

Sluts & Studs: Why Promiscuity is Acceptable for Men and Not Women

291 upvotes | 5 January, 2015 | by Cyralea

"Doesn't TRP encourage men to have sex with lots of women? Aren't you guys just a bunch of hypocrites for saying women can't do the same?"

We've all heard this before. It's about time we put this one to rest. Male promiscuity differs from female promiscuity because **men and women are not the same**. This is the lie that's told in overly progressive societies, but with some examination this is clear to see how it's inaccurate.

There are several differences between genders that determine why one behaviour is acceptable and the other not. The first is the most relevant one, and the one that is the core of most human behaviour: evolutionary psychology. Throughout every population on earth you can pick out qualities that are common to nearly all people -- such qualities aren't accidental. Most people have a natural aversion to danger, for example, the reason being that those that did not have this aversion simply didn't live to procreate as well as those that did.

So what's the evolutionary advantage to slut aversion in males? Simple, prior to modern technology, there was no way to ensure that a child was biologically yours. Men who were averse to promiscuity had an advantage in that they avoided being cuckolded. Eventually they would have outcompeted the DNA of a man who was indifferent to slutty behaviour. This is why you see anti-slut attitudes across multiple cultures. Women would not have developed this trait because they cannot be cuckolded.

The second reason comes down to value. Desire is often determined by the need to have something of value. Consider how women find the Chanel brand desirable. Get your girl a Chanel bag and watch her excitement. Now imagine that Chanel bags were given to every girl in the world. How much do you think women would care about it then? It's precisely the rarity of the object that foments that desire.

For women, sleeping around is trivial. It literally requires no effort to be a slut; announce your intentions and open your legs, that's about it. A female slut is the equivalent of a Walmart-brand handbag. In fact, it's incredibly rare that a woman remains chaste as she ages. Women have their SMV front-loaded; they are at their most attractive during their youth for no other reason than being young and nubile. They will have offers left and right. Note that this is about the number of partners, and not frequency of sex; a woman that fucks the same man a thousand times a year would have men lining up to marry her, a woman who has slept with a thousand men, not so much.

Conversely, male virginity is trivial. A man that does nothing to raise his SMV runs a real risk of being a lifelong virgin. Women generally only have eyes for the top 20% of men. To be the kind of man that most women want to fuck is incredibly hard. To be a player that has slept with many women requires that that man have raised his SMV to the point that other women want to fuck him, if only because he is desirable to other women. Note how this is not true for men -- we don't give a fuck that our best mate wants to fuck a chick, only that we do.

Those are the core reasons. Jim Jeffries said it best: "There are many fat, ugly sluts, but no fat, ugly studs" I'll finish with my favourite analogy on the matter:

"A key that can open many locks is a very good key; a lock that is opened by many keys is a shitty lock"

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

runnerrun2 • 66 points • 5 January, 2015 06:39 PM

Women have a 9 month investment in a child. A woman is sure the child hers, a man isn't. This makes our psychology that men are sexually attracted to most women while women are only sexually attracted to a select few men. These are the only causes of why it is the way it is, all the rest follows naturally.

sp0radic • 4 points • 5 January, 2015 10:33 PM

For more information... http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parental_investment

[deleted] • 0 points • 5 January, 2015 06:44 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 26 points • 5 January, 2015 06:53 PM

Alpha fucks/Beta Bucks. Women will get pregnant with the Alpha Fuck machine and then seek to lock down a Beta Bucks provider she knows will be loyal and provide for her and her kid. This is basic stuff here.

dbphreakdb • 1 point • 5 January, 2015 07:10 PM

The problem with this, is that the Alpha Offspring, being a creature of his environment, will become Beta, thus fueling the machine of Hypergamy and the degradation of values within society

ziggypipes • 23 points • 5 January, 2015 07:15 PM

AF/BB is the pure nature of women. You cant change that.

GRRMkills • 3 points • 5 January, 2015 07:26 PM [recovered]

No, in the AF/BB theory we need betas for society to continue functioning normally. Suppose 60% of children are fathered by alphas, 40% by betas, but only 10% of the population is alpha. If those 60% of children with alpha fathers all turned into alphas themselves, society would change drastically.

Whether or not it would be a good thing for there to be more alphas in society is questionable. I prefer to have enough to have some voting power and protect our rights/values, but not enough to where there's too many people competing for the small amount of room at the top

DarthRoach • 3 points • 6 January, 2015 02:39 PM

You can't have a functioning society made wholly of leaders.

dbphreakdb • 1 point • 8 January, 2015 07:54 PM

The question at that point would be a question of scale.

Are you a leader in your own home only? In your community? In your city? In your state? In your region? In your country?

If society were all of a sudden to 'flip alpha', and retained the framework of a functioning civilization/society based upon the benefits it offers, I think it would function far more efficiently than any iteration of government we have now.

exit_sandman • 1 point • 18 January, 2015 12:42 PM

Reminds me of Cyprus in Brave New World.

Heck, Aldous Huxley even called the alphas "alphas".

[deleted] • 1 point • 5 January, 2015 10:53 PM

Hypergamy does not care and does not account for the degradation of values of society. Values of society are not conducive to the female mating strategy. Hypergamy is intrinsically harmful to society, put optimum for the propagation of the human race.

bobbatosakosanose • 2 points • 5 January, 2015 09:40 PM

I think this is a strictly Western issue. I really never see Asians, hispanics, Indians or Arabs take on single mothers or be dumb enough to raise children that aren't theirs. Sure it may happen. But not to the degree or with the overtness that it does to Westerners. I mean "having dinner with an ex" is usually unheard of in those cultures. Anyway we have paternity testing now. So that is one thing that helps men.

Deaddpoolcomment score below threshold • -29 points • 5 January, 2015 07:23 PM

How many women in real life would knowingly make their husbands raise a son who isn't theirs? They'll all get killed.

Stop being a fucking idiot.

fodosho • 11 points • 5 January, 2015 07:53 PM

1 in 25, or 30% in some places. Stop being a fucking idiot.

<http://menshealth.about.com/od/lifestyle/a/paternity.htm>

Deaddpoolcomment score below threshold • -11 points • 5 January, 2015 08:02 PM

It not about how prevalent it is, Its about how sinister it is.

When the truth comes out and it will somehow ,what will you do then?

And if a bitch is so dumb that she doesn't fear the backlash of the man she is fucking with ,she shouldn't exist

[deleted] • 7 points • 5 January, 2015 08:17 PM

Well it's like I said: women are not consciously trying to carry out some malicious trap.

They are not trying to fuck over some poor schlub. They are simply trying to optimize their biological imperative as efficiently as possible.

[deleted] • 3 points • 5 January, 2015 07:31 PM

The husband usually doesn't find out. And do you think most men would risk going to prison for life to murder someone? I'm sorry if you've been cuckolded and feel bad about it but being angry isn't going to change anything.

The point isn't that women consciously do this. In fact I'm sure they don't. You underestimate the power of our limbic brains and subconscious. Just how people find themselves emulating a lot of relationship problems they found in their childhood. It's not a conscious choice. It's something much deeper than that.

I read a scientific study conducted about the heredity of certain blood types and the study

concluded something it never set out to do, and that was that 70% of the fathers were not the biological father of their children. This shit happens far more than you probably feel comfortable with. Oh well. That just means women are successfully fulfilling their biological imperative. Good for them

Deaddpoolcomment score below threshold • -11 points • 5 January, 2015 07:47 PM

Wow! If this happens to you , would you just accept it and forgive her

If he is a warm blooded man he will find out 10 ways to ruin the woman's life. There are things much worse than murder.

MrExpress • 3 points • 5 January, 2015 08:18 PM

Just leave, kids not yours, free and clear. Hopefully you found out early.

nopbeentheredonethat • 1 point • 5 January, 2015 07:54 PM

there you go

<http://disinfo.com/2011/02/one-out-of-ten-people-werent-fathered-by-the-man-they-believe-is-da-d/>

Deaddpoolcomment score below threshold • -16 points • 5 January, 2015 08:03 PM

1 in 10 isn't alarmingly high

Newdist2 • 15 points • 5 January, 2015 08:33 PM

Are you fucking kidding?

One in ten parachutes is really a bag of cinder blocks, now let's go skydiving.

runnerrun2 • 7 points • 5 January, 2015 07:06 PM

No, this is called the 'sexy sons' hypothesis. Women prefer to have a kid with a sexy man over all else. Note that these are their primary reactions which manifest in many direct cognitive ways, direct as in no planning required, immediate impulses. Choosing the provider over the sexy man requires a woman to plan, which means it is evaluated by her neocortex. That's why it is mainly the constraints of the society they live in that makes women behave monogamously.

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 06:54 PM

No, this is called the 'sexy sons' hypothesis. Women prefer to have a kid with a sexy man over all else.

From an excerpt I of a book I recommend to all entitled, the Myth of Monogamy. great broach on the subject, with proofs echoed throughout nature.

Women want sexy sons, because the son will attract and thus aid more women. Ideally they want a sexy son to grow up, ignore his SMV, and be an obedient BB. They want the perfect blend in their minds of what makes a man. But since they rarely if ever find this hybrid, and if they cant create it, they will game guys to keep their options open.

Newdist2 • -2 points • 5 January, 2015 07:00 PM

A little. But the fact that they **can** sleep around means they are higher value to begin with.

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 06:57 PM*

Not necessarily. Taking a plate while it's hot is simply common sense / intelligence. It wont be as good tomorrow, or 20 years from now.

Doesn't mean it's your favorite food when you take the plate, but well, a man's gotta eat.

Strike while the iron's hot.

What men desire is a virgin who is a whore. We won't find it, it's too rare, if it exists, but we wont starve chasing the elusive, fanciful unicorn.

We men are cowboys, we are pioneers. We saddle up, make our own laws and rules, and ride bucking broncos til their broken in, and then we get off.

exit_sandman • 0 points • 18 January, 2015 12:45 PM

Taking a plate while it's hot is simply common sense / intelligence.

Sure about this?

(scnr)

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 28 January, 2015 04:56 AM

You don't take plates off these.. you take pots off these, like body builders did when their eggs came to a boil in Muscle beach, while they clean bulked for the offseason of the Olympia.

But still funny. You can grab the pot, just use pot holders.

candyred1 • -2 points • 6 January, 2015 07:46 AM

Woman here, I can only speak for myself, but I have a very select attraction to men. I would say out of 100 men, I would find one maybe two that I am attracted to. I cant even list what similar qualities may be, its just something thats there. A friend showed me a picture of a man and I just stood there speachless for a minute. We have been married for 7years and whatever it is, he has it.

ROIVeritas • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 07:08 PM

Irrational, but at least you admit it.

Attraction is not a choice, it's not always logical. But DISTRACTION, is.

[deleted] comment score below threshold • -7 points • 5 January, 2015 10:52 PM

I think we just have to accept that women are naturally promiscuous, and its easier for them to get laid full stop. whether its right/wrong easy/hard, it just is. Women are meant to gather seed from alpha males in their 20s. This is done via promiscuity. An LTR is of no genetic benefit to her. As long as there is financial support, whether it be the AF biological father, a BB, or the government, promiscuity is a viable female sexual strategy. Provided there is financial support, an LTR is of no use to a female.

[deleted] • 4 points • 6 January, 2015 12:45 AM

"Provided there is financial support". Thats already big. Outside of developed countries you would at least also have to add "Security for her and her children" An LTR with an AF is genetically the best deal for a woman. She gets good genes. And her genes (kids) will be safe and raised to their full genetical potential.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 01:08 AM

There is a difference.in poor countries,they NEED ,not want an ltr. In the west,especially at uni,women are financially safe,therefore the CC is more favourable than the ltr.

[deleted] • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 01:40 AM

Children (genes) raised in a stable family are significantly more successful in life than single parent children. Also women have their highest SMV, between 18 and 30 maybe. That's when they can secure a LTR with a high SMV male. No high SMV male wants a LTR with a slutty (low SMV) female. Especially when getting after 30 that becomes important, because LTR with a high SMV male translates directly to life quality (social and material wealth). It's only the dumb chicks that favor the CC to the LT. The clever ones understand, that the best deal is to secure a high SMV male in their prime.

Deaddpool • 188 points • 5 January, 2015 07:15 PM*

Promiscuity is bad regardless if you ever want an LTR for life

It's worse for women no doubt, but if you think that after fucking 50 chicks in 5 yrs you'll miraculously be monogamous for the rest of your life, it's naive and stupid.

Thrill of fucking a new chick is a bad bad addiction .

Apex_ Steez • 34 points • 5 January, 2015 08:29 PM **[recovered]**

So true. Currently trying to figure out how to digest and apply this realization to myself

olaf_from_norweden • 29 points • 6 January, 2015 12:28 AM*

I felt that way in my late 20s. Turns out into my mid-to-late 30s I realize I'm becoming more and more interested in the idea of settling down. Been dating someone for 2 years now. Maybe something changes with age? Or maybe my experience with her has been changing me.

Either way, it's like this constant itch I've had all my life has been fading into constant satisfaction instead of the hunt for it. Either I'm conquering it or I'm just low on testosterone. ;)

Rock2MyBeat • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 02:42 AM

Oh yeah, I got Low T, baby ;)

Wish_I_Was_Savvy • 0 points • 6 January, 2015 04:34 AM

lol this is stupid. Professional Bbers are married and trust me they don't have low T lol

imeasureutils • -2 points • 6 January, 2015 02:52 AM

This must have some part in it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 08:30 PM

Either way, it's like this constant itch I've had all my life has been fading into constant satisfaction instead of the hunt for it. Either I'm conquering it or I'm just low on testosterone. ;)

This is my thoughts on it as well. Something I've always felt compelled to do, but as I did it more and more the allure faded. Plus when you find a quality woman you don't feel the need to go to the thrift store to try out others.

a-orzie • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 09:56 PM

Of course. Its like a toy that you got bored of.

Haptic_Affinity • 27 points • 5 January, 2015 09:08 PM

Thrill of fucking a new chick is a bad bad addiction .

Yes, but logistically speaking, the temptation will never be as high for you as her, simply due to the ease with which it occurs for women vs men,.

thus, self control is more important for her.

[deleted] • 15 points • 5 January, 2015 10:50 PM

bang on. its women who really struggle to remain faithful when options present themselves.

[deleted] • 12 points • 6 January, 2015 01:16 AM

I'm not sure how true this actually is. A women of even average looks has options, a man as we know, not so much.

ROIVeritas • 3 points • 6 January, 2015 06:35 PM

Valid. And as we all know, women are as faithful, as their options.

"Never make someone a priority, when to them, you are but only an option"

suloco • 5 points • 6 January, 2015 10:32 AM

Agree with you, Zhun. Women are used to having options.

Imagine you are a AFC with a not-that-awful gf. Imagine you go TRP. You unplug. After twenty something years of being used to rejection and how things were for you **suddenly** these girls are opening to you, giving you the eyes etc. etc. It will take balls of steel to stay faithful in these conditions (if still find yourself in the relationship).

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 06:26 PM

Nope we dont even notice guys when you're in love.hell we dont even eat

AlphaJesus • 13 points • 5 January, 2015 11:12 PM

Not when you actually really internalize and live out red pill truths. Think about it. If you really become a "red pill" man you will hit your prime and never stop until your about 60. Cause that is who and what men are. Think about that if you do want to get married. You're a red pill man in an ltr or marriage and all your girls friends are with beta bux and you're the only guy that is a master of the Alpha/Beta frequencies going on in your person. The hypergamy you will experience from all these women who have hit the wall, those who haven't and even those who are still in their prime in their 18-30 years of age as your marriage progresses trying to get your dick will probably be parallel to what hb7s and up experience from the time they hit puberty to when they are stopped by the wall.

It's the clit carousel. When a man swallows the red pill, self-actualizes the red pill AND acta non verba, lives it out.

That's a hard fucking thing for a man to fight. You got to prepare for that shit now.

AlphaJesus • 22 points • 6 January, 2015 12:04 AM

To clarify, I am only speaking for the other guys here who DO want to get married. Red pill is about achieving ultimate happiness as YOU deem fit. Red pill is not about getting your dick wet, unless of

course you desire to utilize it to that effect. Red pill is a cheat sheet to the culture. Red pill is the means to YOUR ends. Blue pill is being led by other forces to an ends not your own. Remember that. Marriage CAN work today in our society. Unicorns do exist. They are made, not found. AWALT is true. But we are NOT in the category of AMALT in a blue pill/plugged in/betabux sense. If you get that. If you get red pill. You have to tools for a successful marriage or a non successful marriage. You literally have the tools for whatever the fuck you want. That's why you don't talk about this shit with your friends, because it works. It is power.

All of us should know, when a marriage fails it is never the fault of the woman but the man. If a woman cheats on her husband, that's his fault. If your girl desires another guys dick at any point in any relationship you are in with a woman in any way, you lost frame, you did something wrong, and you're at fault.

Lift, game, life.

This is 10 times as much important when you're married.

Lifting shows your wife you value yourself. And that pussy will be dripping wet for you everyday as she progresses towards the wall herself. But if you're lifting for you, it'll encourage her to keep herself fit too. She will find value in herself as you find value in yourself. Her value is based on her mans value.

The rest of your marriage and your life with that women is gaming her. Game isn't just for polyamory it is for monoamory as well. Master game and you will master your marriage/wife as well.

And, keep it captain/firstmate dynamic if you want a successful marriage in my opinion. A woman does not want to be a mans world but a part of his world. Live your fucking life and make sure that your woman knows if she wants to be a part of it you're the captain, and make sure she realizes too that you have standards for the way your ship(life) is run.

edit: nazi grammar

[deleted] • 6 points • 6 January, 2015 02:12 AM

I beg to differ in regards to a woman wanting to improve herself if you improve yourself. My last relationship several years ago ended because my GF became a fatass. I was lifting regularly and playing intense sports (boxing, MMA, and Martial Arts). She didn't do a damn thing to herself, and of course I didn't do anything for her (I wasn't going to fuck a fat chick).

Just a heads up to all the guys out there: What you read on TRP is true for the most part, but keep in mind, humans are complex. Sometimes, TRP may not work well or at all.

asdfghjkltyu • 10 points • 5 January, 2015 11:56 PM

Promiscuity is bad regardless if you ever want an LTR for life

See this is one thing people rarely mention. Being a 'slut' is only bad for the women who *want* a LTR. If they just want to sleep around, power to them, I'm sure the men they sleep with will support their choices.

It only goes poorly for them when they think they can just return from the abyss and find a chap to marry them after this. Sadly, even that isn't too difficult for them.

suloco • 4 points • 6 January, 2015 10:26 AM

FINALLY! Someone finally takes into account male promiscuity and it's consequences. Thank you, Mr. Deadpool!

[deleted] • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 06:02 AM

I've been doing it solid for 10 years now and I was ready to settle a long time ago. That's all I's available at the moment. The "right-now" chick.

ROIVeritas • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 06:46 PM

In the past, it was called "going steady", now with these immoral women wishing they'd been born men, thus fucking men anyway they can for the sake of all women, as if they'll become ever closer to becoming a man simply by sleeping with men.

Now, because of the above scenarios playing out and being accepted as the new normal, it's just "steadily going nowhere"

[deleted] • -2 points • 6 January, 2015 07:14 PM

I think the majority of women are happy being women. I don't really agree with the points you made.

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 9 January, 2015 08:25 PM

I didnt say they dont enjoy being women. Im saying that women's empowerment has them walking a fine line between being a hybrid species all their own, hence the crappy situation today.

Women are more in touch with their masculine side, balancing it in proportion to their feminine side. They are encourage to do it and its easy for them.

Men aren't encouraged conventionally to achieve a perfect balance of masculine feminine, ying and yang. There is no men's equivalent of "The View". We men are either near totally masculine, or near totally emasculated, before we even think about getting into bed with anyone.

Its like kabuki in ancient Japan. Either women weren't allowed to act, or men were better actors, either way, it was men mostly, posing as women, and doing a damn fine, albeit scary job might I add. Today we have that right here at home, except dudes arent wearing masks when they act like bitches, theyre just bold faced doing it, same for women, no shame that theyre burping, farting, and becoming equally as corrupt as the days from when women had few rights

King2realz • 1 point • 5 January, 2015 11:15 PM

Open relationship. All the goods of having a girlfriend while still being able to have fun with other girls. It worked for me for several years.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 07:36 AM

How do u actually convince the girls to go there?

VancouverSucks • 6 points • 6 January, 2015 08:11 AM

Have a 6-pack and game and not give a fuck.

ROIVeritas • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 06:48 PM

Women truly are weak for a man's physique. Something about controlling something of higher value than herself, more powerful, if albeit temporarily, is the height of pleasure for a woman.

King2realz • 1 point • 9 January, 2015 09:36 PM

Leverage. They fall in love and want me to be their boyfriends. I agree to if they let me 'have fun and be young'. At this point there already in love so they don't really have a choice.

[deleted] • 3 points • 5 January, 2015 11:43 PM

Probably because you realize how fucking stupid LTR's are as a man, and instead of losing yourself in the rapacious female void, you decide to stay single and not be ruled by another (if you enter an LTR, you are inviting the state into the relationship, so the woman now has a gun that she can use at any time on you).

VancouverSucks • 6 points • 6 January, 2015 08:11 AM

This is exactly it..I would be down for an LTR, but common law in Canada even grants spouses property rights...its a joke. If the girl stays at your place for 4 days a week for a few months, its common law marriage. No thanks. Were not that dumb, blame the government, not us.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 09:12 AM

Agreed, I'm glad to see another Canuck here, and perhaps a fellow vancouverite?

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 06:43 PM

This is also why married / involved women wear their rings on the right hand instead of the left. To remind herself and the world, you see.. I'm marriage material, but I have the right to pull the trigger on you, I'm the don. Most time it is bohemian hipster college CC riding women who buy these rings for themselves to show the world they are marriage material, but aren't acting like it, because men aren't doing their "duty". (chasing, escalating, showing interest)

ROIVeritas • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 06:40 PM

Someone give this man the key to all cities.

[deleted] • 2 points • 7 January, 2015 12:10 AM

Oh well. This type of red-pill truth is not so popular here, because most people here are newbies. You'd probably find more support for this in /r/alreadyred

ROIVeritas • 2 points • 9 January, 2015 08:27 PM

Newbs, and trolls paid to pose as RP'ers to spam post. But they suck, they lift up their own skirts in discussions where sex isnt even remotely broached as a subject.

cocaine_face • 2 points • 5 January, 2015 11:45 PM

Keep the relationship open on your end.

Problem solved.

If you aren't capable of doing that, improve yourself until you are.

Riot101 • -4 points • 6 January, 2015 12:24 AM

That's assuming a LTR requires monogamy.

[deleted] • 35 points • 5 January, 2015 08:12 PM

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2733220/Women-don-t-sleep-wedding-happier-marriages-men-play-field-without-worry-study-finds.html>

Women who don't sleep around before their wedding have happier marriages - but men can play the field without worry, study finds

53% of women who had slept only with husband felt satisfied in marriage

**Dropped to 42% if woman had more than 2 partners and 22% if more than 10
Sex with many different partners 'may be risky' if wanting a happy marriage
Those with more partners struggled because they are aware of alternatives**
<http://i.imgur.com/7bDwvvtk.png>

soulmatter • 5 points • 6 January, 2015 02:34 AM

This is the most damning evidence and should be paraded around everywhere.

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 07:10 PM

"All things that are done in, and shrouded in darkness, shall come to the light"

ioncloud9 • 7 points • 5 January, 2015 10:30 PM

Reading your image, preselection is a real thing.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 05:05 AM

This is why TRP is so goddamn hard to swallow. How many women fit this category? How many men dating women fit this category? Not a lot. That's for sure.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 11:20 AM

This is so true. The more sex you have the easier it is to tell good from bad.

The girl I'm seeing told me that with her ex-boyfriend she used to squirt maybe once or twice a year. I can get her squirting twice a night. When she ends up settling down she's in to be thinking back to the way I fucked her. Her LTR will never measure up to me in bed.

How is she going to live with that?

I'm glad you asked. she a girl with zero sex toys is currently badgering me for a 'replica of my cock' dildo. I don't know if I'm going oblige her.

Mucl • 33 points • 5 January, 2015 08:02 PM

This is also why women and men have opposite values on fidelity as it relates to emotional cheating and physical cheating. I remember when I was separated from my exwife years ago and when I knew it was over I took the advice of friend and hit the dog park and talk to one of those cute 20 year olds. I did that and started dating a cute girl and we fucked like bunnies.

Smash cut to 3 weeks later the wife saw a lot of texting activity on the phone statement and came into my house while I was in the shower and started going through my phone. She did not give a shit about the tit pics and talking about fucking, she was mad that I had what looked like an emotional connection.

Someone who didn't give two shits about me is suddenly screaming about how she's moving back in and i need to cut it off didnt care I fucked this girl in the slightest. If anything she realized others thought I was desirable. Men are completely opposite, oce I heard she fucked someone else it was over.

[deleted] • 31 points • 5 January, 2015 11:23 PM

once I heard she fucked someone else it was over.

Never, ever, ever take back a girl who has cheated. That's like trying to put spoiled milk back in the refrigerator, it won't work.

rymdsylv • 11 points • 6 January, 2015 12:29 AM **[recovered]**

she's lying next to me, sleeping right now. never, ever, have I so much regretted the decision of taking her back.

I can only agree to your statement. it's never the same and you'll be ashamed of yourself for the rest of your days.

[deleted] • 14 points • 6 January, 2015 12:58 AM

never, ever, have I so much regretted the decision of taking her back.

So why are you still with her, now that you realize you don't want to be?

rymdsylv • 7 points • 6 January, 2015 02:39 PM **[recovered]**

just broke up with her. I'm so happy I feel like crying haha.

and, of course, she said nasty things to me that I'm a spineless cunt and I'm the devil himself.

"you've wasted three years of my life and toyed with my heart since the beginning". now, about an hour later, she's trying to call me on skype and texting me that she doesn't want this and that she regrets her actions. pfft, not falling for that again!

[deleted] • 8 points • 6 January, 2015 04:06 PM

Good on you, man. Stay strong.

[deleted] • 1 points • 6 January, 2015 01:40 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 6 points • 6 January, 2015 12:50 AM

Absolutely. I would also refrain from an LTRs with a girl that cheated in the past on other partners. The good women are the ones, that had very few LTRs and did not cheat. It shows that they understand the value of an LTR for them.

colombianguy • 5 points • 6 January, 2015 04:04 AM **[recovered]**

The thing is...I don't think I've encountered a female who hasn't, at some point in her life, cheated. Universally, I think males and females consider as cheating anything that one wouldn't do with another person in the presence of one's SO. However, women often break that rule and define cheating very differently for themselves, especially when they encounter a guy that really gives them the tingles and she thinks she can have a tryst with him without getting caught.

For instance, some women will allow "harmless" flirting to extend into snuggling, kissing, groping, heavy petting, and groping with a clear conscience. Some women will allow it to get to mutual masturbation and oral stimulation. Some women will take it as far as anal sex, but it's not cheating because there is no PIV sex. And there will be some women who will have complete sexual intercourse, but it's not cheating because it's not love, just sex, and they always are faithful in their hearts.

It sounds ridiculous, which it is, but I've been the confidant to many, many women in my lifetime, particularly during my defiantly Blue Pill and White Knight years, and I've heard the rationalizations, even from women that by all appearances were sweet, kind, faithful, and in every other way "good" girls.

ROIVeritas • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 07:19 PM

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jvnSJuv5sa8>

Watch Tony Starks as the girl says faithful. This is the reaction of many an RP'er.

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 January, 2015 03:29 AM*

I think you re right for many, many women. But I met women, including my girlfriend, that know about these female weaknesses and understand, that it's not good for them. That does not mean, that they are totally immune to this seductions, but they live a life that does not favor these situations happening. On the other hand you have lots of woman, where you can tell at first sight, that she will take dick from any decent man who has the guts to just take her.

But of course, there's always the possibility of my gf lieing to me about her past.

snbdmliss • 0 points • 6 January, 2015 07:24 AM

I'm a woman, and have never once cheated on any relationship, and never will. I can control myself and my actions. I'll leave a relationship if there's a major issue that is unresolvable, such as the other person cheating on me, but I will not succumb to that low level of being a cheater. So there's one for you at least.

However, I have been cheated on more than once....

thesaltysoup • 11 points • 6 January, 2015 08:01 AM

Good for you. Here's your cookie.

pissoutofmyass • 9 points • 6 January, 2015 09:32 AM **[recovered]**

Why should anyone take you at your word? You've never done wrong and you're the victim.

We've never heard that line before.

snbdmliss • 1 point • 7 January, 2015 12:58 AM

I think it's important to be good to people, and to be a good woman. That's how I was raised and how I act. I'm not prefect, but I try to be conscious of myself, rational, learn from mistakes, and make good farsighted decisions.

You can down vote if you want, but it's truth. Both men and women can be horrible to one another for a multitude of reasons that don't even matter, but in the end, how can there be any good in the world if no one ever tries to be above that?

FoxMcWeezer • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 03:41 AM

I can't shake the fact that she's "used" after she cheats.

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 07:24 PM

We men assume that women are encouraged to play fair, and be honest as men are groomed to be.

They've had no such training. Girls are tapped on the wrist for sitting with their legs open, and forced to walk with books on their head. That is all

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 07:13 PM

Women want what other women have, and they want to keep what other women want.

Jealousy ranks high on the list of females incentives and imperatives.

[deleted] comment score below threshold • -6 points • 5 January, 2015 11:02 PM

So what's the point in physical remaining faithful to our LTRs? If I fuck other women on the side and don't get attached, then its ok

[deleted] • 7 points • 6 January, 2015 12:56 AM

You could infect yourself with STI, infect your spouse, which can lead to disabled children. Which makes them not very competitive in spreading your genes of course. Best thing for a man are several LTRs with high quality woman. I think there's a reason why in Sunni Islam it's perfectly normal to have several wives. Also in the Old Testament Abraham, Isaak, etc. all had several LTRs.

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 8 January, 2015 08:05 PM

I think there's a reason why in Sunni Islam it's perfectly normal to have several wives. Also in the Old Testament Abraham, Isaak, etc. all had several LTRs.

This is the answer to many relationship problems. Familiarity breeds contempt. If you're with someone somewhere for too long, complacency sets in, and both parties begin to take each other for granted regardless of how it was when you met.

Have several wives, you're there long enough to enjoy each other, do things together, and go to work.

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 January, 2015 02:32 AM

Absolutely. I think women will accept other LTRs if your relationship with them does not suffer from it, i.e. you caring for them adequately. As you said, usually the relationship will even benefit from it and both parties will be happier.

ROIVeritas • 2 points • 26 January, 2015 04:50 AM

I concur. I especially hope so, because as stated in the sidebar.. women would rather share high quality than miss out on it entirely. So they better not mind sharing.

Quality trumps quantity.

[deleted] • -3 points • 6 January, 2015 01:05 AM

STIs are not an issue as we have widespread access to cheap and effective birth control.

[deleted] • 4 points • 6 January, 2015 01:43 AM

Birth control does not protect you from infecting with STIs. If you sleep with a slut and infect yourself with HIV, you and your genes are done. Because every girl you impregnate will most probably also have HIV and subsequently your children.

[deleted] • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 02:51 PM

Condoms are a form of birth control.not every slut has HIV. This is an extreme case

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 January, 2015 02:27 AM

Yes, condoms are a type of birth control and a type of safe sex. But condoms will not prevent infection from Hepatitis C Virus, HPV and other stuff. People forget that you can very easily infect yourself with Hep C and it's usually not curable as well. Especially if you not barely stick you dick in, but receive blowjobs, lick pussy etc. There's a lot of nasty

stuff out there, people are not widely aware of outside the health care profession. In the traditional pickup teaching it is always emphasized, that quantity is the holy grail for men and quality the holy grail for women. Then they often deduce it back evolutionary to the stone age time. But I don't think this is quite accurate. Especially in our ape origin, there was no treatments for STIs. Look up what "congenital syphilis" does to you offspring for example. I think spouse quality is therefore evolutionary quite important for men too. Also in your tribe, if you have several LTRs it will be accepted by the other males, if you have enough SMV and are alpha. But the lower SMV males also need women. They won't accept that you take all of them and their genes being totally wiped out.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 06:05 PM*

Talk to your girlfriend about you banging other chicks, maybe even bringing some back for the two of you to share. The most important part is for your girlfriend to understand and remember that she is and will be the only one you form an emotional connection with, because that's what she values most.

For this to work, meaning for her to agree, you have to have a strong, genuine emotional connection. Word of warning though, never let your emotional bond be stronger than you are. If you're more dependent on her and the relationship than yourself, it's only a matter of time before she loses interest.

CornyHoosier • 27 points • 5 January, 2015 09:09 PM

It's harder to be a stud than it is to be a slut.

Lets take a fat & ugly male and a fat & ugly female. All it would take for the woman to get sex is to open her legs and there will likely be at least a few desperate men who will sex her up. However, no matter how far apart the fat & ugly male opens his legs, he will not find a woman ready to pounce on him.

It's a pretty simple concept.

soccerplusaviation • 6 points • 5 January, 2015 11:52 PM

Yeah, but once your a stud the world is yours. Since your a stud, improving yourself becomes a way of life and you can sustain a high SMV until your 60.

If your a slut, once you hit the wall, your value droooooopss after 30. So in the long run, it's easier to be a stud.

[deleted] • 6 points • 6 January, 2015 12:59 AM

it's easier to be a stud.

Once you get there, maybe. But the initial work to get to that point is more work than a slut will ever have to put in during her carousel years.

soccerplusaviation • 7 points • 6 January, 2015 01:06 AM

that's most definitely true. Personally I don't mind that. I would rather have a life where I can continuously raise my SMV for a good 30-40 years as oppose to being in my prime for 15 years.

[deleted] • 8 points • 6 January, 2015 01:55 AM

[permanently deleted]

soccerplusaviation • 4 points • 6 January, 2015 03:09 AM

That's true the average 35 year old male has a reduced SMV because of what you stated above. I am just stating that if a man was RP, avoided the pitfalls of marriage and kids, and continued to keep improving himself, he can push his wall back a decade or 2.

[deleted] • 2 points • 7 January, 2015 12:25 AM

Who invited you to drop your mindless blather here? Let us men have our peace, thanks.

flyingwolf • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 03:10 AM

Don't downvote her. She is being honest here, why downvote her?

I like her honesty, its refreshing.

pissoutofmyass • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 09:33 AM [recovered]

How in the world do you know she is being honest?

flyingwolf • 5 points • 6 January, 2015 09:41 AM

Because you ask most any female this and they will say its bullshit and that they look for stable men etc and muscles don't mean anything etc.

But if you stop listening to what they say and pay attention to what they do, (this sub) then you will see quickly that what they say is bullshit and much more in line with what this person has said.

ROIVeritas • 3 points • 6 January, 2015 07:32 PM

What women say, and what they do-- are 2 separate chemical reactions that are in separate realms. They rarely ever run parallel to logic, they are often perpendicular to progress.

[deleted] • 1 point • 7 January, 2015 12:26 AM

Here comes the first white knight.

flyingwolf • 1 point • 7 January, 2015 01:03 AM

lol, I can assure you, I am by far no white knight.

If you took less than a minute to read my previous posts you would see that.

[deleted] • 1 point • 7 January, 2015 01:11 AM

Maybe I misread you bud, cheers.

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 07:26 PM

I think this needs to be yodelled from the highest peaks of every mountain from the Rockies to the Andes, to Kilimanjaro, to Mount Everest.

wildeep_MacSound • 9 points • 6 January, 2015 05:52 AM

That's why the male version are called Studs.

There are plenty of ugly sluts.

There are no ugly Studs.

ROIVeritas • 0 points • 6 January, 2015 08:17 PM

Argued with my pal about this years ago. When we used to lift together, we'd survey the scene, in our younger, 'I give a fuck what women think about me stage', and some hotties would be scoping us as well.

Compared to my army vet friend, I thought he was more Alpha than I, he had the cars, the motorcycles, the money, and the muscles etc. But he always said, I was the stud.

I never got this til one day I realized he was right. I had no car, no steady income for over a year, bummy clothes, had just started lifting seriously-- but I had what he didn't. I had the mind, or what my blood brothers, cousins, and pals call the aura, if you beleive that.

They told me that I exude an aura of confidence, an aura that naturally attracts people to me, not just women, that I walk like a model, etc. Those were their projections onto me! I did not feel I personified what they told me, but obviously they were right, because women saw it too.

Part of being a stud is internal; that is, it can't be bought.

Removing the outcome from situations as a deterrent to take more risks, falling in love with lifting and self teaching / self help, not having the ideal life with money, glitz and the like, but still remaining emotionally in control of myself brought more women than I could handle across all age demographics and cultures.

The moral of the story?-- there are a shortage of studs / real men in the eyes of women the world over. No one is going to give us men permission to be great. That initiative is reserved for those prepared to embark on that course of action.

Newdist2 • 31 points • 5 January, 2015 06:58 PM

This is remedial-level stuff in both redpill and evo psychology, but it's well written, and there are new people here every day who need to read it.

ShekelBanker • 6 points • 6 January, 2015 08:42 AM

I've seen a Tinder profile about this (of a girl, surprisingly) which addressed it, and it goes like this:

"There's a lot of work put into being a male stud. As a female you just have to 'be there' while as a guy you must put on months and years of work in looking good and dressing well. Do fat sluts exist? Yes. Do fat studs exist? No."

EasyChief • 6 points • 6 January, 2015 04:30 PM

That's a Jim Jeffries quote

ROIVeritas • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 08:03 PM

... " And we hold these truths to be self evident.. that sluts and studs are NOT equal.

IcarianComplex • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 10:49 PM

Here's a fat stud.

Mermaid_Splashes • 4 points • 6 January, 2015 05:10 AM

I can't speak for all women, but I get a little turned off if a guy's number is too ridiculously high. That generic, any-chick-will-do type of desire can be off-putting, and being selective is sexy in my opinion. I imagine guys must feel this way about women with high counts too.

DarthRoach • 5 points • 6 January, 2015 02:49 PM

How many studs have you seen with an any-chick-will-do attitude? That's more an attitude for the thirsty loser, not someone with an abundance mentality.

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 08:08 PM

If the male sees himself as a stud, like Quagmire from Family Guy, then I guess doing every girl that moves is his definition of a stud.

But a more high quality version of the term should be attributed to a man who has options, but chooses his pursuits logically, and acutely.

[deleted] • 2 points • 7 January, 2015 12:29 AM

Quagmire is actually a fictional character, if he was real he would either be desirable to many women and picky, or not desirable and not picky.

It's kinda rare to meet a grown up stud who isn't discerning.

Cyralea[S] • 3 points • 6 January, 2015 02:01 PM

It's exemplified. A man can have a wild past, but if he's looking for serious commitment few women will turn their noses. Most men would with a similar woman. Men abhor promiscuity when it comes to commitment.

J2501 • 13 points • 5 January, 2015 10:06 PM

It isn't, to my knowledge. Being a promiscuous male will certainly disqualify you from many opportunities. One of the great fears of the prized, hard-to-get LTR female is sleeping with a smooth-talking man-whore who ultimately won't take her seriously, and this is the primary reason many women are so reserved, picky, and quick to flee once they perceive a red flag. They see promiscuous men as unlikely to be able to abide by commitment, in the same way that men see promiscuous females as similarly unreliable. There is just as much slut-shaming of man whores as of promiscuous females, and to believe otherwise is to fall victim to feminist mythology.

Cyralea[S] • 16 points • 5 January, 2015 10:17 PM

It's a unique dilemma for them. They *want* the commitment of those men, but they know (or eventually learn) that such men are hard to tie down. Were they given assurance of one's commitment I doubt many of them would care about your past.

The same is simply not true for men. Women become broken after sleeping around. They simply can't pair-bond the same way, their entire attitude towards men shifts.

J2501 • 10 points • 5 January, 2015 10:27 PM

It can go even further than that: in my community, the most desirable females have a feminist community that guards them: if such an alpha female has a crush on a man that can't be quashed with the usual behind the back character assassination, they will then conspire to 'hook him up' with an inferior female specimen, both as a means of diverting him and making him less attractive to the enpedastalled female.

[deleted] • 5 points • 6 January, 2015 12:59 AM

Which country are you from ?

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 08:02 PM

if such an alpha female has a crush on a man that can't be quashed with the usual behind the back character assassination, they will then conspire to 'hook him up' with an inferior female specimen, both as a means of diverting him and making him less attractive to the enpedastalled female.

Lived it. And these desirable women have these older women to teach them the ropes, because they

suck at reading men.

If a desirable woman wants a man, and he's not the run of the mill BP, throwing his jacket over puddles for her, she's going to at first be taken aback, but then she'll start to get disturbed.

After all, her female wiles and charm have gotten her all she wanted thus far.. right? WRONG

I know guys who've tried with 9s and 10s, and the guy's at best a 5, 6,7, and the guy, indifferent to rejection, test these women to see how far he can get with them. Upon the results of his findings, much of what guys put on a pedestal, ain't much to brag about.

I don't care how many tricks, wheelies, endos and 1080's I can pull with a brand new mongoose town bike. I don't care how many speeds it has, how many gears, or how many different sets of pegs it can be accessorized with.

No matter how nice looking the bike, it is still the town bike. It doesn't belong to any one man, it never can. And if it doesn't belong to you, you can't take it home-- or at least you shouldn't.

No guy is going to hold the handlebars, or the hands, of a top of the line, high quality, high maintenance bike / woman.. and present her to the town as having never been ridden. It simply ain't gonna happen.

As a rule of thumb commonly accepted, men are supposed to be ruled by our cocks, we aren't supposed to turn down sex under any circumstances. While a woman can at will, and often does, even after she's complied.

She makes one man court, and woo her, for a piece of ass that she is giving away for free to some juicer or spiky haired poser.

Your post was great sir, I'd like you to expound on this topic if you have any examples, for instance. Not many can relate to having gone through this.

J2501 • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 09:24 PM

All I will say is that a female's desire can make a man a target... in a bad way. In a town full of white knights trying to save women from their own bad judgment, misinformationists who either break down their social enemies or hype their social allies, people who are judgmental of each other's relationships (Do you really think THAT'S the right guy for her?!?!) And let's not forget about insecurely jealous lesbians and feminists who want to sabotage any kind of healthy relationship, which they see as 'patriarchal'. Liberal, pretentious, big city bullshit, basically. Probably quite common.

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 8 January, 2015 08:26 PM

This is gold. I almost forgot that being a rake or a casanova either naturally or through learning frame or becoming RP, will make the avg BP hate you, it will make other women hate you. The envy that comes about from access to certain women is dangerous to the man receiving attention.

"Only women are allowed to be careless. Women and children. But not men."-- Marlon Brando - Vito Corleone in the Godfather

Guys who get girls with little effort, say just by being in a gym full of slores aching to get boned lets say, is in danger. Some guys don't care, but as you said. Once a guy has his catch, he has to fight to keep it, fending off an array of do gooders, jealous exes, etc.

I once talked to a cute chick at the front desk of my gym to ask her about the hours when it's less crowded.(I had just started lifting)

Some guy, who looks like he gets lots of women himself, was watching my every blink as I asked this girl a single platonic question.

Even after I shook her hand, thanked her and walked away, he was still staring at me like I was Houdini or David Blaine. I could tell he was mad, since she was hot, but I wasn't trying to score. In beta guy's minds, they think being super respectful or having manners when dealing with a woman means you're trying to get in their pants. But this is not always so.

cocaine_face • 4 points • 5 January, 2015 11:56 PM

This. I dated a girl that was super into getting into a LTR (claimed to not ever sleep around - not virginal but maybe 1 or 2 LTRs with sex), and from her awkwardness it seemed realistic and she didn't care so much about my -past-, that didn't bother her, it was the fact that I wouldn't commit to her and cut out all other girls before sleeping with her.

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 07:34 PM*

Ya just cant keep a good man down.

The same is simply not true for men. Women become broken after sleeping around. They simply can't pair-bond the same way, their entire attitude towards men shifts.

This paradigm is what popularized the term, JADED. Some of the most run through slores on the market today still have that bubbly perky personality, like nothing can ruin their day as long as they have a man, his cock, his money, or some combo thereof. It's an act / fake. This is why pornstars are called actors.

Other women who were probably raised right, but get to college and turn girls gone wild, try to follow their feminazi whore aspiring friends and find out that mentally and physically, they aren't built for the ONS's, she sees the diminished number of males chasing / expressing interest her own age, and her heart turns hard.

Her face turns super serious. When she's spread her southern cheeks in bed a few times too many, her northern cheeks above the border / equator on her face will be in a cryogenic state. If she smiles she might crack her face in half, because she is not happy.

This, and many other women and people with this mindset, actually believed that she / they could be shallow, and that it would somehow lead to a deeply fulfilling life. It didn't, It doesn't.

She thought she could trade immorality / personal preference for security, financial or otherwise. She can't. So her cadre is made up of beta white knight orbiter supporters, because they came from a generation where they were spoonfed, no, forced this garbage, and us young boys / men simply aint havin' it. Point blank.

It's long been said that real recognizes real. Sure. But real, recognizes fake too.

Above all: Women want to be saved from the lives / relationships they create with men, with the men THEY attracted, by ANOTHER MAN.

Witherkay • 10 points • 5 January, 2015 10:13 PM

Ecologically in animals, males and females have different reproductive strategies:

Male's reproductive fitness (think fitness in terms of evolution) can keep increasing with each mating, a male's sperm can easily impregnate every egg the female can produce, up to millions. Keeping fucking, a male's reproductive fitness can keep increasing, he's not playing against females, he's playing against the other males.

Female reproductive fitness essentially plateaus after one mating, continuing having sex has no effect, she is

pregnant, all her eggs are fertilised.

Mating instinct has been shown to be correlated with testosterone levels, and has a negative correlation with parenting efforts.

Just from the ecological perspective, we're all animals after all.

through_a_ways • 5 points • 6 January, 2015 01:07 AM

Ecologically in animals, males and females have different reproductive strategies:

In **all organisms**, males and females have different reproductive strategies, and this strategy is *fundamentally* the same across organisms as diverse as primates and flowering plants.

The male strategy is one of quantity and competition. In mammals and birds, this manifests itself as the individual male engaging in pursuit of the female.

In plants, this manifests itself as the gametes (pollen) competing for geographic placement on the pistil (female reproductive structure).

In the vertebrates, this means that the most fit males (biggest, tallest, most socially desirable) get most of the women.

In the plants, this means that the most fit male parts (the ones that produce the smallest, fastest, and most pollen) fertilize more of the flowers.

Cyralea[S] • 6 points • 5 January, 2015 10:19 PM

The need to secure the sperm of one high-quality male is precisely why women only chase the top 20%. They are predisposed for having eyes for the top, as that would have been advantageous evolutionarily.

errorstarcraft • 3 points • 6 January, 2015 05:21 PM

Women were the possession of men for the majority of relevant history. They passed from their father's to their husbands, as figurative deeds of ownership. Only in 1976 did women become peers when they began serving on juries in the United States.

Women stayed at home and stayed pure, their skills were to be thrifty and good at spending their husbands money, shopping well. Men were much more free to be promiscuous, in whatever fashion was available to them.

This context much better explains why men can be studs but women can be sluts.

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 08:41 PM*

Women were the possession of men for the majority of relevant history. They passed from their father's to their husbands, as figurative deeds of ownership. Only in 1976 did women become peers when they began serving on juries in the United States.

True, hence the tradition of massive dowries at weddings. A man was securing his return on investment, I.E a daughter, by wedding her off for a certain high worth. this still goes on in much of the world today.

But the liberal, feminist West, with their men are dumb, women are smart approach has removed any and all need for dowries.

Get rid of dowries, back to bartering again.

The only thing with bartering is that women trade sex horribly, and unequally, especially outside of prostitution / porn. The platform is called marriage, and stage is set for the woman to become the undisputed champ

bohemian_fappsody • 4 points • 9 January, 2015 01:05 AM

The difference between a man sleeping with many women and a woman sleeping with many men is like the difference between riding a bike uphill and riding a bike downhill: they may look the same, but one requires strength, effort, and dedication, while the other requires just sitting there and letting nature take its course.

Cyralea[S] • 2 points • 9 January, 2015 02:07 PM

That's actually a really apt analogy. I'm going to borrow that for the future.

Venicedreaming • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 12:47 AM

One could also argue that birth control and STD preventions have given women so much more power than ever before in their evolutionary timeline. If you think it's bad now, wait until the invention of a perfect female condom. A lot of people here voiced the opinion of not wanting an offspring, and this opinion will become more relevant with time, which is a bad sign for humanity in general going forward.

xPURE_AcIDx • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 05:25 AM

Jim Jeffries on Studs and Sluts

[deleted] • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 06:00 AM

"To be a stud, you gotta work hard. To be a slut, you just have to be *there*."

snbdmliss • 2 points • 7 January, 2015 12:26 AM

Personally, I find it a major turn off if a man has slept around a lot. I understand there is some need for them to have experience to know what they want, need, don't want etc. in a relationship and to be confident, but beyond that, no thanks. I've stopped dating guys before because it became clear they were man-whores and I'm not going to share myself with someone who shares themselves so easily with everyone else. There are a variety of reasons for that, and to be honest the repulsion to that type of behaviour feels innate to me, for both sexes.

In part, the reasoning is because it means they have no self restraint, no real care or concern for others, no concern how their actions affect others, no farsight or understanding of potential outcomes from behaviors, they only care about their own immediate satisfaction and are generally reckless about it, they are usually very selfish too, IMO most all women they've ever had will just be jumbled together in their mind, they won't really appreciate a good woman when they find one or treat her well deserving of her being a good woman to them, and will never really be capable of building a real relationship together with a solid captain and first mate dynamic, a partnership that is capable of lasting their while lives. They'll be quick to run if things are ever difficult or will always be looking for another conquest on the horizon if things were to go bad (the 'several in the kitty' approach which is repulsive, means they're preparing to cheat or leave the relationship, how can you ever have a solid foundation like that???), these are immature and insecure boys and it'll always feel like they only have 1 foot in the relationship. Add to that STD worries, and that I'll think about them with other women and that'll make me feel uncomfortable/insecure in the relationship, and I'll shut down sexually with them. Not a good combo for any relationship. Feeling secure and loved in a relationship is important for women just as feeling that your woman is loyal and there for you whenever you need her is for a man.

There's no question, I very much know my man can easily go get other women if he wanted to (just as I could find other men, but I won't even entertain the thought as I only want him), but he doesn't need to reduce his value, waste his time or effort, or damage our relationship quality or future by giving any other women any thought or time. His being selective and choosing to be only with me is incredibly attractive to me as my being selective and conservative is attractive to him, and as long as he's a good man and captain to me I will be the best woman and first mate I can be for him. Good relationships are built and nurtured constantly.

Cyralea[S] • 2 points • 7 January, 2015 03:29 PM

Women and brevity are water and oil, hah.

You're not wrong, women are similarly averse to excessively promiscuous men, particularly if they exhibit a lifestyle surrounding it. Past behaviour predicts future behaviour and all that.

The key difference is that when a high-value man wants to commit, he can do so because he brings with him all the qualities that contribute to his value (you said it yourself -- your man *can* find other women, just chooses not to).

With women this is entirely something different. Any woman can get up and find a man to fuck. She simply has to signal her desire. There's nothing special about this, no element of her SMV is made up by her ability to fuck around. The more she *does* sleep around the more she is seen as an inferior prospect relative to other women.

When a promiscuous woman wants to commit, it's typically because she fears the idea of being a spinster in old age. High-value men can sniff out such women.

That's the difference between the aversion to promiscuity between men and women.

ROIVeritas • 2 points • 8 January, 2015 08:39 PM

High-value men can sniff out such women.

Like a drop of blood in a 2,000 gallon tank full of sharks.

One part per 25 million

ionforge • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 03:12 AM

If a woman want to fuck a lot thats her problem, I don't see why people care so much. Yea she got it easier that guys, the point of the red pill is to accept this reality and work on yourself to overcome this, not whine that girls get it easier.

You wont be crying in 20 years when you are still getting young pussy while woman your age hit their wall a long time ago.

Cyralea[S] • 6 points • 6 January, 2015 02:04 PM

This has nothing to do about them and everything to do about you. The idea that a man can have preferences, that is, a desire to be with a chaste woman when looking for commitment is generally shamed and looked upon as not being progressive.

If a woman wants to fuck a thousand dudes, more power to her. Myself (and I'd wager most commitment-minded men) want nothing to do with her.

ROIVeritas • 5 points • 6 January, 2015 08:45 PM

The idea that a man can have preferences, that is, a desire to be with a chaste woman when looking for commitment is generally shamed and looked upon as not being progressive.

If a woman wants to fuck a thousand dudes, more power to her. Myself (and I'd wager most commitment-minded men) want nothing to do with her.

Seen it. Lived it. The horror. Thank God that Morpheus gave us the ability to be Neo's.

A guy's weird, if he doesn't want to settle down with a town bike fresh outta college who has more miles on her tires than a used up honda civic... HE's the weirdo-- for not wanting the potential first teacher of his children to be a simple minded female doggy.

But she can slobber all over however many cocks she wants, and then come to me and tries to plant a kiss on MY cheek? Hell, no thank you.

bobbatosakosanose • 4 points • 5 January, 2015 09:16 PM*

But what about the man she screw's 1000 times? Would she not be an alpha widow? And his genetic imprint on her etched forever, possibly also rubbing off on your children with her? I mean if she's been with one man for 5 years. She already gave him her best years. You are getting seconds. I think red pill is way too forgiving on women who date above their SMV, get strung along and dumped. Not to mentions her Ex's will always be around for life and she will inevitably end up fucking them if your relationship goes rocky.

Limekill • 7 points • 6 January, 2015 02:14 AM

1 is better than 1,000.

And if your better than him, she will look at you as the Alpha.

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 08:23 PM

True. Plus, there is no such thing as breaking up in the modest sense. When I call things off, I tend to burn bridges. All my pals think I'm insane.

Most relationships start with a week to a month of mind altering sex, only to end with a brief ugly fight, only to resume the relationship on a less heated scale, by fucking to make up, to show each other, "it's not totally personal, I still like your body / person."

ohsnapitsnathan • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 12:41 AM

Okay, but what you're describing here is a (hypothetical) explanation why *why* people are hypocritical about male and female sluttiness. The fact that something has been selected for doesn't automatically make it beneficial or not hypocritical.

Cyralea[S] • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 02:10 PM

It makes it rational, which by definition makes it not hypocritical. It's not hypocritical if the two genders are differently incentivized.

RPtrowaway123 • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 01:01 AM

Hear hear! This puts the concept into simple words. Newbies should read it.

ghee99 • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 11:38 PM

This seems to sum it up quite nicely:

<http://imgur.com/gallery/0Kxrd>

TheEverlastingScar • 1 point • 7 January, 2015 11:11 AM

OP,

I find this topic of evolutionary psychology of sexuality very interesting. Do you happen to know any books or articles on the matter? I'd like to study this in a little more depth.

Thanks.

Cyralea[S] • 1 point • 7 January, 2015 02:46 PM

If you want some basic material, start with *The Selfish Gene* by Richard Dawkins. He lays the foundation for

the genetics of ideas (i.e. memes).

The Mating Mind by Geoffrey Miller is a book with interesting ideas, although it can be a sloggy read. His main focus is how women are the gatekeepers of sex and as such shaped human evolution.

One last book that's on my to-read list as it's been recommended several times now, Sex at Dawn by Christopher Ryan. From what I understand he discusses the evolutionary psychology behind Alpha Fucks/Beta Bucks. Sounds like an interesting read.

slippu • 1 points • 6 January, 2015 02:17 AM [recovered]

I think both sexes can choose to be promiscuous, it just depends on how low you want to reach into the bottom of the barrel

Cyralea[S] • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 02:05 PM

Male promiscuity is generally not as frowned upon. Particularly if a man decides it's part of his past. Women are generally willing to overlook that.

obe1kenobi • 1 point • 28 March, 2015 01:07 AM*

That is a terrible analogy, as are most of the analogies on here that try to justify male sexuality and slut shame female sexuality. Inanimate objects of a lock and key have nothing to do with genitals. It's like saying gay people shouldn't have sex because two plugs or two outlets don't fit together, does that make any sense? Of course not. It's very easy to come up with bullshit analogies that have nothing to actually do with anything, a pencil that is sharpened too many times eventually is whittled down to nothing but a sharpener that sharpens 100's of pencils is a very good sharpener. Do you see how easy that is? does it make it relevant to an argument about male and female sexuality? Not at all.

bigkerplunk • 1 point • 5 January, 2015 11:02 PM

A key that opens many locks is called a master key.

changshuaidiao • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 03:59 AM*

There are three kinds of women in the world: Virgins, sluts who'll fuck me, sluts who won't

I have nothing but respect and admiration for women from groups one and two.

Women don't like "cheap" sluts (even though all women are sluts for the right guys) because they ruin male thirst. If every girl was a slutbag there would be no beta bucks, and women might actually have to settle for men who are only as good as them, and lose the lustful validation from betas.

Sluts also game the system. It is only by there being a sizeable number of women who withhold sex that sluts get to enjoy the ability to fuck men out of their league. This is also why men dislike sluts, or at least those who won't sleep with them. These delusional women bang a bunch of dudes who are two or three steps above them and then look down their noses at the men who are actually in their league because they don't understand they are merely the path of least resistance that better men will settle for and foolish men will work for.

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 08:35 PM

This whole post is gold, dipped in titanium.

What did you see? -- Christian Slater, Interviewer

Might as well ask heaven what it sees; no human, can know - Brad Pitt in Interview with a Vampire

omnomdrugs • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 04:48 AM*

If you guys are going to make these arguments, you should take into account the difference in rates of STI transmissions; women are far more likely to become infected than men based on the mechanics involved. Evolutionary psychology can be dismissed because it's soft science. Transmission rates can not because it's hard(er) science.

Extra credit: <http://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/87/11/08-059212/en/>

Edit: also this:

<http://www.yourtango.com/2014233119/std-facts-surprising-connection-between-stis-and-monogamy>

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 10:14 PM

The second reason comes down to value.

Damn straight. Women know subconsciously there is value attached to their vagina. They have a love/hate relationship with it.

They enjoy that value when it is valuable (virgin, young), but the moment reality slaps them in the face that their vagina is NOT valuable (they gave it away too much, too old), oh how fast they turn against the idea that vagina has value. Suddenly they condemn people for "treating them like meat". Funny how they had no problem treating men as disposable objects when her own value was high.

Criviton • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 03:05 PM

"A key that can open many locks is a very good key; a lock that is opened by many keys is a shitty lock" must save

huge_gap • 0 points • 5 January, 2015 10:47 PM

Saw in a post yesterday:

There can be fat and ugly sluts, but not fat and ugly studs.

[deleted] • -1 points • 5 January, 2015 11:36 PM

I just read "Sex at Dawn" by Christopher Ryan and Cacilda Jetha. It was an interesting read, if slightly dry in patches, but they do a decent job of laying waste to the common "standard narrative" of human sexuality. Their compelling and well-substantiated argument is that the state of monogamy and nuclear families as we presently do them is an unnatural, and largely cultural artefact, rather than being innate to humanity. They describe many cultures where women are openly promiscuous and society works around this quite fine. This may not invalidate your points above, as we live in this world, not prehistory or some tribal jungle culture, but I'd recommend it as another perspective on things.

Your para on the supposed evolutionary advantage of slut aversion makes no sense, though. It's a numbers game - for the man only. Who cares what the female is doing unless you have to apply resources to raising the kids you may (or may not) have produced?

Cyralea[S] • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 02:16 PM

I wrote an article touching on that, actually. Haven't read Sex at Dawn, but maybe I'll put it on my readings list.

Your para on the supposed evolutionary advantage of slut aversion makes no sense, though. It's a numbers game - for the man only

Not entirely true. A man's optimal mating strategy is to procreate with as many women as possible, while providing protection and provision for a small number. This is more optimal than simply fucking multiple

women. In times of scarcity, K-selection is favoured, as having a lot of babies isn't beneficial if they all simply die in adolescence. In such times mate-selection is extremely important.

Much of our ancestral past would have been times of scarcity, leading to punctuated evolutionary changes.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 09:55 PM

A man's optimal mating strategy is to procreate with as many women as possible, while providing protection and provision for a small number.

Fair point, although I wonder if that logic requires our procreative drive to be more of a conscious strategy than it might be. Testosterone driving us to fuck is a fairly low-level process, whereas understanding the politics and social constructs surrounding offspring survivability to adolescence is a bit more complex. Certainly involves a bunch more factors that a seasonal foraging troupe might not spend much time pondering.

One of the points made in Sex at Dawn is that prehistoric times weren't characterized by as much scarcity as Hobbes imagined. I'm not completely convinced, but they do have some good evidence.

[deleted] • -1 points • 6 January, 2015 05:41 AM

You made up and conjecturedd soooooo much of that.

IcarianComplex • 0 points • 6 January, 2015 12:54 AM

The first is the most relevant one, and the one that is the core of most human behaviour: evolutionary psychology. Throughout every population on earth you can pick out qualities that are common to nearly all people -- such qualities aren't accidental. Most people have a natural aversion to danger, for example, the reason being that those that did not have this aversion simply didn't live to procreate as well as those that did. So what's the evolutionary advantage to slut aversion in males? Simple, prior to modern technology, there was no way to ensure that a child was biologically yours. Men who were averse to promiscuity had an advantage in that they avoided being cuckolded. Eventually they would have outcompeted the DNA of a man who was indifferent to slutty behaviour.

This may explain why men have a natural aversion towards promiscuous women, but that doesn't make it moral. To suggest otherwise is an argumentative fallacy called an appeal to nature.

Cyralea[S] • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 02:07 PM

You're correct, I didn't want to make a case for morality as that would have been a post on its own. Briefly though, I believe that a utilitarian outlook on desiring a chaste mate is not immoral. A core tenet of TRP is learning to look out for yourself first and foremost.

IcarianComplex • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 08:54 PM

Okay cool, we appear to have consensus. Although I would say that it makes more sense to be repulsed by behaviors that indicate they're not trustworthy. That's a sign you're going to be betrayed in the future. I'm just not sure promiscuity is tantamount to deceitfulness.

Cyralea[S] • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 09:17 PM

The two aren't mutually exclusive. It's merely another facet to consider when selecting partners. Promiscuity has a notable correlation with relationship failure, no sense in dismissing it.

IcarianComplex • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 10:39 PM

No of course not, I didn't mean to sound like I was dismissing it. I just think promiscuity itself doesn't undermine the relationship. The host of other behaviors that may or may not come along with it does -- like selfishness, deceitfulness, etc. Hence, it makes more sense to me to be repulsed by the behaviors that present a genuine threat to a healthy relationship.

Correct me if I'm wrong, but it seemed like the first point you made in your post implicitly said this: promiscuity leads you to doubt faithfulness, and unfaithfulness is unattractive. Much of what I've said so far is a rebuttal to that and I'm not sure if that's the real premise you stand by.

Cyralea[S] • 1 point • 7 January, 2015 02:56 PM

That's indeed my premise. I reference studies such as [this one](#) that show a clear link between female partner count and elevated infidelity risk.

Pragmatically speaking, you're taking on a much greater risk by committing to a slutty woman as opposed to a chaste one. All else being equal, one should favour the latter.

Quansau18 • 0 points • 6 January, 2015 04:30 AM

Meh, this is still ethnocentric thinking. If you look into the varied social structures that exist cross culturally you'll realize that there are a variety of sexual partnerships that can be condoned dependent upon the environmental factors that go into shaping them. For example, in matriarchal societies (yes they are rare but do exist) it is true that a man cannot be sure his offspring is his own, and their belongings are passed down through women so they don't necessarily wish to pass on their belongings to someone else's child. So men in these cultures take on what we consider a father's role to their sister's kids (no doubt as to the genetic makeup there). When we look at the way things exist now and attempt to deduce past social organizations, as though our social structure was crafted by our ancestors with forethought, we are missing out on huge bodies of scientifically researched knowledge that is available to us all.

Cyralea[S] • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 02:02 PM

There has never been a true matriarchal society in human history. The rest of your argument is moot.

ex_astris_sci • 0 points • 6 January, 2015 07:52 PM

So what's the evolutionary advantage to slut aversion in males? Simple, prior to modern technology, there was no way to ensure that a child was biologically yours.

Hm. Which means that, currently, there is no evolutionary advantage to it.

Cyralea[S] • 3 points • 6 January, 2015 08:09 PM

Not as far as propagating your DNA, no. There are studies however that show clear links between female (and only female) promiscuity and infidelity/divorce. Promiscuity breaks the pair-bonding mechanism in women.

ex_astris_sci • 1 point • 7 January, 2015 04:05 AM

Good point. But I thought the disruption of that pair-bonding mechanism was encouraged (or at least not frowned upon) by evolutionary forces when one's offspring reach a certain age- so does that mechanism continue to be an evolutionary advantage or more like a social comfort zone?

Cyralea[S] • 1 point • 7 January, 2015 02:49 PM

Recent studies have shown that women may have developed antagonistic qualities towards their mate

for precisely the reason you suggest. They become bitchier as that increases the potential for mating with another high quality mate after they've already reared a child past adolescence.

The pair-bonding mechanism generally fades after 1-4 years (it's somewhat variable between people). Those are, incidentally, the years where child mortality is highest, so one can see how it may have been advantageous to lose a specific pair bond once your child has grown past that age.

ex_astris_sci • 1 point • 7 January, 2015 03:37 PM

Yes. And if it was advantageous in the past, nowadays it's equally, if not more, advantageous, as single parents have more resources to care for their offspring (community/legal support etc- at least in advanced countries). Sure, the psycho-social implications can be almost traumatic for children but I don't think mutation/selection have these considerations in "mind".

Cyralea[S] • 1 point • 7 January, 2015 03:41 PM

And that's where morality kicks in. Morality skews our behaviour where questions of "Is" versus "Ought" come into play. Of course, our morals have been fluid, and our specific views of morality too recent to have had any evolutionary effect.

I do wonder if thousands of years down the road we wouldn't develop a stronger ability to pair-bond due to our current practices.

[deleted] • 1 points • 7 January, 2015 04:05 PM

[permanently deleted]

Cyralea[S] • 1 point • 7 January, 2015 04:19 PM

What's more advantageous to the individual isn't necessarily more advantageous to one's DNA propagation. Increased stress and hardship mean nothing if the result is that you pass on your genetics more frequently.

Morality is specifically the study of protecting one's well-being.

ex_astris_sci • 1 point • 7 January, 2015 07:33 PM

What's more advantageous to the individual isn't necessarily more advantageous to one's DNA propagation. Increased stress and hardship mean nothing if the result is that you pass on your genetics more frequently.

That's my point exactly.

Yes, in the end, morality itself is a selected trait because of its obvious advantages but I wouldn't say that morality is (always) in one's self-interest (both Kant and Hobbes agree on that, I believe).

[deleted] • -20 points • 5 January, 2015 06:21 PM

[permanently deleted]

waylanderthelayer • 9 points • 5 January, 2015 06:47 PM

why then does the concept vary so greatly across cultures?

So you agree it exists across all cultures?

The reason it varies is because of birth control and feminism. Since the introduction of condoms and the pill,

it's trivial for a woman to sleep with 20 men and not end up living in poverty with a dozen kids. Virginity was prized so that a husband could be sure any kids the woman has are hers. On the other hand, a woman doesn't gain an evolutionary advantage from knowing who the father of her child is, but does if she can get a man to offer his protection and resources to her and her offspring. Hence, women as a rule find muscles and power attractive.

[deleted] • -8 points • 5 January, 2015 06:55 PM

[permanently deleted]

waylanderthelayer • 2 points • 5 January, 2015 11:55 PM

Anti-semitism is just a specific form of racism, which held evolutionary advantages - your tribe would have more of your own DNA in it, so by denying and trying to outcompete other tribes you would gain an advantage. The jews were simply in the unfortunate position that they were foreigners everywhere.

That doesn't mean that racism is something good, just that it used to be an advantageous trait. And understanding that this is where racism comes from is important in countering it nowadays.

[deleted] • -10 points • 5 January, 2015 07:43 PM

[permanently deleted]

BlueSunTzu • 3 points • 5 January, 2015 09:16 PM [recovered]

But then how often does it occur in the modern world than a man is tricked into caring for someone else's child?

Our genetic dispositions weren't developed in the modern world, they were developed over thousands of years. The same reason having sex with a condom still feels good is the reason that men aren't disposed to be attracted to sluts. Even though technology has neutralised these age-old problems, our brains can understand but our bodies have yet to catch up.

[deleted] • -4 points • 5 January, 2015 09:26 PM

[permanently deleted]

BlueSunTzu • 2 points • 5 January, 2015 11:08 PM [recovered]

You haven't satisfactorily proved that they do.

In any case, your point about how often men are "tricked" into rearing other men's children in the modern world is irrelevant. Although, on a side note, countless episodes of Maury seem to be a point against you.

[deleted] • 0 points • 5 January, 2015 11:19 PM

[permanently deleted]

waylanderthelayer • 2 points • 5 January, 2015 11:52 PM

Does it really need proving?

In an internet debate, yes. If you are just shifting the burden of proof it's safe to assume you're talking rubbish, or at least have little to no evidence to back yourself up.

Invalidity • 10 points • 5 January, 2015 07:05 PM

Evolutionarily, from the perspective of women men who have sex with a lot of women are not reliable fathers and therefore not desirable.

You're speaking from an idealistic point of view. Gene Simmons can proclaim that he's slept with thousands of women (for his profession, if he puts in the effort, it wouldn't be unrealistic) and be even more desirable. It is PRESELECTION at work.

But you're right about one thing, they may not be desirable... as fathers. A woman looks for two types of characteristics in a man, his ability to provide and his ability to seduce. Most men typically only fulfill one or the other, whether by the choice or by inability.

But the thing is, at the end of the day, a woman can have her cake and eat it too. She can find reliable fathers at any time of any day. There are TONS of them, and they are not special. Which leads me to my next point, which addresses your quote:

Every woman likes to feel special. Getting fucked by a fucking-machine certainly doesn't make any woman feel special.

Getting fucked by a fucking machine does not seem special to you, but in her mind, she isn't thinking about being 1 in a billion of girls that have been there done that, she's thinking, "Oh man, I'm getting railed by a rock star!"

A woman doesn't feel special because she's the only girl a guy has fucked; a woman feels special when she knows she's gotten with a guy that doesn't appear often in her daily life. She feels special because she's experienced a rare opportunity in her life, not because she's the center of someone's universe.

cocaine_face • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 12:03 AM

If anything, being the center of someone's universe would be terrible to her, because she knows she is not that special, and if she knows that, and the guy doesn't, that means he can't have much experience or preselection.

[deleted] • 14 points • 5 January, 2015 06:29 PM

This is the female response to the OP.

[deleted] • 6 points • 5 January, 2015 06:34 PM

[permanently deleted]

Dev_on • 3 points • 5 January, 2015 07:09 PM

Because you're arguing the leaf color, and we are talking about the forest

[deleted] • 1 points • 5 January, 2015 07:31 PM

[permanently deleted]

Dev_on • 5 points • 5 January, 2015 07:41 PM

It's not because you are one. It's because you sound like one.

Either way, this is a male space, no reason to be here.

[deleted] • 0 points • 5 January, 2015 07:47 PM

[permanently deleted]

Dev_on • 3 points • 5 January, 2015 07:48 PM

Yeah, and most of us shit on them over there as well... So we agree there

DonRP • 6 points • 5 January, 2015 06:52 PM

Your hypothesis is weak because it doesn't explain why the concept of sluttiness varies across different cultures so greatly

It doesn't vary. Almost every culture views slutty women as negative. What varies is that Western Cultures are more "forgiving" (for lack of a better word) of what society views as a negative trait. Therefore, it's the same act that is frowned upon but the bar is just set lower or higher in certain cultures.

Furthermore, I don't see how your arguments don't equally apply to females. Evolutionarily, from the perspective of women men who have sex with a lot of women are not reliable fathers and therefore not desirable.

You are confusing life/marriage with sex. When a woman sees a good looking man at a bar she is almost definitely thinking short-term (sex) rather than long-term (marriage and kids). The same is true if you reverse the sexes.

Same thing with your point about desire. Every woman likes to feel special. Getting fucked by a fucking-machine certainly doesn't make any woman feel special.

Pretty much the same as above. You are confusing long and short term. Most people of both sexes don't care about the details when sex is concerned. Guys will have sex with a slut without caring so that he can get laid and then leave her, but nobody wants to marry a girl that everybody has been inside of. Same with women - they will have sex with a good looking guy to get laid but may think they are not "father material" if they find out the guy is a "fucking-machine".

Your last point about it being easier for women to have sex and harder for men to get laid goes against all my knowledge and experience. For attractive men it is as easy to get laid as it is for attractive women.

You are living in an alternate reality. You are lying to yourself if you really think this is true.

Newdist2 • 6 points • 5 January, 2015 07:05 PM

By contrast, a woman who hasn't had sex by 22 would be considered a prude. By 25 she would be considered a freak. If there is an actual evolutionary basis for "slut-aversion" why then does the concept vary so greatly across cultures?

Until about 100 years ago, the concept didn't vary across cultures. Sluts were sluts, the difference was if they were stoned to death or just ostracized.

We are the product of millions of years of evolution -- the sexual revolution and attendant pathologies are a blink of an eye in comparison.

[deleted] • -1 points • 5 January, 2015 07:16 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 4 points • 5 January, 2015 08:03 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • -1 points • 5 January, 2015 08:10 PM

[permanently deleted]

Newdist2 • 4 points • 5 January, 2015 08:46 PM

What exactly is the correlation between restraints on female sexuality and the rise and fall of empires?

Please read the sidebar or read a little bit about the subject. We don't mind educating you (even though you've already admitted you aren't in our target audience), but you need to put in most of the work, just like a man would have to. We aren't going to chew up and regurgitate the entire subject just for you.

However, in a few sentences: **The "benefits" of unrestrained female sexuality only go to a few men.** All the other men are worse off. They become less invested in a stable society, less interested in producing goods and services, and increasingly angry.

[deleted] • 0 points • 5 January, 2015 09:29 PM

[permanently deleted]

Newdist2 • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 12:11 AM

But unrest seems to be correlated with more, not less, restraints on female sexuality. Europe and North America are more peaceful and stable than Asia and Africa.

Now we get into inherent differences between groups. Which is not a topic the mods want discussed extensively here.

And you're wrong-ish about Africa -- the men there are so uninvested in working for their children because they have low confidence in who their children are. You can see something like it in the black ghettos in America.

[deleted] • 1 points • 6 January, 2015 12:36 AM

[permanently deleted]

Newdist2 • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 12:51 AM

Are you this naive? Racial groups.

mykart • 2 points • 5 January, 2015 10:44 PM

Oh jeesh this is embarrassing. Go read Guns, Germs, and Steel if you really want to know the thousands of reasons why North America and Europe is more stable than Africa and Asia.

Hint: Variations in female sexuality is not mentioned.

[deleted] • -1 points • 5 January, 2015 10:55 PM

[permanently deleted]

cocaine_face • 3 points • 6 January, 2015 12:14 AM

I believe the argument typically is that unrestrained female sexuality is a symptom of the stability, which then leads to instability, which then leads to

restricting sexuality, which then leads to stability, in a cyclic pattern.

I'm not entirely convinced that's how things work, but that is a common idea advanced in the Redpill.

[deleted] • 6 points • 5 January, 2015 06:46 PM

For attractive men it's easy to get laid...only compared to less attractive men. Attractive women can get laid easier than attractive men and unattractive women can get laid easier than unattractive men. This is why there is a large male pua community while a female equivalent barely exists.

Holden_Frame • 1 point • 5 January, 2015 08:38 PM

It's really hard to believe you've done any dispassionate and objective analysis of the sexual market place and it's dynamics if you truly think that average to unattractive men face the same challenges finding sexual partners as average to unattractive women.

As far as "attractive" men and women, it is true in a sense that they both have an "easy" time getting sex. However, among other things, the 80/20 rule shows that this is far from an equitable distribution of willing partners.

Again, if you revise your argument about who has it "easier to get laid", you might get taken more seriously. The fact that you are trying to argue such a self evident issue is not helping your other arguments.

Hokuto199x • 6 points • 5 January, 2015 06:35 PM

In my experience women can score above their SMV easily because of how motivated men are to fuck.

Areimanes • 4 points • 5 January, 2015 11:09 PM

Correct, this is why a female 6 can sleep with a male 8-9, but not receive their commitment. However, because they slept with such high SMV men, they feel entitled to these men and as such don't want to settle for someone on their level. They are the 'Alpha Widows'.

They got fucked by Chad Thundercock during their youth because he was looking for a cum dumpster and then throws her to the curb. She keeps looking for guys similar to Chad, because after all she 'deserves only the very best', so she doesn't want to settle with Joe McBlow once she hits The Wall.

ggqq • -1 points • 6 January, 2015 02:51 AM

although there are a lot of go-to sayings here, did you just chain up a bunch of previous TRP quotes and push it off as a post? You just wasted 5 minutes of my life.

[deleted] comment score below threshold • -12 points • 5 January, 2015 10:55 PM

So what if women can be sluts with less effort than men. Why does the amount of effort matters at all? If you ask me, you sound an awful lot like those religious nutcases.

Promiscuity should be acceptable for both sexes.

Cyralea[S] • 7 points • 5 January, 2015 11:35 PM

Short people should be considered just as attractive as tall people, but they aren't. You can't negotiate attraction.

[deleted] • 0 points • 5 January, 2015 11:52 PM

So you are saying sluts aren't attractive? I find them attractive. Actually, it is funny because I find virgin girls unattractive. Their virginity is almost always a result of their obsession with maintaining the value of their vagina. I do not care for that at all.

Newdist2 • 5 points • 6 January, 2015 04:02 AM

Attractive to fuck, maybe. Certainly less work to fuck.

Worthless to commit to.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 January, 2015 04:07 AM

I never understood what is so great about committing.

ROIVeritas • 1 point • 8 January, 2015 08:46 PM

It used to be that the kids were yours and so was the woman.

But materialism has largely contributed to the declining need for long term sompany by people with options.

People have to be forced to commit now, there's no incentive, and there's no failsafe or evacuation route or plan for guys who get caught up in a mistake.

Cyralea[S] • 2 points • 6 January, 2015 02:12 PM

Sluts aren't attractive as long-term partners. You may not care, but some of us older guys do. They've been shown to make remarkably bad partners.

If you just want to fuck, a hole is a hole. Just wrap it up.

[deleted] • 10 points • 5 January, 2015 11:28 PM

Lolllzzlolz

Seriously? A fat man in Ethopia is impressive, a fat person in America is gluttonous. The amount of effort required is everything that distinguishes between impressive and disgusting.

[deleted] • -4 points • 6 January, 2015 12:04 AM

I just don't see how sluts are disgusting.

Seriously? A fat man in Ethopia is impressive, a fat person in America is gluttonous. The amount of effort required is everything that distinguishes between impressive and disgusting.

It doesn't work for every case. I takes effort for me to turn into a woman, because I was born a man. Therefore by your logic if I don't surgically remove my genitals, then I'm am disgusting.

It doesn't make any sense.

[deleted] • 3 points • 6 January, 2015 12:16 AM

Therefore by your logic if I don't surgically remove my genitals, then I'm am disgusting.

It doesn't take much effort to remove one's balls.

Also if it did take a lot of effort for a man to become a eunuch, it would be a high and revered position. It is not, and has never been in any culture.

[deleted] comment score below threshold • -5 points • 6 January, 2015 12:31 AM

It does take a huge amount of effort, money and time.

We will just have to agree to disagree.

[deleted] • 3 points • 6 January, 2015 01:36 AM

It does take a huge amount of effort, money and time.

You just need scissors and something to stop the bloodflow.

Either way, regarding why sluts are considered shameful is not a question of effort to me, but rather one of economics. If you indulge in something that is readily available to you, then it makes sense that you could be shamed for it. If you go out of your way to obtain something that is scarce to you and your kind, then you should be praised.

cocaine_face • 2 points • 5 January, 2015 11:59 PM

A woman can do whatever she wants.

That doesn't mean we're going to commit to her.

jimmyb207comment score below threshold • -10 points • 5 January, 2015 08:02 PM

Aggressive promiscuity in women is a sign of power that is intimidating to most men. I'm not talking about the submissive or low self esteem types of promiscuity. These women place themselves with men that will use them and never amount to much.

An aggressive promiscuous woman may be looked upon as challenge to a mans dominance, authority and quite possibly his manhood in the presence of this woman. She is to men what a womanizer is to women. It is a role reversal that most men don't want to be subjected to.

[deleted] • 3 points • 5 January, 2015 10:09 PM

[permanently deleted]

cocaine_face • 2 points • 5 January, 2015 11:58 PM

Yeah, I don't really find women very intimidating, except for perhaps some female bosses.

MensaNominee • 0 points • 5 January, 2015 08:42 PM

I wouldn't call it "Aggressive" Promiscuity so much as I'd call that "Actively Calculated Promiscuity".

Aggressive Promis. just sounds like a slut of violent proportions. Either way, the type of woman you are describing is rare and usually only depicted in movies because your average woman lacks the ability to have sex without getting emotionally involved.

[deleted] • -1 points • 5 January, 2015 09:31 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • -1 points • 5 January, 2015 11:25 PM

Downvoted because mobile site and redirect loop.