

Vetting doesn't work. Boundaries do.

July 25, 2019 | 268 upvotes | by [RStonePT](#)

A lot of TRADCON types love to use vetting as the be all and end all. Personally, I can't stand the sentiment, and it's exactly the kind of disney esque lies that screw men over. I know a lot of guys in here are 'looking for a wife.' and think vetting girls is the way to get there. There's so much in that statement that needs to be unpacked and fixed, and plenty of guys who are better than me have done far better work on that front. I'll focus on vetting, and why it never worked.

How can I have any confidence? I never had the TRADCON experience, my christian friends did. I fell back on boundaries, some by accident, and some as I got better at enforcing them. I'm watching guys zero out left and right. There's something to it that isn't useful, and it benefits a guy to walk through whats so great about it.

Vetting

Vetting is the relationship strategy where a man takes a list of values and qualities he prefers in women and uses it to assess the viability of the woman he is currently dating so that he can know if she is worth committing to over the long term. The quintessential strategy for the type of men who readily identify with being traditional and conservative within a modern and liberal society. Note, these are little 'l,' and little 'c.' This isn't about tribal politics, this is about men. The vetting strategy is thrown around as if its the same strategy men have used throughout history, when in reality it's a horrible mental model; a narrative guys use to provide comfort for the grim reality that relationships all end, and most end well before the man is ready to move on, or his children have had the full biological father experience.

Vetting is a horrible strategy for the following reasons:

1. Men do not know what they want in life. Men have a wonderful ability to rationalize what the world offers, transforming it what men wanted all along. A vetting list is guesswork and post hoc rationalization.
2. Vetting a woman is vetting for values. The question is, whose values? Men today are instilled with feminine values, created by and for women to meet their own needs, not his.
3. Vetting only works if everyone is doing the same and is immunized from everything else.
4. Vetting for values is a narcissistic fantasy, and serve to hide the true nature of women and men in order to live in the narrative it presents. By the time the masks come off it's too late.
5. Vetting creates an ego investment, where a man ignores anything that is outside of his vetted criteria. If the list is wrong, it's an attack on a mans ego, and he will fight tooth and nail to protect it.
6. Even if the masks are off, and humans are naked and honest in their interactions (which they aren't) vetting offers a snapshot into someones values, not a longitudinal assessment. It has the same longevity as an MBTI assessment; it's astrology for the educated.
7. Vetting is often done to the exclusion of actual relationship strategies. Boundary enforcement is far superior and doesn't require a lifetime of instilling feminine values in a man in order to understand them.

I.

Men do not know What they want in life. The idea of taking a man at his most inexperienced and encouraging him to develop a list of qualities that give him the best choice in a long term relationship is naive. Vetting is touted as mitigation of risk, but risk is a wonderful container word that we can fill with whatever feelings we want. What exactly is a man risking?

...

The risk is ones ego. Most men who tout vetting as a relationship strategy tend to be early into their relationships. It's not that a man knows it works, it's that he hopes it worked, even though it was largely guesswork and coming to terms with the person that took interest in him. Our ego tells us that this one of a kind girl is the kind of girl that we carefully observed and concluded that she was one of a kind, one in a million of her kind. For most men, the one of a kind girl wasn't one of a kind, she was the one girl who kind of showed us any affection at all. The girl we were the kind of man that she was able to attract, he was her niche.

She had a specific type of man she could attract, and we let life happen to us. And this is why vetting does not work. Vetting implies we are taking control over our lives, and in reality, most men are letting life happen to them, and vetting provides a narrative that allows a man to pretend he doesn't sail to wherever the winds decide to take him. For the inexperienced man (most men) he doesn't get to decide, others will decide for him and he has to come to terms with that, hence, vetting.

[All 7 parts here](#)

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

SeasonedRP • 57 points • 25 July, 2019 08:48 PM

This is an excellent contribution. I've seen "3" and "6" in action many, many times. That woman with all the right qualities in her early 20s becomes a different person once she locks down a husband and has two kids, and there are zero consequences to her. Her friends and society will encourage her "growth" as a person.

The notion that one can lock down a good churchgoing girl in her late teens or early 20s and have a BP fantasy life is just that, a fantasy. It isn't real and won't happen. Modern churches create slutty women and weak, submissive men.

RStonePT[S] • 24 points • 26 July, 2019 08:37 PM

people don't pray unless they want forgiveness

FastingCharlie • 10 points • 28 July, 2019 02:50 AM

With all due respect to an SEC. This is incorrect, Bible prayer changes eternity...it's that important...thus the need for correction.

But let us stick to the subject....

escapethesolarsystem • 20 points • 30 July, 2019 12:24 PM

The notion that one can lock down a good churchgoing girl in her late teens or early 20s and have a BP fantasy life is just that, a fantasy.

I think the underlying problem with this fantasy is not that women will magically become sluts on their own, but when you live in a decadent, degenerate, sexually uncontrolled society like the west, every women will eventually be socialized by her peers and friends to dump whatever traditional values she had and go along to get along. Women don't stand up to social pressure well.

On the other hand, if you live in a more traditional christian society, the social pressure will be in the opposite direction, and even women who are predisposed to be slutty will eventually conform to the traditionalist social norm.

rnsbrum • 0 points • 5 August, 2019 06:56 PM

Why does the over sexualization of women pisses you off so much?

escapethesolarsystem • 10 points • 5 August, 2019 09:40 PM

I don't understand what you mean by that...?

SatanAscending • 3 points • 14 August, 2019 12:15 AM

I imagine that would be Code Red from the Glossary of Shaming Tactics. The fun part is it's right on the top.

Moxiecodone • 3 points • 11 August, 2019 06:43 PM

I don't see how he is pissed off. He is stating the consequences of social pressure and what exactly the social pressures a girl faces despite her parent's programming (religious, conservative, whatever)

[deleted] 27 July, 2019 07:30 PM

[permanently deleted]

vreller • 1 point • 11 August, 2019 03:16 PM

Hunt & grow your own food? How?

wanderer779 • 4 points • 31 July, 2019 01:46 PM

From what I can tell the church is now more scared of women than they are of God. Not sure why, but my theory is that they had to tell the congregation what they wanted to hear or run out of money.

I think the best way to be religious is to probably just sit at your house and read the book on your own.

FastingCharlie • 2 points • 28 July, 2019 02:23 AM

Well, it would be more accurate to say that a good churchgoing girl (of any age) will be fantasy for anybody but a good churchgoing guy. They aren't dumb, why would they want the typical guy off this site? But it is real, and it does happen. It just doesn't happen for most guys on here because they wouldn't darken the door of a good church because they don't believe they will learn anything of value. Their loss.... lay off the church comments or go watch Joel Osteen for a week or two.

Slutty women and weak submissive men? Hardly. Ignorant and judgmental though....

KomandoMetz • 1 point • 29 July, 2019 05:49 PM

can confirm. marriage and kid transforms a woman, not the man. the man more often than not suffers and loses. seen it with my sister and his husband... it is all the same with al married couples!

bsutansalt[M] [score hidden] 25 July, 2019 06:05 PM* stickied comment

Vetting women doesn't necessarily work as they can change, slip up, etc., especially where alcohol is involved, but a threat of consequences for straying from the straight and narrow can be a huge motivator to avoid circumstances in the first place where Bad Things can occur. I've said it repeatedly over the years...

You have to make your standards and expectations known in no uncertain terms, as well as what happens if they fail to measure up.

YOU have to follow through though if they don't live up to their end of the bargain. If a woman pushes the boundaries, odds are it's because she thinks she can get away with it. In other words she doesn't respect you and thinks you're soft.

The key to relationship success is **avoiding the appearance of impropriety**. That implied threat of consequences + **trust, but verify** goes a loooooong way to keeping your relationship out of trouble and from there the ball is in your court. All you have to do is keep being attractive and hold that mutherfucking frame.

edit: relevant when it comes to screening women....

/r/TheRedPill/comments/38ig03/the_loyalty_test/

EdmondDaunts • 7 points • 26 July, 2019 06:48 AM

When a woman pushes boundaries it also depends when it starts. The push can be subtle and that's when she is testing but hopes you push back. When it's more blatant then you've lost half the battle.

By being watchful and aware of your own boundaries you can often nip it in the bud. But as ever this is a skill of being brutally honest and not just seeing what you want to.

RStonePT[S] • 6 points • 25 July, 2019 06:07 PM

I figure if you and another dozen guys have already said it, there must be something to it.

Tried it, worked rather well, half a decade later here we are

INNASKILLZ2K18 • 4 points • 30 July, 2019 09:01 AM

This resonates with me.

I don't understand why guys in Asktrp believe in never communicating boundaries. Just soft nexting and withdrawing. It comes off passive aggressive and confusing.

You have to state clear, certain boundaries. Hen, as you say, enforcw them. Don't fuck around. Then if she fucks up and faces consequences, it's not passive aggression. It's simply following what you've clearly communicated.

The problem comes when guys verbally communicate their boundaries, then try to verbally enforce them. Don't have a long conversation or text wall explaining how what she's done has affected you. Medium is the message. Withdraw attention. SHOW you don't waste time with disrespectful shit.

Verbally communicate, then enforce through action. We train others how to treat us.

In regards to vetting, I agree it's not that useful. Sure, big red flags should be paid attention to. Otherwise, we teach and train women how to treat us moving forward

Project_Zero_Betas • 3 points • 26 July, 2019 02:23 AM

If a woman pushes the boundaries, odds are it's because she thinks she can get away with it. In other words she doesn't respect you and thinks you're soft.

Not only that, but if you refuse to enforce any semblance of boundaries on her, it signals to other girls in the future that such behavior is acceptable, and you thus perpetuate it even further.

frykidse • 2 points • 5 August, 2019 05:17 AM

I set a few simple baseline boundaries. I have found this conversation to work well for me. Usually happens after things start getting a little more serious. Works best over 1-2 drinks. My personal intro to this convo usually goes something like there's a few things we need to get out there so were on the same page here.

1. No drama. I state I just don't rly care what so&so did at work or your fb comments or whatever. I will let you vent out some shit yet dont pull me into it.
2. Disrespect will not be tolerated. This does not need elaborated, ppl know inherently what disrespect is.
3. I ask you to answer me sincerely if I ask you "Do you want me to just listen or are you looking for an answer here?"

No drama& no disrespect covers the basics of human relationships. 3 is optional yet I find it easier to just acknowledge part of female emotional communication. Many times they just want to vent out shit vs getting a real solution.

These 3 rules make it simple. I can address any bad behavior from there as needed.

[deleted] • 2 points • 15 August, 2019 01:53 AM

I clicked on the link and started reading... wow, solid post. Everyone makes sense. No cuck talk. What's going on here... oh, it's 4 years old. TRP is in terminal decline.

TruthSeekingPerson • 2 points • 25 July, 2019 08:59 PM

I think there are two issues here. You can set boundaries and still vet your partner. The more impulsive your partner the more likely she'll step over the boundary. That's the point of vetting.

Just because vetting doesn't guarantee anything doesn't mean that it doesn't help. But yes, mutual respect through the avoidance of impropriety is crucial to a relationship. Don't go out with your friends until 3am all the time. Your post is very well phrased.

bsutansalt • 5 points • 25 July, 2019 09:01 PM

Just because vetting doesn't guarantee anything doesn't mean that it doesn't help.

That's the crux of this thread https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/38ig03/the_loyalty_test/

Figuring out which kind of women you have can give you an idea of their likelihood of sticking to the boundaries, but it's still not a guarantee.

BatsNightmares • 1 point • 29 July, 2019 08:22 PM

Ugh, this. Just don't care about women. They are there? Fine. They leave? Fine.

drumperion • 1 point • 31 July, 2019 03:37 PM

Amen. I posted about this a while ago, turns out its a pretty popular opinion, which makes me glad to see.

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 August, 2019 01:52 AM*

I clicked on the link and started reading... wow, solid post. Every comment makes sense. No cuck talk. What's going on here... oh, it's 4 years old. TRP is in terminal decline.

BusyHearing • 27 points • 25 July, 2019 04:30 PM*

This is all pretty tip of the iceberg consider the most obvious issue—

any man wanting to lay some pipe, or any man who is finally getting attention from a decent looking chick is going be a worse judge of character than your average housewife was of Bernie Madoff.

RStonePT[S] • 9 points • 25 July, 2019 04:51 PM

some pipe, yes

a tons of pipe... I like to think by repetition alone he's learned to develop preferences in accordance with his best interest

RStonePT[S] • 4 points • 25 July, 2019 04:48 PM

That's what part 4 articulates and 5 expands upon

We see what we want to see.

TruthSeekingPerson • 44 points • 25 July, 2019 08:43 PM

There is risk associated with any partnership but to say vetting is pointless is just ridiculous. Do employers vet job applicants? Of course they do. And the more thorough they are the less risk they undertake.

To say men don't know what they want is just as ridiculous. If that's the case then just chalk everything up to randomness. If you want to say that what men want often changes then so be it but there are many men who want to work and come home to something. That's the goal. And they don't want to worry about walking in on their wife with some random guy she seduced because she was bored with her day.

No matter how much vetting you do there is risk but vetting is necessary to pick a mate. It's why body count,

stripping, tattoos, kids and criminal history are all important.

I think the reason you are drawing these conclusions is because vetting modern women is impossible—literally nobody over 21 can pass the requirements. What does that mean? Date young before they've been corrupted by our nihilistic society. But if you try and set boundaries with someone who fails the vetting process then good luck to you, you're likely in for a world of hurt.

TruthSeekingPerson • 8 points • 25 July, 2019 08:54 PM

For the record, I'm aware of the millions of men trapped in unhappy marriages. To me the point of marriage is to raise a family. Some people say that's the only way to happiness. Some people say to never get married. Each man has to make their own decision.

I don't have kids myself and will never have them but as a Tradcon with independent analytical ability (at least I try to step back and analyze things) I think vetting is the only way to begin to control hypergamy. There are millions and millions of happy marriages, somewhere around 50%. So hypergamy has been controlled. And studies have shown the fewer partners the better the chances of success. Once you get past 2 or 3 those women are on a slippery slope indeed.

I guess what I'm saying is that vetting is very important and the fact that so few women can pass these requirements should be a warning to anyone pursuing marriage or cohabitation.

Good luck to everyone, and I hope I wasn't too harsh in my initial reply I thought the post was well thought out and thought provoking I just can't get behind the idea of not vetting a woman.

pacjax • 5 points • 2 August, 2019 04:18 AM

50% of marriages end in divorce, other 49 is dead bedrooms

RStonePT[S] • 6 points • 26 July, 2019 08:37 PM

Do employers vet job applicants? Of course they do

And they generally suck because of it. the interview process doesn't vet for good employees, it vets for people being good at interviews.

No matter how much vetting you do there is risk but vetting is necessary to pick a mate. It's why body count, stripping, tattoos, kids and criminal history are all important.

These are all symbols, and mean nothing, it's what they represent that matters, short term impulse gratification e.g. Boundaries are an ongoing process to detect these root causes, and ignore the surface crap.

Baby rabied women can put on a sun hat and summer dress and act as nice as you want her to, she'll pass all those tests, then go back to normal after you wifed her up. Trusting the secondary characteristics only makes it easier to deceive you.

Vetting is useless in that it makes it easier to manipulate you, and make you ego invested in the process

TruthSeekingPerson • 15 points • 26 July, 2019 10:40 PM

There's more to the vetting process than interviews. Education, job experience, etc. You think a woman with bi-polar or borderline personality disorder is going to follow your boundaries? That's what vetting reveals. You can do your own thing and marry a stripper with a triple digit body count and that's cool but you're the one living with the consequences.

You're essentially recommending people only rely on the job interview but any chick can act normal for a long time. Once she reels you in you'll see a different person. That's why you look at her track record

to predict her behavior in the future.

The reason men keep vetting women and getting fucked over is because they don't have high enough standards which is largely due to the fact there are hardly any women who are worth investing in a ltr with.

RStonePT[S] • 1 point • 26 July, 2019 11:18 PM

How old are you?

[deleted] • 3 points • 3 August, 2019 07:32 PM

Quick question, were you vetted for your 'Senior Endorsed Contributed' flair?

RStonePT[S] • 4 points • 3 August, 2019 11:43 PM

were you diagnosed with autism?

[deleted] • 9 points • 3 August, 2019 11:54 PM

Haha, so because answering my question would invalidate your original stance of vetting being dumb, you've resorted back to an ad hominem attack - the true mark of an intellectual.

RStonePT[S] • 2 points • 4 August, 2019 12:17 AM

So you took my question as an attack.

Strange, are you saying these weren't questions at all, but some sort of internet argument?

Though I'll have to go back, pretty sure the point was that vetting is useless and the people who vet are dumb.

[deleted] • 8 points • 4 August, 2019 12:41 AM

...regardless.

I disagree with your point man. Vetting occurs all the time, everywhere, for a reason. That it isn't perfect or fool proof does not mean it isn't a useful tool.

RStonePT[S] • 1 point • 4 August, 2019 07:18 PM

K

Cods_gift_to_reddit • 1 point • 5 August, 2019 07:56 PM

No you were trying to be funny and a smartarse by undermining the SEC in this thread, so he put you back in your box.

escapethesolarsystem • 5 points • 30 July, 2019 12:31 PM

But if you try and set boundaries with someone who fails the vetting process then good luck to you, you're likely in for a world of hurt.

Very true, this is why I say do both. Vet *and* set boundaries. There always seem to be a little bit of false dichotomy / false choice in a lot of these kinds of TRP posts. What prevents people from doing both? Vetting is not the be-all-end-all, but why toss the whole idea out completely? It doesn't make sense to me.

nobody_thinks • 15 points • 25 July, 2019 08:16 PM

women are chameleons and adapt the values of whatever man happens to satisfy her hypergamous imperative *at that moment*. Meaning her values are subject to change as an ex post facto rationalization of branch swinging, status whoring, etc.

That is the strongest argument against vetting women by their values. Some but not most men adhere to their principles.

There are only three real criteria for vetting women: age, beauty, and family (i.e. alpha father and submissive mother no divorce).

escapethesolarsystem • 4 points • 30 July, 2019 12:38 PM

There are only three real criteria for vetting women: age, beauty, and family (i.e. alpha father and submissive mother no divorce).

I would have to disagree with this and add many more vetting points:

friend group / circle

maturity level (does she throw tantrums or roll with the punches?)

attitudes about money

notch count

past dating history

red flag habits: drugs, alcoholism, lots of tattoos, etc

I wouldn't vet by "values" because that's basically just what a woman says she believes, which is almost totally worthless - but vetting by actions is important.

nobody_thinks • 4 points • 30 July, 2019 02:51 PM

in my experience, all those things fall in line if she had an alpha father and submissive mother with no divorce.

But don't set your standards too high on those details. modern young women are under the influence of social media etc. What I measure is how much they fall into line when I correct them. Again, directly follows mother and father in my experience.

Brutal13 • 4 points • 26 July, 2019 11:06 AM

Also, if her family provides connections, money, and they can take care of the offsprings.

nobody_thinks • 1 point • 26 July, 2019 03:11 PM

yeah major bonus points

Cods_gift_to_reddit • 1 point • 5 August, 2019 07:57 PM

Her face tells the story of her past

GayLubeOil • 47 points • 25 July, 2019 04:53 PM

Didn't expect to agree 100% with Rian Stone of all people. Especially on a nuanced, long detailed post. Excellent work Rian.

The root problem with TradCucks is they believe that Meaning is Fixed. So if they find the perfect girl via a screening process she will stay perfect and everyone will live happily ever after.

The problem is that meaning is not fixed. Meaning is variable. Things change with iteration.

So for example if a person says *I'm not a homosexual! I mean it I'm not a homosexual!* The first and second

iterations of the phrase have different meaning.

Just because something is a certain way doesn't mean it will stay that way. In fact it will most likely change through external circumstances. The only constant is change.

This brings me to my final point. TradCucks are too stupid to understand how everything is context dependent and that context is rapidly changing dragging everything along with it. Their inability to account for change leads them to create shitty models for the world and getting ass fucked on the regular.

TradCucks especially love getting fucked in the ass by the is-ought distinction

oajgaowj321khdnkanw • 13 points • 25 July, 2019 08:56 PM

"The only constant is change"

Rifleshoot • 4 points • 25 July, 2019 05:24 PM

I don't think vetting is necessarily a bad strategy. A man has an image of what he wants in his mind and he finds a woman that's close to that image. Sure, she will never be entirely there, but that's your job as a man: to direct her to be the woman you want her to be. Vetting is simply finding who would be easiest to mold into what you want. It's a lot easier to mold a woman into your tradcon wet dream if she is already traditional than to mold a leftwing free love hippie type. Vetting has its place, but it can't supplant proper guidance and discipline from a man.

RStonePT[S] • 8 points • 25 July, 2019 06:11 PM

He didn't invent that image. His social circle put that there during his formative years.

but that's your job as a man: to direct her to be the woman you want her to be.

You cannot control women. This is the blue pill lie that won't die. Everyone comes here thinking they can lift enough, read enough Evola, then be able to tell a woman to 'act right' (read: do what you want her to)

You can't do that, you can only change how you react, and people can conform, or not to you if they want to.

It's a lot easier to mold a woman into your tradcon wet dream if she is already traditional than to mold a leftwing free love hippie type

Look behind the curtain, those trad con women, underneath their sun hats and summer dresses were ridden hard and put away wet. they fill your narcissistic fantasies so they can get a baby out of you, then when the masks come off, she gets the itchs for the pool boy.

but it can't supplant proper guidance and discipline from a man.

And if she decides not to, what authority, what hard power do you have to enforce that?

Rifleshoot • 6 points • 25 July, 2019 06:16 PM

You simply walk away. Once you are in a LTR, you have to switch to dread game. She has to feel that you still have options and that pleasing you is still necessary. Obviously, she isn't going to obey you if you aren't worth obeying, so it's understood that you have to increase your own value.

RStonePT[S] • 8 points • 25 July, 2019 08:02 PM

yes, that is best. It's good practice though, since walking away doesn't address the underlying issues, and you'll merely repeat them with the next girl.

even divorced men kick the can down the road and turn wife #2 into wife #1, cunty behaviour and all

Rifleshoot • 0 points • 25 July, 2019 08:08 PM

If your SMV is high enough, you can make her chase after you. That's the entirely underlying philosophy behind dread game. You have to have her value you enough that you can mold her into what you want. There's a limit to how much you can, which is why vetting isn't necessarily a bad way to start.

RStonePT[S] • 8 points • 25 July, 2019 08:13 PM

No. Who in gods name gave you that information?

Dread game is a deliberate set of steps to build your value while simultaneously securing a better option than the girl you have now. It's literally female branch swinging for a male sensibility, with an olive branch at the end.

Women don't chase, women make themselves available, men chase. Even if a girl wants you, most will just put themselves in front of a man and get frustrated if he doesn't approach because girls are terrified of rejection. the worst male rejection fear is a 3, hers is an 8. they take it so bad they get violent.

Women don't trade, and you cannot mold them. women merely act as best they can if they have a man that's worth holding onto, aka her best option, aka hypergamy.

I don't know how you missed it, but women will lie when in the epiphany phase, baby rabies and all. She will act exactly the way you need her to act, for as long as she needs something from you aka briffaults law. The vetting becomes useless then, and again, boundaries to the rescue.

If you're arguing it's not completely useless, sure. A water gun isn't completely useless in a house fire, but it may as well be.

Rifleshoot • 0 points • 25 July, 2019 08:20 PM

I'm fairly certain that you and I have completely different perceptions on dread. I'm talking from the married perspective. If you're in a sexless, boring marriage, dread is meant to inspire your wife to fall in line behind you as a result of your higher SMV. Why sit in a sexless marriage if your goal is branch swing? Just divorce the woman and move on if that's what you want. There's no need to make her dread you leaving in that case, lol. Just do it.

RStonePT[S] • 4 points • 26 July, 2019 08:34 PM

First penned here

Then refined

Dread

Dread

What dread are you referring to?

Just divorce the woman and move on if that's what you want. There's no need to make her dread you leaving in that case, lol. Just do it.

Dont' let the word fool you, it was an edgy word that got guys interested in 'forbidden knowledge' and not to be taken literally. Divorce your wife when you're not prepared and you'll have the same issues with the next woman. Dread isn't about making your

wife DO ANYTHING, you cannot manipulate people that way.

It's about making you a high value man with options who can then cull the useless from his life, holding an olive branch out of the wife gets her shit together. It's a methodical branch swing, but with an olive branch. I'd look forward to reading about your alternate form of dread that has nothing to do with the above, I'm always up to learn

[deleted] 27 July, 2019 08:06 PM

[permanently deleted]

RStonePT[S] • 9 points • 28 July, 2019 04:45 AM

Most guys shy away from an assault charge, as they should.

There is no greater loss of frame than resorting to violence

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 July, 2019 06:38 AM

Amazing post and comment. In my current relationship I have made the mistake of showing my absolute disgust to hoes early on. I think it might have been a mistake. Any way to fix this?

RStonePT[S] • 1 point • 28 July, 2019 10:14 PM

Stop doing that, ignore people's questions when you do.

Theguygotgame777 • 1 point • 30 July, 2019 09:28 PM

He didn't invent that image. His social circle put that there during his formative years.

What I want to know is, how are men even supposed to desire something the world or society doesn't offer? That would be like someone in the Middle Ages saying "What I really desire is to play video games!"

RStonePT[S] • 1 point • 30 July, 2019 11:19 PM

Not society, the women raising you

[deleted] • 5 points • 26 July, 2019 05:15 AM

Great critique of vetting.

However, I know guys who are needlessly marrying crack-heads because the very idea that a woman should be held to any sort of basic standard is completely foreign to them because they believe in unilateral, male to female unconditional love.

So, while it's not perfect, at least it's a step in the right direction.

Also, I think of all the guys who settled for the first woman who would give them regular sex, the guys with low self esteem who pedestalize women and fall all over themselves to compete to qualify themselves to women, and how they wind up.

Of course, as OP said, it has a bunch of issues as a strategy. It should really be used in conjunction with setting boundaries.

RStonePT[S] • 5 points • 26 July, 2019 08:41 PM

However, I know guys who are needlessly marrying crack-heads because the very idea that a woman should be held to any sort of basic standard is completely foreign to them because they believe in unilateral, male to female unconditional love.

Yup, 0 boundaries

Akitz1 points 21 August, 2019 01:02 AM* **[recovered]**

It sounds like you're acquiescing that vetting has value? Or are you just avoiding having to defend your point? Because what he said directly conflicts with your post.

RStonePT[S] • 1 point • 21 August, 2019 12:03 PM

Why in God's name would I defend myself against a random internet anon?

[deleted] • 6 points • 27 July, 2019 05:34 PM

Great women are made, not found

DeChef2 • 3 points • 27 July, 2019 03:17 PM

If you put all 7 parts into a post, I would say it's sidebar material.

At first, I didn't like the post. Why should boundaries work any better for a man who's emasculates? And isn't boundaries just vetting over time?

But I had the feeling that I should read all 7, and I'm glad I did. Vetting over time obviously works better, but that's not the point and besides, boundaries just work better.

You've made me realize that vetting caps potential. Once you've checked off everything from the list, there is no improving.

Boundaries cap negative behavior; too much and you're gone, but leaves no limits on potential.

DullIntroduction • 7 points • 25 July, 2019 04:45 PM*

Interesting read, but I think your reasoning is built on quicksand.

Vetting is the relationship strategy where a man takes a list of values and qualities he prefers in women and uses it to assess the viability of the woman he is currently dating so that he can know if she is worth committing to over the long term.

I would agree with this definition, if it wasn't for the term *prefers* about the qualities and traits. It implies that the process is built around one's belief system, and while the latter is eventually taken into account, the former is simply spotting behaviors and traits that are objectively bad for sustaining a relationship in the long term. The so-called *red flags* are supported by countless empirical evidence (this sub being a prime example), and common sense.

You're stating that vetting is purely based on preference, then associate it to the typical tradcon bluepilled dream, that I agree is pointless, and blame vetting when it obviously fails. You're also implying that vetting for a LTR implies any form of exclusivity, and that the following relationship should be eternal, which is not true, it is again tradcon values forced into a simple process.

Vetting, like Dread, is just a tool among many others in TRP. If you don't know how to use a hammer, and you get your thumb crushed, you don't blame the hammer for not working.

Besides, it is not incompatible with maintaining boundaries, which you absolutely should do, and it absolutely, *absolutely*, doesn't allow someone to get complacent in a relationship.

I don't know about you, but I know what I want, and I'll use any tools at my disposal to get what I want.

RStonePT[S] • 1 point • 25 July, 2019 04:47 PM

You actually got through all 7 parts this quickly?

DullIntroduction • 2 points • 25 July, 2019 04:53 PM

Got lucky on the timing, I opened reddit right after you posted. Two or three minutes for each part, it's not that fast imo.

RStonePT[S] • 4 points • 25 July, 2019 04:58 PM

the thrust of it is whether you want to put your trust into multiple authorities (mom, sister, pastor etc) who have betrayed that trust for their own interests (vetting is a system they design and you adopt)

Or take your own initiative and learn from experience (try something, fail, don't do it again, establish what you will put up with, keep your ego out of your assessments, and don't trust that human relationships are a one and done scenario)

I use Tattoos as my goto example. Guys who vett always say never date a girl with tattos. My good friend matt met his highschool sweetheart and they lost virginites together. No tattoos etc. I was with a 19 year old party girl with tattoos and parents who never married. I did strong boundary enforcement (slipups aside) and he vetted for a good polish virgin girl with a good family, they divorced 6 years in, I just passed the 11 year mark. I wish I was older and could give it more, but at some point grandpas experience doesn't count anymore.

Vetting is magical fairy dust IMO

DullIntroduction • 6 points • 25 July, 2019 05:24 PM

I agree with the reasoning, but I disagree that you're associating the process exclusively with tradcon mentality. If your statement was *Vetting doesn't work if you're a tradcuck*, I would agree with that, because you make very good points, especially since TRP is typically associated with conservatives.

Tatoos are personal preference, and they are only a symptom, typically of someone displaying narcissic or impulsive behavior. Someone using tatoos alone as a criteria to make conclusions is absurd, because he's focusing on a small issue, treating it in a binary manner, while being blind to many others. Scrutinizing every detail is the sign of a lack of vision.

Another example of personal preference, I wouldn't go out with a smoker, because I do not like that, but it doesn't mean that the smoker would be bad in a LTR. You need to see further, over time, which behaviors makes someone smoking, or getting a tatoo. And usually it shows rather fast.

Behaviors that are not worthy of commitment will display themselves on many instances, details of each separated instance are not relevant in this process.

In the meantime, if I judge someone is worthy of commitment, I can emotionally invest myself, but bearing the knowledge that things can change, and the risk is always present. And to be honest, I like a bit of risk.

RStonePT[S] • 7 points • 25 July, 2019 06:15 PM

Vetting doesn't work if you're a tradcuck, I would agree with that

Of course, tribal reinforcement gets upvotes. i don't care about that shit though. besides, I'm

pointing at the moon and you're critiquing the finger. This isn't about tradcon larpers, tattoos, or smoking.

It's about you, the whole post is about the man.

In the meantime, if I judge someone is worthy of commitment, I can emotionally invest myself, but bearing the knowledge that things can change, and the risk is always present. And to be honest, I like a bit of risk.

And that judgement, is it experience, or did your pastor tell you? did you require her emotional investment first, or did that laundry list of preferences suffice? Is she pretending because she wants something from you, or does she really want to make you happy? Do you like the risk, or is it easier to think you do and tell yourself you're happy, until you aren't?

I'm not accusing you of anything here, consider this a sober second thought.

DullIntroduction • 4 points • 25 July, 2019 06:48 PM

All your points are valid, especially about rationalizations, I think this is the most important one because it is related to the man's own ability to introspect, and that goes beyond the tradcon example.

My point is that the process is objective, it has a simple purpose, that is indeed way overvalued by people. But it is useful.

I'm critiquing the finger because as a opening statement, it has weight on your argument. As I said, you don't blame the hammer if you cannot use it appropriately. I'll push the analogy further and say that if you want to accomplish something more ambitious, like building a house, you'll have a hard time doing that using only a hammer.

I liked your post a lot, and I'll like to develop a bit later if you don't mind, I'm having a hard time putting my thoughts and this post together piece by piece between deadlifts sets.

RStonePT[S] • 1 point • 25 July, 2019 08:02 PM

It's more useful than doing nothing, but approaching a thousand girls is more useful than 100... I don't think it's a good return on investment to give it too much credit however

DullIntroduction • 3 points • 25 July, 2019 10:15 PM

I'd argue that vetting is among the easiest thing to do, because it seems mostly passive. That is probably why it is heavily promoted. But it does the work, because of the one thing that makes vetting unique, imo, is that it's a disqualifying tool. You can't see the actual benefits, because you eliminated the potential threat to your dignity preemptively.

And that judgement, is it experience, or did your pastor tell you? did you require her emotional investment first, or did that laundry list of preferences suffice? Is she pretending because she wants something from you, or does she really want to make you happy? Do you like the risk, or is it easier to think you do and tell yourself you're happy, until you aren't?

My judgement comes mostly from experience, and empirical evidence from TRP and askTRP (which is kind of a gold mine for that). I'm working on myself to always question my own reasoning and avoid those biases and rationalizations

feeding the ego. I'm probably vetting myself more than I did any girl, heh.

The issue is that people have the wrong mindset, whether it is about vetting, boundaries, dread, positive reinforcement, or any other tool, mostly because of a lack of internalization of RP principles.

For example, there's this weird trend that consists simply in changing the denomination of a relationship. Some guy discovers TRP, read the sidebar, began self-improvement, so now his girlfriend, in the bluepilled sense of the term, is not his girlfriend anymore, she's his *LTR*. The main issue is that the change is only semantics. In its core, the relationship is the same, no actual value is applied.

The simple fact to be aware of TRP makes people think they're now immune to failure, feeding the ego, and rationalizing the vast and complex nature of life to fit a bullet list, because alpha spergs love bullet lists. If some phenomenon or behavior isn't on that list, it is irrelevant, thus not a threat. Until it comes back to fuck them in the ass.

RStonePT[S] • 2 points • 26 July, 2019 08:39 PM

Yeah, it's a sophisticated version of '10 eays to be more alpha, mew your tongue bro!'

Or

'read Evola!'

p3n1x • 1 point • 26 July, 2019 02:09 PM

I'm probably vetting myself more than I did any girl, heh.

Based off of what metrics though? Money matters? Pussy matters? What colleagues think matters? Your home is 2000 sqft but should be 4000 by now??

When biology kicks in, YOU don't get to choose who you fall in love with. You don't consciously control those chemicals. Vetting is a crutch to make others happy.

You don't need to vet yourself to care for yourself.

Flynn-Lives • 3 points • 25 July, 2019 07:57 PM

Disagree. Is vetting the end all be all? No. But it certainly acts as an effective first wall of defense against shitty behavior. It's just one out of many tools and to say you're not going to screen women and just set up boundaries is fighting an already losing battle with one hand behind your back.

RStonePT[S] • 2 points • 25 July, 2019 08:05 PM

Boundaries do far better.

Easier to deceive than it is to detect deception

red_philosopher • 3 points • 27 July, 2019 02:03 PM

Frankly, I agree with your position when *vetting* is defined the way you've defined it. But attempting to separate it from boundary enforcement is nonsense. Vetting is a process of enforcing specific boundaries, both for yourself and your preferences, and for the woman undergoing the process. As far as I understood vetting, the

process shouldn't ever stop, just as boundary enforcement should never stop. Why should they never stop? Because they're the same thing.

Should your boundaries be told to you by a pastor, your mom, or her father? Hell no. And just like vetting is bullshit if you stop vetting or get your "preferences" from someone else, boundaries are just as bad if you do the same bad things.

RStonePT[S] • 2 points • 27 July, 2019 04:15 PM

It's not so much the way I've defined it, but the ways guys are defining it today.

I generally thought of it the way you did, but one flippant comment about it hit a nerve with a lot of aspiring and <3 year married men.

Though I'm not sure how boundaries can be made by anyone other than yourself. you vet for behaviours, not values, and no one can tell you what you dislike in a woman, you kind of have to experience it IMO

red_philosopher • 3 points • 27 July, 2019 07:38 PM

Maybe it's because we're just a lot older than the new kids in town, and they still have a lot of blue to shake off the hard way.

Boundaries get enforced by you, and you alone, but *what you decide your boundaries are* can be taken from others who have influence over you, if you let them.

And I agree, nobody can really tell you what you like or dislike in women until you find out for yourself.

jonald_fyookball • 5 points • 25 July, 2019 06:22 PM

Women are empty vessels that you mold into what you desire. She'll become the woman of your fantasies if she values you enough.

RStonePT[S] • 6 points • 25 July, 2019 08:01 PM

For a while, itll she doesn't
thats exactly what the 'epiphany phase' is

p3n1x • 2 points • 26 July, 2019 02:12 PM

She will only on the idea that you are going to "change" to the vision she has. Hold your ground long enough and your fantasy will turn into a volcanic temper tantrum OR you just have to be ok with that "molded disney" fucking guys like us at TRP on the side.

RStonePT[S] • 1 point • 5 December, 2019 03:49 PM

I call that the Laci Greene Effect

Caper67 • 2 points • 26 July, 2019 11:52 AM

I live in a smallish town and I feel like boundarie maintainence has an advantage even more so here where more people or women may have a general idea about your past relationships. For example the girl you're dating now knows or has heard that you've cold dropped your last couple of relationships for boundarie slip ups and not only takes your word for it but realizes by your past actions that you're not bluffing and if she doesnt want to be dropped in the same manner she better not fuck up.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 July, 2019 07:56 PM

I see what you're saying that using vetting by itself is a horrible idea.

I use vetting *up front* to see if she is someone even worth my time to enforce boundaries (aka LTR). If you get flack from family members about being "controlling" or "possessive".....don't sweat it. Ho's gonna be ho's & you MUST be able to put them in their place at any moment.

Don't be afraid to tell her she can't do x,y,z (ex. drink without me there, go to clubs/bars, have gay friends, hang out with another male alone, or whatever you find unsuitable). This is where vetting is important because hopefully, you have not LTR'd up a gutter rat.

Other good phrases to use are: *"My girlfriend doesn't (insert bad behavior)". "That's not something my GF does". "You can do what you want, but I'm not going to be with someone who....."*

Was in a 3 year LTR & the first 2.5 years were fantastic because I set those boundaries. Be direct about what she can/can't do. "Let your yes be yes, & your no, no".

Theguygotgame777 • 2 points • 30 July, 2019 09:32 PM

Personally, I think the invention of sex dolls/robots, VR porn, and legalization of sex work will be, in the long run, the things that force women to return to their more traditional domestic status since they'll lose their sexual power over men.

RStonePT[S] • 2 points • 30 July, 2019 11:20 PM

Lol, sure

Those aren't the men they are vying for

clanleader • 2 points • 5 August, 2019 12:22 PM

Not sure I agree entirely. The reasons to not vet are of course valid for someone prone to being misled by girls, but vetting in and of itself is a necessary strategy for any relationship. Ignore vetting to your own detriment. All humans (men and women) are a blank canvas shaped by their experiences. Indeed AWALT will always apply but you can vet for a canvas that is currently a slut or you can vet for a virgin or low n count girl that's been brought up well and has shown that she's been able to keep her legs shut most of her life. Why wouldn't you do that? I agree though that making a "list" is a bit weird. Rather you should just gain the intuition through trial, error and experience as to which women are good social pretenders, which are genuine, and which meet your minimum standards in terms of a low n count. Low n count and genuineness should absolutely be a requirement before a man enters into a serious relationship with a woman. Whether a woman is pretending about either of these things can only be learnt through pain and experience. No man is ever born with that ability. Some "blue pill vet list of my unicorn" however will of course lead to a predictable disaster.

[deleted] • 2 points • 6 August, 2019 11:00 PM

This seems like it was written by a woman. Vetting won't stop me from fucking. However if a women has qualities that I like, why wouldn't I want to spend more time with her?

RStonePT[S] • 1 point • 7 August, 2019 12:46 PM

What does that have to do with anything written here?

[deleted] • 2 points • 13 August, 2019 10:24 PM

There seems to be a large upswing in the number of Autists creeping in from the dark recesses of the internet to argue lately. Dont agree that vetting is a pointless endeavor, but I do strongly agree with Boundaries being much more important than pre-screening.

RStonePT[S] • 1 point • 14 August, 2019 01:21 AM

If it got no resistance is think I was failing at offering insight.

BobbyPeru • 2 points • 15 August, 2019 12:22 AM

Vetting can be useful to RP men, but the woman should be totally unaware you are vetting.

Acta Non Verba... actions not words. Watch her subtle actions over a long period of time.

In the end, vetting is limited though because the woman will be auditioning until she locks you down

LifeTopic • 2 points • 25 July, 2019 04:24 PM

Spot on! So many guys on here think they'll find their unicorn by vetting her. They fail to realise they have the same goal as your average blooper. Only difference is that they're using redpill techniques

p3n1x • 4 points • 25 July, 2019 05:04 PM

How mighty the mental meltdown and denial when that Unicorn goes off-script.

AutoModerator[M] • 1 point • 25 July, 2019 03:22 PM

Why are we quarantined? The admin don't want you to know.

Register on our backup site: <https://www.trp.red> and reserve your reddit name today.

I am a bot, and this action was performed automatically. Please contact the moderators of this subreddit if you have any questions or concerns.

Gnosiis_ • 1 point • 25 July, 2019 05:00 PM

I need more reflection on some of these. You may be right that men may not know what they want due to a number of external factors such as feminism. However it is far easier to understand what a man DOESN'T want. I think most vetting starts from identifying red flags or other negative behaviors as a baseline.

I like #7. It's better not to be a control freak and just sit back and observe. It's far easier to understand what a person wants to do when they do it. Let them show their hand. See if they will listen to the devil on their left shoulder or the angel on their right. Then you can act accordingly.

On a side note I always like guys who have a big mission. Keep up the writing because you can't get there unless you just do it.

RStonePT[S] • 4 points • 25 July, 2019 05:13 PM

I don't believe I mentioned feminism, my example was a divorced mom turning a child into a promise keeper. I was guilty of being that for my teenager years, and suffered way too long of a bout of virginity because of it.

However it is far easier to understand what a man DOESN'T want

these are how boundaries are made. A very simple way to look at it

vetting = what I do want

Boundaries = what I won't accept

I like how you put it though, it's an ego free way of observing, instead of building a value system and jamming it into reality

Project_Zero_Betas • 1 point • 26 July, 2019 02:29 AM

vetting = what I do want

Boundaries = what I won't accept

Perfect phrasing.

mukumuku_pyonpyon • 1 point • 25 July, 2019 05:44 PM

Excellent read. Thank you sir

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 July, 2019 09:31 PM

Caricatural vetting as some advocate is stupid, that true.

Now if you plan for an LTR, you want to check some things like you kind of go along well, see if you can project to live with the other person, if your way to approach life and the point you are and she is on the road are compatible or not.

You also need to guard against some bad behavior too. If you understand that your potential LTR has borderline personality disorder, you know that you shall leave her while you still can.

I think one need to apply a bit of common sence.

RStonePT[S] • 1 point • 26 July, 2019 08:37 PM

you're describing boundary enforcement, so I wholeheartedly agree

ex_addict_bro • 1 point • 25 July, 2019 09:44 PM

The hell are you rationalising, mr Stone... rationalising in 7 parts...

RStonePT[S] • 1 point • 26 July, 2019 08:38 PM

Ha! I was going to have it as a 7k single post, but it was strongly suggested to break it up into bite sized pieces.

Blame ritalin.

It's just boundary enforcement, nothing you haven't heard before

Proto_Sigma • 1 point • 26 July, 2019 01:38 AM

I'd say that getting is necessary but not sufficient. The fact of the matter is some women aren't worth the headache- drug addicts or std riddled sloots for example. You as a man should absolutely identify and reject unviable candidates for prolonged affection, especially if you want to settle down and have children, for example.

That being said people obviously change and when they change for the worst you have to have consequences. Just as you don't stop running game when you get into a relationship or stop going to the gym you don't relax your standards. Vetting is merely setting boundaries before the relationship begins- if you don't maintain those boundaries they aren't going to matter. The game isn't over til you're dead.

RStonePT[S] • 1 point • 26 July, 2019 08:40 PM

The fact of the matter is some women aren't worth the headache- drug addicts or std riddled sloots for example.

Ever met a functioning alcoholic or drug user? you'd never know it for a long time

hazelstein • 1 point • 26 July, 2019 04:09 PM

Great Article. Very Interesting Read.

throwaway9324661 points 26 July, 2019 08:48 PM **[recovered]**

been lurking quite a while and still dont get any of it. is there a reason to make it deliberately hard to get into slang

RStonePT[S] • 3 points • 26 July, 2019 09:03 PM

Most of the slang exists to reinforce the idea of reading and lurking before posting, as well as distilling longer, more complex topics to single words for the sake of brevity.

The FAQ does a good job at getting newcomers up to speed. which are you having trouble with?

[deleted] 26 July, 2019 09:50 PM

[permanently deleted]

RStonePT[S] • 1 point • 26 July, 2019 11:19 PM

Go vet then

RivenHalf • 1 point • 26 July, 2019 11:44 PM

I see where you're coming from but not how you worded this. This isn't a new or foreign concept here and can be summed up way more simple. Vetting is flawed at its core because men will invent ways for a woman to pass if he wants her to pass. If a woman shows interest in a man 99% of average men will make a woman pass just because of that fact. At its core it's ego yes. Anyone that shows interest in you is automatically a unicorn. She is not like those other girls...until she is.

awakenedspirit1 • 1 point • 29 July, 2019 07:55 AM

Dude, this is great. Really appreciate you taking the time to write it up. It's another way to emphasize how important control game is. Thanks again.

BatsNightmares • 1 point • 29 July, 2019 08:21 PM

Fucking got it right. I've been setting my own updated boundaries the last few days, You can't believe the relief I have in my life. I do what I want whenever I want and on my own terms, no time to waste and if necessary not wasting it on other people, even if they're family members. Work, money and well being comes first to a man's life.

escapethesolarsystem • 1 point • 30 July, 2019 12:19 PM

Why not do both? With my current LTR, I vetted her before even considering getting in a relationship, shit-test her a bunch at the beginning of the relationship, then set strict boundaries moving forward.

Vetting a woman is vetting for values.

Maybe I see vetting a little differently. For me vetting means vetting for red flags, sexual history, relationship with parents, what kinds of friends she has, attitudes about money, etc. Good values is like a little extra frosting on the cake, but I don't hang too much on it because women are notorious for betraying their own values or "evolving" over time.

RStonePT[S] • 2 points • 30 July, 2019 01:00 PM

Oh yeah? I'll bet she was forthcoming with her sexual history too, and it was exactly what you wanted to hear

escapethesolarsystem • 1 point • 30 July, 2019 01:38 PM

There's other ways to verify than just asking. You can't be this dumb, right? It's pretty easy to get a rough idea of a girl's sexual history with a little digging, to see if what she says matches her actions and reality.

RStonePT[S] • 2 points • 30 July, 2019 02:23 PM

I'm not dumb, I'm also not naive. Your ability to be deceived will always be greater than your ability to detect deception.

If anything, you're making my case for me here. Maybe you're right, but I guarantee your ego is only showing you what you want to see with your stringent criteria.

Not to mention it's not the real issue anyways. N count is a secondary characteristic for a girl with short term impulse control problems. virgins are extinct

escapethesolarsystem • 3 points • 30 July, 2019 10:00 PM*

Your ability to be deceived will always be greater than your ability to detect deception.

Sounds good on paper but I'm not sure if this is actually the case. I think it all depends on your experience with detecting deception and who is doing the deceiving.

I guarantee your ego is only showing you what you want to see with your stringent criteria.

Not really. I certainly have a pretty large ego, but over 3 decades of mistakes I've developed a pretty rigorous set of intellectual rules to constantly evaluate and challenge the accuracy of my assessments about the world.

In then end, reality always wins, and lying to yourself only means you'll pay for it when reality catches up with you. With that in mind, I'm very careful about what I believe, why I believe it, and trusting myself. The most important thing for me is not to believe what feels good, but to make sure whatever I think or believe is the most accurate reflection of reality.

I have interacted with thousands of people over my life (as most people have), in 23 different countries (maybe a less common experience), and I've made a pretty extensive mental map people's behavior and what that says about who they are. When I go out, always I try to meet as many people as I can and understand what makes them tick. With that in mind, it's actually pretty easy to spot a slut, a liar, a naive innocent person, a person with certain personality flaws, a person with certain noble traits, a leader, a follower, a loser, a coward, a hero, etc.

Imagine there being a wide range of tells that suggest to some percentage of certainty that they are a certain kind of person. For example, let's say the tells of "she's a slut" to make it simple. You then interact with this women for some amount of time, and see how many of these tells she checks off. 10/20? 2/20? 18/20? and so on. Then you compare what she says to the number of tells she gives off. Say, she checks off 18/20 of the "I'm a huge slut" markers, then she says: "I've only slept with one guy!" It's easy to figure out she's probably a liar.

In addition to tells, you can also investigate her history, circumstances and personality. Did she have a lot of opportunities to sleep around? Did she not? Is she highly agreeable? What percentage of men does she give IOI's to? Every detail about the woman comes together like pieces of a giant puzzle, and in the end you have a rough idea of what kind of person she is and what the risk of getting in different types of relationships with her are.

Finally, none of this has to take a lot of time. If this kind of thinking and analysis is a habit, you can learn to put all the pieces together pretty fast. It's like doing puzzles over and over until you get really good at them. When I just turned 18, it would have taken me months and months to figure out anything about a person, and even then lots of my assessments were pretty far off. Now, a decade and a half on, I've become better with practice. A few days with someone, and I have a pretty large portion of the puzzle already filled in.

N count is a secondary characteristic for a girl with short term impulse control problems.

Yep, but give that girl a little bit of time and eventually her lack of impulse control will catch up with her and her N count will soar. Time corrects all imbalances.

virgins are extinct

Virgins are still moderately common in my part of the world. Different culture, different society, different socialization of women.

JamesSkepp • 2 points • 31 July, 2019 07:57 AM

I think it all depends on your experience with detecting deception and who is doing the deceiving.

She had more experience in hiding her "sluttiness" than you had uncovering it. It's natural for her to be private and prudent about it, AWALT. You OTOH are an outlier, 30 decades of experience with women is not the usual demographic of TRP. For an average young dude or someone who just found TRP it's better to assume she's hiding her past than assume you yourself judged her accurately.

10/20? 2/20? 18/20?

Do you actually have 20 checkpoints? If so post it even in a comment, maybe there's something new we can all learn.

RStonePT[S] • 1 point • 30 July, 2019 11:20 PM

K go getum tiger.

[deleted] • 1 point • 3 August, 2019 01:28 PM

Really interesting. What you seem to be saying is that no matter what, the woman will default into her 'true nature.' Does this imply that she cannot be trusted? And what about religious women who will meet many of our criteria. I'll admit I am a bit of a tradcon.

MasculineDevelopment • 1 point • 3 August, 2019 05:20 PM

Vetting plus boundaries work. Set boundaries, and see if she adheres to them. That's what vetting means - noticing if she will continually press them or not.

RStonePT[S] • 2 points • 3 August, 2019 11:44 PM

yes, if you use vetting as a word thats identical to boundaries then it works just find.

Boundary enforcement works better in my opinion

Totsean • 1 point • 7 August, 2019 07:15 PM

How about, VET first and get as close as possible. And then set boundaries that keep her in line. You can use both and they can easily compliment your approach. You need to vet to get the bad apples out, and get the red flags checked before you set boundaries.

RStonePT[S] • 2 points • 7 August, 2019 11:26 PM

Go getum tiger

calcul8rallig8r • 1 point • 9 August, 2019 05:19 PM

Women are like lumps play-doh, you arent going to fucking find one that is formed exactly like you want. Instead you have to take one and mold her using your boundaries and leadership

u-r-silly • 1 point • 10 August, 2019 05:07 PM

Vetting shouldn't be considered using qualifying values. It should be done regarding disqualifying behaviour, through all the relationship. Do not ignore red flags because miss unicorn passed your vetting with her values at some point in the past.

Remember the basic principles: a woman does not climb up your ladder, she can only be demoted to lower ranks.

metallicdrama • 1 point • 18 August, 2019 11:30 PM

They can pass your vetting at any time when it suits them. They will also let who they really are out at any time when it suits them. Women are never who they demonstrate themselves to be, who they would like to think of themselves as or anything but what they want to be at a moment's notice. Don't be a sucker.

Pistolius • 1 point • 28 July, 2019 04:41 AM

Interesting article but would it kill you to proof-read it?