

The Final Exam

April 25, 2016 | 69 upvotes | by [Whisper](#)

[Last time](#) I spoke about the apparent contradiction between men pressing for sex (and not wanting to be put off), and men wanting partners with low n-counts. And how these are actually two manifestations of the same male desire for a passionate, involved partner.

So, it may not be hypocrisy, but it still leaves today's young woman with a problem. **She cannot simply treat men like slot machines where you pull the sex handle until you win the relationship jackpot...** because with each pull, her odds get worse. Entering into a series of sexual relationship, and simply hoping each one will be "the one that works out" is foolish.

Every time a woman goes to bed with a man, she takes a risk, and makes an investment. Getting to lifelong, happy relationship, with the best possible man, is about managing this risk, and maximizing returns on her investment.

So, answering the question, "What is there?" leads to "What shall we do about it?"

The Final Exam.

"The moment after I first bedded a girl, that is when I would meet her for the first time."

The man who once told me this knew what he was talking about... he had loved a lot of women, some for a single night, some for years, one until breast cancer finally took her in the twilight of both their lives.

It took me a while to understand what he was talking about, but I eventually did. When a young woman meets a man, she naturally asks herself *"Is he serious about me, or does he simply desire my body?"* What she often doesn't realize is that such is the power of the male sex drive that *often he doesn't know, himself.*

Simply put, many men, in the first stages of getting to know a woman, are wearing **"lust goggles"**.

Couple this with the fact that male emotions are dimmed down to the point that **many men are unaware of their emotional state** from moment to moment, and you get a man who simply **doesn't know what he wants yet**. He may say he wants a relationship. He may even believe it. He may try hard for weeks or months. But the true test is **how much emotional attachment remains when the "horny goggles" are off**.

When sexual desire is out of the equation, whatever remains is emotional attachment.

So:

- The first "moment after" is like getting your grade back on the final exam.
- You are just now seeing the results of what you did up to this point.
- He, too, is just now seeing the results.
- If he's edging towards the door, or edging you towards the door, you failed.
- If he's spooning and nuzzling, it's more likely you passed.

Nothing is finalized until those "horny goggles" come off, and promises or facebook statuses don't change this. Men do not leave you because they "didn't pinkie swear". Men leave you if they are unhappy with who you are, or what the deal is.

So, given that the goal is *the best possible relationship, with the best possible man, lasting indefinitely if possible*, then there are a few obvious implications of this metaphor.

1. Don't take tests if you don't care about the class.

Never have sex with a man if you are not passionate about him, and specifically him. If you want an orgasm, get a vibrator. If you want attention, get a dog. If you are lonely, go hang out with friends. If you want to feel pretty, get a makeover. If you're not sure you're into him, and you want to test it and see, then you're not into him, and you should stop wasting his time. Any relationship that you do not enter into out of urgent desire for that specific man is a bad risk.

2. Don't take tests if you don't know the material and haven't studied.

If "how to be a keeper" is an abstract idea to you, if you don't really know what it means to "be feminine", if you find yourself *arguing with men* instead of *charming them*, then you are not relationship-ready, and you need to be in monk mode, working on that, before you gamble on your relationship readiness.

3. Don't take tests unless you are prepared to take responsibility for the results.

If you are focusing on "searching for a commitment-minded man", "finding a trustworthy man", or "making sure he's not a player", then you are shifting responsibility. Getting to sex is men's responsibility, but getting to relationship is yours. There's a reason why we think a college student who complains that "the test was too hard" is a lazy, irresponsible lout.

4. Don't take any class that you are not good enough to pass.

Condemning men as "players" is shifting responsibility, but also be aware that any woman can have sex with a man that is out of her league for relationships. If you know your girl game isn't good enough to reel him in, let him swim past.... even though you know you could get him in bed. Some players are too good for you. Don't like that? Become better.

5. Be prepared to take the test when it's scheduled, or drop the class.

The purpose of a test is to assess your ability. If you tell the professor you need extra time to study, or you will fail, you are telling him you deserve to fail. If things are getting hot and heavy, and you have to put on the brakes and say "not yet, I need you to commit to me more", then he knows you're thinking you can't pass the test. You are telling him right up front your girl game isn't good enough, and that he won't *want* to stay without a binding promise in the mix.

6. Choose your university carefully.

Nightclub University gives tests on the first day of class. Maybe if your girl game is really tight, you can pass, but that's risky. Thirsty Beta University gives easy tests after a long class, but who the hell wants a degree from TBU? Fundamentalist Bible College doesn't give very hard tests at all, in fact, sometimes it gives you a passing grade *before* the test, but it only admits fundamentalists, and commits you to a career in the church. The Homewrecker School of Married Men lets you delay tests, but only a handful of women have ever successfully graduated, and they are not very popular.

Some good schools include Social Circle State, which gives slightly more study time and degree programs are pre-vetted for prestige and career impact. And the Workplace Crown College uses a unique model of allowing students to observe classes for some time before declaring the intent to take them. Clever students will think of other examples.

Key Takeaway points:

- Turning sex into a relationship is your responsibility, not his.
- Relationships are only truly tested after sex has begun.
- Putting men off when they think it's about time damages your prospects. (You are visibly not passionate about him.)
- Prefer nexting men over delaying them. You are either all-in, or you're out.
- Balance risks and rewards.
- The venue you meet in a man in has a lot of impact. Choose wisely.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

xertlust • 74 points • 26 April, 2016 02:14 AM*

Whisper, you seem to be obsessed with convincing RPW to sleep around more, and I'm beginning to doubt your motives.

For this reason: the "horny goggles" never come off for more than a few minutes. You should know this. Therefore your advice to women to sleep with the man to discover his true motivation is a crock.

How many men keep GFs they aren't particularly attracted to, and which mostly annoy them, because of their "horny goggles?" Because they give them sex? Their goggles allow them to look past all her deficiencies.

I imagine RPW would prefer a man with the emotional maturity to not be completely blinded by lust, so blinded that he cannot see her for who she is without first busting his nut.

These men you describe do exist. They are average, common men. But I do not imagine RPW are looking for average, common men. Why do you keep pushing them to romantically accommodate such men?

Edited 8m after posting.

[deleted] • 38 points • 26 April, 2016 02:32 AM

I agree, this post just does not reflect reality at all and is pretty TERRIBLE advice. I mean:

"If things are getting hot and heavy, and you have to put on the brakes and say "not yet, I need you to commit to me more", then he knows you're think you can't pass the test. You are telling him right up front your girl game isn't good enough"

Really? The marriage-minded patriarch kind of men RPW want will respect that she's too prudent to jump into bed with strangers, any man who doesn't is the wrong sort of guy for a RPW and should be nexted!

" If you are focusing on "searching for a commitment-minded man", "finding a trustworthy man", or "making sure he's not a player", then you are shifting responsibility."

So RPW are not supposed to search for commitment-minded men? What kind of men *are* we supposed to search for?

The whole post seems hamstery. "Don't screen for commitment-minded men, put out immediately, but you better magically make sure he sticks with you forever (somehow, despite only knowing him long enough to feel "passion" aka tingles before jumping into bed) because if not you're now a ruined slut."

The guys in this subreddit seem personally invested in spinning a fantasy analysis of how things work, when it's just not true. The best advice for women will always be to screen men carefully, behave modestly and chastely, and get commitment and exclusivity before sex.

[deleted] 29 April, 2016 12:40 AM*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 1 May, 2016 02:30 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 1 May, 2016 02:43 AM*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 1 May, 2016 02:59 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 1 May, 2016 03:09 AM*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 1 May, 2016 03:11 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 1 May, 2016 03:15 AM*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 1 May, 2016 03:20 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 1 May, 2016 03:03 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 1 May, 2016 03:12 AM*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 1 May, 2016 03:19 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 1 May, 2016 03:35 AM*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 1 May, 2016 03:37 AM

[permanently deleted]

SkylarWyte • 49 points • 26 April, 2016 02:39 AM

Whisper, you seem to be obsessed with convincing RPW to sleep around more, and I'm beginning to doubt your motives.

I agree. He has proved himself invested in the success of men, not women, again and again and should not be allowed to continue abusing this space. He is *clearly* violating the rule that states men may not give advice intended to advance their own sexual strategy.

Thirtysomethink • 6 points • 26 April, 2016 01:37 PM*

I think /u/Whisper is producing stellar content that does indeed serve women's interests and that we as a sub should be appreciative of his contributions. I made a lengthy comment below explaining how my own life experience conforms with his advice in this post.

However, it seems to me that Whisper's advice is mostly applicable to the subset of women who (1) seek to land a man with a lot of alpha traits and (2) have the good judgment to resist the advances of men whom they do *not* stand a chance of landing.

Women who are seeking a beta provider, or whose record proves that they are prone to succumb to

wishful thinking when a man who is out of their league shows interest, would probably do better to withhold sex at least for a little while in order to make sure they are in fact dealing with a man who is sufficiently beta and not likely to plate or next them.

/u/Whisper, would you agree with that caveat to your advice, or not?

SkylarWyte15 points 26 April, 2016 09:14 PM* [recovered]

I think /u/Whisper is producing stellar content that does indeed serve women's interests and that we as a sub should be appreciative of his contributions.

I'm sure you do, dear. It's a natural tendency to endorse advice that validates our poor life decisions.

Thirtysomethink • 7 points • 26 April, 2016 09:47 PM

Actually, as explained elsewhere in this thread, I've never had reason to regret sleeping with a man (all three of them).

Maybe you should start /r/RandomActsofCondescension to find an appropriate outlet for your superiority complex.

SkylarWyte13 points 26 April, 2016 09:58 PM [recovered]

And you are in fact, in your thirties and unmarried? With a man who left another woman he was in a committed relationship with because he was more attracted to you?

That's sure to work out very well for you. I'm positive you won't be alone in your 40s, 50s and 60s. You're still going to be pulling top tier alphas then :)

Thirtysomethink • 3 points • 26 April, 2016 11:13 PM

First, I agree with you that your comments should not be censored. The mod who removed it has accommodated my request to reapprove it, since I was the target of the "insult".

Now for my reply:

That's correct, but you are leaving out important context, including the rationale for our not marrying.

You also fail to address my evaluation of the two options open to me:

Staying with a man I am still madly in love with even as we approach a decade together, even though he will not make me a promise to stay with me no matter what happens, and accepting the risk involved.

Giving up my connection to this man voluntarily and downgrading to a relationship with a man who is beta enough that I can be reasonably sure he will never leave me

Am I to understand you would have me pick option 2?

Or do you just want me to *insist* that my current partner marry me, and if so, why do you believe that a piece of paper will magically make him less likely to leave me as I age?

Haven't you seen the divorce rates?

All in all, it seems to me you are demonstrating very little empathy with the tradeoffs faced by women in relationships with alphas. I wonder why that is?

SkylarWyte • 13 points • 27 April, 2016 08:26 AM

First of all, I am sorry I was snippy with you. If you felt insulted by the jab, I

apologize for that. I could have found a better way to convey that I feel your comments come from... a perspective of youthful optimism that maybe doesn't acknowledge how much more difficult mate acquisition is for women as they age than to make a jab that implied you are naive.

Am I to understand you would have me pick option 2?

Absolutely not. It sounds like you are happy in the situation you are in, so who am I to judge? I am simply pointing out that I think it is best for women, when possible, to avoid putting herself in a spot where leaving her as she ages/trading in for a younger model has no risks for him.

why do you believe that a piece of paper will magically make him less likely to leave me as I age?

Financial incentives. Social incentives. Family incentives. Religious incentives if applicable.

I am seriously curious what your plan is for your 40s, 50s, and 60s. Do you assume you will still be together? Do you plan to keep enough of your finances separate that if he walked out one day you would still be able to stay afloat? Will you buy a home together? Cars? Save one retirement account, or two?

I'm sure you're wonderful and will keep your man happy as you both age, but surely you know he might still be tempted away by a pretty, young thing. After all, he was already tempted away from another woman by you! I don't think a marriage contract keeps a man loyal and around, but I do think it's an incentive, and if it's not a big enough one it provides a clean, legal path whereby a woman can be guaranteed she won't literally end up kicked out of a home she's lived in for the last 30 years and replaces with a newer model. And I think to pass up on that incentive *willingly* if all other factors are equal would be foolish for a woman. It's like buying a car without insurance... But for your whole life!

So, while I think it's wonderful that you and your man are happy, it concerns me to hear you advocate it to young women, unless you also have a plan for how they can build a paired life that can be safely and instantly split without any legal structure to do so. I would be very interested in posts from you on things like: How you would buy a home together. Who's name goes on the mortgage? The deed? How you would structure bank accounts? Savings accounts? Retirement accounts? How you would deal with potential time off work for having children? Many men cheat when a wife is pregnant or recently delivered (I can provide a study on this if you like), so what if he were to throw you out right after baby? How would you put a roof over your head? Etc?

My point here is that it seems like without the marriage contract building a life together would be very difficult and risky. But if you have a plan to do it, I want to hear!

[deleted] • 6 points • 27 April, 2016 11:02 AM

Great response.

Thirtysomethink • 1 point • 27 April, 2016 11:03 AM

I don't care about insults, but I'm glad you have now upped your game from the mere expression of condescension to engaging in a straightforward discussion of our differences of opinion. As a general note, I really think this subreddit would stand to benefit if everyone would take it upon themselves to engage in less huffing and puffing, because it's all too easy to kid oneself, as you seemed to do at first, that just giving someone else attitude is enough. It is not. If one wants to be taken seriously, one must engage with the other party's arguments - as you have now started to do. :)

Unfortunately I have to begin my reply by repeating information I have already provided which you failed to address, namely that I do not want children and that I am financially independent of my partner and do not own any assets together with him. Clearly, then, my situation is different from that of a woman who wants children, because there is absolutely no reason for my partner and I to get married except for the symbolic value. And in the comment you have already read, I explained the rationale for not getting married just for the sake of the symbolic value. So I maintain that it's a non-issue whether I am married or not. The fundamentals of my situation - notably the lack of children and the risk involved in the fact that he will still be a high-value man well into my middle age - would remain exactly the same if we were married.

You mention social incentives, but in today's society (at least where we live), divorce is so ubiquitous as to be devoid of stigma. Conversely, it is not uncommon for couples to remain unmarried, similar to the aunt and uncle of /u/nargin0, and it is common for couples who do get married not to marry until after having their first child (i.e. they do it for financial reasons, not for symbolic reasons). In our social circle and in our families, no one has ever questioned the fact that we haven't married or encouraged us to get married. This is the only place anyone has ever raised an eyebrow. Now, I realize that one's mileage may vary, but that happens to be the cultural context for my situation, and people here should judge my unmarried status with that context in mind.

Next, is my *fundamental* situation (i.e. being in a childless relationship with an alpha male of my own age) risky? Of course it is, and it is fatuous of you to talk about the risk as if though I were not aware of it when I have in fact addressed it at length. You must not be making much effort to read and understand my comments, which is a pity, because people are generally able to contribute greater value to a discussion when they actually think about what they are replying to.

Let's turn back time to when I was in my mid-twenties. Back then I had the world at my feet, but my choice was ultimately the same as it is now: Do I choose a risky childless relationship with an alpha I am madly in love with, or do I make a (perceived) safer choice in order to minimize the risk involved of being alone in my 40s, 50s, 60s? Now, keep in mind that I am a woman who has never wanted children. What would you have had me do back then, exactly?

And don't cop out again by repeating that coy "who am I to judge?" shtick. You're claiming I am not qualified to give advice because I have made poor life decisions, so by all means let's hear how you think I should have played the hand I was dealt in life. Would you have me bear children despite my complete lack of desire for them? If so, would you have me get pregnant by the love of my life against his

will, or would you have me reject the love of my life and instead settle down with a beta provider? Or would you perhaps have me remain childless, but reject the love of my life in favor of seeking out a replacement for him who is 10 years older or more and thus less likely to leave me as I reach middle age? I'm all ears and eager for you to back up your condescension with the wisdom that surely underpins it!

Until then, I posit that I am as qualified to give advice about how to end up in committed relationships with high-value men as anyone here.

SkylarWyte • 6 points • 27 April, 2016 11:16 AM

I feel that you haven't really answered any of my questions beyond the child part. Ok, you don't want kids. Do you want to own a home? Save for retirement? Purchase vehicles? Etc.? If you get in an accident who will make medical decisions for you? Will you give him your power of attorney so he can? Or do you have plans to have friends fill these roles usually reserved for a spouse? All of these things look small in your 20s and 30s and become very important later in life when your parents are gone and you need family. If so, well, alright, but I feel that is not what very many women want.

CrazyHorseInvincible[M] • 3 points • 26 April, 2016 10:16 PM

Do not go through users' posting histories looking for ways to belittle them. That kind of nasty, spiteful behavior is precisely the kind of thing that is not welcome here:

The community values truths, even harsh and unpleasant ones, over pretty or comforting lies. However, this is not allowed to cross the line into personal abuse, either of individuals or directed towards the community as a whole.

You may (are encouraged to) call others out for bad or foolish behavior when you do so with the intention of helping them to realize their mistake and do better. However, harsh speech motivated by personal rancor, or direct insults for any reason, are not allowed.

SkylarWyte12 points 26 April, 2016 10:34 PM **[recovered]**

Do not go through users' posting histories looking for ways to belittle them.

I did no such thing! She posted that in this very thread, as proof of her "success" with Whisper's strategy. Pointing out that I don't think that success will be lifelong is very valid if she is using that success as a basis for advising other women to follow her path. Pointing out that she will not be able to get top tier alphas to leave other women for her in her 40s, 50s and 60s is pure fact.

Current partner: We met through mutual friends and became friends while I was still reasonably happy with guy #2, so by the time we were both single and finally got together (each of us thought the other wasn't interested and held off on expressing interest, so it took us a looong time), we knew each other very well. Once again what happened was that I made my intentions clear, he broke up with his girlfriend (took him two months) and then came over to my place about a week later. I was ready to have sex that night, but he wanted to take his time and savor

the process of becoming lovers, so it actually took us three dates to consummate the relationship. He and I are still together. LESSON 1: Did not delay sex. Was rewarded with LTR. LESSON 2: Can confirm once again: Social Circle State is a good school. :)

CrazyHorseInvincible[M] • 4 points • 26 April, 2016 11:03 PM

I find your comments to be deliberately inflammatory, rather than intended to help the person whose behavior you are criticizing.

I understand that your opinions are strongly held, but if you find yourself that angry, I'm going to have to ask that you take a few hours to do something else, and cool down, before replying. Because you are putting out fire with gasoline.

CrazyHorseInvincible[M] • 0 points • 26 April, 2016 10:13 PM

If someone personally insults you (as happened here), rather than engaging with them, please hit the report button so a mod can remove it.

Thirtysomethink • 9 points • 26 April, 2016 11:02 PM

Wait, hang on - I thought this subreddit was trying to adopt the give-it-to-me-straight tone of the other (male-dominated) TRP subreddits? I don't need to be coddled and I don't appreciate communities that rely on censorship of comments like those of SkylarWyte, instead of simply relying on downvotes and counter-arguments. I would prefer that her comment be reapproved so I can submit the reply I have already written. Will you respect my preference, since I was the target of the "insult"?

CrazyHorseInvincible[M] • 6 points • 26 April, 2016 11:06 PM

In TRP, our standard practice is to remove personal arguments ("pissing contests") once they become heated. We draw a distinction between that and giving someone a wake up call.

But if you want it back, it's back.

Thirtysomethink • 3 points • 26 April, 2016 11:11 PM

Thank you! :)

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 April, 2016 10:09 PM

Your comments are verging on personal insults, be careful.

SkylarWyte • 12 points • 26 April, 2016 10:36 PM

Are you going to delete Whisper's comment where he told the other poster

I'm beginning to doubt your reading comprehension.

Or are the rules just for women around her?

Pointing out that she likes Whisper's advice because it validates her past choices is very valid to the discussion.

[deleted] • 3 points • 26 April, 2016 10:37 PM*

There's a difference between pointing things out and being rude, 'dear'.

[Edit]: The rudeness was not in tone, but in the personal nature of the comments.

SkylarWyte • 7 points • 26 April, 2016 10:40 PM

Ok, I won't call anyone 'dear.' Seems like a very small condescension given Whisper is saying people can't read, but I will follow the rules.

Whisper[S] • 6 points • 26 April, 2016 11:27 PM*

/u/Whisper, would you agree with that caveat to your advice, or not?

I'd take it a step further.

A man is a bad choice if a woman is not passionate about him. But there are plenty of men a woman might be passionate about who are very bad choices.

These men are best to avoid *before* developing attraction to them. In fact, before even meeting them. That's one of the reasons why venue selection is important.

If we take it as given that estrogen produces emotional volatility, precisely the sort of volatility that TRP talks about using for seduction, then a good plan isn't "clench your teeth and have self-control", it's "*avoid dangerous temptations*"

Plans that require a high degree of self-control are somewhat akin to abstinence-only sex education. They work if people follow them.... but they don't. (Abstinence-only sex education is statistically known not to work).

But these plans *appear* sound, because any time they don't work, we blame the person, not the plan.

"Oh, you were slightly drunk, and wildly attracted, and you had sex on the with someone off Tindr the first time you met in person? You slut! Why didn't you follow the plan, and wait for X number of dates, then get him to change his facebook status, then coolly and calmly decide if it's sex time?"

The plan didn't protect her against temptation, but when she succumbed, we don't call the plan out for that.

A better plan is *Don't use Tindr. Use your social circle instead. That way, when you succumb to temptation, it won't be with some random, but with someone more appropriate, who you have a better chance of making things stick with.*

Wisdom means knowing you are fallible.

Whisper[S] • 5 points • 26 April, 2016 06:40 PM*

Whisper, you seem to be obsessed with convincing RPW to sleep around more, and I'm beginning to doubt your motives.

You've interpreted an article saying "sleep around less" as "sleeping around more", and I'm beginning to doubt your reading comprehension.

The whole thing is a long list of "don't sleep with him if". Look, let me help you out by breaking it into smaller pieces.

Imagine a young girl of about 20, and three groups of men. A, B, C.

C are the men she is not interested in. (Large group.)

B are the men she has some interest in, but is capable of controlling herself with, saying "not yet" to, etc.

(Smaller group.)

A are the ones who make her forget all her resolve to say that. The ones she can't say no to. (Tiny group.)

Obviously, C is right out. Equally obviously, A is in. Otherwise, they wouldn't be part of group A.

The question is about B. "Don't have sex until after X dates", or "don't have sex until you're in a relationship" is a strategy for having sex with group B.

I'm recommending: don't have sex with group B at all. Reject more, reject early, reject often. Focus all time and energy on *keeping* someone from group A.

You think I'm saying "turn 'not yet' into *yes*". I'm saying "turn 'not yet' into *not ever*".

[deleted] • 27 points • 26 April, 2016 08:40 PM

And this is how you make an alpha widow.

Popsicle666-2 points 27 April, 2016 05:52 AM [recovered]

He doesn't have to be Alpha, he does have to meet high expectations. Are we hamstering away high expectations because we simply *must* disagree with Whisper?

[deleted] • 17 points • 27 April, 2016 07:03 AM

No, we're disagreeing with whisper because he's wrong.

[deleted] • 20 points • 26 April, 2016 09:23 PM

This is literally how alpha widows are created. Choosing based on "tingles" above all else. Having sex immediately with complete disregard to screening for any good qualities.

SkylarWyte • 25 points • 26 April, 2016 09:24 PM

A are the ones who make her forget all her resolve to say that. The ones she can't say no to. (Tiny group.)

This group doesn't exist. It's pure male hamster fantasy to think there is a group of men out there so hot women literally cannot say no to them. Look at any long term study on cheating patterns. Men cheat more than women. This is because women, unlike men, are *very capable* of saying no even when attracted. Women are not driven by a fundamental, undeniable need for sex like men are. And this type of lack of basic understanding is exactly why men should not give sexual strategy advice to women.

Or would you say all those women who have not cheated on a partner simply have never met a group A man yet? And if that's the case, that they are so very, very rare, should single women really wait for them?

[deleted] • 3 points • 26 April, 2016 10:35 PM

This is because women, unlike men, are very capable of saying no even when attracted.

He was speaking in hyperbole. And men actually are able to say 'no' as well, even if wildly attracted.

SkylarWyte • 8 points • 27 April, 2016 08:27 AM

Well, good. If it's just hyperbole and the woman is actually capable of waiting until she knows the man, then she should do that. It's better strategy for her.

[deleted] • 10 points • 27 April, 2016 12:51 AM*

Yes! I tried to reason myself into a lasting relationship with a great guy that I wasn't wild about. It doesn't work.

Attraction wanes naturally, so give yourself a fighting chance. From the onset, make sure there is a FIRE, not a couple of sticks rubbing together to make smoke.

Attraction is not negotiable.

Rarerestofbeans • 2 points • 31 December, 2021 01:51 PM*

I know this is an old comment but I just wanted to add that this theory that you've created is not acknowledging a crucial part of a woman's biology and psyche. Which is that when we find a man in Group A, and sleep with him the moment we get an inclination to, there's a high likelihood that we haven't properly vetted them and will attach.

There's all this talk of becoming an Alpha widow and not being successful in attaining commitment after the "final exam" but very little discussion about making sure that you're choosing the right partner to commit to.

We are the gatekeepers of sex, not because we need to make sure that this man is absolutely head over heels for us and wants to stay long afterwards. No, that's a fear-based approach that many hurt women utilize because they've elevated approval above their own need to choose.

For a lot of us, sex and commitment go hand to hand. Because once we have sex with a man, we are committed. So it's important that we do our due diligence.

You briefly mention dating within your social circle as the best route to dating so as maybe to combat attaching to someone you haven't known for long.

I can absolutely see why that might work. But you are also talking to a group of hypergamous women. And honestly, I don't have not one man (I'm 22, boy might be more appropriate) that I have interest in. Most of us are looking to date men within a social class a step up from ours, a lot of our dating takes place with men that we need adequate time to get to know since we're starting from Day 0.

Ultimately, it's up to the women to choose when to conduct the final exam. And us protectors of our emotional well being, and physical health both present and future, it's most sensible that we do that when we have properly vetted the opposite sex.

Because we know that once we do, we're opening a can of worms of emotional and hormonal commitment.

TheYellowPill • -5 points • 26 April, 2016 03:09 AM

Are we reading the same post? 5 out of 6 points start with "Don't take tests..." and "Choose your university carefully." She even acknowledges that each pull of the slot machine with a new partner devalues a woman.

Whisper, if you hadn't mentioned that a man had told you this revelation then I would've assumed you were a man.

Sometimes men think with the other head and he does talk. Men have hamsters too. "Bro, give her a chance. You don't know, this might be the one." Nah I really don't think she is. "You're so pessimistic. She's cute and look you're having a good time right?" I guess. "Cool, I'm going to make a move."

[Moments later]

Shit why did I do that. Hey, I need more of your motivation talk. "Nah bro, I'm going to sleep ZzzzzZzz." Fuck. I hope I didn't lead her on. I didn't know if I wanted a relationship with her. Now I know for sure.

xertlust • 15 points • 26 April, 2016 03:28 AM*

He is a man, as am I. The "test" he is referring to is your sleeping with a man you are attracted to, as soon as possible, in order that he may see your qualities objectively without the distraction of desire. In order to even take the test you must sleep with the man, and since you should know if you are compatible (at least from his perspective) sooner than later, you should sleep with him sooner than later, to see if you "pass."

This seems to benefit the man more than the woman, who would quickly raise her N count right off the bedpost. And hey, what do you know, I like things that benefit my sex life. But I don't like them in discussions of woman's sexual strategy. I could very well be wrong in my assessment, for I am not a woman.

TheYellowPill • 0 points • 26 April, 2016 03:38 AM*

Again are we reading the same post?

RPW, do **not** sleep with a man if you don't think he's captain material. He's not saying take the test sooner. He's saying you don't get your grades back until after the test.

I personally know that I want a relationship with a woman if I want her to stay after having sex, and not a moment sooner. I might be 90% sure before, but never 100%.

[EDIT] To further clarify, even a man who gives his commitment thinking he wants a relationship with her won't truly know 100% until after. Maybe I'm just projecting my anecdotal views and other men do know for sure 100% before having sex.

But at least with the committed guy, you have a significantly higher chance of staying together because he enjoyed your company for so long even without sex. Which is why I suggest women try for commitment first. It's still not a guarantee of long term. People break up for various reasons.

xertlust • 15 points • 26 April, 2016 03:48 AM*

That's fair. But that's not what Whisper is saying. That last 10% for you is probably how she was in bed, your sexual compatibility, right? What he is saying is that men, or at least men of his class, are so blinded by lust that they are unable to determine if she has the qualities and virtues necessary for something serious, until after his lust is satiated. And then I guess they are again blinded 6 minutes later when they are horny again. I wonder, in Whisper's mind, how many "tests" does it take?

Edited to 12 minutes.

Upon reflection, re-edited to 6 minutes.

[deleted] • 27 points • 26 April, 2016 10:34 AM

"5. Be prepared to take the test when it's scheduled, or drop the class." No, the woman is the one running the test because she is the gatekeeper of sex. The man decides if the test (her terms and conditions for access to sex) is worth sitting through or if he should walk out.

SkylarWyte • 25 points • 26 April, 2016 11:53 AM

Yes what Whisper is trying so hard to push on young women is not even Red Pill! He is saying that because he is upset about the *laws Of the land* (marriage laws, his point about women ruining the contract) he wants to invalidate *natural law*. No more will women be the gatekeepers of sex! From now on, men decide when sex *and* commitment happen..... because of legislation he doesn't like?

Good luck with that. Sounds about as likely to happen as a beta bucks guys wife being turned on by his weak behavior just because they have a marriage contract.

The whole point of Red Pill, and what makes it so special, is the desire to look past the way we think the world *should be* (in this case Whisper thinks women should have to give up sex immediately to atone for divorce laws) to what it actually IS! And in this case the reality is that men are the gatekeepers of commitment, and women sex. You can't change that natural law to penalize one group.

It's actually a bit funny to even think of trying.

[deleted] • 15 points • 26 April, 2016 02:12 PM*

"From now on, men decide when sex and commitment happen."

Which we know isn't true unless they are pursuing girls who they consider way beneath them, and the girl has low self esteem and desperately wants to keep him so she puts out whenever he says. Don't think many RPW will want to be that girl.

Women decide when sex will happen (immediately, couple dates, after marriage) and men decide IF commitment at all will happen from his end.

SkylarWyte • 11 points • 26 April, 2016 09:16 PM

it's ridiculous. Just as ridiculous as saying he doesn't like free speech laws so he's going to make women stop being attracted to Alpha males. Laws and culture have nothing to do with how sex and relationships work. Those things were coded long, long ago and we cannot change them. TRP is supposed to be about accepting that, and working within that framework.

redpillschool • 3 points • 27 April, 2016 06:08 AM

I'm not sure he's pushing *incorrect* information, but I'm not sure it's leading to a better strategy- I detailed it below:

https://www.reddit.com/r/RedPillWomen/comments/4gfzqa/the_final_exam/d2j0uo7

[deleted] 27 April, 2016 06:20 AM

[permanently deleted]

MissNissa[M] • 2 points • 27 April, 2016 07:19 PM

If you have a problem with someone's comment, make a counter argument. If you think they are breaking the rules, use the report button.

Nullberri • 1 point • 27 April, 2016 10:35 PM

I read it a little differently. I read it as, if a man is pushing for sex and you reject him at this point then from his point of view you are not urgently desiring him (From the previous post), and he should move on. Alternatively if a man is pushing for sex and the woman is not ready, she should also let him go for the same reason.

larrythetomato • 0 points • 27 April, 2016 07:21 PM

This isn't from the man's perspective, it is written for the woman's perspective, the test isn't sex but what comes after sex: creating a lasting relationship.

Icanneverremembermy • 8 points • 28 April, 2016 06:38 PM

Ehh... after reading through all of the comments here I guess I understand what you're getting at. Only ever try to date guys in group A. Right? Since group A is already hyper selective your count will never get high even by having sex before commitment, basically, right?

I partially agree with the women here who say this is a recipe for an alpha widow. While this could very well work as a potential sexual strategy for women it is very risky in that regard.

Now my main objection is... Does this "group A" actually exist? This magical elite group of men that I just can't say no to. Obviously I can only speak anecdotally, but I've never experienced attraction to anyone at that level. So naturally I am skeptical that it's possible outside the world of "romance" novels.

DebatePony • 13 points • 26 April, 2016 02:31 PM

I...disagree. And here is why:

"1. Don't take tests if you don't care about the class."

Wait, why would I be taking a test (sex) without being enrolled in the class (relationship). Are you seriously suggesting that one should take a test before they have even enrolled? That is bad, bad advice (IMO).

"2. Don't take tests if you don't know the material and haven't studied."

One is able to disagree and not resort to *fighting* about something. Having conversations or being able to verbally spar *can be* a great way to charm a man. Just because a woman isn't a wilting flower who is ready to drop all their beliefs about subjects at the slightest hint her SO (lol even potential SO) has a differing opinion, doesn't mean she isn't ready for a relationship. In fact, I would say a woman who knows what she wants and doesn't want in a relationship, and is able to state so clearly, is the one who is most ready for a relationship.

"3. Don't take tests unless you are prepared to take responsibility for the results."

Again advocating women taking tests (sex) without actually being enrolled (commitment). It is a woman's responsibility to obtain commitment before entering into sexual relations.

"4. Don't take any class that you are not good enough to pass."

I am honestly a little confused about this point. Would you mind elaborating?

"5. Be prepared to take the test when it's scheduled, or drop the class."

I would say that the only thing a man knows when a woman puts the breaks on and then states that she needs a relationship before continuing, is that she wants a commitment before continuing. If he then decides that she secretly meant she was not attracted to him, well that is on him. How silly.

"6. Choose your university carefully."

I agree, however when one is applying to college, one does not take any tests until after they have been accepted, sure there are applications and (sometimes) interviews, but the final say lies with the applicant. So again, tests (sex) after enrolling (relationship).

This advice really seems like it would benefit men more than women.

EDIT: typing is hard

[deleted] • 0 points • 26 April, 2016 10:03 PM

I feel like you've missed the point on a couple of these. My understanding is that the analogy is as follows:

1. 'Being enrolled' is being on track for a relationship, maybe being exclusive but not yet committed
2. Taking a test is 'having sex for the first time'
3. Passing is 'being in a committed relationship.'

It seems like Whisper's contention is that, even if a man has said you're in an exclusive relationship, the first

sexual encounter is when a man realizes whether REALLY he wants to commit and continue exclusively or wants to stop the relationship, because at that point the 'lust goggles' are off.

That makes sense to me - lots of men will say things about being exclusive before sex because women want to hear that, but after sex, when the thrill of the chase is over, they may no longer be interested. So even if you're confident you've gotten his commitment, you don't really know his intentions until after you have had sex.

1. Don't take any class that you are not good enough to pass."

If you're a 6, you can probably have sex with a 9 (take the test) but you're not going to get into a committed relationship with him (pass). Remember that men's standards for sex are much lower than their standards for an LTR. Don't have sex (take the test) with a 9 if, realistically, your SMVs are so disparate that you won't be able to have an LTR (pass).

What do you think?

DebatePony • 4 points • 27 April, 2016 12:10 PM*

Thank you for taking the time to respond, sorry it took me so long to get back to you.

I guess my biggest problem is the idea of "lust goggles" ruling a man so that he is unable to think rationally about a relationship before he gets it in. And then only after he has gotten off is he able really think about if he wants to continue or jump ship. It seems to me that those type of men are not relationship material in the first place. This is not to shift responsibility, but calling a spade a spade.

Now, I am not saying that sex isn't important, because it really, really is, but I think that the idea that "men are unable to think rationally about a relationship before sex because they are too horny" is a disservice to the male gender.

I very well could be wrong about this because I have very little practical dating experience in today's world.

Thank you for explaining the "Don't take a class..." and for the most part I would agree. While I understand that it is possible for a man's standards for sex *to be* lower than his standards for LTR, I do not know why he would stick around a chick and give the "exclusive" title before sex if he were only looking for a roll in the hay. I think an extensive vetting process would weed those men out pretty quickly.

EDIT

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 April, 2016 12:21 PM

Yeah, I agree with you on that - hopefully, most decent men are able to think clearly enough even when they're lust-crazed that they can tell if a relationship has serious potential or not. The world is not full of decent men, though. But I agree, that isn't relationship material to me.

And yes, more vetting is always a good idea. Whisper's contention seems to be that men now don't have to wait around while women vet, which I'd disagree with as a fundamental principle. Maybe they can get easier sex from lower value women, but that's not that attractive to many people.

DebatePony • 3 points • 27 April, 2016 12:47 PM

Of course no man has to wait around during a woman's vetting process. That's kinda the point. Men who are unwilling or unable to stick it out through the process automatically fail and encouraging women to lower their standards because "Oh noes, he might leave me if I do no put

out" is silly and not a good female dating strategy.

Popsicle666-3 points 27 April, 2016 06:30 AM [recovered]

You only read the headlines. Please read the whole article rather than manipulating his words.

DebatePony • 5 points • 27 April, 2016 10:21 AM

I did read the whole write up, I just quoted the headlines. Please don't make assumptions.

Thirtysomethink • 9 points • 26 April, 2016 11:22 AM*

Thank you for this excellent follow-up to your Passion post which was also excellent!

As a woman, I agree completely with all six points. I've had three relationships and this is how they went:

First guy: I was 16, he was 18, we started dating almost immediately after I met him and dated for a month during we had about eight heavy makeout sessions. I held off on sex because I was a virgin (he was not), and I did not want to have sex before I was so comfortable that my passion was overriding my nervousness. When he finally did penetrate me it was spontaneous because I got so excited I just couldn't wait any longer. **LESSON:** Yes, I delayed sex, but not because I asked for commitment, but for a reason he could understand and which only served to highlight my passion as it came to the forefront and overshadowed my nervousness. We ended up dating for two and a half years until I ended the relationship.

Second guy: I was 19, he was 22. We met at mutual friends' party and hung out a bit with other people present. He was in another relationship at the time (but was already thinking about ending it). I asked him to come over and spend an evening with me and he did. There was no touching, just a lot of talking, but the sexual tension was palpable and I made my intentions clear, then he said "I have to talk to Tara" and left me, broke up with her, and came back to me a week later. We had sex that night (with no promise of exclusivity or commitment) and stayed together for seven years until I ended the relationship. **LESSON 1:** Did not delay sex. Was rewarded with LTR. **LESSON 2:** Meeting someone through mutual friends is indeed a good way to meet.

Current partner: We met through mutual friends and became friends while I was still reasonably happy with guy #2, so by the time we were both single and finally got together (each of us thought the other wasn't interested and held off on expressing interest, so it took us a looong time), we knew each other very well. Once again what happened was that I made my intentions clear, he broke up with his girlfriend (took him two months) and then came over to my place about a week later. I was ready to have sex that night, but *he* wanted to take his time and savor the process of becoming lovers, so it actually took us three dates to consummate the relationship. He and I are still together. **LESSON 1:** Did not delay sex. Was rewarded with LTR. **LESSON 2:** Can confirm once again: Social Circle State is a good school. :)

So in all three cases, I never asked for commitment (and keep in mind these were attractive, in-demand guys for whom there was heavy competition). I assumed they would *want* to commit to me, and simply by making it my business to make my company enjoyable, I was proven right.

I want to add that my presumption that they would find me worth committing to has extended to a non-possessiveness that I have been explicitly praised for by my last two partners. I have never done anything to restrain my partner from talking with other women or asked him to report back to me about what he talks about with them. My attitude has reflected this saying: "If you love someone, set them free, and if they come back to you, they are yours to keep." My current partner is free to spend time alone with other women and he even used to maintain a friendship with his ex-girlfriend (they stopped since she couldn't handle not being together with him anymore). He has told me that the freedom he feels in knowing I was fine even with that is extremely attractive. He resents feeling chained down, so ironically, not being possessive has helped keep him committed

to me.

In sum, I would say my personal experience vouches for the truth of what /u/Whisper is saying. **I've gone all-in with each of the three men I've slept with without requiring commitment first, and in each case this has resulted in an LTR (two of which were ended by me and one of which is still going strong).**

Caveat: You may or may not agree that my current LTR is a good one. You can read more about it [here](#).

Edit: A note on point 4. I haven't been single much, but I've been single for long enough to have experienced being hit on by men I found sexy but who gave me the sense that I wasn't their type and I would be plated or nexted. For some reason I was never tempted by that. I've only gone for men where I could sense that they enjoyed my company and wanted to spend more time with me even if it didn't lead to sleeping with me. Pride has worked in my favor, I guess.

InquisitorCupcake • 7 points • 26 April, 2016 04:03 AM

I liked this post because I liked a lot of the advice in between the lines.

What I took out of it is that a woman should be careful about sleeping around and knowing what she wants in a relationship and to choose the man carefully.

I do know that a lot of men focus on sex, but there are commitment minded men that would respect a woman's boundaries to delay sexual gratification until she feels the commitment is there.

Edit: A word was misspelled.

TheYellowPill • 6 points • 26 April, 2016 04:24 AM*

That's exactly what I took from his post as well. I'm so confused how other people didn't comprehend that. This is advice I'd give my little sister. So in plain English (not between the lines).

1. Don't have sex unless you think he's captain material.
2. Don't have sex if you don't know how to be a first mate (feminine, charming, nurturing, supportive, pleasant). Otherwise a good captain won't keep a bad first mate.
3. Don't have sex unless you're willing to accept the responsibility.
4. Don't have sex with a guy out of your league (not common but there are positive relationships where one is significantly better looking than the other). This is generally good advice because, if you don't know, guys have lower standards for who he will have sex with vs. higher standards for who he will marry.
5. Before putting yourself in a situation to potentially have sex i.e. alone at his place Netflixing with drinks, make sure you're ready to.
6. Where you go looking for a captain is important. Parties, clubs, and bars are more likely to end in just sex and not a relationship. Higher chances of relationship when meeting in your social group or work.

[deleted] • 12 points • 26 April, 2016 04:48 AM

Don't have sex unless you think he's captain material.

Except how are you supposed to do that when you're not supposed to be "searching for commitment minded men" and are supposed to put out immediately without securing any commitment first?

TheYellowPill • 9 points • 26 April, 2016 06:10 AM

Look for those things, but don't let that be your focus. Your focus is to become a woman that men want to marry. If you use the excuse "he's just a player" or "he's not looking for a relationship" then you're just shifting the blame and not taking responsibility.

If you're a woman, men are going to be throwing sex at you. If you're a high quality woman, men are going to be throwing sex and commitment at you.

faerie87 • 12 points • 26 April, 2016 02:39 PM

There are tons of guys who simply don't want commitment even with a high quality woman.

Also, often times men push the exam when a women has not even had the time to study. There's a high chance to fail. At that point, she needs to tell him, she's not ready, and he needs to give her more time.

And it takes time to evaluate if the guy is captain material. Both genders have goggles in the beginning and we both need time to evaluate.

[deleted] 26 April, 2016 08:42 AM*

[permanently deleted]

LuckyLittleStar[M] • 1 point • 26 April, 2016 08:15 PM

Please try to make your point more coherently. After reading this I could not determine what your thesis was.

JupeJupeSound • 1 point • 27 April, 2016 04:34 PM*

This comment has been overwritten by an open source script to protect this user's privacy. It was created to help protect users from doxing, stalking, harassment, and profiling for the purposes of censorship.

If you would also like to protect yourself, add the Chrome extension TamperMonkey, or the Firefox extension GreaseMonkey and add this open source script.

Then simply click on your username on Reddit, go to the comments tab, scroll down as far as possible (hint:use RES), and hit the new OVERWRITE button at the top.

LuckyLittleStar • 0 points • 27 April, 2016 07:49 PM

I didn't really understand how is was relevant. Why is learning this important, and how does it relate to the topic?

InquisitorCupcake • 6 points • 26 April, 2016 05:13 AM

That is EXACTLY how I read that.

Especially with number five. If you're not ready for that step, don't put yourself in a position where having sex is is an assumed activity. (Like you said, Netflix and chill.)

I may be completely missing it, but I don't see anywhere in this post about having non-committed sex. To me it reads as one giant caution sign. Some men may not know whether or not the woman is relationship material until that moment. There could be chemistry and sexual tension, but it takes doing the deed to know whether or not you are fully sexually compatible with someone. Where sex is a necessity to guys, I believe that feeling that sexual connection with a potential life partner is a major element for them.

I don't see anywhere in the post that says "sleep with as many guys as possible in order to bag the one that finds you sexually compatible and will therefore wide you up."

I see this as "guys really know that they'll be able to be a long term commitment with you once they know you're sexually compatible." It's not saying that other factors aren't in the equation at all.

Whisper[S] • 5 points • 26 April, 2016 06:10 PM

#1. Don't have sex unless you think he's captain material.

#5. Before putting yourself in a situation to potentially have sex i.e. alone at his place Netflixing with drinks, make sure you're ready to.

This is a good rule, but I was talking a little more about emotional state.

Basically, #1 and #5, taken together, can be rephrased as:

"Maybe" => **Never**.

"Not yet" => **Never**.

"Later" => **Never**.

"Meh, okay" => **Never**.

"OMG yesplease" => **Yes**.

If a woman wants to keep her n-count low, the way to do that isn't *"hold out for a promise"*, it's *"immediately and permanently reject any man you're capable of holding out on"*.

Those n-count increases are precious to her, and it's a bad mistake to waste one on a man she is capable of being calm, reserved, and calculating with. Only the ones who inspire wild passion should make the grade.

If he doesn't drive her wild, he's not good Captain material for her, no matter what his other qualities might be.

Bpgiissues • 8 points • 26 April, 2016 08:40 PM

Quick comment on this. I have learned in my past that I am attracted to and attract women high on the BPD scale. The instant chemistry spark one also happens with people high in that spectrum. It took me a while to realize I was addicted to that instant attraction and to learn to look a little more carefully.

redpillschool • 5 points • 27 April, 2016 06:07 AM

If a woman wants to keep her n-count low, the way to do that isn't "hold out for a promise", it's "immediately and permanently reject any man you're capable of holding out on".

Whisper, this is an incredibly fascinating approach to this, and I'll be honest I'm really not sure what I think about it yet.

The two camps are currently- hold out until he proves he's going to stick around, *or* lose anybody you can hold out on.

Which ends with longer relationships?

Which ends in a lower N count?

Which ends in more happiness?

There's a lot of negative reactions in the comments here, I hope - for their sake- they understand their negative comments are welcome and their critiques important, so they don't think they're taking crazy pills. Your ideas have merit, but I'm not sure they're conclusive.

SkylarWyte • 8 points • 27 April, 2016 08:11 AM*

There's a lot of negative reactions in the comments here, I hope - for their sake- they understand their negative comments are welcome and their critiques important, so they don't

think they're taking crazy pills.

I appreciate you coming here and weighing in on this. As always, your take is level headed and open minded.

It is very hard to believe this, however, when one of my comments was immediately deleted and I was scolded by mods for calling someone 'dear', which I fully admit was snippy and condescending... However, comments standing in this thread right now include....

Your agenda is showing! You must be a sock puppet for RedTrollWives to roll a sh** sandwich of legislation blather from Whisper's post You doth protest TOO MUCH! Isn't Rule Zero- Stay on topic, mods?

To my post that *you* actually replied to, apparently feeling I was not off topic or a "sock puppet", whatever that is. No one tells me what to say but me, thankyouverymuch, I am not a puppet to anyone.

Then Whisper told someone...

I'm beginning to doubt your reading comprehension

And another poster told someone else....

Are we hamstering away high expectations because we simply must disagree with Whisper?

You can see how this all being up for hours, and me calling someone "dear" immediately being mod removed because, "There's a difference between pointing things out and being rude, 'dear'" really makes it look like insulting people to defend Whisper is just fine, and being even a little rude to the people who defend him is not tolerated.

Yes, I was snippy and rude, and my next order of business it to apologize to the member I was rude to. CrazyHorse suggested I take a few hours away, and I did. Although you can see how hard I was come down on... Yet so far... Not a single thing said to any of the people I quoted above. How are we supposed to really believe our comments are welcome and our critique is important when the mod policy is so unevenly applied?

[deleted] • 3 points • 27 April, 2016 10:59 AM

The use of the term 'dear' was not the issue, it was its place in a targeted personal comment about someone's life situation . (I would hardly call my reply scolding, but I apologize for the phrasing). For what it's worth, I appreciated your later reply to that comment - acknowledging your 'jab' and apologizing showed grace, self-reflection and dignity.

How are we supposed to really believe our comments are welcome and our critique is important when the mod policy is so unevenly applied?

The mods are only human, and we don't catch everything. When there is a comment that you believe breaches the rules, PLEASE do report it - we really do appreciate it.

SkylarWyte • 3 points • 27 April, 2016 11:17 AM

Thank you, I understand what you are saying. I still feel her strategy is short sighted but like I said, I pointed it out wrong.

LuckyLittleStar[M] • 2 points • 27 April, 2016 07:40 PM

Your agenda is showing! You must be a sock puppet for RedTrollWives to roll a sh** sandwich of legislation blather from Whisper's post You doth protest TOO MUCH! Isn't Rule Zero- Stay on topic, mods?

Looks like by the time I read this the offending post was already removed. In the future, please use the report tool if you see someone breaking the rules. It makes our jobs much easier. Thanks!

SkylarWyte • 2 points • 28 April, 2016 03:33 AM

. In the future, please use the report tool if you see someone breaking the rules. It makes our jobs much easier. Thanks!

I did report it about an hour before I posted it here, but I understand mods are not perfect and you have a hard job. I'm glad to see the rules were eventually applied equally and fairly :) Thank you!

LuckyLittleStar • 1 point • 28 April, 2016 03:51 AM

No problem! Thanks for alerting us to the situation! =)

Whisper[S] • 1 point • 27 April, 2016 06:40 PM

Then Whisper told someone...

I'm beginning to doubt your reading comprehension

Did you not see what I was replying to?

I'm beginning to doubt your motives.

Look, I get that this has kicked off some controversy. I'm happy about that, it's a debate we should have. It has been brewing a long time in the growing gap between TRP and RPW language and thought, and the amount of heat we're seeing is proportional to how long overdue it is.

But this habit of impugning my motives is silly and distracts from the real conversation. Personally, I think it's hilarious how butthurt people are over this, but I don't think the mods have the luxury of being amused. They have to turn down the heat so people can be thinking about ways to talk instead of ways to make each other look foolish.

Popsicle666-1 points 27 April, 2016 09:31 AM **[recovered]**

You can critique. People will also critique a pattern of suspect behaviour and rudeness.

SkylarWyte • 3 points • 27 April, 2016 10:03 AM

I will not defend my use of the term "dear" in a condescending way anymore. I have apologized to the person I did it to, and it has nothing to do with you. Furhrer the idea that you are upset about it after the way you have spoken to everyone in this thread who disagrees with Whisper is laughable.

Further, RPS does not seem to consider disagreeing with the idea women should sleep with men they are very attracted to immediately the "pattern of suspect behavior" that you do.

Whisper[S] • 9 points • 27 April, 2016 06:24 PM

One of the motivating factors behind this is that I've been watch for some time this emphasis on the *explicit statement* of relationship status, and the focus on that, rather than bonding.

I think, that, despite the spread of PUA skills stuff, the majority of sex in our society occurs in "relationships". And I use the quotes deliberately, because these "relationships" are explicitly announced, but they're not very passionate, or committed, or stable.

So what happens is that women (the ones who aren't slutty party girls) spend their twenties in a series of sort of pseudo-LTRs that last six months or a year, and then someone's unhappiness exceeds the convenience of the relationship, and it dies, not with a bang, but with a whimper. So women wash up on the windy side of thirty having *never had sex outside a relationship*, but still they aren't in, and have never been in, a passion, joyful, intense, loving, relationship.

When I talk to young women who feel they've screwed up their n-count, whether they are of the variety "*Oh, no, it's 2, and I'm not married! My life is over!*", or of the type "*It's not fair! Real men shouldn't feel threatened by all those dicks I sucked in college!*"... the one thing they all have in common is **they had sex with men they didn't really feel that strongly about.**

A woman with an N-count of 15 isn't a woman who fell madly in love 15 times with men who didn't stay because she didn't get him to change his facebook status. She's a woman who slept with Mr. Right Now, hoping that it might work out. She's had the right-now relationship sex, and the rebound sex, and the makeup sex, and the depressed-because-she's-single sex, and the I-want-attention sex.

The theory I've working with for years (seriously, I have an article from years ago defining "slut" that lays it all out) is that **the big problem isn't lack of sexual boundaries, it's lack of relationship stability.**

In other words, we are focusing on the "pump" part of the "pump and dump" threat, when the real damage is the "dump" part.

We know that **there is something wrong with the way we deal with commitment** in our society. We know this because **marriages are failing left and right.**

So a strategy that has "secure acknowledged commitment" as its main goal isn't good enough. Because Marriage 2.0 is the ultimate in acknowledged commitment, but still half of them fail.

So women need to explore relationship-finding strategies that don't set the ensuing relationship up to fail.

[deleted] 27 April, 2016 02:17 AM

[permanently deleted]

MissNissa[M] • 1 point • 27 April, 2016 03:22 AM

Removed, violates the rule about non red pill perspectives. Men are gatekeepers of commitment and women are gatekeepers of sex.

maya_elena • 2 points • 2 May, 2016 06:39 AM

I'd have to agree with this post, even though some of the corollaries ("you will not get a relationship unless you sleep with him") may not sit quite so well.

I'll also add that the manner in which a man expresses his sexual desire and wears his "horny glasses" is one of

the criteria on which we judge him. Men's loyalty and women's affection both have to be earned - and to the extent that either one is failing to earn the value he or she seeks, the value must not be granted.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 April, 2016 12:34 AM

I appreciate the time spent on this clever read and find it helpful. If only all young women could read this. Women would enter relationships in which they were wild about their men, and hook up culture would vanish. I do have a bone to pick with #5 though. It's irrational to assume that a woman should be on the same sexual schedule as the man. She has to match his eagerness? I could list many reasons why that might not happen (at that chosen time), but testosterone and estrogen differences are sufficient enough.

[deleted] 26 April, 2016 05:14 AM

[permanently deleted]