end goal is marriage, becoming a side dish to someone who is unable to commit (in general or to you) is the worst plan ever.

The problem is that too many people aren't as forward thinking as you are and consequently don't have a plan (both men and women). Figure out what you want out of life in 5, 10, 20 years and start working towards those goals and sacrificing things that take away from them.

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 14 April, 2016 05:48 PM

Hopefully reading here will help them see the light.

maya_elena • 3 points • 14 April, 2016 02:46 AM

I can understand the reason behind spinning plates, but If I were in that position, I would probably find it very difficult to swallow. Unless you unconditionally and wildly worship the ground beneath the guy's feet, an "open relationship" of any kind either seems like an excuse for the girl to sleep around, or you come out feeling like you do from a one-night stand: a bit sullied, a bit used, and a bit hating yourself for letting it happen.

As a future post, it would be interesting to discuss, perhaps, how to avoid being a plate - not just through self-improvement (maintenance of appearance, cultivation of domestic skills, "improvement of the mind by extensive reading"), but also knowing how to signal to and pick out men actually interested in building something long-term, and not just in "pumping and dumping", as someone so eloquently put it in another post.

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 April, 2016 02:29 AM

From male POV, I have had a handful of partners and relationships, so not extensive experience. However, girls I should have pumped n dumped were not in line with who I am. We weren't on the same wavelength and we wanted different things - example, me at 23 was banging a 22 girl who wasn't even out of college and wanted kids in less than a year. Short term to say the least.

Girls of longer term or long term potential were more so my best friends, it was just easy with them. I'm a believer in the concept of love languages, and the best relationships I had and where I felt the most secure for LT potential were girls who spoke that language also.

Furthermore, you will know by my behavior if I'm LTR potential. Men who are not are bro types, have bro friends and a group of orbiting women. These men are your bar goers and heavy drinkers who are talking about other girls with their friends. Often times they seem airheadish. But, these are your men that are typically the ones women find super sexy which is the rub.

I've had a healthy portion of bullshit, anger, betrayal and hate towards women from relationships. Been going solo for over a year now. I don't like most women and I am tired of all the shit that comes with trying to talk to women and get dates, sex, etc.

That being said, I'm LTR potential because I've had the shit kicked out of me emotionally and I've been humbled by what I've seen and experienced in dating. Why does that make me LTR material? Because I'm jaded. I'm tired of the bullshit. I know what a healthy relationship is and feels like. I have my own set of laws that I follow and uphold to myself, such as I will never cheat, I'll never bad mouth or call my partner names, I'll never put my partner and I in a situation where it is me vs her because that's not the definition of a partner. I'm in her corner and she's in mine. That's how I see it.

As mentioned in TRP, getting sex is insanely difficult for me and a good chunk of men. I've only been so fortunate because the girl also came from a bad relationship and we were both just tired of it. I'm not for settling though, so I don't want to give that impression. But I do not have a means of dating around easily without tons of rejections and effort. Plate spinning isn't easy and I don't want to try at this time because it is too frustrating. Honestly I'm in therapy because of dating and relationships.

LTR men are respectful of you and your time. They treat you like a friend and like an equal partner. I am trying to get through the experience of life the best I can like you, I'll need help just like you and I won't always be alpha male Mr. Masculine, and I don't expect you to be miss bubbly feminine all the time. I am in no way better than a woman I'm in a relationship with - I don't need to maintain this frame or whatever it is and I don't need to showcase all the pussy that I (supposedly) could get because there's a thought that women pursue men who are pursued by many women.

You can spot LTR men easily because they treat you like a partner, like a copilot or someone in the passenger seat next to them and they tell you that you get to control the music for a while if you want or we can keep it off and talk or just ride in silence because ultimately **we are both moving in the same direction**.

If you feel a guy is going somewhere else, like bars or out with friends and you want to go a different direction, like building a relationship by staying in, building a fort and watching movies.... Then odds are, yes, you're not moving in the same direction and he is not YOUR LTR potential...maybe someone else's.

Anyway...hope that helps

ElfFey • 6 points • 17 April, 2016 06:05 PM

i realize you wrote a lot and things are changing around here, but I don't think your post is appropriate to be on RPW. It's the kind of thing I would expect to see deleted because it is so far out of line with RPW values.

We generally don't take advice from men about women especially from guys like you. You were taking advantage of a woman who wanted kids at the prime of her life by using her as a plate. Although her strategy wasn't RP, her goal was and you ruined it for her.

Now, you say you are LTR material because you are "jaded." I'm sorry but anyone who describes their view towards male/female relationships as "jaded" is not going to trust their partner and trust is the foundation of a good relationship, so I don't see how you could be good LTR material.

"Spinning plates isn't easy" No it's a sexual strategy advocated over at RP for men to satisfy their base instincts. This instinct was satisfied for thousands of years through marriage and/or prostitution. Spinning plates is just using modern culture to confuse a woman who you view as a prostitute that you might one day upgrade her to wife. I'm not sure if the girl you mention in this paragraph is your girlfriend or just a side chick, but if she is a side chick it sounds to me like you have not learned much since your early 20s.

"LTR men are respectful of you and your time." Yes and if you are spinning plates, you are not being respectful of our time. According to RP theory I have a limited timeframe to secure my best possible mate. Every man who sends me mixed signals so he can get sex from me instead of being honest about whether or not he sees me as someone he could commit to is taking me for a nice Sunday drive into the Wall.

Granted if you are honest with the woman and she chooses to stick around, that's on her. And with the current dating climate in some cities women feel like there is no other way, because all the women around her are having casual sex. The discussion in this thread should be about that: If/when being a plate is ever a viable strategy (with RP theory leaning heavily towards NO.)

But your post doesn't tell me anything except the mental state of a guy who spins plates. Seems like there is a lot of hamstering and a lot of justifying what you know is poor, disrespectful behavior towards the women in your life *now* due to the hurt and anger you experienced in the *past*.

Although I do feel sympathetic towards you for a lot of what you wrote, this should only be read by RPW as a case-study, NOT advice.

Whisper • 5 points • 17 April, 2016 08:03 PM

Although I do feel sympathetic towards you for a lot of what you wrote, this should only be read by RPW as a case-study, NOT advice.

I don't think one should expect anything else. He's not going to have a game plan all mapped out for you. He's telling you what his experience is like.

What's interesting to me, however, is that you view the observation that he is jaded and distrustful as being *his problem*. As if there were an infinite supply of cheerful, trusting, old-fashioned gentlemen out there, waiting to drop to one knee and pop the question.

What we are dealing with today is a *marriage strike*. Men are refusing to get married, either on purpose, with forethought, or simply out of disinclination. And that hurts women a hell of a lot more than it hurts men.

So, "the mental state of a man who spins plates" means awful lot. Because "the mental state of a man

who spins plates" is what single women have to learn to deal with if they want to get married.

Your suggestion seems to amount to "replace man". Which is a natural reflexive response, because humans instinctively regard men as disposable. But if that were a solution, then the overall rate of marriage wouldn't be plummeting.

Problem is, there's nothing to replace untrusting, once-bitten-twice-shy men *with*. They're all like that.

So, the question is not "is working my way up from plate a viable strategy or not?", it's "*how do women regain men's trust?*"

Because men can't be forced to get married, and withholding sex isn't going to work when there's plenty to be had elsewhere.

SleepingBeautyWokeUp • 9 points • 19 April, 2016 12:35 AM*

I have a question for you, Whisper. This is sincere, I'm just trying to tease out your ideas a bit more.

Lets say a man posts in TRP saying that he wants to start a family. Bearing offspring and passing on his genes is important to him, and for a variety of reasons dealing with stats on childhood success in single parent homes versus that in two parent households, he wants the mother to be involved in the children's lives (so, he doesn't view buying eggs and hiring a surrogate as a good option.) He's looking for a woman to LTR not just for a few months, but hopefully for life.

Imagine he meets a girl. She's "jaded", and "distrusting." She informs him that if he wants to be a part of her life in any meaningful way he will have to work very hard to "regain the trust of women" on behalf of men everywhere. Men rape. Men murder. Men commit domestic violence, so why would she ever trust one? He can't start with a clean slate, as a new person in her life, because she's been bitten before and intends to hold him responsible for the actions of all those men who came before him.

Would you advise this man on strategies to earn that woman's trust, or tell him to hard next and look for a less damaged woman?

Because these are the simple facts: your statement that there is a marriage strike and men are 'all like that' is simply not true. Only about 20% of people over the age of 25 have never been married. For every man who says he won't ever settle down, there are 4 out there who already have.

If what you were saying, that ALL men are now "once-bitten-twice-shy" was true, sure, women would need to try to earn back the trust of these men.... But it's not. There are still plenty of men, a MAJORITY of them eve, who are open to marriage or a serious lifelong LTR. So if a woman meets a man who wants her to atone for the sins of women everywhere by being a plate and asking nothing in return, why on earth wouldn't she just say NEXT and look for someone who was either less damaged, or mature enough not to hold her responsible for the actions of an entire gender?

It seems unreasonable to suggest women should (or even can) "fix" damaged men, rather than simply screening them out through strong partner vetting. I would never advise anyone (man or woman) to try to "fix" someone. It's a fools errand, because the only person who can fix a man is himself. A woman, who should be submitted to him, certainly cannot do it.

Whisper • 7 points • 19 April, 2016 08:58 PM

Good question.

Men's and women's advice needs to be different. Men and women are different, and need to do different things to be attractive.

One of the key elements of women's attractiveness, which becoming scarcer and scarcer, and thus more and more attractive, is *empathy and compassion*.

So, when a woman is presented with a man who says:

I've had a healthy portion of bullshit, anger, betrayal and hate towards women from relationships. Been going solo for over a year now. I don't like most women and I am tired of all the shit that comes with trying to talk to women and get dates, sex, etc.

She has a variety of possible response *attitudes*.

The first one is being **tough**, and *standing up for herself*, like this:

How DARE you say that? Your attitude of blaming all women for the actions of a few is DISGUSTING, and is just a threadbare excuse to justify the CONTEMPTIBLE behaviour of plate-spinning, which harms women to gratify your BASE INSTINCTS. Die in a fire.

The second is being **fearful**, and *protecting herself*, like this:

Clearly, this man is DAMAGED. His untrusting attitude is not something I should have to deal with. I'm going to have nothing to do with him, because I DESERVE a good man. He should just go away and not bother decent women like me with his unworthy presence.

The third, which doesn't exist, is being a **blue pill straw RPW**, and doing whatever strangers want of her, like this:

Clearly, women are awful, and I am awful. Let me immediately commit myself to the first angry dude that comes along. As soon as I get done hitting myself in the face with a brick.

The fourth, which is very rare, is being **empathetic** and trying to *understand others*, like this:

Wow. Is it really that bad out there? I have a little trouble understanding what experiences you're talking about, because I have really seen this sort of thing. I don't think I do it. I certainly HOPE I don't. Can you tell me maybe some of the specific stuff that made you feel this way?

So what results do these women get:

The first woman just picked an argument with a man. She's having a toughness contest with people who are designed to be tough from the ground up. Not going to get anywhere with that, *even if she wins*. Because if she wins, she looks like a tough bitch. This does not make people like her.

The second woman avoids men. While not every man is as untrusting as the man in our example, many, indeed most, of today's men are not so trusting. The marriage strike is a thing.

Your 20% is huge. It represents a much larger portion of young people not getting married. She will avoid many men, and she will, in effect, say to others "prove yourself to me", making them feel less cared about... "wait, women sabotaged the marriage contract, women made men commitment-phobic, and now *you* want *me* to prove myself to you?" Men attractive enough to spin plates will prefer spinning plates to her.

The third woman just sits there as a fictional idea in the minds of TBP.

The fourth woman engages with this man, and treats him as valuable, important person, rather than a "damaged" write-off. She focuses on *his* emotional state, instead of vigorously defending her own.

So, who do you think is not only more attractive, but also more liked, valued, and respected, not only by the man in question (who may or may not be a good catch after all), but by *every man watching*? And soon, by all the men in her life, because **attitudes are habit-forming**?

I recommend empathy, compassion, femininity, warmth, displays of a submissive attitude, etc, because they are a woman's most powerful tools for getting what she wants.

Why fight men, and lose, or avoid men, and get little, when, for the price of kindness, which is free, men will treat you far better than you could ever win with an argument.

TL;DR:

Do not immediately get naked and sweaty with /u/ThePifManGiveth . But DO treat him as if he were a valuable, important, worthwhile human being who deserves your time, care, and attention. Because that builds the habits that will make men *want* a relationship with you, instead of just reluctantly giving you one.

SleepingBeautyWokeUp • 3 points • 22 April, 2016 08:16 AM

Thank you! I might not agree that these are the only paths a woman can take in the dating world, but I appreciate you taking the time to explain your line of thinking to me :0)

Whisper • 3 points • 22 April, 2016 09:24 PM*

You're welcome.

A core idea I'm getting at here is that a lot of women *talk* about femininity, empathy, compassion, etc, but they seem to think they can or should reserve it for their mate.

They will talk about their man being their "Captain", but some of them talk to everyone else in a way that makes me want to ask ... "Do you kiss your husband with that mouth?"

It seems to be based on a fundamental misunderstanding of the *reason* for submissive behaviour.

You don't engage in submissive behaviour because it's some sort of moral obligation in a relationship. You do it because *it is the best way to charm and influence men*. So, while mating behaviours (anything from sex to flirting) are reserved for men you are either in a relationship with, or getting there, feminine behaviours and submissive mannerisms should be used with most, if not all, men... because they *work*.

In other words, obedience only to your man, submissiveness often, empathy always.

Men like the ThePifManGiveth often appear angry and bitter, and it's easy to regard them as "broken". But that anger comes from somewhere. Angry men *care*, or they

would not be angry. A man who is furious about the absence of unicorns is a man who really wants one. Convince him you are one, and well... watch that anger flip 180 degrees very fast.

By the same token, I know that must be bold, confident, independent, stoic, and protective *in my life*, not just "around this particular girl".

Masculinity and femininity are virtues to be cultivated, not just behaviours targeted to that one particular special person, so you can "acquire" them, put them in your closet, and resume your old habits.

Cultivating masculine or feminine virtue is transformational, and life-long.

[deleted] • 2 points • 19 April, 2016 11:04 PM

To /u/SleepingBeautyWokeUp

Yes what /u/Whisper said

I am not pursuing plates and sex because I personally know I'm not in a good place, and further more being all of my daily experiences with women are not healthy; they are anger invoking and all around provoking. This meaning at my work place or if I do feel good enough or trusting enough to ask a girl out, I get instant negative feedback from her body language, maybe something rude out of her mouth, and this huge sense of being judged as creepy and off putting.

Now TRP sends the message that "you're a pussy, women treat you that way because you're not a man in their eyes". My response is "well I'm not sure what else you want me to do, I can't make her find me attractive and I can't make her want to talk for a bit".

Like what /u/Whisper said, if you want to go toe to toe with a man based on toughness, good luck. Women make vicious digs and jabs, and men can be worse. No matter who wins, everyone loses no matter who comes out as tougher. It's a temporary ego victory. But the ego is a huge part of what fortifies men's sense of toughness in being challenged. So if you win that challenge, say an argument, you've basically hit the core or foundation of him.

Why do I like /u/Whisper's approach about empathy? Because wow...a decent experience, albeit through the internet, with a female. Even for a few seconds it makes me think a little bit more positively about women.

I am working on my own fixing. I don't expect anyone else to do so for me. That's not how it works.

From a silly but meaningful metaphor, the best way to describe one facet of this angry man/fixing men thing is this....

Picture a massive male lion...huge mane, scars on his face from battle, muscles flexing with each step he takes...terrifying claws, a deep roar, and fierce penetrating eyes.

Imagine that you are going to walk up to him...after he's been in so many fights over the years and shouldered so much on his own. You walk up to him, and he stares straight at you with an angry scowl...even growling as you walk closer.

You slowly step closer and closer, he becoming more tense and ready for you to initiate another battle, because that's what he's used to.

His hostility towards you is terrifying, but you keep walking to him. You don't raise a fist, you don't shout... instead, you rest your hand on his mane very gently...moving your hand slowly onto his back. His breathing becomes very quick and shallow....but as you continue to caress his worn, battered fur...the lion's breath actually starts to change. He breathes more deeply and his breath begins to slow as he calms down.

Then you kneel down in front of him and wrap your arms around his head, resting yours against the side of his whispering "shhhh it's okay" in his ear very very softly.

A sense of calm and safety washes over the lion as his breath becomes deeper and deeper. Soon he closes his eyes and begins to purr his deep guttural purr...all while your arms remain around him. And in this moment you can see king of all beasts let his terrifying mask down and the healing wash over him.

That's what it is like for me except my encounters have all been threats, enemies, women wanting to leave more scars.

You don't have to fix the lion. The lion is at the top of the food chain; he's a master at what he is and what he is supposed to do - fight, kill, survive (protect the ego).

When the girl wraps her arms around him, she is in a sense acknowledging the ego but being careful with it. She could easily get in close, then stab the lion...further reinforcing him (and other TRP'ers) to never get close again...that all things exist for battle and will kill him when given the chance, thus living in an angry fear. Only when he realizes that she's not going to do those things, she's simply going to hug him and show him a gentle affection, then can he let down his terrible fearsome beast armor and let in love.

Or maybe you think it is shit but I think it is accurate for me at least.

SleepingBeautyWokeUp • 1 point • 22 April, 2016 08:21 AM

Oh man, this bums be out! I'm sorry your experiences with women have been so bad. Even as a happily married woman, if a man approaches me I try to be friendly and open. A short, light conversation with another human can be so uplifting (I'm talking about very non-flirty things like someone asking you your favorite coffee in line at a shop, or the guy behind the counter at a deli making chit chat about the weather while your order is prepared.) If he then asks me for my number or something overtly flirty I will usually say something like, "Wow, thanks for the complement! I'm REALLY married though!" I always add the 'really' to make it clear that although I accepted the complement it's not an open door :0) I'm sorry you've met so many rude women. Just inexcusable, really.

I wish you so much luck in your dating life, and hope you find a skillful, kind, big hearted lion tamer one day!

ElfFey • 3 points • 17 April, 2016 10:34 PM

I expect him, you, and other RP men to avoid posting here and offering advice to RPW. I don't expect him to map out a game plan for me and I don't care what his experiences are like. I can go on TRP if I'm curious about the psyche of plate-spinning men. His being jaded is absolutely not my problem, and any justification of "I was bit once so now AWALT" only serves to further sympathy for commitment-phobic men, which is antithetical to female rp values. Men like this do not commit and it is not my job to change their minds. It is my job to find one who will and build a relationship with him, and to encourage other women to do the same. I would never advocate replacing men that is ridiculous and quite an accusation coming from someone who wrote a post basically outlining and defending the MGTOW narrative.

CrazyHorseInvincible[M] • 1 point • 18 April, 2016 05:10 PM

I expect him, you, and other RP men to avoid posting here and offering advice to RPW.

No. Read the rules, they state otherwise.

If you do not wish to view any particular user's comments or posts, you may invoke reddit's new and improved "block user" feature, which will render those posts and comment invisible to you.

https://www.reddit.com/r/announcements/comments/4dmnn6/new_and_improved_block_user_feature_in_your_inbox/

The rule for the subreddit is, and will remain, that users must post advice that is useful to women, not that advice must come from women and only women.

ElfFey • 1 point • 18 April, 2016 05:34 PM

From the rules: This is a spot for like-minded Women to objectively and realistically discuss sexual strategy. **Content therefore must serve for the benefit of women.**

Anything deviating from this goal is off topic. **Male-centric advice is not permitted. Do not give advice to women which is primarily intended to benefit men, or *is based around male desires without considerations for women's desires or goals.*** Male users will be scrutinized more closely for compliance, but this rule applies to both sexes.

I want to clarify what I meant in the statement you are quoting. I am in no way saying that I don't want men to post on the forum. I am saying that men **advocating a RP strategy** is not useful to women. thepifmangiveth and whisper's comments both do that.

You have obviously read through the discussion so I'm not going to explain myself further. I have no idea the gender of the OP but if you are both male, I think you should consider your own personal bias in allowing a thread like this to be posted *in a forum for women* and the kind of comments you are allowing to be posted on it.

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 18 April, 2016 06:01 PM

advocating a RP strategy is not useful to women. thepifmangiveth and whisper's comments both do that.

Do you really think that being a woman worthy of a man's trust is a pro-male strategy?

[deleted] • 1 points • 18 April, 2016 06:36 PM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 18 April, 2016 07:04 PM

You can disagree with the approach that whisper takes, he's pragmatic, occasionally to a fault.

But that doesn't mean he is providing advice to satisfy his own strategy. I don't take it as such, and I think it's a complete misinterpretation of his point to take it as such.

If you are in a place that is relatively untouched by the marriage strike, his words may have little meaning or value to you. But that doesn't mean they don't have meaning or value.

CrazyHorseInvincible[M] • 1 point • 18 April, 2016 08:01 PM

Do not insult other users. That includes /u/redpillschool and the other mods. The strength of your feelings is not an excuse for impoliteness.

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 April, 2016 08:09 PM

Whisper's comment, while unpalatable, was realistic. He wasn't saying 'have sex without commitment', he was saying 'men can get sex without commitment and don't want to commit because they've been burned, so you need to be aware of that when devising your sexual strategy', which is very reasonable. If he were specifically advocating a strategy that benefited men over women, then his comments would be deleted. Unpalatable truths are still truths.

Whisper • 5 points • 14 April, 2016 01:44 AM

The question is not *if* you are a plate, but how long.

Sex takes about 5 minutes to two hours, building a relationship takes time. The question isn't the whether you are ever a plate... that's unavoidable. Even if he wants a relationship as badly as you do, it takes time to build.

Until then, you are someone he's had sex with, but hasn't emotionally invested in.

And all the promises in the world mean nothing. If he tells you he loves you before he ever gets your bra off, that means nothing. Because words are wind. Anyone can say anything. You can get all the promises in the world, and be dumped the next week, and he'll be over you by the following one.

So, at risk of arguing semantics, "plate" isn't a status you avoid altogether. It's a danger zone you get out of as quickly and irreversibly as you can.

Now, deliberately *staying* a plate, well, that's insane. Women who do that are working against their own long-term happiness, and it doesn't make any sense to discuss that here, any more than it makes sense to discuss tactics for how to shoot yourself in the foot.

lackadaisicalily • 18 points • 14 April, 2016 02:26 AM

No woman should ever let herself be a plate.

DebatePony • 16 points • 14 April, 2016 08:27 PM

Being a plate is totally and completely avoidable by not having sex until you've developed an emotional bond with the person you are dating.

I've never been a plate. We didn't have sex until we were emotionally invested in each other, and while I can

only speak for myself, it has only made our sex life fun and exciting.

[deleted] • 10 points • 14 April, 2016 02:58 AM*

So what's the fastest and most efficient way to get out of the plate-zone and into the girlfriend-zone?

Allowing oneself to become a plate first and then trying to transition into a relationship doesn't seem like a great strategy. It's what ends in heartbreak for many women, because most plates end up staying as plates.

maya_elena • 16 points • 14 April, 2016 03:32 AM

Hmm - in my rather limited experience, and more from reading TRP posts, I'd guess that the jump from plate to partner for a girl is about as likely as besties to bedfellows is for a guy.

I'd love to ask some men about this... But I'd also say that not having sex until you're explicitly exclusive would be a workable solution....

Whisper • 2 points • 14 April, 2016 07:06 AM

I'd also say that not having sex until you're explicitly exclusive would be a workable solution....

Except it's not. First of all, explicitly exclusive is just a promise. It's not an emotional bond. You can be explicitly exclusive one week and dumped the next.

It's the bond that keeps you together that is the relationship, not some words. Words are nothing. If all you have is words, guess what you have.

Second of all, a lot of men ain't gonna go for that. Why? Because men don't like that. They only ever went for it as part of a compromise. Now that this compromise is broken, men aren't going to keep holding up their end of it.

If you want men to do something, you have to provide them with an incentive. This is about getting what you want by doing that. Not about sitting around and deciding what you want and just expecting men to give it to you, regardless of whether it is in their best interest or not.

The cornerstone of female sexual strategy cannot be the assumption that men are stupid. Because not all of them are.

maya_elena • 9 points • 15 April, 2016 01:46 PM

I'd have to respectfully disagree. Words are words, but they act as a screening tool. Yes, you can't and shouldn't police his activity away from you - and you shouldn't assume exclusivity by default or try to control him, etc.

But (unless you're ready to handle being a plate) in your first few dates, assuming the guy isn't into lying (in which case he might not be your best option anyway), I think he's more likely to be up-front with you. I think it's fairer to tell him what you want and let him leave than wasting his time and resenting him later for not committing. This approach will narrow your field of men, but presumably you are ultimately only looking for one.

Besides, not sleeping with every guy who takes you out for coffee twice is one way to keep "n count" low.

Whisper • 3 points • 15 April, 2016 05:41 PM

I'd have to respectfully disagree. Words are words, but they act as a screening tool. Yes, you can't and shouldn't police his activity away from you - and you shouldn't assume exclusivity by default or try to control him, etc.

Certainly screening is a good idea. And listening to what he says can play into that.

Besides, not sleeping with every guy who takes you out for coffee twice is one way to keep "n count" low.

Yes. One implication of the whole idea of the "Passion" article I put up a few days ago (and I'm still working on the second part) is *don't ever have sex with a man you're not passionate about*.

I think the focus on *delay* rather than *vetting* is a mistake.

I once had a (mostly sexual) relationship with a beautiful Korean PhD student at my university. She'd only had one previous partner, but I never promoted her above FWB, because the *way* she had him creeped me out. She told me she had been about 21, and figured it was about time to lose her v-card and find out what this "sex" thing was all about. So she just picked one of her male acquaintances.

Weird.

I would have been much more willing to invest in her if she'd had three or four, but they were all men she cared about and relationships she was trying to make work.

A woman's n-count is like her credit rating. A woman's sexual history is like her credit history... there's a lot of detail there that the number doesn't capture. Two women with the same n-count can be very different in the amount of trust and investment they inspire from the same man.

maya_elena • 2 points • 16 April, 2016 05:00 AM

I can't disagree and concede the point.

Whisper • 1 point • 16 April, 2016 04:28 PM

Cool. I also get the sense of some of your reservations.

I think I'm going to have to abandon the word "plate" here. It's too inflammatory, and it causes people's ears to turn off.

Where I'm trying to go with this, is that I've got this idea that right after sex first occurs, there's a danger zone where it hasn't quite cemented into a stable relationship... regardless of how long sex took to happen, or what the couple has said to each other.

It's important to describe this zone with the right metaphor in order to talk about the most effective ways to cross it. I don't have that yet.

While it has some things in common with the "plate state", talking about those clearly isn't working.

But so far what I've got is that this is the point of highest risk, for a woman, and it's inevitable... it can only be mitigated, not avoided altogether.

In the example I gave from my own past, I had a problem with her sexual history, because with the previous man, *she deliberately bailed out at that point*. In fact, she came in with the intention of doing so.

Deliberately losing her virginity to a man she didn't love, and wasn't infatuated with, struck as particularly cold and calculating... not good relationship material.

maya_elena • 2 points • 17 April, 2016 12:35 AM

I can see that. Of course, a cold, calculating wife may be an asset if you are a professor or politician.

It's also interesting how the advice on dating from someone older, say (mom, grandma) loses its utility for modern women because sex is much expected in dating, when it wasn't before.

lady_baker • 1 point • 16 April, 2016 06:59 PM

right after sex first occurs, there's a danger zone where it hasn't quite cemented into a stable relationship... regardless of how long sex took to happen, or what the couple has said to each other.

So if sex + having said words of exclusivity doesn't constitute a relationship, because words are nothing, how do you put a measure on that *bonding*? It is only in his head?

Sex shouldn't be occurring until you have a read on whether he is going to say things like "I don't want you seeing other men" and have it be a lie.

ElfFey • 2 points • 17 April, 2016 06:17 PM

I don't know why you guys are downvoting Whisper, she is correct. Every girl who has ever been dumped knows that this is true.

A man can promise you the world and sleep with you and dump you the next day or after 20 years of marriage, for whatever reason, because people have free will.

RP strategy focuses on making this *less likely to happen* (for both parties) by securing emotional investment from your mate, being the best possible mate for that person, and proper screening in the first place. But at no point in your life are you "guaranteed" a relationship.

Whisper • 5 points • 17 April, 2016 08:11 PM

I think many women are focusing too much on out-loud verbal acknowledgement, and not enough on real emotional investment.

The trick isn't to get a man to make promises. Men will say anything to get laid.

The trick is to make him *actually want a relationship*, in the same way that TRP works on making women *actually want sex*.

FreeRadical5 • 2 points • 14 April, 2016 04:36 AM*

Currently in a relationship with a girl that was a plate for ~8 months. She won me over by consistently making it a more fun experience to be around her than any other girl (I had 6 overlapping plates during this time). Eventually I just didn't see a point in pursuing other girls anymore.

But you're right, chances of this strategy working out are very low. I have more feelings for my used gloves than an average plate.

Edit: would love some input by the people down voting this comment. Is it because you disagree with my point or is it a negative emotional reaction to realizing how lowly an average plate is worth to someone with choices?

ElfFey • 2 points • 17 April, 2016 06:20 PM

Considering all the messy comments from men on here, yours is not the worst.

SirNemesis • 4 points • 14 April, 2016 06:36 PM

Right. It's like the female-equivalent of "friends first".

Whisper • 2 points • 14 April, 2016 03:22 AM

I think that's arguing semantics.

Point is, there is *some* period of time, whether people plan it that way or not, when a couple has had sexual contact, but just hasn't put in the time for a breakup to be really emotionally difficult.

So, sex, but with low emotional investment on his part. "Plate" may not be the word people like, but it carries the same hazards.

The only other option is to try to get a man to emotionally invest *before* sex. That's probably not realistic nowadays, when sex is so cheap and easy.

Sure, one can hold out for a promise, but that's not emotional investment. That's just something he says. Men lie, too. And also change their minds. A relationship is when he really doesn't want to lose you, for reasons other than sex... in other words, when bonding has occurred.

FieldLine • 15 points • 14 April, 2016 11:32 AM

A relationship is when he really doesn't want to lose you, for reasons other than sex... in other words, when bonding has occurred.

Yet developing an attachment to one particular woman is something TRP actively encourages men to avoid. The idealized 'RP Man' will *never* choose to invest in a woman the moment she looks to move past the 'plate-zone'.

All said and done, The Red Pill is a shit deal for women. You do the ladies of this sub a disservice by pretending otherwise.

[deleted] • 8 points • 15 April, 2016 03:14 AM

Errr I've been reminded multiple times that RPW do not aspire to get with TRP men. It's clear to me why now. With opposing end goals it's probably best to just give a friendly wave as our ships pass by in the other direction.

Ojisan1 • 5 points • 15 April, 2016 03:00 PM

All said and done, The Red Pill is a shit deal for women. You do the ladies of this sub a disservice by pretending otherwise.

There is sufficient reading material on the main TRP sub about LTRs. RP is not a "deal" it is being able to look at reality in an honest way and talk about what's going on in the world of male/female relationships, aka the SMP.

Search for "What Makes LTR Material" which lays out a foundation of characteristics which make an LTR woman versus a plate, and other posts which talk about how to have a good LTR with an RP mindset (LTR is also called "RP in Hard Mode").

Yet developing an attachment to one particular woman is something TRP actively encourages men to avoid. The idealized 'RP Man' will *never* choose to invest in a woman the moment she looks to move past the 'plate-zone'.

Not avoid for *everyone*, and not *never* choosing to invest. Just being really selective and aware of what it means to invest, and the risks of investing in a poor choice of a woman. The problem isn't that RP is inherently anti-LTR across the board, it's just that society has created a generation of women (and lopsided rules against men) that make only a small subset of women worth it, and so only a subset of RP men will decide to walk the more difficult path.

But there's plenty of advice on "LTR game" and plenty of RP men in LTRs. I think it does a disservice to women in general to say that RP means "never".

Quoting /u/IllimitableMan here from a longer post about why LTR's *in general* aren't worth it, but note the use of the word "most" and not "all" here in describing women, which is where your statement of "never" fails to accurately reflect on RP philosophy (bold/italics emphasis mine):

Don't get me wrong, **I think a lot of men would like a family - but it has to be with the right woman**. Not a dim, boring, narcissistic empty shell of a human-being. Personally I rather never reproduce than put my children through the pain of being raised by a stupid, horrible, whiny self-entitled woman. I don't even care if she's good to the kids, if she's a cunt to me the kids will see that and it will affect them detrimentally. That's not how I imagine raising a family, you either DO IT RIGHT or you don't bother doing it at all.

LTRs should be mother material - *most* women nowadays aren't mothers because they deserve to be, but simply because they stopped taking their birth control. Too many whores are fucking dragging kids up nowadays, not raising them right - and that's why we have all the problems we do in society. Millennials are a mess because of divorce and single mothers. I don't want to put my kids through that bullshit. **If she puts herself above family**, she's not a woman I ever see as anything other than a hole to be used for my momentary leisure.



[deleted] • 12 points • 14 April, 2016 10:57 AM*

I agree that it's unrealistic to wait for sincere emotional commitment (because that takes forever and AMALT), but don't you think that puts a lot of unnecessary risk onto the woman? It's like a lose/lose situation, either you get used for sex or you lose the guy's interest. It comes down to which is a bigger loss, I guess. Personally I'd rather limit the chances of being pumped and dumped as much as possible.

So you haven't really given me any workable strategy that would guarantee an adequate percentage of success. Being a plate for any amount of time is just playing into the male imperative at the woman's expense.

chances of this strategy working out are very low. I have more feelings for my used gloves than an average plate

A quote from this very thread. Why would any woman want to risk sharing her body with a man who thinks like this? That commenter said it took his current girlfriend eight months of prostrating herself at his feet and waiting for him to finish fucking other girls, that doesn't sound like a great deal from a female perspective. That sounds like a whole lot of wasted time and heartache over a man who doesn't value her.

Whisper • 4 points • 15 April, 2016 02:09 AM

I agree that it's unrealistic to wait for sincere emotional commitment (because that takes

forever and AMALT), but don't you think that puts a lot of unnecessary risk onto the woman?

I'm not *telling* women to do anything here.

I'm pointing out that this risk is unavoidable. All you can do is try to reduce it, or estimate that it's too great, and next the guy.

It's important, I think, that women not mistake words for a real emotional commitment. It's dangerous to say "I'm not a plate, because he said we'd be exclusive before we actually did the deed."

... and relax, and wind up breaking up two weeks later.

The super-new relationship is precarious. It carries the same risks. Instead of quibbling over what is and isn't a plate, we need to identify this danger zone, the **sex-relationship gap**, and talk about how to cross it.

[deleted] • 3 points • 14 April, 2016 02:56 PM

You're 100% correct but this is unfortunately the catch 22 modern women face due to feminism. At some point you will likely have to take a calculated risk because the majority of men who will commit emotionally before sex are beta.

aanarchist • 2 points • 16 April, 2016 04:35 AM

you reap what you sow.

Ojisan1 • 2 points • 15 April, 2016 02:21 PM

The point circles back to your previous post about the mathematics of n-counts (which was a great read).

In that post — and this was not explicitly stated, if I remember right, but it seemed to me — the thing that keeps your example women's n-counts low is *those women ended up being worth keeping around*, not because of some nice words or false promises or anything else, but because those women had made themselves into someone valued in the relationship beyond mere sexual gratification.

If all you have to offer is sex, then I guess withholding sex until commitment (i.e. marriage) would seem like a good strategy. But if you develop interests, knowledge, personality, treat a man well, support him and do these things that make a guy like being around you *in addition to sex*, then you don't have to worry about extracting some explicit (and possibly false) promise from him, or blackmail him into committing to you. *He just wants you around because he decides his life is better with you around than without you around.*

It's like Patrice O'Neal used to say about being likable versus lovable. A woman who is likable is valuable to a man. In reality, many women are able to be successful in the SMP without being likable, because a lot of men are thirsty and don't have good role models, but those women are generally going to be attractive to low-value men, or will be attractive as plates only, because they aren't desirable aside from being sexual objects. (If they are manipulative, controlling, overbearing, mean, uninteresting to talk to, etc.)

Be desirable (in all aspects that you can control), show that you're available, and then be selective. That's more or less the women's side of the RP equation, no?

Whisper • 3 points • 15 April, 2016 05:44 PM

the thing that keeps your example women's n-counts low is those women ended up being

worth keeping around,

Finally someone got the point.

If all you have to offer is sex, then I guess withholding sex until commitment (i.e. marriage) would seem like a good strategy.

Yes... except that this doesn't work anymore, because sex is no longer a scarce commodity.

The scarce commodity is femininity.

aanarchist • 2 points • 13 April, 2016 09:24 PM

question, how do you know that your man isn't a beta if he doesn't plate you?

-Anteros- • 20 points • 13 April, 2016 10:38 PM

Alpha/Beta are for describing behavior. Not people.

To answer the gist of your question: ask yourself if he could have plated you.

FleetingWish • 2 points • 15 April, 2016 02:58 PM

I believe /u/aanarchist is male.

trynarpw • 10 points • 13 April, 2016 10:40 PM

Why do you think you want to be in a relationship with an alpha? For a monogamous relationship to function there will always be a mix of alpha and beta qualities. Also, alphas don't always only plate, they just lead. Whether they do it by plating or not, doesn't make them more or less of an alpha.

If you're looking at the guys over at TRP, the alphas over there have a different goal (generally) than the women here (generally).

Ojisan1 • 6 points • 13 April, 2016 11:09 PM

If you're looking at the guys over at TRP, the alphas over there have a different goal (generally) than the women here (generally).

Best write up of this I've seen is this article describing three different types of alphas: the Bull alpha, the Bear alpha, and the Wolf alpha. Each of these types exhibits alpha characteristics, but in line with their own goals as individuals.

Bears are outside the scope of discussion because their motivation is mainly outside of the male/female SMP dynamic (MGTOW or gay, are two subtypes). But the difference between Bulls (who want to spread their seed far and wide, the ones who like to spin plates and aren't interested in an LTR) versus Wolves (who want to lead a pack, their own pack, for whom an LTR with a woman who shares his values is a goal) seems very relevant to this thread.

Heldenhaft • 1 point • 15 April, 2016 09:56 AM

@Ojisan1 thanks so much for sharing the great article! Ive learned some new things now :)

[deleted] • 2 points • 14 April, 2016 01:16 AM

[permanently deleted]

MissNissa[M] • 1 point • 14 April, 2016 02:05 AM

You can say this without being rude.

[deleted] • 1 points • 14 April, 2016 11:30 AM

[permanently deleted]

VeronicaTate • 3 points • 14 April, 2016 12:29 PM

By stating, I'm not interested in your friendship. I'm interested in a committed romantic relationship only, take it or leave it.

Well they *could*, but many men claim to be "put off" by that and women worry that they'll scare a man away by doing that. While I wish more people did this and reacted accordingly, being so blunt as to state such a thing somehow seems to come off as 'too needy', clingy or desperate.

In my last relationship I was aggressive with actual courtship and I made it known that I was sexually interested and interested in making her my girl take it or leave it

Well yes. Men are the gatekeepers of relationships and most women *want* relationships, so of course a woman would be receptive, if not thrilled to hear something like that from the start.

Why would any person male or female accept plate status even temporarily?

Because today, many people believe the proper way to "date" is to just keep sleeping with someone and "see where things go". More importantly, this is indeed how many relationships are formed. People just sort of "fall in" to relationships with the person they happened to be sleeping with casually.

Women accept plate status with the hope that one day he'll decide he wants to seriously date them.

aanarchist • 2 points • 16 April, 2016 04:30 AM

women accept plate status because feminism created trp and mgtow. men got put through the meat grinder and learned that ltrs are not something to aspire towards, rather something for her to earn.

[deleted] • 1 point • 17 April, 2016 10:09 AM

truth-brother

[deleted] • 1 points • 14 April, 2016 12:41 PM

[permanently deleted]

VeronicaTate • 1 point • 14 April, 2016 01:15 PM

You don't make a great case for women.

Just as well, I had no intention of making a case for anyone.

MGTOW looks more and more attractive every day.

Well, everyone must choose their own path in life and MGTOW is certainly an option some need to take.

[deleted] • -2 points • 14 April, 2016 10:47 AM

[permanently deleted]

lackadaisicalily • 5 points • 14 April, 2016 01:39 PM

You should never have to lie, to make a relationship work or get your way.

IsleView • 3 points • 14 April, 2016 04:28 PM

What kind of man will respect a woman and want to be in a relationship with her after finding her so willing to go against her beliefs for some D?

questioningwoman • 1 point • 14 April, 2016 05:24 PM

If played right, he won't think of it that way. He'd think "Wow she must be head over heels for me because she's willing to go that far."

aanarchist • 1 point • 18 April, 2016 11:25 AM

exactly this. a man will love a woman like that. the only reason a relationship where she's like that won't work out is because she choose poorly, a very common denominator.

DebatePony • 1 point • 14 April, 2016 08:17 PM

That's the second worst idea ever. Almost as bad as wanting to be a plate. One should never aim at creating a bond via manipulation.

Because that isn't a bond, it's a lie.

questioningwoman • 5 points • 14 April, 2016 08:23 PM

I'm just giving advice to other women. How else would a woman get past the hypocrisy of men wanting women to sleep with them ASAP yet also wanting a girl who doesn't sleep with men easily?

DebatePony • 4 points • 14 April, 2016 08:30 PM

By weeding out those who are looking for a quick...what's it called?...pump and dump?

If a man is only interested in sex and is unwilling to respect the boundaries she set, he isn't relationship material. Starting a relationship with a lie will not end well for either party involved.

aanarchist • 1 point • 18 April, 2016 11:27 AM

if a woman puts her pussy on such a pedestal that she's making him pay for it rather than out of genuine desire and affection, she isn't relationship material. you can go in circles all day with this, but at the end of the day it's all semantics. you know the right and wrong applications of this, i hope.

DebatePony • 1 point • 18 April, 2016 01:31 PM

Where did I say that the man had to pay? I don't believe I did, don't be silly.

The pussy shouldn't be put in a pedestal, nor should it be in the gutter.

One can have genuine desire and affection without jumping into bed with every Tom, Dick, and Harry.

aanarchist • 1 point • 18 April, 2016 04:54 PM

i don't think you got the point of what i said. i'm not sure you care to get the point either.

[deleted] • 1 points • 15 April, 2016 01:56 AM

[permanently deleted]

questioningwoman • 1 point • 15 April, 2016 02:24 AM

I'm talking about very low n count women actually too. Virgin is a mega status.

aanarchist • 1 point • 16 April, 2016 04:37 AM

how do you cope with the idea that every partner you have cuts your value in a man's eyes ?

questioningwoman • 1 point • 16 April, 2016 04:42 AM

I'm not promiscuous so I don't care. I'm just telling women how to beat men at the game they created.

aanarchist • 2 points • 16 April, 2016 04:48 AM

you know that the goal of an ltr is harmony and not one person beating the other, right?

questioningwoman • 3 points • 16 April, 2016 04:54 AM*

How things should be and how the world really works are 2 separate things. Do you suggest women go out there with blinders over their eyes and not win against the hypocrisy and unrealistic expectations? I understand how the under 35 men are. They demand submission because of the backlash yet don't want to give women anything in return. They want virgins yet next anyone who doesn't sleep with them in 3 dates. I'm writing survival tips for women to give them a heads up.

aanarchist • 1 point • 16 April, 2016 05:09 AM

a lot of trps have fallen off the deep end, and fallen into feminism's end goal of turning them into machines rather than people, obsessed with more and better, consumer culture with a fancy spin on it, i'll give you that.

i never suggested blinders, rather not let nihilism take over. at this rate we're moving into a mgtow vs wgtow movement, and people having children will be under legal contracts rather than relationships. you don't have to be a perfect submissive virgin, despite that being the ideal. you just have to be warm and feminine, a good person. men being salty as fuck over getting screwed over and over is going to have them set a very hard to reach standard, because they've compromised with imperfect women before and it bit them hard in the ass.