

# Women used to be just like you

546 upvotes | 19 December, 2014 | by Archwinger

---

We often describe that men go through different stages of awareness as they learn about The Red Pill. We start off unaware, possibly even deluded, believing in a reality that really ought to exist – a reality that makes good logical sense – but one that doesn't work out in practice.

Because The Red Pill is a male-centered resource, we don't really devote much time to the perspective of women, other than to acknowledge their role in reality. When you think about that for a minute, we might be missing some information as a result. Women go through similar stages of awareness as they grow and develop. They don't emerge from the womb understanding themselves. Some never do.

Women start out a lot like we do. They've grown up watching the same Disney movies and living in the same society that we have. They start out genuinely believing in true love, that a certain "the one" is out there for them, and that there's someone for everyone. They genuinely believe that they want to meet and end up with a nice guy who treats them well (e.g., like a princess), and that this is the path to their happily ever after. A woman thinks that once she finds the perfect guy, she'll love him forever, he'll love her forever, they'll never get divorced, and they'll be happy, because they're both nice people who are nice to each other.

Why would a woman start out thinking anything different than what most of us started out thinking? Women grow up in the same world that we do and are exposed to the same message. They start out with very little self-awareness, and very little awareness of reality. They've been fed the same nonsense, and early on, they have no reason to believe the world is any other way.

When women start dating, many of them don't get it. They always seem to end up with the wrong sort of guys. It never works out. A guy will seem nice at first, but after awhile, she starts to notice his flaws, and he seems like a real asshole. Or a guy will seem nice at first, but after awhile, her feelings change, and that spark and chemistry in which she believes so strongly just isn't there. It doesn't dawn on women that sexual attraction is an important part of every relationship, because much like your average blue-pill-beta-loser guy, women have grown up being fed a line of bullshit about how sex is this trivial, minor thing, and real relationships are all about feelings. It also doesn't dawn on women that sexual attraction can cause them to fail to notice various things about the guys they date. That those "assholes" were always assholes, but due to her attraction, she never saw it. After all, sex is a minor, trivial thing, so to suggest that a woman's sexual attraction might blind her doesn't make any sense. You'd be calling women animals.

The very concept that a woman may be sexually attracted to someone who isn't a nice guy, and not attracted at all to someone who is, sounds like utter, hateful bullshit to an unaware woman, because it doesn't make sense. If you were to tell a woman something like this, she'd think you were calling her stupid, because who the hell isn't attracted to a nice guy who treats you like a princess? That would be stupid, right? Completely illogical.

But newbie women start out falling for the wrong sorts of guys and feeling nothing for the types of guys they always thought they wanted. This is the crossroads for a woman. Many of them stay stupid. They rationalize that the cocky, confident, assholes they keep falling for aren't actually assholes, or that they were so smitten they were just blind to it, and that while there's nothing wrong with the nice dudes, there's just no magic spark or chemistry there. But some of them start to get a little self-aware. They start learning girl-game.

Because society keeps trying to teach everybody that sex is a trivial, minor thing that for some reason,

shouldn't be a cornerstone of a relationship, that also means that sex outside of a relationship is a trivial, minor thing. So some girls start having sex outside of relationships. And they learn that guys are stupid and will do stupid things for sex. They learn that they can be as choosy as they want, because getting laid is pretty much guaranteed as long as they're decent-looking. They learn that it doesn't matter if the guy's an asshole and to just go with their feelings, since they're not looking for a relationship. They learn that relationships are pretty much guaranteed, too, since they have a stable of loser guys who want to fuck them just waiting in the wings, begging to be their boyfriends.

Some even learn that fucking guy A and having a relationship with guy B aren't mutually exclusive. Men practically beg for that outcome. Guy A doesn't want a relationship, and he's too much of an asshole to date anyway. And guy B wants to show off how nice he is, so he keeps insisting that sex isn't important to him and sits on his hands, never making a move except to buy shit for the girl. Men practically engineer this situation for women.

In a fairly short time, smart women become very self-aware. And self-aware women can be pretty manipulative cunts. After all, what's their incentive to be better? They can have all of the sex and free shit they want, and when that wellspring dries up, they can settle into a life of slightly less sex and all the free shit they want with one of the losers waiting in the wings.

A precious few self-aware women may end up as Red Pill Women, since they recognize that there's going to be a future time when they're not as hot, men don't want them as readily, and they really need to bring more to the table than mere existence if they want to end up with someone they actually like instead of someone they settle for after that wellspring runs dry.

But luckily for us, most women are pretty stupid. Okay, stupid's not the right word. I just threw that in there so the rest of Reddit can quote me as a woman-hater, because I think it's funny. And because most women are stupid cunts. More like...consciously ignorant, maybe? They never become self-aware. They'll hit 30, 40, 50, 60 and even go to their graves believing that things just didn't work out with the 200 guys they dated. Yes, after 200 different partners, not one was worth staying with. Either no chemistry or bad judgment in not realizing the guy was an asshole. They'll marry at 32, and genuinely believe things will work out for the best. Then end up cheating on their husbands, but figuring it's okay because it feels right and they're still searching for that Disney soulmate. Then end up divorcing their husbands because it didn't work out. No chemistry or he's an asshole. --Okay, maybe that's not the path most women take. But most end up settling, unhappily married, saddled with kids, not attracted to their husbands in the slightest, dreading the once a month missionary they have to endure.

They're not happy. Women who end up married to losers, used up by assholes – they're not happy. They'll never admit it, because admitting to mistakes would mean that they'd have to do something hard, like change, and women hate working hard. But lack of Red Pill awareness makes women unhappy, too. Not just men. Women get screwed because they grow up believing the same bullshit we do.

So the next time you're fucking some desperate 28-year-old you just picked up from a bar that you have no intention of ever committing to, remember to smile a little bit inside, because that used-up slut used to be just like you. Now look where you are, and look where she is. You're on top now. (Unless you like her on top.)

---

Archived from [theredarchive.com](http://theredarchive.com)

---

## Comments

---

[deleted] • 206 points • 19 December, 2014 06:30 PM

<http://therawness.com/the-myth-of-female-maturity-part-2/>

First, society is far more comfortable with teaching women about the dark side of men than vice versa. It starts in childhood with both the father and the mother's advice to the daughter, and it continues into adulthood. I touched on this yesterday, and I'll repeat it here, so forgive the overlap.

For example, I think books like *The Great Female Con* educate men to be aware of the dark side of many women. I think this is very important because I think the average man puts the average women on a pedestal far more often than vice versa, and men are trained and socialized by both parents to do this from young. Women on the other hand get an education from both parents on how to protect themselves from the dark side of most men from a very young age. "All men want is just one thing." "Give it up too fast and he won't stick around." "He's just not that into you." "He won't buy the cow if he can get the milk for free." "Don't let yourself be alone with a guy you barely know." "All men will cheat given the opportunity."

Meanwhile, I don't think men are capable of even believing the average woman has a dark side. They think only the outliers do. (I believe this is why the Madonna/Whore problem is still prevalent today.) Women are totally fine accepting that the average guy has a dark or unsavory side and that they need to be informed about that, without believing that doing so makes them man-haters. Yet men feel like the mere entertaining of the idea that the average woman (not just the mythical "bad girl") can have an unsavory side will transform them into instant misogynists.

For example, go into the relationship section and see how many relationship books aimed at women warning them about shady men. These are the female-targeted versions of books like *Women's Infidelity* and *The Great Female Con*. Book after book about dogs, cheaters, players, emotionally unavailable men, narcissistic men, "Nice Guys" (the apparent latest bogeyman of the dating world), immature men who need to "man up!," passive aggressive men, verbally abusive men, men who string women along with no intention of committing or marrying, and so forth. In fact a NY Times article once estimated that over 85% of codependence books are aimed at women. Yet you hardly see women on blogs, message boards, or book review sites falling over themselves to point out that it's only a subset of men like that, or to defend them in general. Even when women admit that all men don't fall into the bad categories described in a book or article, they make it clear they found "one of the good ones," which still implies that the good ones are a minority of what's out there.

However, when the tables are turned and the advice is about warning men about the dark side of many women, guys really resist it a lot more. The comparative lack of demand for such books alone speaks volumes. Men complain about the cynicism, decry the misogyny, say they don't want to think of women that way, they want to make sure it's clear that it's only a minority of women that are bad...they hate the very idea of any negative generalization about women. I'm not saying to demonize all women, start hating everything about them, and become a misogynist, but at the same time too many men are Pollyannaish and give them the benefit of the doubt to an extent that they never do for us, which ends up with a lot of guys getting totally blindsided later on. Many guys write me to ask about how they can learn to be less codependent and develop better boundaries, and from talking to them I've become convinced the biggest culprits are the implicit, unexamined belief that women are on average inherently more mature and empathetic than men, and the belief that if they stop viewing "good" women as naturally exalted enlightened creatures and start accepting them as a human mix of strengths and flaws, they won't be able to still love

them anymore. The Manic Pixie post touches on this latter idea.

As I said yesterday, I think these Pollyannaish beliefs men grow up with about women give men a lot of faulty, idealized expectations about women, and when they get blindsided and hurt enough times by women not living up to these ideals their parents and society put in their heads, they overcompensate in the opposite direction with extreme misogyny and a feeling that they've been lied to their whole lives. I think a lot of the new misogyny we're seeing wouldn't happen if society and parents were as comfortable educating boys about the dark side of women as they are educating women about the dark side of men.

alpha\_n3rd • 51 points • 19 December, 2014 08:12 PM

Holy fuck this hits the nail on the head

iBrokeRSA • 36 points • 19 December, 2014 11:10 PM

I like to think of women as snakes, just as the ancients did. They're pretty and fun to play with, but they'll fuck you up if you have no clue what you're doing.

Idle\_Redditng • 59 points • 19 December, 2014 10:52 PM\*

and a feeling that they've been lied to their whole lives

Men have been lied to their whole lives. It's why a sizable proportion of the guys here go here in the first place. The people who further the lies go so far as to demonize this place for helping men be more than beta doormats. They're also institutionalized to the point where any acceptable relationship advice is complete crap, with marriage counselors being among the very worst.

EDIT: Should have said institutionalized with things like divorce laws, child custody and child support laws, and harsher treatment towards men by cops and courts. Along with universities becoming an increasingly hostile environment towards men.

[deleted] • 26 points • 20 December, 2014 12:51 AM

Along with universities becoming an increasingly hostile environment towards men.

So much so, that if you don't support the feminist status quo, majority-ruled thought of academia, you are basically a heretic.

[deleted] • 43 points • 20 December, 2014 01:54 AM

[permanently deleted]

Luke666808g • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 06:22 AM

This woman that they boo'd, did she at least have a few choice quotes from 30 years ago that they could take out of context, or was it just for talking about men's rights?

Killer\_Wolf • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 07:42 PM

At my 65% female university

Let me guess, Sonoma State University ?

Am I right?

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 08:56 PM

[permanently deleted]

\_\_var • 1 point • 21 December, 2014 02:54 AM

Their website says 58.4% of incoming students are female.

Queen's University Quick Facts  
Enrollment Report (PDF)

ColdEiric • 0 points • 20 December, 2014 05:54 PM

The best laugh comes when they hit the wall.

oldredder • 5 points • 20 December, 2014 06:55 AM

Yup. Academia-hosted kangaroo-courts are a regular reminder the fires are being stoked for a fresh witch-burning and the standard has been set very, very low for what qualifies you to be a witch.

elysius • 22 points • 20 December, 2014 05:59 AM

society is far more comfortable with teaching women about the dark side of men than vice versa.

It's more useful for society that men are conned than women. A woman strapped to an unworthy man puts a burden on society -- they are going to either help raise her kids (welfare) or deal with the results of insufficient parenting (underachievement, crime). So it's important that women learn to recognize the deadbeats, even though their now unrestricted sexual nature makes that kind of knowledge mostly moot.

A man needs to believe a woman is special if he is to commit to her. Take away the fantasy that the woman he is in love with is different from the others and you've put the stability of the relationship at serious risk. A man who is living in hell but believes this is the best he can get is a very useful idiot: it's best that he provides for a family than to just spread his seed wantonly. So society tries to keep man in the dark as much as possible.

RedPope • 7 points • 20 December, 2014 09:15 AM

Excellent post.

We should point out the role of the birth control pill, Plan B, and abortions. These changed the game for women. It gave them absolute control over reproduction, and are directly responsible for "their now unrestricted sexual nature".

A man's options are dissatisfying (condoms) or permanent (vasectomy). As such, there has been no change in what boys are taught. Until a better male contraception is available, society will "keep man in the dark".

jerpta • 2 points • 21 December, 2014 10:48 AM

We should point out the role of the birth control pill, Plan B, and abortions. These changed the game for women. It gave them absolute control over reproduction, and are directly responsible for "their now unrestricted sexual nature".

I have a cousin to which this applies perfectly. Lost her virginity young, her mum took her straight down the doctor to get her on birth control.

As if by magic - she hits about, ooh, 30, 32 - and her boyfriend-at-the-time (who she'd known for a couple of months) is now going to be a dad. She's living in a room in a shared house - not exactly ideal conditions for a baby.

Turns out she "didn't think she could get pregnant".

Yeah, right. More likely she saw the wall rapidly approaching, stopped taking the pill and her hamster came up with that as an excuse to give her family and friends.

altra\_hex • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 07:35 PM

Enter Vasalgel. It still requires a shot to scrotum area, but it should be another option here in a couple more years.

Overkillengine • 2 points • 21 December, 2014 06:39 AM

Be prepared for it to be interfered with in some way via legislation/media circus. Having access to more hard to detect or tamper with male birth control options means it will be harder to extract funds from/lock down men and creates less future tax slaves via "oops" pregnancies.

Either harsher bachelor taxes or outlawing the birth control will be the probable routes of attack.

Society hates change that does not involve some sort of immediate profit.

circelhat • 14 points • 19 December, 2014 11:03 PM

I was hoping someone would say something like this, if all we had was Disney movies things would be fine. Instead we have a society reinforcing the female imperative.

Females are warn about the male imperative, that we will have sex with them without caring about their emotions

However males are never warn about females's hypergamy, beta bucks, alpha fucks.

Add to divorce laws and courts favoring women you have beta's trap.

No men is truly beta, its just most men aren't idiots if they fight back they lose everything they worked for so the wiser choice is to become a better man and improve themselves.

They make more money, buy more romantic dinners and yet they are stuck because divorce law.

oldredder • 3 points • 20 December, 2014 06:53 AM

upvoted but some men truly are beta. Ask yourself why a man who went through 2 divorce-rapes would marry a 3rd. Yet... they do.

PeppermintPig • 5 points • 20 December, 2014 11:58 AM

Timid or headstrong, men can always be burned by not paying attention. Being gentle and appearing beta-like doesn't inherently mean you're a sucker if you are watching for the red flags. One can always embrace the theta.

circelhat • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 12:18 PM

The concept of the one, he treats women as individuals, which is true but only to a extent(same with men)

CrimsonCapsule • 11 points • 20 December, 2014 02:37 AM

Absolutely. Not even *women* can speak truth to power about this. Remember all the heat the (very female) author of *Gone Girl* got?

<http://www.theguardian.com/film/2014/oct/07/gone-girl-backlash-david-fincher-misogynist-feminist>

[deleted] • 7 points • 20 December, 2014 04:01 AM

Hahahahaha holy shit! I got to this part:

Book after book about dogs, cheaters, players, emotionally unavailable men, narcissistic men, "Nice Guys" (the apparent latest bogeyman of the dating world), immature men who need to "man up!," passive aggressive men, **verbally abusive men**, men who string women along with no intention of committing or marrying, and so forth.

And I thought about why that sounds familiar. I leaned back in my chair and my eye wandered to the shelf above the computer desk and I shit you not this was what was on that shelf:

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

Rarely is it that a comment becomes so relevant so quickly.

Red\_Invictus • 3 points • 19 December, 2014 09:05 PM

Holy shit. So true. Will have to save this and read later in depth, thank you.

Larry-Man • 13 points • 20 December, 2014 09:56 AM

I think a lot of the new misogyny we're seeing wouldn't happen if society and parents were as comfortable educating boys about the dark side of women as they are educating women about the dark side of men.

I'm a feminist (I sub here to round out my views) and I agree with this statement 100%. Not sure how I feel about OP, I agreed with some bits, disagreed with others, but this post here is one of the greatest things I have read in a long time. Even though I'm a woman and generally take this sub with a grain of salt (or a few) I have to say men who are ill-prepared for the millions of fucked up women in the world are the ones who end up bitter and misogynist. I've been forewarned of all kinds of men out there and about manipulation and abuse and everything and we definitely just teach men to "be nice to women, respect women" - which is a good lesson but it never really occurred to me that there was such a strong double-standard of how men are raised to look at women.

As Annie Lennox said, some of them want to use you, some of them want to get used by you.....

F9R • 7 points • 20 December, 2014 09:26 PM

Good to see an openminded feminist. This subreddit is intended to be for men (a "male space", if you will), but if women want to stop by every now and then and see what the red pill is really about, especially in the context of rounding out their views, I think that's great. Some women come here and actually like what they see (which is why /r/RedPillWomen exists).

generally take this sub with a grain of salt (or a few)

That's how it should be taken. Many of the posts/comments around here are either guys shooting the shit and not caring about offending anyone, obnoxious newbies still in the anger phase jerking themselves off about how evil women are because they just got dumped, or jaded men who have failed to improve themselves and want to push the blame onto the opposite gender. For the most part, though, the guys in this subreddit do not hate women, and seek to understand them, and improve themselves, so that they can lead fulfilling lives. Sadly, the latter tend to be less vocal.

I'm pretty sold on most red pill ideas (they've improved my life considerably and do seem to reflect reality), but I still find myself having to filter out ~20% of this subreddit. The signal-to-noise ratio here isn't great, but the underlying message is powerful and, in my opinion, can provide guidance to men who have lost their sense of purpose in our increasingly gynocentric society. At the end of the day, all a guy

really wants is to have his primal needs met, to have a mission in life, and to feel wanted in some way (notice that sex is involved in two if not all three of these things). Feminism has made it more difficult for the average man to get these things, so we come here and talk about what we can do to now that the game has changed, so to speak. To quote the sidebar,

The Red Pill: Discussion of sexual strategy in a culture increasingly lacking a positive identity for men.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 12:30 PM

I'm a feminist

Boy did you take a wrong turn, ending up in this sub.

F9R • 11 points • 20 December, 2014 09:36 PM

Come on now, how many of us end up in TwoX every now and then? For fuck's sake, it seems like every other post on the front page of TRP is from that subreddit. We can't just all stay in our respective echo chambers and jerk ourselves off about how awesome *we* are and how evil *they* are. Sometimes it's good for people on opposite sides to, like, mingle around, and jerk *each other* off so that they can see where the other side is coming from; you cannot be secure in your beliefs unless you have intimately entertained their alternatives.

JackGetsIt • 6 points • 19 December, 2014 09:03 PM

Great post. Quick question:

Women's Infidelity and The Great Female Con

Have you read either of these?

vizakenjack • 0 points • 20 December, 2014 11:27 AM

"unexamined belief that women are on average inherently more mature and empathetic than men"

I'd have to disagree with that. Majority of men know women aren't angels, especially those who party/social/"players" etc

[deleted] • 39 points • 19 December, 2014 09:51 PM

[permanently deleted]

oldredder • 24 points • 20 December, 2014 06:25 AM

The difficulty there is you're family & male. What women will admit to each other with no men around and no family (I know, they are family to each other here too, bear with me) is entirely different than the hive-mind denial to your face because **damn, men aren't supposed to call us out on our shit, we must deny together using gurrll™ power**

MattyAnon • 7 points • 20 December, 2014 06:58 PM

But you missed the coded language.

They really said "he's too asexual, too beta, no alpha about him at all, utterly boring".

You said "You will never get the prince of your dreams." (At that age their brains still believe in that stuff, even if their pussies don't. And they don't see a mismatch between today's alpha asshole and future prince

charming.)

Of course they want to believe that they are nice, and maybe sometimes they even want a guy to be nice to them. It's just not as important as alpha, sexual, interesting, etc.

boloxchops • 22 points • 19 December, 2014 08:49 PM [\[recovered\]](#)

"More like...consciously ignorant, maybe?"

Best line ever. I call it voluntary naivete. They are stupid on purpose so long as it benefits them. "Oh he's just a friend. He's really nice to me and just wants friendship in return. Nothing more. "

JackGetsIt • 10 points • 19 December, 2014 08:57 PM

"Consciously ignorant" is the best description I've ever heard for women. I think that OP is underestimating the vast majority of women that would remain 'consciously ignorant' even if they received proper redpill understanding from redpill women. Society makes it way to easy and comfortable to stay playing the alpha fucks beta bucks game.

[deleted] • 36 points • 19 December, 2014 06:58 PM

[\[permanently deleted\]](#)

TheOneTrueMagnet • 20 points • 19 December, 2014 09:42 PM [\[recovered\]](#)

The real kicker is when you realize that most sluts are just the female equivalent of beta orbiters. The only difference is that they provide sex instead of resources.

Venicedreaming • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 04:43 AM

Then those two belong together eh? Less drama for our world for sure.

Antagonistic\_Comment • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 03:30 PM

If a "Sluts 4 Betas" resource program was established I'm sure our national average blood pressure would drop significantly.

jcrrpta • 0 points • 21 December, 2014 10:51 AM

Not really.

The sluts pussies would dry up like the sahara within minutes. You don't honestly think they'll be up for fucking betas now, do you?

[deleted] • 13 points • 19 December, 2014 07:27 PM\*

Great post as always. The issue runs even deeper than this. The past 50 years in the Western world has seen the erosion of the collectivistic, nuclear family and the introduction of the self-centered, hedonistic, and unsustainable (on a societal level) lifestyle. I think you're right in that women more often than men don't seem to realize the unsustainability of their actions until it comes down on them like a ton of bricks as they purchase their first cat to replace what had always been a Chad Thundercock. It turns out that one does reap what one sows, though it's comical that many women still lack the self-awareness even at this point.

[deleted] • 13 points • 20 December, 2014 01:03 AM

self awareness is too hard. cheesecake and sex and the city is easier.

oldredder • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 06:31 AM

The nuclear-family is unstable in the long-run and never could have lasted. However what we have now is worse. What was stable in the long-run is multiple generations living in the same home, all contributing to each other. Through good times & bad that lasted. Things got too good too quickly with cheap energy & now the good ride is over the shit-storm is coming

[deleted] • 30 points • 19 December, 2014 06:34 PM

I don't even talk to or approach women anymore if they look like they are in their late 20s. It's not worth the time or effort.

[deleted] • 34 points • 19 December, 2014 09:36 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 17 points • 19 December, 2014 09:38 PM

I notice that most of the women that approach me are in the late 20s bracket; they do make good plates if they're 'career women' or have given up on marriage already.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 16 points • 20 December, 2014 01:01 AM

women like that delude themselves into thinking that their partner prospects will always be there and will always get better. And that working like a man is what a modern women should do. Yes of course you can find some dude to fuck you, but the guys you get will be worse and worse, meanwhile they won't want to commit to a gross older "career" lady who would rather put in hours at an office wearing shoulder pads than actually have any female qualities whatsoever. The great tragedy here is that women have a total misconception about what makes them attractive to us.

For instance, I see often on instagram such things as "Strong is the new Beautiful". No sorry, beautiful is beautiful. Men don't want a woman that's like a man. Why do they even think that?

jrpta • 2 points • 21 December, 2014 10:54 AM

For instance, I see often on instagram such things as "Strong is the new Beautiful". No sorry, beautiful is beautiful. Men don't want a woman that's like a man. Why do they even think that?

It's not just men who are lied to. Women are too.

The feminist lie is enormous and it pervades society at every level; so much so that to deny it publicly is to become a social pariah. It's not like it's some huge conspiracy that all the women are in on - quite the reverse, it would never work that way.

lindependentmale • 5 points • 20 December, 2014 06:11 PM

'm always skeptical when a woman says she doesn't want to get married or doesn't want kids  
As you should be. Women who say this are liars.

My LTR told me the same. I was just a few months on the other side of a divorce when we met and I was very vocal about never getting married again and being done having children. She was all about it. Said she never wants to marry either, never dreamed of her wedding day like most

girls, doesn't want kids of her own, etc.

A year in and she changed her mind. Now that's all she wants. She asked me to sell my house that I love, get married, get a place together, undo my vasectomy and start over. I'm going to be 40 in a few years, I'll be god damned if I'm going to start a new family and jump on the crazy train that is marriage again. Fuck. That.

I said nope and won't be budging. I'd rather be single than married and raising children again. It's put a real strain on our relationship and I won't be surprised if we break up over it.

Overkillengine • 1 point • 21 December, 2014 06:44 AM

The louder they are about not wanting kids and marriage, the harder they are lying too.

"The lady doth protest too much, methinks"

If they really did not want that, they'd just say "nah" and go on with whatever they wanted to do instead.

[deleted] • 12 points • 20 December, 2014 12:58 AM

I get hit on a lot by older post-wall ladies at whatever offices I've worked at. The worst part to me is that they think they have a shot. That's what really grosses me out the most. Their reality is so far gone. Think, these are the same women that held out for career for several decades, far past reproductive age. Now they are unable to even have kids. But for some reason they think they still have a shot at guys younger than them for some what reason I have no idea. I would rather never have sex again for the rest of my life than to have sex with one of them a single time.

Venicedreaming • 7 points • 20 December, 2014 04:42 AM

Some men are into cougars yo, respect

rpkarmacomment score below threshold • -5 points • 20 December, 2014 05:37 AM

And in my experience all of those guys are either ugly or lack any sort of decent game. They're "into" Cougars because they can't bang that tight 20yo they follow on Instagram that they wank to every night.

ScumbagBillionaire • 22 points • 20 December, 2014 06:26 AM

Stop being so dramatic. Plenty of women over 28 still look good.

Girls that are hot as fuck typically remain hot as fuck into their mid 30's. It's average girls that hit the wall hard when they lose their youthfulness.

People need to stop fuckin dramatizing the wall so much on this subreddit in terms of attractiveness. Every day I leave my house I see objectively attractive women who are "post wall". It's when women near their 40's that most of them become undesirable with wrinkles and menopause and increased bitterness.

I feel like the guys who talk shit on banging hot 30 year olds on this subreddit are full of shit and have no life experience. Even the players I know who are in their early to mid twenties are down to bang hot 30 year olds and hot MILFs.

Pussy is pussy. Why the fuck would I turn down easy 30 year old snatch if she looks hot? One of the hottest chicks I've met of late was a 28 year old with an amazing body. Stacked fucking tits, small waist, and a fat ass. You sound like a keyboard warrior when you say stupid shit like "I would rather never have sex again than to have sex with one of them a single time".

I mean what age group are you talking about? 40's or 50's might make sense but the idea that a hot girl magically becomes unfuckable after the age of 29 is stupid as fuck. Dudes need to quit peddlin this keyboard warrior nonsense.

rpkarma • 5 points • 20 December, 2014 07:05 AM

Cougars are 40+ by definition bro. That's what I'm talking about.

Venicedreaming • 3 points • 20 December, 2014 11:53 PM

Some people like oldies, some like fatties, some like dudes. Just their taste yo

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

oldredder • 0 points • 20 December, 2014 06:18 AM

Ain't nuthin' free.

If she wants a free psychology lesson I'll give her one. It will be 100% manipulation layered in the tones & phrases she wants to hear but it will be self-serving to me alone.

Heys, ya gets what ya pays for.

Thank you NLP & alt.seduction.fast

GayLubeOil • 22 points • 19 December, 2014 10:04 PM

Excellent post. The reason why so many women are not self aware is that no one ever calls them out.

Lets say Liz is being a self centered cunt. How would she ever find out?

Most guys wont say anything because they want to fuck her and/or are told all their lives never to offend a women. Women will never say anything because they fear direct confrontation. They might talk shit behind her back but they would never flat out call her out (unless they're black). Liz has no mechanism of identifying problems in her behavior/logic so she cant correct it.

Society coddles women like their children. We spoil women. We don't tell them no. We don't call them out.

That's why we have to babysit.

ThorLives • 11 points • 19 December, 2014 11:07 PM

I really thought you were going to post the Bill Burr video: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hite8haEu\\_g](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hite8haEu_g)

Antibuddy • 3 points • 20 December, 2014 06:54 PM

And the problem becomes that after so many years of such treatment when you come along, some random asshole, and tell her how it *really* is, now *you're* the crazy one.

For every one person that's willing to set a woman straight, there are 20 that are happy to exist as shrubs in the grade-school play that is her life.

twolanterns • 5 points • 20 December, 2014 12:23 AM

This is what I've felt was the last piece of the puzzle. Why some women, although a minority, don't behave the way I would expect them to. Because I'm still very young, I see it a lot. Thanks man, this will really help me understand a lot more.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

Archwinger[S] • 89 points • 19 December, 2014 08:34 PM

Oh come on. You upvoted this crap for not being anti woman? I called them cunts twice in this post, and stupid at least a few times.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

Redrog1 • 5 points • 19 December, 2014 09:54 PM

That went well over your head, didn't it?

vengefully\_yours • 13 points • 20 December, 2014 12:41 AM

He might have taken some windchill damage, roll 2 d20.

sunwukong155 • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 04:43 PM

Most men are picky. I would never fuck a fatty or a girl that looks like a troll.

Nothing wrong with that.

sunwukong155 • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 04:41 PM

Hahaha "come on man! I'm TRYING to be anti-women?! What's a guy gotta do to be misogynistic around here?"

That's why I love the red pill. We don't hate women, we love them. We just love ourselves more.

Seriously though, you need to be a women beater or a rapist to be anti-women around here. Cunts are cunts and women are all kinds of stupid. Everyone here has seen it.

AdmiralVonJackass • 13 points • 19 December, 2014 10:22 PM

In the end it's you that ends up choosing what you'll put up with, and how you spend your time.

If you have to walk away from women, so be it. Are we to give up our time, money, and sanity, so that our wieners can get off to a better texture?

No thanks.

runnerrun2 • 7 points • 19 December, 2014 11:11 PM

Evolution has equipped women with a meriad of strategies that ensure they mate with the best available man they can get. This involves the potential for cheating, the need to entice displays of negative emotion, being strongly influenced by the opinions of other women, jealousy and so on. Best to accept this and play the game properly.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 03:07 PM

On the other hand everyone is what they are and they do what they do because that's just the way they are and thats what the society let's them get away with. Anyone with the same genetics and environment would act the same way.

While true the above argument is not a good one for stopping to call people out on their shit. Your anger might be the very thing that stops them.

ex\_astris\_sci • 23 points • 19 December, 2014 06:30 PM

You might be in need of a wake up call, too, if you genuinely think that most monogamous relationships (chemistry or not in the beginning) don't end up as those mediocre relationships you described towards the end. It makes no difference whether they go for the good/nice guy or not, monogamous relationships are by rule destined to fail sooner or later.

[deleted] • 23 points • 19 December, 2014 07:52 PM

That's why LTRs are considered hardmode. Both parties involved, men especially, constantly must strive to maintain attraction.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 5 points • 20 December, 2014 02:32 AM

I think what you are saying is true. Women who were very beautiful at a young age and were able to wake up sooner realize the game. They understand it in a deeper level. They play with their orbiters and truly often feel sorry for them.

They wonder if they will meet a good man who also knows game. Who is red pill aware of what he has to bring. And they are saddened by our societies creation of millions of blue pill orbiters.

They want to have children but so many men are just low value. They struggle the same.

runnerrun2 • 7 points • 19 December, 2014 11:14 PM

monogamous relationships are by rule destined to fail sooner or later.

Depends entirely on the social norms and social expectations and support structure they happen in. It's not uncommon for arranged marriages to work out better than people choosing love.

ScumbagBillionaire • 4 points • 20 December, 2014 06:30 AM

Because "love" isn't real. It's a myth forced on us which we're indoctrinated to believe in, like all religion.

"Love" is nothing more than chemicals, pheromones, and sexual urges that we rationalize as some objective, all powerful force, that will "conquer all".

Love is one of the biggest lies western society ever told.

runnerrun2 • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 12:32 PM

Well love in itself is a real thing (it's a mechanism evolution has shaped to ensure we pursue the proper mate), the lie is that once you find it, it magically lasts and as you say that it conquers all and other such properties that love doesn't have.

newlifeasredpill • 14 points • 19 December, 2014 06:54 PM

There are alot of men here who are quite happy in their LTR. They understand that the man is the prize and these men work hard to be their woman's best alternative.

ex\_astris\_sci • 5 points • 19 December, 2014 07:02 PM

What I mean is that sooner or later that chemistry will permanently vanish. You can try to be your woman's best alternative all you want after that point, it's all as pointless as it gets. Once you both realize that, yours becomes one of those mediocre relationships.

R4F1 • 18 points • 19 December, 2014 07:30 PM

You are definitely correct to assume that all relationships and marriages eventually wither to mediocrity. But I think many people have no problem with that. There are certain cultures where marriages start out mundane to begin with (arranged marriage), and then slowly become something more valuable once children and assets start becoming a bigger part of the picture. Some men just want a hot meal to return to from work, and a wife he can raise kids with, and whatnot.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 01:05 AM

honestly having all that beats the alternative. I know several older guys with absolutely no women or game at fucking all. Pretty sad. And apparently this is pretty common as a buddy of mine who also rents a room in a house says his housemates are such older single dudes (50's+). I have known for a while that I want kids and a family. I love kids, they are super cute and I think raising a family would be very fulfilling. Of course I want to sow my oats and bang lots of girls first. And trust me I've done lots of that too!

DaSaw • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 02:49 AM

Question: Do you intend to stop the oat sowing once you settle down? Do you expect to be able to?

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 04:50 AM

Yeah sure why not? I'll marry a hottie for sure and we'll be happy together. I think it's possible to be happy like that.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 03:13 PM

No matter how hot the girl... There is a guy somewhere tired of fucking her.

[deleted] • -1 points • 20 December, 2014 03:29 AM

I think it might be ok for me to just spin plates into any future LTR I get into. Keep getting numbers and secretly having women "friends". I just won't fuck them. Unless my wife gets fat and stops sucking my dick. Then I can move to a plate already spinning.

And I can play dread game because she knows that women are giving me their numbers. Just keep playing the game forever. There really is no other choice to keep your pre-selection bias high.

oldredder • 0 points • 20 December, 2014 06:44 AM

I'd rather stay single the rest of my life. No reason to avoid sex but plenty of reason to avoid letting a woman run my life/house from the inside. She'll get her shot at manipulation / exploitation elsewhere when I have a chance to hold frame or lose it. In my home I am king. It's my sanctuary and shall not be trespassed.

the\_red\_scimitar • 10 points • 19 December, 2014 08:06 PM

We're on the same page here. Ethically and openly non-monogamous. I think one of the worst things, if you want a real LTR, is living together. Sounds odd, I know - an LTR where you live apart, but basically, seeing anybody most days is going to cause that relationship to decay to a perfunctory shorthand set of actions in place of actual participation.

A big part of keeping it alive seems to be seeing each other less often. This limits the effect of

"familiarity breeds contempt", and accentuates "absence makes the heart grows fonder".

I'm not saying this is good in a child-raising situation, just strictly from the viewpoint of delaying mediocrity as long as possible.

Anyway, there are lots of problems with that in traditional relationships. Not much as a solo poly guy (and "solo poly" is now a "thing" and a term, per Dan Savage just this week - a person who has multiple relationships of different intimacy and significance, simultaneously - i.e. no primary relationship).

"Solo poly" sucks as a term though, because it is just awkward (sounds like "sloppily"). So... Mono Poly? No, that's a board game. Frankly, in the past, it had a name: non-hierarchical open relationship.

ThorLives • 11 points • 19 December, 2014 10:49 PM

Not much as a solo poly guy (and "solo poly" is now a "thing" and a term, per Dan Savage just this week - a person who has multiple relationships of different intimacy and significance, simultaneously - i.e. no primary relationship).

To be honest, whenever I hear a guy say he's "poly", it really just means that he's a player, but he's smart enough to use the "poly" euphemism for what he's doing -- for PR reasons.

[deleted] • 3 points • 20 December, 2014 02:20 AM

He's spinning plates and calling it by happy terms so he can feel 'honest'.

the\_red\_scimitar • 1 point • 22 December, 2014 05:14 AM

You are so very wrong. This is one of the reasons I dislike the word poly - most people have no idea even what it means, so they've concocted some bogus definition based on what somebody did who claimed they were poly.

Just because some players pretend to be poly, doesn't mean poly = player. It's just convenient for them to use it as a smokescreen. There is another whole thing called poly which is actually what the word originally meant.

So... how about not using the label in such a prejudiced way? How about using some social consciousness before making such blanket and frankly hate-speech language. It's like saying "all gay people are just promiscuous butt-fuckers". It's exactly the same kind of ignorance.

[deleted] • 0 points • 19 December, 2014 08:31 PM

[permanently deleted]

the\_red\_scimitar • 3 points • 19 December, 2014 09:28 PM

There is nothing wrong with monogamy that couldn't be cured by real honesty, and by giving women a hypergamectomy. Sadly, nobody seems to know how to do the latter.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 December, 2014 11:05 PM

What do you mean by "hypergamectomy"?

Subtleterious • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 01:08 AM

I think it means removing their hypergamous ambitions. Think of it as appendectomy for the personality.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 02:55 AM

Jeez that sounds hella difficult. Lol.

oldredder • 4 points • 20 December, 2014 06:41 AM

it's downright incomprethinkable

the\_red\_scimitar • 1 point • 22 December, 2014 05:15 AM

Coined satirical word for "surgical removal of one's hypergamy".

vengefully\_yours • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 12:44 AM

There is a reason for the term "Seven year itch" and it's not eczema.

vacuu • 5 points • 20 December, 2014 08:11 AM

Great post, and even more than that, it's a great perspective to take and think about.

I recently saw a typical tumblr post getting liked on facebook, posted by a female and upvoted by all her friends. Overall, it pretty was benign and the type of thing you ignore.

But being ever observant however, I was watching who was liking it. 19 women and 1 guy liked it. lol, who is this guy? I browse to his profile and see he studies women, gender, and sexuality at a university. I guess that answers that question.

Anyway, I watch a video on his wall - it looks like typical "girl power" feminist stuff. Being the open minded and unbigoted redpilller that I am, I watch the video and actually thought it was interesting and got good information out of it.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XjQBJWYDTs>

Obviously the conclusion of the video is wrong, but lets break it down.

In the beginning of the video we have some socially well-adjusted adults who illustrate the typical feminine behaviors when asked to do certain actions "like a girl". This is followed by prepubescent girls asked to illustrate those same things, but they don't display any of those preconceived feminine behaviors.

This is healthy in my opinion, and shows a real change in girls as they develop. In a society that has a healthy relationship between men and women, the women are able to become more feminine and behave "like a girl" because there are men always around to protect and support them. The reason is because in that more traditional society, women have value. They are worth pursuing by men, and hence they can afford to become more feminine.

At this point in the video however, they introduce a clearly emotionally damaged feminist. Unlike all the other people in the video, she looks unhealthy, like she has all kinds of psychological issues. Her facial expressions show thinly veiled sadness and anger. Her bright lipstick shows a need for attention, which she doesn't know how to get from a man. She is overweight, most likely from overeating due to anxiety.

Her entire point in the video is that women should not be weaker, different than men, or reliant on men. And from her perspective, since no men want her anymore, she is actually forced to get rid of her femininity and become more masculine because she has no one there to take care of her. Because she was fed lies most of her life about how good it was to be a promiscuous strong man-hating female, she ended up with actually no option to be feminine or happy. And now she is feeding those lies to the younger generation. She's bitter that she didn't get to experience attention and love in her life, and to feel better she must believe that it actually can't exist for anyone else. Because of her ego, emotional damage, and social network of people just like her, she keeps

pushing forward the ideology.

Tying this back to the OP, there are systemic problems being perpetuated in society. Women are being lied to about their identity and what makes them valuable to men, and how to be loved and happy. In turn, these women grow up used and bitter, and indoctrinate the younger girls to ensure they are just like them. Men are letting themselves be used, and more importantly perpetuating the lie. They aren't rejecting these out of control women, but instead enable them and stay silent. Fathers are too timid to raise their own children to know the truth, many times because they are too scared to accept the truth themselves. If the knowledge transfer from father to son is broken, society will fall apart.

human\_bean\_ • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 09:30 AM

Suppressing natural female instincts to make them act more masculine.

Yeah, I'm sure that will make girls and women more happy on the long run.

dj10show • 13 points • 19 December, 2014 06:55 PM\*

I somehow doubt that lack of Red Pill awareness makes women unhappy. They get the best of both worlds with their alpha fucks/beta bucks and can easily pass blame elsewhere.

I'd be pretty stoked to have a wife who was a good mom, a freak in the sheets (may or may not be the same girl), and no accountability for anything that was my fault.

I think that's a bit of a hamster statement for those of us that aren't at that 20% SMV level to get the 80%

[deleted] • 17 points • 19 December, 2014 07:41 PM

I somehow doubt that lack of Red Pill awareness makes women unhappy.

post-wall.

It makes a lot of them unhappy in the long-view. They have it made in their twenties and early thirties, sure.

[deleted] • 3 points • 20 December, 2014 01:07 AM

early thirties

this is diminishing really really fast. Unfortunately for them. I actually sympathize with them. It's like they don't know.

Hoodwink • 6 points • 20 December, 2014 02:54 AM

There is a constant feminist and tabloid chorus in the background telling them they can have it all and that 40 is the new 20 for women.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 03:31 AM

LOL so true. But there are women who realize that they were hotter at 18 then they are at 24.

They see their witchcraft fading.

Though they are still AWALT and will still cheat on you if you lose frame and your SMV falls.

\_fappycamper • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 02:23 PM

My buddies girlfriend is 32 (he is 26). She is a typical CC rider and you can tell that she is standing with her face pressed against the wall. Needless to say any conversation with her is pure RP gold.

Venicedreaming • 3 points • 20 December, 2014 04:47 AM

Careful there, once you unveil the secrets they may up their feminist game

teeelo • 3 points • 19 December, 2014 08:56 PM

This was a really great post OP, thanks for taking the time to write it up.

FrontTooth • 10 points • 19 December, 2014 10:52 PM

I think you overestimate what impact disney movies have, and "society" is a very, very, general term. I won't dive into googling now but research shows that friends are the most influential thing in life for kids and teenagers. And friendcircles are influenced by the current culture of TV, school, and the like so I guess we end up with society anyway, but I prefer to call it modern culture.

Girls in my college, when talking about marriage, say that they don't want to marry young because they want to "live" before they do. I translate that as marriage is now seen as a boring thing. Being with one man is boring. And who can blame them? Getting emotionally caroused by one good looking alpha male one week and then once again hardfucked by another the other week? What kind of girl wouldn't love that? Girlie TV shows like Sex and the City, Girls, Gossip girl, pretty little liars, desperate housewives etc. Its all about sex, money, and drama. It's narcissism and hedonism to its very core. And they all happen to be good looking, (mostly born or married) rich, and somewhat successful in their settling. Whether this trend is a consequence of the female nature, or of our modern capitalistic materialistic culture, I don't know. It seems to be the case in every society, so I wager for the earlier alternative. It would explain why human society has repressed female sexual freedom for so long. According to feminist, that is just a story of barbaric-gender oppression rooted in physical attributes of the naturally stronger gender. I'm not convinced.

Its not really a one gender thing, look at boys shows and its all about action, fucking supersexy ladies and being the tough guy. Maybe the difference is that modern male-portraits actually achieve stuff rather than bicker and being born rich. You say that women are ignorant, maybe see when it comes to looking over the larger perspective, over the horizon, but they still outdo males in school and are expected to surpass males in income very soon. They are more successful in handling modern society, a fact that can not be ignored. Male repression in schools and culture could be another, but I am yet to see an example of a case that proves it.

And many women still achieve what they want by either single motherhood, settling down in their 30's with someone who is a lesser alpha or upper beta, they still have the picking since they have vaginas. Or just not having kids at all. For what I know women aren't more unhappy than men.

I'm not so sure that if I would follow hardcore TRP philosophy and be a lonely unmarried male without sons in my 40's that I would be "on top" compared to a woman that has gotten equally laid, married unmarried, divorced or not, and still has kids. She can still rationalize herself to happiness in solitude. "I've lived a good life, kids!". Chocolate and dramashows will be there for them, while men turn to frustrated humps, in worst case pedophilia. I guess my conclusion is, women have never been like me, just because I fuck bar sluts and don't commit to them doesn't mean I have really achieve anything, and neither does it ensure long term happiness.

Antibuddy • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 06:51 PM

Achwinger, you are easily my favorite poster around here. I want to be you when I grow up. But I'm 30 and it would be super awkward if you're younger than me.

[deleted] • 3 points • 20 December, 2014 04:16 AM

Another great theory post. Thanks for sharing; I'll be keeping a copy of this saved somewhere.

Scw222 • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 04:18 AM

This is pretty well written and something a bit different than the average post. Nice job.

Overkillengine • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 08:18 AM

Corollary:

Just because you understand that the societal bullshit indoctrination is fucking her up as bad or worse than you, still does *not* make it your job to be Captain Save A Ho.

praiseth3sun • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 02:12 PM

Very well written and great analysis! Especially that last line

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 08:08 PM

Women get screwed because they grow up believing the same bullshit we do

At least as a man I know what I am attracted to. A fit girl with a pretty face, C tits and not a bitch. If you ask a woman they will say "a nice guy who is sensitive..." ha next joke. Either most women don't know what they are attracted to or their liars

Sasha\_ • 1 point • 22 December, 2014 07:00 PM

Very good.

A woman marries the man of her dreams. After a while she sees faults, maybe he suffers a career set-back. "This can't be right," she thinks, "men are privileged - I've been told so all my life." But if he fairs somehow, then he can't be a rear 'man', and if he's not a real man, and he's certainly not a woman, then he's not really 'human'...

And in a flash she falls out of 'love' with this sub-human succubus he tricked his way into her bed, and begins to reject this animal-imposter.

87GNX • 1 point • 24 December, 2014 03:47 PM

Annnnd you've just described why Christian girls are sluts.

asd1100 • -1 points • 20 December, 2014 06:51 AM **[recovered]**

THis is so much woman bait "I can't even".... - seriously mods, I get the need to be more accessible to man pussies, but are we fishing for women now too?

Women stop thinking like men from the moment we stop acting like human beings around them and start behaving like subservient hairless chimps.(as early as 3 or 4 - not kidding, our self-esteem culture is creating monsters that know nothing of emotional boundaries)

Their self-awareness is limited structurally, unless a woman undergoes a trauma repressing her impulses(emotional reactions) interlap in every action she undertakes, she is not as rational(the functional definition of rationality applied to men) as you and me: between intent and action there is no direct causality(pussy men do it to, so no misoginity there). Intent is more orientative than imperative, the vague: "I want to eat healthy" is much preferred to "I will only eat oats for breakfast".(those who know about frame control in relationships know why that is: vagueness breads exceptionalism)

It's not that she thinks you are calling her stupid/unhappy, she thinks you think she won't have it(=doesn't deserve it). Because that is how a woman's mind works. THEY call us entitled, but in their solipsistic bubble they deserve all the good things they get romantically(this applies to other people as well: that asshole isn't loved because of tricks, but because he deserves love) and all the bad things are other peoples/circumstantial(or like

you are doing: because of culture). That is why critiques to a woman's sexual strategy takes away from her as a person, it is an insult, it's like commenting on a man's manliness, valor or courage, it cracks at a fundamental level your ego.

Antibuddy • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 07:07 PM

First of all, at 3 or 4, boys either HATE girls or are completely indifferent to them. This continues for years. Second of all, you have too many fucking parenthesis. For the love of God.

Gilda87 • -4 points • 20 December, 2014 02:47 AM

So the next time you're fucking some desperate 28-year-old you just picked up from a bar that you have no intention of ever committing to, remember to smile a little bit inside, because that used-up slut used to be just like you. Now look where you are, and look where she is. You're on top now. (Unless you like her on top.)

Double standard alert. Sex is important, but if a woman has too much sex, she is a used up slut.

[deleted] • 3 points • 20 December, 2014 07:15 AM

Not really a double standard since having sex for men is considered a skill due to it being a lot harder for a man to have sex than a woman. Women just practically have sex thrown at them, even if they are average Looking. Shaming someone for not having any self control and indulging in something that is commonly available to them makes perfect sense.

human\_bean\_ • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 09:32 AM

I don't know if my lack of capability for schadenfreude and general pettiness is a strength or a weakness.

Antibuddy • 0 points • 20 December, 2014 07:11 PM

I don't know why people think double standard is a dirty word. Yes, it's a double standard. There's a standard for women and quite separate standard for men even pertaining to the same thing, in this case sex.

[deleted] • -1 points • 20 December, 2014 02:21 AM

[permanently deleted]

favourthebold • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 05:59 AM

Yeah man. Things are as they are. Don't deal with any girls in the short term. Get in shape.

the\_red\_scimitarcomment score below threshold • -6 points • 19 December, 2014 08:00 PM

This entirely misses the mark. In fact, I can't tell from what OP wrote that he has really read much in RP, and certainly doesn't seem to have experienced almost anything as a test of it. That could all be wrong, but if it is, then OP hasn't understood what he read.

The whole gender role programming that one gets growing up seems to be something OP has forgotten. And THAT is ... oh... pretty much everything that isn't strictly biological.

And speaking of - just like men? Women start out just like men? Not at all. Not from the moment sperm fertilizes egg is a female "just like" any male.

There are biological and genetic differences all the way. And those drive much behavior, and what it doesn't drive, social programming provides.

Even the whole relationship drama spelled out misses the entire point: hypergamy, shit tests, SMV, and the like. This is why it seems he's basically read nothing as far as actual theory goes, and has just read random posts.

OP: Read... oh... best of Rational Male. Listen to about 20 hours of the Black Phillip Show. And if you did before, this time, actually pay attention to the stuff you tossed out as unimportant, because apparently that was actually the RP material.

Archwinger[S] • 12 points • 19 December, 2014 08:30 PM

You're buying a little too much into the everything-is-this-way-due-to-biology school of thought. Being born female does make a woman physically and mentally different than a man, but the X chromosome doesn't actually affect what she thinks is and isn't reality. That's not biological, any more than being born male biologically forces you to ascribe to conventional (e.g., blue pill) or red pill beliefs.

My contention is that women actually experience the same social programming that we do. They respond to it somewhat differently, of course, because they fill an entirely different role both in the false reality we're taught and the actual reality that exists. But they start out in the same non-aware place that we do. They end up in an entirely different place.

And without awareness of how the world actually works, most of them aren't happy.

the\_red\_scimitarcomment score below threshold • -7 points • 19 December, 2014 09:24 PM

No, you're reading into what I wrote. I also mentioned social programming, and did not give either a vote of supremacy. So, since your premise is wrong, your reply isn't very cogent.

There is so much that is just factually wrong in your comment, I don't know where to begin. How about genetics? The "X" chromosome isn't a gene, and it "affects" nothing. The genes, however, do, and they absolutely do affect how thinking gets done. Unless you have some genetics breakthrough that proves wrong many studies of such things, all of which you can do your own search for, then ... no, absolutely incorrect. Mental illness is very much subject to gene expression, for example, but that's a tiny one.

Next: Women experience the same social programming. Wrong, and, frankly, very obviously wrong. First off, there's identification. People experience the same stimulus in different ways. And some of that is gender based. But also, people have been told they are "a girl" or "a boy", and one has role models that may be influenced by this. Girls will tend to mimic girls more than they mimic boys. They take cues from what other girls are doing and saying, just as boys do with other boys. Obviously there are exceptions, but as with all RP, we are talking about, usually, the heteronormative state.

If you mean the environment presents the same things - no, again. Sure, if boys and girls are in the same room, watching the same show, the SHOW is the same. But their experience of the show is not the same - not at all, and not for any of them as compared to any other of them in the same room at the same time. Anybody who's heard multiple people tell what happened at a crime that they witnessed knows that people experience sometimes dramatically different things from the same actual occurrence.

They don't even "start out in the same non-aware place". The genetics ensures that they don't, except on a simplistic, ignore-most-of-the-facts sort of over generalization, as in "well, they start as one cell, then divide into two". Sure, that happens. It says nothing about the individual. You might as well describe personalities based on the bumps on one's head, as the old-timey phrenologists used to do. Absolute non-factual bullshit.

Archwinger[S] • 2 points • 19 December, 2014 09:34 PM

This is borderline philosophy. People with brown eyes and people with blue eyes might see the color green differently. Maybe blue-eyed people see green as red and red as green, but they grow up their entire lives calling red green and associating everything we associate with green with red instead.

But red is a much warmer color. It hits the eyes with different wavelengths of reflected light. Some

things about red and how it affects you may be immutable. Even though blue-eyed people were exposed to the same color, maybe it's perceived differently, and that's why everybody doesn't have the same favorite color, right?

the\_red\_scimitar • -3 points • 19 December, 2014 10:12 PM

Sigh. First off: restatement of very old debate about perception and reality.

Secondly, it appears, once again, that you have spun far off of any recognizable topic. I'll comment if and when there is anything relevant. That is all.

Archwinger[S] • 6 points • 19 December, 2014 10:40 PM

Yeah. We're just not on the same wavelength today. I appreciate the alternate perspective to think about.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 12:38 PM

Sigh.

No need to be condescending, *especially* to a highly regarded, endorsed contributor. Disagreement is fine, condescension is not.

the\_red\_scimitar • 0 points • 22 December, 2014 05:17 AM

Hey! We also have our version of suck-up SJW. Just repositioned into an RP framework. People, meet your new Keeper Of Propriety for TRP, u/sway\_usa.

Antibuddy • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 07:19 PM

Half of this post is you saying "You are wrong" and the other half is complete garbage. Your distinction of chromosomes and genes is an exercise in semantic nit-picking like that seen in a high school debate. What flies over your head is that the social programming /u/Archwinger talks about pertains to how they deal with the opposite sex specifically, not the sum total of social programming each gender receives.

And then you write fagshit like "sigh" down below. Get the fuck outta here man. That's low-level crowd manipulation that's not going to work on people who actually know what's up. If you're so smart, then write a post better than this.

the\_red\_scimitar • 1 point • 22 December, 2014 05:21 AM

Since you think you know my mind, I'll just say that you are... wrong. Maybe ask what I think before you comment on things I did not say. I never said anything about the scope of the social programming, but you read that in. So fine - you are sensitive to that issue.

And I don't think anybody in TRP can really credit the use of "fagshit" in what you pretended was an intelligent reply, earlier.

So since you are an expert in high school debate (as opposed to actual debate), I'm afraid you got an F for the obvious failure of logic and substituting ad hominem attack for... well, anything at all.

Okay, done failing your fail. Please reply with appropriately apoplectic and content-empty invective.

newlifeasredpill • 7 points • 19 December, 2014 08:26 PM

"Cant tell from what OP wrote that he has really read much in RP"

Dude...archwinger has FORGOTTEN more RP then you will ever know.

Archwinger[S] • 1 point • 19 December, 2014 08:29 PM

I don't need a white knight. You're pretty cute, though. Not really my type.

teelo • 2 points • 19 December, 2014 09:14 PM

Shhhh didn't you hear that guy? You don't get it! Go back to the matrix Beta bux!

the\_red\_scimitar • 1 point • 19 December, 2014 09:15 PM

Thanks, fan of Archwinger. I stand by my statement. Forgetting stuff = not knowing it. So... thanks for the support?

newlifeasredpill • -1 points • 19 December, 2014 09:33 PM

No. You rarely write anything worth supporting. You write bitter rambling dissents that bragsplain your "non monogamous" lifestyle. You just aim to be disagreeable whether the thoughts make sense or not.

the\_red\_scimitar • 0 points • 19 December, 2014 10:13 PM

Lol. Nothing bitter or dissenty in your post.

And obviously, as a disagreeable person that you are, you only see disagreement. If you read much of my posts, you know there is a lot of other stuff. But you'll see what you want to, and I can't stop your from you fantasy existence as a Archwinger disciple. So carry on - whatevs.

[deleted] • -1 points • 20 December, 2014 09:52 AM

[permanently deleted]

MagicGainbow • 1 point • 20 December, 2014 01:07 PM

Says the guy wasting his life away on WoW, I consider that sad, does that make me right? it's all perspective.

Viirocomment score below threshold • -5 points • 20 December, 2014 01:17 PM

Awh that's a funny way to make a point. Are you a child :)?

Viirocomment score below threshold • -5 points • 20 December, 2014 01:19 PM

Actually don't bother. On second thought; I have no intrest in talking to anyone from this subreddit. You literally disgust me. Have fun with all this, i'm sure it works out great!

Antibuddy • 2 points • 20 December, 2014 06:59 PM

So you came here looking to express your dissatisfaction with our membership, and you open with the insult that we are basically embarrassing ourselves.

Then someone tells you that you aren't anybody to make that claim, because you belong to a group of people that no one takes seriously anyway, that people would also say embarrass themselves on the regular.

Then you say you don't wanna talk. Despite being the one to start the conversation.

You're a fucking idiot dude.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]