

# Lacking value results in wanting to eliminate standards

August 24, 2015 | 17 upvotes | by [Cyralea](#)

---

It's been my experience that people who call out others for having standards only do so because of their lack of attractiveness. Fat women become feminists because they want men to stop finding higher-value women (re: thin, non-promiscuous women) attractive. Male feminists want their effeminate nature to be perceived as attractive as well. Feminist male movie stars are the exception, they are merely paying lip service to increase the popularity among their female fans -- note the type of women these actors actually date.

Rather than make the change necessary to become attractive, they demand that other parties drop their standards for them. Movements like HAES and Slutwalk are less about acceptance, and more about gaining the perception of attractiveness by eliminating others' standards.

[My post about this in the TRP main sub](#)

---

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

---

## Comments

---

exit\_sandman • 19 points • 24 August, 2015 02:13 PM

Sailer's Law of Female Journalism: The most heartfelt articles by female journalists tend to be demands that social values be overturned in order that, Come the Revolution, the journalist herself will be considered hotter-looking.

Except that it isn't just journalism.

[deleted] • 7 points • 24 August, 2015 05:28 PM

Rather than make the change necessary to become attractive, they demand that other parties drop their standards for them. Movements like HAES and Slutwalk are less about acceptance, and more about gaining the perception of attractiveness by eliminating others' standards.

I agree, although I'm not sure that any kind of campaign to eliminate standards would succeed. Even those who seek to eliminate double standards face an uphill battle.

The best anyone can expect is a policy of non-discrimination when it comes to jobs, housing, education, etc. - "equal before the law." When it comes to social activities and personal relationships, it's a whole other ballgame.

Lonny\_zone • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 05:55 PM

Even those who seek to eliminate double standards face an uphill battle.

As fat acceptance catches on, and I believe it had momentum before there was a term for it, more women will allow themselves to become overweight. This will result in more obese women being granted sex and relationships merely by virtue of the fact that there will be even less thin women available.

[deleted] • 4 points • 24 August, 2015 07:31 PM

Fat women become feminists because they want men to stop finding higher-value women

Eh, I don't think it's all about attraction. Fat people in general are less likely to get hired, get promoted etc.

Cyralea[S] • 15 points • 24 August, 2015 07:53 PM

The feminist angle is always "unfair beauty standards" and "unrealistic bodies", never "workplace discrimination for being fat". It has everything to do with attraction.

scrantonicty • 5 points • 25 August, 2015 07:14 AM

Is that definitely a case of discrimination? What if fat people are generally less hardworking, have less willpower/motivation etc.?

It's amazing what being fit and healthy does for your energy levels throughout the day. A lot more can get done. All other things being equal, I'd hire the fitter-looking person (not facial attractiveness before anyone mentions that) every time.

[deleted] • 3 points • 25 August, 2015 02:51 PM

I've hired some great overweight people over the years. Sometimes the reason they're overweight is because they are workaholics. My sister put on a lot of weight over the course of two years of nonstop

travel for IBM.

[deleted] • 7 points • 24 August, 2015 02:28 PM

This makes me laugh so much given how much of an issue TRP takes with so called 'female hypergamy'

[deleted] • 25 points • 24 August, 2015 03:29 PM

Well it puts men in a bit of a bind. Equality of outcome is now required so we have some giant thorns up our ass if we're gonna out compete the women. We've gotta do it with one hand tied behind our back and when we do, the standards just get harder again. Next, men finally push through all this and can't get sex because the women don't want someone who matched their outcome, they want something better. If it was hypergamy+equality of opportunity then everything would be hunky dory since virtually all men would be at a higher status than virtually all women. Only men with downs syndrome or something would have trouble competing.

OfSpock • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 09:16 PM

To be more accurate, men had no trouble out performing women when women had one hand tied behind their back. Now that it's approaching equal, they are struggling.

[deleted] • 17 points • 24 August, 2015 09:33 PM

Just how the hell is it equal? We face more violence, poverty, homelessness, we're barred from educations, at higher risk of dv, gonna get arrested in we become dv victims, and even if we get into education we're not gonna be given the women's scholarships, women's centers, women's treatment, women's immunities or any of that. We'll be taught from a young age that we're monsters, told in university that we're racists, told that nobody wants our opinions because we're just white males. We have to watch our ass, our conduct, and all that shit and get demonized daily. If we make it to graduation than quotas and affirmative action will let the woman shove in front of us again too. Luckily, there's still the deadly jobs and the military jobs waiting for us so that we can at least eat until we die young.

But tell me, when did we reach equality? Oh right, women are still oppressed by catcalls. Sorry, forgot.

OfSpock • -1 points • 24 August, 2015 09:54 PM

I'm in Australia, so no Duluth model, no scholarships based on gender. Everyone has to watch their behaviour, we live in a society and don't get to just do what we want. None of these things are causing men to graduate from Uni at a lower rate.

[deleted] • 12 points • 24 August, 2015 09:58 PM

Okay well in places that actually matter, like America, women have every possible advantage. Though quite frankly I strongly doubt Australia's as you make it out to be.

OfSpock • 0 points • 24 August, 2015 10:05 PM

I'm sure your penis lets you know about other countries more than women who live in them. Government pays for Uni (mostly) so there are very few scholarships. Gender studies wasn't a thing at my University, free healthcare. Much better country than the US.

wombatinaburrow • -1 points • 25 August, 2015 07:37 AM

And this lot claim they don't downvote. They are as credible as Joe Hockey.

OlBastard • 17 points • 24 August, 2015 03:19 PM

Issue?

It's a tenet.

Atlas\_B\_Shruggin • 4 points • 24 August, 2015 09:33 PM

What "issue" does trp take with female hypergamy?

dr\_warlock • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 12:03 AM

There is no issue, it is law.

Hypergamy 102: Her Perception and Context Means Everything (it includes 101)

Atlas\_B\_Shruggin • 6 points • 25 August, 2015 12:13 AM

Yes thanks, I was trying to get the person who made the assertion to tell me

wont\_tell\_i\_refuse • 5 points • 25 August, 2015 12:20 AM

The only guys who take "issue" with any aspect of female behavior are Anger Phasers.

Carkudo • 0 points • 25 August, 2015 02:44 AM

Yep. A prime example of TRP hypocrisy. Or maybe the prime example of their hypocrisy is how they're all failing to see the hypocrisy here.

joseremarque • 7 points • 25 August, 2015 05:35 AM

I don't see the hypocrisy. OP says that women with low SMV use feminism to raise their relative value. Hypergamy is "The instinctual urge for women to seek out the best alpha available." Not only are these two ideas not contradictory, they are complimentary. A land whale can't seem to attract seem to attract the kind of male attention that she desires so she uses Fat Acceptance as way of leveling the playing field so she can more easily climb the dating ladder.

Carkudo • 3 points • 25 August, 2015 06:44 AM

The hypocrisy is in that TRP is very strongly opposed to hypergamy. Oh yes, sure, terpers claim that they're just adapting and seeing it how it is, but the amount of whining and complaining they put out makes it pretty clear that they're angry and offended at hypergamy.

joseremarque • 4 points • 25 August, 2015 06:48 AM\*

TRP describes hypergamy as it is: just another part of the playing field. The goal of TRP is to accurately describe the dating world and to help men be successful in it. Beta males on TRP complain about hypergamy because they know deep down that they are in the bottom percentiles and therefore that they are not going to be attracting many women. But no amount of foot stomping and temper tantrums will change female behavior. The misplaced anger is sad, but understandable: just another step in the awakening process.

belletaco • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 02:30 PM

Listen to what male celebrities actually say when they are asked why they are feminists. It's not to increase their popularity, people like aziz ansari, Joseph Gordon levitt or matt mcgorry don't need to speak out so people like them more. As for fat women feminists, um, Emma Watson? I also thought we have determined all blue pillers

are probably attractive and that's why we don't understand TRP because we never had problems getting laid.. As for me, I have no issues WIH people having standards. The problem is shaming and being upset that hot women don't want YOU. You can have standards, but we are supposed to lower them so you can get laid, that's when it's an issue.

Cyralea[S] • 21 points • 24 August, 2015 02:33 PM

It's not to increase their popularity, people like aziz ansari, Joseph Gordon levitt or matt mcgorry don't need to speak out so people like them more. As for fat women feminists, um, Emma Watson?

An actor's job is literally to be popular. There is no "popular enough". They are entertainers. If they aren't being entertaining, they don't get to keep their jobs.

The problem is shaming and being upset that hot women don't want YOU. You can have standards, but we are supposed to lower them so you can get laid, that's when it's an issue.

You'll find it's male feminists, not TRP'ers who do this. TRP states that one should raise their SMV if they want hotter women. Male feminists demand that being emotional should be sexy.

belletaco • 0 points • 24 August, 2015 02:39 PM

Being emotional IS sexy! To a degree. No one likes someone who sobs all the time, but I am uncontrollably attracted to my SO when he tells me how he feels about me or comes to me when things are bothering/upsetting him. But anyway- no, it's all over PPD and TRP "it's womens fault we can't get laid bc HYPERGAMY" does TRP tell you to up your "SMV"? Yes they do, but they also blame women for being attracted to attractive men. The whole 20% 80% study or whatever you guys bring up all the time..

disposable\_pants • 14 points • 24 August, 2015 03:20 PM

You're putting the cart before the horse here.

*Limited* emotion, from someone you're already attracted to (I'm assuming you're attracted to your SO), can make that person *more* attractive under the right circumstances.

This does not mean that emotion is the best way to attract someone in the first place.

Emotion is not sexy by itself; it's only contextually sexy. Almost *anything* can be sexy in the right context. Therefore it's bad advice to suggest that "being emotional is sexy" because outside of the perfect situation it's not.

Yes they do, but they also blame women for being attracted to attractive men.

Show me where TRP says "Women have no right to be attracted to attractive men!" TRP tells you how the game is played, gives you a few strategies to get what you want, and says if you fail it's your own fault.

belletaco • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 03:22 PM

Who said it was the way to attract people? Of course its not! It's awkward. But TRP is all about never showing your emotion to your SO, it makes you look beta if you talk about your feelings. That's bullshit.

Dietyz • 4 points • 24 August, 2015 04:09 PM\*

Negative emotions are a no-no to TRP, you can show positive emotions preferably if its veiled within a bit of ego. TRP is fine with being emotional(even negative) given the right context

like your mom died, a child is born, you got your dream job etc

Whenever men withhold our standard negative emotions (like trust issues) and a woman can tell she will say something like this "I promise I won't get mad" (example of power talk) but you can be damn sure there's about to be nuclear war in your living room. There isn't any reason to let those feelings loose. Those aren't even the worst negative emotions, yeah if it's insulting to her she will be pissed for a while but if it's negative towards yourself she's gonna be gone if she notices a trend based on what you revealed to her.

belletaco • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 04:11 PM

That seems unhealthy.

Dietyz • 5 points • 24 August, 2015 04:29 PM

TRP says that you should only share your negative feelings when they have been resolved, so it's not like you are keeping secrets you just shouldn't confide or expect a woman to give you any advice emotionally. You should be emotionally self-sufficient.

I don't want to generalize too much but I'm going too. The vast majority of women enjoy hearing a man's emotion because it allows them to feel secure and comfortable in their relationship. Women enjoy being the person you confide in, it shows that you care and trust them. They enjoy being supportive without actually doing anything besides listening.

*However* all those good feelings from hearing a man's emotions disappear and turn into fear or disgust if the man's emotional story ends abruptly without a resolution. If you end your story with the words "I don't know what to do" then you shouldn't have told that story in the first place, at least not until you fixed it on your own. She will actively be aware of this problem and look for it in your behavior to judge you.

Women want to share emotions with men and feel supportive by *listening* but don't want to be put in a situation where the man needs advice or help.

Don't you think this sounds pretty accurate for most of the population?

belletaco • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 04:33 PM

I really can't speak for most of the population but I don't mind helping my SO out with solutions, I like being included in it, I feel like I have helped make him happier and his life a bit easier.

nomdplume • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 09:27 PM

What if you don't have any solutions either, though? What if you don't see a way to make him happier and his life easier, or if you feel like the ways to do that are too unreasonable or demanding for you to handle?

Now he has just transferred his anxiety/depressed state to you. If he does that enough times, I predict that you will get resentful. And being resentful and being attracted are mutually exclusive.

Also, saying, "I don't know what to do!" is a statement of weakness, for everyone, in any context.

Women, in general, have a low tolerance for weak men. Some have lower tolerances than others, but I have yet to find women who are totally cool with the men they are close to being weak. Even the most masculine women still

tend to prefer stronger men over weaker.

gregariousnefarious • 5 points • 24 August, 2015 06:57 PM

Every high functioning couple I know have the will and mutual respect necessary to discuss emotional issues. If you don't, there's very possibly going to be a time when that strains or breaks the bonds of intimacy. There's a reason women in unhappy marriages go to couples counseling with a lack of emotional openness being a primary complaint.

gregariousnefarious • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 06:54 PM

I dunno, I simply don't buy that women only want to listen; sure they do that, but also they like to advise and troubleshoot. Otherwise we wouldn't have female counselors and therapists, but surprise surprise, that's a professional area where you will find loads of women. Part of being raised as a woman (at least in a reasonably traditional home) is being told that men need you to be supportive and nurturing. That bleeds into romantic relationships all day long. Now, if you've got an emotional problem that is completely unsolvable, most people are going to take a dim view of that, but this is not exclusive to women at all. If you're a depressed sad sack but refuse to work on it, you're going to wear out the person who wants to help you. That's not female nature, that's human nature, IMO

Dietyz • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 08:22 PM\*

The biggest factor is how long you have known that person and how intertwined your lives are. This will obviously lead to people being more willing to advise and troubleshoot. My last post is always relevant, but it becomes less and less relevant the longer your relationship goes on. This is one of the reasons why the friends first style of dating is popular with women, they have access to your emotions before they commit to you. So if they don't like what they see they can back out without having a messy situation.

Women might enjoy being therapists and counselors, but how highly do they see their patients? I cant imagine any of them feel any level of attraction when they see a client portraying negative emotions, I cant imagine it being a positive thing in the slightest.

Its the same type of thinking that women have when they try to eat only clean foods when they first meet a guy, you wanna have the best first impression and keep certain things in the closet until you know each other better. Random memory, but I once heard a girl say "if I liked you I wouldn't be eating pizza in front of you" and it made me wonder how in the hell you can be messy eating pizza

nomdplume • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 09:31 PM

If you're a depressed sad sack but refuse to work on it, you're going to wear out the person who wants to help you. That's not female nature, that's human nature, IMO

I would agree. I don't know that RP really makes a big gender distinction on



that, but the stakes are much higher with women because it directly affects attraction.

One of the problems I had in dealing with my "unsolvable" problems (not really unsolvable, but extremely difficult) was that, by sharing them with my wife, she became anxious as well, and her anxiety impacted me and sent me further down the hole, which led to more anxiety for her, and on and on down the spiral until the resentment was huge on both sides.

If I knew then what I know now, I would have shut my goddamned pie hole and dealt with it on my own (which is what I'm trying to do now - we don't talk about my problems anymore).

disposable\_pants • 9 points • 24 August, 2015 03:24 PM

But TRP is all about never showing your emotion to your SO

That's inaccurate -- discussions about LTR or marriage strategy routinely recommend that showing emotion is at times beneficial. Search for "comfort test" or the phrase "mix of alpha and beta traits" if you want to read those threads.

gregariousnefarious • 5 points • 24 August, 2015 07:00 PM

See this doesn't make sense though, "comfort tests" are when a woman is seeking validation of some sort. But what about the times when the dude genuinely has an issue that he'd like his partner's input on? TRP discourages that, full stop. Sounds like a shit deal for the dude, which makes me suspect it's just another "women are crappy people" hobbyhorse from our dear TRP friends.

disposable\_pants • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 07:22 PM

TRP doesn't recommend inventing emotional material to handle comfort test, though, so in those situations the guy necessarily will bring up a "genuine issue." Men also have many other places where they can discuss issues that are troubling them -- friends, family, or anonymous internet forums. TRP is saying that men should use these avenues (or find another way to handle their problems) instead of bringing them up with their partner and possibly destabilizing their relationship.

A LTR is a lot like a career. You want to get up in the morning and look forward to it, you want to be respected, and you'll do things you'd rather not (to a point) to make it work. If I have an emotional issue, would I bring it up with coworkers? That could jeopardize my career and I have other outlets I can use to handle it. Why would I introduce an unstable element when I don't have to?

scranton1ty • 2 points • 25 August, 2015 07:22 AM

But what about the times when the dude genuinely has an issue that he'd like his partner's input on?

I think that'd be alright in a framing of "I have this idea of how to solve my problem, what do you think?"...never a framing of "I have no idea what to do, what do you think I should do?", or any indication that the problem is overwhelming you or that you are reliant on her input/support.



Also, don't start crying. Just yesterday there was a thread from /r/relationships from a woman who was viscerally *disgusted* by her husband when he broke down crying after losing his job. This is especially true if you fill the role of provider, because it shows that you're a mess and do not have your shit together.

wombatinaburrow • 2 points • 25 August, 2015 07:43 AM

So she's a shitty person. I know a man who left his wife when she lost her breasts to cancer because she wasn't hot any more. Shallow fuckwits are there, and it's not gender determinate.

scrantonically • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 07:48 AM

I don't think so. You can get other jobs. How insecure and emotionally fragile must you be to be reduced to a blubbing mess by redundancy? It's something that's happened to many millions of people up and down the country in the last 7 years. I'd want to tell the guy to pull himself together and start looking for work.

Villaintine • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 09:14 PM

So she's a shitty person.

What a cop-out. Do you assume everyone who reacts negatively to certain behaviors are "shitty people" without knowing anything else about them?

belletaco • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 03:27 PM

It's so crazy you have names for being vulnerable. I imagine someone's mom dying and them going to TRP to search comfort test to know exactly how much emotion to show instead of just feeling and letting their partner take care of them in their time of need.

disposable\_pants • 10 points • 24 August, 2015 03:35 PM

What's wrong with using a shorthand term to describe a common occurrence? "SO" is used all the time and I've never heard that called crazy.

I imagine someone's mom dying and them going to TRP to search comfort test to know exactly how much emotion to show

The key words here are "I imagine." That's not how TRP works. Much like how no one immediately thumbs through a self-help book every time they're faced with a decision, no one runs to TRP every time they're thrown a curveball. The whole point -- both with the self-help book and with TRP -- is that you read, internalize, and then largely don't need the actual material because you're applying it naturally.

belletaco • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 03:41 PM

You missed my point- it's weird you would limit your emotions out of fear of, I don't even know what? Appearing vulnerable? Also SO is short for significant other so I don't have to type it out, creating a name for something like showing emotions and then writing a guide book on how to deal with that is a tad different than an abbreviation.

disposable\_pants • 7 points • 24 August, 2015 04:04 PM

it's weird you would limit your emotions out of fear of, I don't even know what? Appearing vulnerable?

Because being emotional/vulnerable is not attractive. If I want to be attractive, I'm going to limit my emotional outbursts.

Look at it this way: Being emotional/vulnerable is not professional. If I want to succeed in a professional environment, I'm going to limit my emotional outbursts. What's wrong with avoiding behaviors that aren't helpful?

creating a name for something like showing emotions and then writing a guide book on how to deal with that is a tad different than an abbreviation.

The term "significant other" is itself a shorthand way of referring to a broad category of relationships. Ditto for "friends with benefits" or "friendzone." Literally every group uses some form of jargon to simplify communication, and the more abstract the conversation the more jargon-heavy it typically becomes. Would you stroll into /r/baseball and think it's weird that they have a bunch of acronyms and odd-sounding terms like "can of corn," "hot corner," "Mendoza line," and "quadruple A"?

Maoist-Pussy • 6 points • 24 August, 2015 06:02 PM

All words are "names", and most of them are metaphors. "Vulnerable" is, itself, a neologism from the 17th century based on the Latin verb for "to injure".

gregariousnefarious • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 07:04 PM

Comfort test and talking about your troubles are not the same. Comfort test implies that the woman in the relationship lacks the emotional depth to care about you and just needs to be reassured. These are not good parallels. TRP does not have a name for sharing your emotional state with a woman (unless it has to do with validating her or telling her to piss off if she's being unreasonable). It sort of denies the notion that emotional intimacy is even possible in relationships. And I think that's rubbish

belletaco • -1 points • 24 August, 2015 06:02 PM

Haaaaamsterrrrrrr

Maoist-Pussy • 4 points • 24 August, 2015 06:06 PM

If you must.

gregariousnefarious • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 06:48 PM

Strong agreement here, TRP treats emotional expression like it's the death knell of attraction, but that's a loaf of poop. Sure, if your emotional bandwidth is taken up by woman resenting static and self pity, yeah, you're gonna have a bad time, but there are plenty of emotional expressions that enhance attraction, circumstances being right, because they enhance empathy and intimacy. But TRP also takes it as a given that women cannot empathize with men, as far as I can tell because women tend not to care if dudes aren't getting laid (which honestly, why should we, any more than we should care about people who are sorry for themselves about a

different issue), and from that follows a sort of perverse insistence that men aren't allowed to express themselves emotionally. Even their hero Marcus Aurelius (who I'm fairly sure most TRP ers have not actually read) understood the difference between being stoic (understanding the nature of things and not becoming perturbed by them) and being an emotionally repressed asshat.

nomdplume • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 09:37 PM

Even their hero Marcus Aurelius (who I'm fairly sure most TRP ers have not actually read) understood the difference between being stoic (understanding the nature of things and not becoming perturbed by them) and being an emotionally repressed asshat.

I don't think that RP's goal is to turn men into emotionally repressed asshats.

That's just the flip-side of the same uncontrolled emotional coin.

The goal is for men to have their emotions rather than their emotions having them.

As I mentioned elsewhere, women, in general in my experience, are very uncomfortable with weak men. If a guy is having a breakdown, can't pull himself out, and she either doesn't know how to help or doesn't feel able to help, she is going to be very concerned about that man's ability to provide for her family what she needs him to provide. She can't take care of him *and* her children (their children, of course, but in those situations, she will see her children as her priority, as she should).

So men would be wise to get control of their emotions as much as humanly possible.

[deleted] • 17 points • 24 August, 2015 02:45 PM

No one "blames" women for being attracted to attractive men.

We simply point out that women are attracted to attractive men. We also point out that women are lying when they say things like "emotional is sexy". We also point out that women aren't telling the whole truth with "we just want nice guys who treat us right".

Most women don't want that truth stated, because you think it makes you look shallow and superficial.

belletaco • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 02:46 PM

Why would it? Isn't everyone attracted to people they find attractive?

[deleted] • 22 points • 24 August, 2015 02:51 PM

Yes. But women lie and obfuscate when they TALK about what they find attractive.

Men know what other men like in women.

Women know what other women like in men.

Women know what men like in women. Now, women do not always like it, but they know it. Because men are clear about what they like: pretty face, H/W proportionate, big tits, tight ass, long legs. Because men say it and show it.

But -- men do not always know what women want in men. Because women specifically use subterfuge, obfuscation, shaming, and social conventions to conceal their preferences. Society aids and abets women in their use of these tactics to throw men off the track. They call their

ONSS "mistakes" instead of the calculating decisions they were.

belletaco • -1 points • 24 August, 2015 03:00 PM

Or because women like different type of men? It's pretty clear what men like because of what female are popular in the media- with women, we prefer different things. I like tall, skinny, lanky guys with striking features like high cheek bones, basically European looking men. My best friend was in love with Jon Cena, I find him repulsive. But that's who she dates- huuuuge guys who spend all their free time at the gym. You're not going to find that much diversity among men. Sure, a lot of guys like bigger girls, but for the most part if you ask men what they like, it's exactly what you described.

relationshipdownvote • 9 points • 24 August, 2015 04:39 PM

basically European looking men

Ah, white guys, aka the most fetishized group of humans in the modern world.

belletaco • 0 points • 24 August, 2015 04:43 PM

am I supposed to apologize for that? It's not all white men though, I find most american men pretty unattractive.

relationshipdownvote • 7 points • 24 August, 2015 05:24 PM

oh so do you fetishize germans or sweds?

[deleted] • 15 points • 24 August, 2015 03:03 PM\*

NO, it's not because women like different types of men. It's because there's a wide incongruity between what women say they want (nice guys who treat them right and who offer them commitment) and who they fuck (confident, dominant men who aren't always "nice" to them; who are demanding and forward; and who don't offer commitment).

again: Why does this have to be reiterated for the eleventy billionth time?

belletaco • 0 points • 24 August, 2015 03:08 PM

If I put 50 guys in a room with the girl you described, I'd say almost all of them would want to fuck her and all of them would fuck her. If I 50 girls in a room with the guy I described, I'd say maybe a quarter would want to fuck him and maybe a little over that would. It 100% has to do with women having different preferences. I DO like nice guys, but if you look like jon Cena, I am not having sex with you.

[deleted] • 16 points • 24 August, 2015 04:40 PM

Nope, women's preferences would fall on a normal distribution, just like guys.

Most women like masculine features. Period.

Women that don't are outliers pure and simple.

I know you think you're a special snowflake, but you're not.

dr\_warlock • 3 points • 25 August, 2015 12:08 AM\*

AF/BB (Alpha fux/Beta Bux) cannot be paraded out loud because no man will offer

provisioning if they knew that they were the ass of this strategy. That's why they are indirect and obfuscate.

Cyralea[S] • 10 points • 24 August, 2015 02:47 PM

I am uncontrollably attracted to my SO when he tells me how he feels about me or comes to me when things are bothering/upsetting him

You're attracted by attention and validation, not by his emotionality. Further, if he didn't provide value to you in some other way he wouldn't even be in a position to open up to you -- he'd have been rejected on the onset.

Yes they do, but they also blame women for being attracted to attractive men

I haven't really seen this. HB9's are going to chase male 9's and 10's. That's a pretty accepted notion.

[deleted] • 13 points • 24 August, 2015 03:00 PM

It amazes me that this basic principle of "women obfuscate and conceal their real sexual preferences because of anti-slut defenses" has to be reiterated over and over again. It's like having to teach  $2+2=4$  to Trigonometry students.

belletaco • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 02:54 PM

Yeah but wouldn't any partner be providing value in a relationship? Otherwise why would you be with them? There's nothing wrong with showing vulnerability to your SO, it shows you trust them and that's not a turn off.. No you probably shouldn't go up to girls you just met and tell them how your grandma died and start crying.

[deleted] • 7 points • 24 August, 2015 02:55 PM

But to women, a man "providing value" is not the same thing as "being attractive". There are lots of beta buxes out there "providing value" to women in exchange for IV drip sex once every other month. Those women stay with those men, because those men are on the treadmill "providing value" in the form of money and services.

belletaco • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 03:04 PM

Not everhthing has to be about attractiveness. Do you guys literally think about anything else? My point was there is nothing wrong with having "feelz" and opening up to your partner. It isnt a turn off.

[deleted] • 10 points • 24 August, 2015 03:09 PM

In the realm of intersexual relationships, it is ALL about sexual attraction. If a woman loses that attraction for an SO or a husband, the relationship is OVER. Men also wouldn't make it all about attraction if it were clear that something other than attraction would actually keep a woman with a man. But in today's day, where women fought for and got the right to divorce for no reason at all, *the only thing keeping most women with their men is sexual attraction.*

THAT'S why it is ALL about attraction.

belletaco • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 03:12 PM

Must be exhausting.

[deleted] • 10 points • 24 August, 2015 03:13 PM

This is the world women wanted. This is the world they demanded be created for them.

nomdplume • 4 points • 24 August, 2015 09:40 PM

Of course, nothing in RP says "Show no emotion when your grandma dies." That's absurd. The goal is for men to have their emotions rather than letting their emotions have them. When a man's family *needs* him, which man do you think they want?

belletaco • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 09:44 PM

Men are entitled to feel how they want to feel. If you have a family, but adults need to buck up for the children, but in private, do what you have to do.

Maoist-Pussy • 5 points • 24 August, 2015 04:49 PM

I also thought we have determined all blue pillers are probably attractive and that's why we don't understand TRP because we never had problems getting laid.

I am pretty sure we determined that blue pill men sleep with 1 or 2 girls their entire lives and are nerdy near-virgins.

belletaco • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 04:53 PM

Have we? I don't know, I would assume most people on blue pill are above average.

Maoist-Pussy • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 04:56 PM

No, we did a survey that showed blue pillers have fewer partners, and in the thread for it a bunch of bloop men admitted to being effeminate nerds with only the one fat girlfriend.

ManRAh • 7 points • 24 August, 2015 05:30 PM

"Muh anecdote breaks TRP; I know a nerdy midget who literally everyone wants to bang." -BP threads in a nutshell.

belletaco • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 05:07 PM

Did they actually say 1 fat girlfriend..

Maoist-Pussy • 6 points • 24 August, 2015 05:10 PM

Not in so many words, but yes.

belletaco • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 05:10 PM

Im going to assume they didn't say that then

Maoist-Pussy • 4 points • 24 August, 2015 05:15 PM

They would admit to having fucked one or two women, ever, because they were happy with that. In a different post, they would explain that the one woman they had fucked was their current girlfriend that they had met in college at the Anime Club or a fat-activists convention or a Renaissance fair or some similarly pathetic nerd gathering.

belletaco • 4 points • 24 August, 2015 05:16 PM

So you're just assuming people in anime club or that go to rennissance faires are fat? Looks like you're basing your assumptions off nothing more than your emotions. Calm down, you're being hysterical.

Maoist-Pussy • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 05:18 PM

So you're just assuming people in anime club or that go to rennissance faires are fat?

Well, yes, because they mostly are. But, even beyond that, you will find that a lot of these dudes will admit that their girlfriends are fat, because they have that weird lack of shame that sometimes goes along with lack of standards.

wombatinaburrow • 0 points • 25 August, 2015 07:52 AM

Your mum is so fat...

Maoist-Pussy • 0 points • 25 August, 2015 03:27 PM

Well, yeah. She is a mum. Likes gardening and so forth.

wombatinaburrow • 1 point • 26 August, 2015 04:10 AM

What's with mum's and gardening? Mine would sleep with her begonias if she could.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 07:59 PM

Makes sense. On a related note, all the people I've met who described themselves as 'communists' tended to be losers who didn't make much money and had weak educational credentials.

wombatinaburrow • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 07:40 AM

Much like all the people who describe themselves as capitalists had their rich daddy buy them everything.

exit\_sandman • 3 points • 25 August, 2015 03:43 PM

Huh, odd.

The most ardent left-wingers I know came from educated privileged backgrounds, while the capitalist-minded, achievement oriented peeps either came from a more modest background... or from East Germany.

wombatinaburrow • 1 point • 26 August, 2015 02:52 AM

So Oestalgia is on the backburner these days?

FallingSnowAngel • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 02:29 PM

Wow, you discovered our secret! It's allllll about fucking. Christ, you're good.

Who cares about accurate media representation? Who cares about mental health, violence, suicides? You have a penis! And it asks all the hard questions! (Pun very definitely intended.)

Christ, if these are the truths the redpill represents, it's no wonder why the warning label includes warnings about cloudy thinking, hallucinations, and paranoia.

Edit: And by the way, BBW women? A porn category. Feminine men? You can find us in the manga section.



Just because you're not attracted to either, doesn't mean we're not getting other people's rocks off - as they never fail to remind us.

nomdplume • 17 points • 24 August, 2015 02:42 PM

So, given that you think there is a big market for BBW and feminine men out there, who would you say make up the majority of the sexually disenfranchised right now? 'Cause there are an awful lot of sexually disenfranchised people out there.

FallingSnowAngel • 6 points • 24 August, 2015 02:50 PM

Judging from their reddit reports? People who struggle with creating a spark. Most are socially awkward, but there are some who are amazing at a conversation - they just don't know how to mutually escalate their way into any fun.

nomdplume • 10 points • 24 August, 2015 02:54 PM

Not judging from their "reddit reports" - in real life, what are you seeing? The internet can report all kinds of stuff.

FallingSnowAngel • 4 points • 24 August, 2015 03:17 PM

In real life, most of the "forever alones" have really high standards, can't detect nuance in a conversation, and refuse to compromise. They may have an anxiety disorder too...

It's pretty much the same thing as Reddit, but with less conspiracy theory.

Carkudo • 8 points • 24 August, 2015 04:38 PM

In real life, most of the "forever alones" have really high standards

How do you know that?

can't detect nuance in a conversation

As in...?

refuse to compromise

Again, how do you know that?

I mean, sure, plenty of forever alone men are unattractive socially and/or physically, but refusal to compromise on standards? That sort of statement betrays you as a person who has bought into the conventional picture without ever considering (and probably unwilling to consider) the actual people behind it. Almost all the FAs I know have no standards at all beyond "she must like me" and I'm pretty sure I know far more FAs than you because I hang out in such communities as well as have quite a few FA friends IRL.

FallingSnowAngel • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 09:07 PM\*

How do you know that?

Hanging out with them, and thinking I could help. Introducing them to friends.

nuance

Let's say a woman grinned, teeth bared as wide as possible. It doesn't really lift her cheeks, just her lips. If anything, her eyes look trapped.

They'd read that as a success. They'd continue doing whatever created that expression, or worse, amplify.

That's actually how I met the first woman I ever did anything consensual with. She was grateful that someone could accurately read her cry for help.

refuse to compromise

My favorite was the guy who had a rare kink. I found a woman with that exact same kink. He rejected her for her taste in first person shooters. He wouldn't let that subject go.

And then there was the guy, who, on a first date, refused to talk about anything except the woman who used him just for sex. Finally, my friend told him she would never do that, and tried to comfort him in other ways...and he accused her of being a heartless bitch for trying to actually have a date with him, instead of a free all night therapy session.

That one was just...ugh. That's not alpha or beta. Are there gamma men?

Carkudo • 2 points • 25 August, 2015 02:30 AM

Hanging out with them, and thinking I could help. Introducing them to friends.

So you've hung out with "most of the "forever alones"?"

No, no you haven't. You just have one or two friends who have high standards and love to whine about being lonely. You don't know anyone who is forever alone.

Finally, my friend told him she would never do that, and tried to comfort him in other ways...

Most forever alone people *who I personally know* have never had anyone care that much for them. The fact that you can call someone who's had that "forever alone" seriously goes to show what you know. Lol.

FallingSnowAngel • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 02:49 AM

He's forever alone now. Nobody wants to know him. And it's curious, the conclusions you leap to. I describe a few, you decide they're all.

You're so desperate to corner me that it's affecting your judgment. You're interested in winning, not any kind of conversation.

You'll also recall I was asked about what I've seen. My life. Not everyone else's on the planet.

Carkudo • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 03:00 AM

I describe a few, you decide they're all.

You're the ones who started talking about "all the foreveralones"

You'll also recall I was asked about what I've seen. My life. Not everyone else's on the planet.

Sure, sure, worm your way out of it.

nomdplume • 4 points • 24 August, 2015 03:31 PM

So, no one "normal" IRL struggles with sex/love/relationships? Interesting observation, but that certainly doesn't match up with my experience.

FallingSnowAngel • 5 points • 24 August, 2015 07:01 PM

There's a difference between someone who struggles, and someone who will never know the love of another.

nomdplume • 7 points • 24 August, 2015 08:01 PM

Oh Jesus. That sounds like an overly dramatic distinction. "I will never know the love of another wah wah wah..."

If someone struggles to have love in their life, they aren't happy. What constitutes "the love of another" and whether that is sufficient to qualify someone as "disenfranchised" is fairly irrelevant.

FallingSnowAngel • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 08:15 PM

"I will never know the love of another wah wah wah..."

I've met them. My roommate is one. They drive me insane. They've deliberately sabotaged all my efforts to hook them up with someone, because they're too scared to take the risks.

I'd have more sympathy, but my fear of sex is fight, flight, or freeze. I scare myself to death every day.

nomdplume • 5 points • 24 August, 2015 08:23 PM

I have, also.

I have about as much patience with them as I do with teenagers, which is basically how I regard them in terms of their emotional maturity.

mashakos • 5 points • 25 August, 2015 02:04 PM

Who cares about accurate media representation? Who cares about mental health, violence, suicides? You have a penis! And it asks all the hard questions! (Pun very definitely intended.)

The OP specifically stated:

people who call out others for having standards

I've known a few friends who ranted once or twice about media representation over the years. They are quite secure in themselves and do not take it farther than the occasional rant. Some loser who constantly keeps "objecting" when someone on their Facebook feed posts one picture or article relating to a celebrity they find attractive? It is all about fucking for the ones "raising awareness" in response to a friend not finding BBW's or androgynous boys attractive.

FallingSnowAngel • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 02:17 PM\*

Some loser who constantly keeps "objecting" when someone on their Facebook feed posts one picture or article relating to someone they find attractive?

How often does that happen? It seems like the worst people are being used to attack everyone else.

Granted, that seems to be the entire point of the internet.

It is all about fucking for the ones "raising awareness" in response to a friend not finding BBW's or androgynous boys attractive.

I will also admit that the assholes who give everyone else a bad name are pretty disgusting. They're not just BBWs and androgynous boys - they include people with that fetish, too. And people who reduce us to a fetish are some of the most shallow I've ever met.

There's a thousand ways they can find to turn any conversation into being about sex, while they boast about how deep they are.

mashakos • 3 points • 25 August, 2015 02:26 PM\*

How often does that happen? It seems like the worst people are being used to attack everyone else.

I didn't see it as attacking everyone, I saw the OP as explaining the behaviour of that type who have very low self esteem and use moral superiority to increase their attractiveness. It obviously doesn't work - no one I associate with irl acts this way (male or female).

EDIT: I don't agree with the OP that a movement like HAES was *founded* on the principle of devaluing conventional standards, but I wouldn't be surprised if it attracts a lot of those who see it as an affirmation of their "moral high ground".

There a thousand ways they can find to turn any conversation into being about sex, while they boast about how deep they are.

Exactly, it's pathetic.

kick6 • 11 points • 24 August, 2015 04:09 PM

Who cares about mental health, violence, suicides?

Everyone does.....when they happen to women. No one does.....when they happen to men. I'll give you two guesses as to which group suffers the higher number of incidents, but you'll only need one.

FallingSnowAngel • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 07:06 PM

That's why the hospital forced me to drink the charcoal. They thought I was a woman. Thanks for clearing it up.

No wonder why you guys don't think feminists ever help men. You don't even know what's really out there.

kick6 • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 07:48 PM

I know exactly what's really out there. But thanks for thinking your solipsism trumps statistics.

FallingSnowAngel • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 07:59 PM

You mean the statistics about men refusing to get help, and being shamed for it when they try, often by other men?

Or the statistics where more people ought to be helping, because there's a shortage?

kick6 • 6 points • 24 August, 2015 08:06 PM

I'm talking about the statistics about which sex suffers mental health, violence, and suicides

most often (men), and the statistics about the number of organizations that exist to help the *opposite* sex.

FallingSnowAngel • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 08:20 PM

Men successfully commit more suicides, because they're more violent, and they don't care what anyone finding the body sees.

The numbers change dramatically when you count failed suicides. I know redpill dogma is that they're all cries for help, because the redpill causes hallucinations, but even the cries for help, are given help, because most of us are not sociopaths who ignore cries for help.

I wish more suicides of all genders made cries for help, of any kind.

kick6 • 8 points • 24 August, 2015 08:26 PM

Men successfully commit more suicides, because they're more violent, and they don't care what anyone finding the body sees.

that's a bold statement.

The numbers change dramatically when you count failed suicides. I know redpill dogma is that they're all cries for help, because the redpill causes hallucinations, but even the cries for help, are given help, because most of us are not sociopaths who ignore cries for help.

Another bold statement wrapped up in an insult. The cries for help are given help when it's women because they're women. Nobody gives a shit when the 22nd veteran commits suicide a day. Why? Because he's a man, and nobody cares.

Note: you made no mention of violence. Is that because you know that violence is OVERWHELMINGLY perpetrated against men? Yet the support groups and other tax leeches are OVERWHELMINGLY designed to benefit women?

FallingSnowAngel • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 08:54 PM\*

that's a bold statement.

What do you think a shotgun does to your head?

Another bold statement wrapped up in an insult. The cries for help are given help when it's women because they're women.

And if I'd never actually been in group therapy, all over this state and the one next door, I might be gullible enough to buy in to what you're saying.

Nobody gives a shit when the 22nd veteran commits suicide a day

Maybe you don't. I let one move in with me, just to keep him off the streets. Why don't you tell me what the redpill does, for men who need more than giving someone an orgasm?

Because teaching them hopelessness and paranoia seems to be increasing their anxiety/depression, not making it go away.

violence

Overwhelming perpetrated by men, if we're talking the kind that happens when

they leave their homes. It's fun watching Reddit rip up feminism instead of holding the people who have all the money responsible for the giant holes in the social safety net.

But anti-feminists only use men's bodies as human shields. Click on some more arrows, talk some more shit, and maybe you'll actually save someone, some day...

kick6 • 7 points • 24 August, 2015 09:23 PM

What do you think a shotgun does to your head?

Yea...focus on just that part of the statement

And if I'd never actually been in group therapy, all over this state and the one next door, I might be gullible enough to buy in to what you're saying.

MOAR SOLIPSISM. Good fix /s

Maybe you don't. I let one move in with me, just to keep him off the streets. Why don't you tell me what the redpill does, for men who need more than giving someone an orgasm? Because teaching them hopelessness and paranoia seems to be increasing their anxiety/depression, not making it go away.

you know what it does? It teaches vets whose wives cheated on them and spent all their money while they deployed to laugh at the damaged goods, and to move on. No orgasms required. Better: we hope to get to the point where they get these lessons BEFORE a dependapotamus latches on, and they never have to suffer at all.

Overwhelming perpetrated by men, if we're talking the kind that happens when they leave their homes. It's fun watching Reddit rip up feminism instead of holding the people who have all the money responsible for the giant holes in the social safety net. But anti-feminists only use men's bodies as human shields. Click on some more arrows, talk some more shit, and maybe you'll actually save someone, some day...

Where in the actual fuck are you trying to take this conversation. Stay on topic.

Villaintine • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 09:04 PM

That's why the hospital forced me to drink the charcoal. They thought I was a woman.

That is the popular strategy for women. Men tend to use more lethal methods. At least tell me it was prescription.

FallingSnowAngel • 2 points • 25 August, 2015 09:12 PM

I wish. This was pre-internet for me, and an overdose of sleeping pills sounded like a peaceful death.

Since I was just one of millions of people to have that exact thought, it didn't even come close to killing me.

Villaintine • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 09:28 PM

At least it wasn't Tylenol /shrug

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 08:46 PM

Feminine men? You can find us in the manga section.

Lol its true, if you're a skinny white dude with no game, go to Asia and you'll be swamped in pussy

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 04:52 PM

[permanently deleted]

dragoness\_leclerq • 6 points • 24 August, 2015 06:37 PM

To be fair, he's a dude.

[deleted] • 0 points • 24 August, 2015 02:13 PM

I always thought it was kind of obvious .

Cyralea[S] • 14 points • 24 August, 2015 02:16 PM

You'd think so, but given how many people support Cultural Marxism as a platform of moral superiority you really have to wonder.

[deleted] • -1 points • 24 August, 2015 02:23 PM

Well , cultural marxism is not only about that.

Cyralea[S] • 9 points • 24 August, 2015 02:25 PM

Care to expound? In my opinion Cultural Marxism is *precisely* about gaining power by eradicating the standards of others.

[deleted] • 0 points • 24 August, 2015 02:26 PM

Well , it's based on the idea that people don't have equal opportunities to prove themselves , so we should force equal opportunities for everyone. At least that's how I understand it , I don't know much about cultural marxism.

Cyralea[S] • 9 points • 24 August, 2015 02:29 PM

I agree that's a common statement from them, but comes from those lacking in personal accountability. Most cultural marxists have it in them to do precisely what's necessary to build value, they simply don't want to do it. They want to use words instead.

Fat, promiscuous women and effeminate men are the best examples of it.

Lonny\_zone • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 06:04 PM

Fat, promiscuous women and effeminate men are the best examples of it.

I am on your side here, but I'd like to note that some women are fat and some men are effeminate because of hormonal problems.

The fat women are *totally* at fault for their promiscuity though.

Cyralea[S] • 4 points • 24 August, 2015 06:23 PM



Those very hormonal problems are largely what influences their brains to prefer feminism. There was a study in here not too long ago that showed that pre-natal testosterone exposure was extremely highly correlated with adoption of feminism in women.

Lonny\_zone • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 07:23 PM

There are numerous studies that expound upon the brain differences between sexes.

Further to your point, there are also studies that indicate amygdala functioning in lesbian women is similar to that of straight men, while gay men have amygdala functioning similar to that of straight women.

But of course, to some 3rd-Wavers, gender is entirely a social construct and has no biological predetermine whatsoever, because their feepees are more important to them than science.

steelpuppy • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 09:24 PM

Those fatties are a minority even amongst fatties. Hormonal problems of that sort are extremely rare and usually followed with mental retardation. Max you can gain with something involving thyroid is 20lbs.

Most of the "my cunditions" crowd are simply stuffing their face with refined sugar and wondering why they are fat as fuck.

Lonny\_zone • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 09:48 PM

You reminded me of the incredible lulz in r/fatpeoplestories, and I am happy to see it is still alive and well!

kick6 • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 04:07 PM

Cultural marxism is the long con to instantiate regular marxism because regular marxism failed to manifest itself in the way Karl predicted.

TRPThrowRug • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 04:18 PM

There's a difference between equal opportunity, and enforcing equal outcomes regardless of inputs.

The latter is anti-meritocratic

[deleted] • -1 points • 24 August, 2015 02:31 PM\*

Cultural Marxism is nothing to with what this fairly intelligent, but in no way so exemplary, that it feels I am being sarcastic, potential nobel laureate is saying, it has nothing to with tumblr feminists, it's a broad term used to describe the theories of intellectuals from the frankfurt schule.

Anders Breivik the Norwegian terrorist was obsessed with the term and used it to describe anything he perceived as anti-White or anti-Western and now far-right cretins have become obsessed with it

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Frankfurt\\_School#Conspiracy\\_theory](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Frankfurt_School#Conspiracy_theory)

hyperreal[M] • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 08:15 PM

Cultural Marxism is nothing to with what this dumbass is saying

If you edit out this personal attack, I'll reapprove your comment.

[deleted] • -4 points • 24 August, 2015 09:14 PM

edited :)

hyperreal[M] • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 09:24 PM

Sooooo while your edit is within the letter of the law, I feel like it's violating the spirit.

If you remove "highly academic" we'll be good, as I suppose they could be a potential nobel laureate.

[deleted] • 0 points • 25 August, 2015 09:14 AM

We good now?

;) .

Maoist-Pussy • 2 points • 24 August, 2015 04:54 PM

Today, you have gained my respect.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 12:16 AM

If I agreed with any of that, we'd both be wrong.

MissPearl • 0 points • 25 August, 2015 12:33 PM

Slutwalks are EXPLICITLY about the idea that someone could be asking for it in dress or conduct. Parading in the clothes you were raped in and carrying a sign explaining that is not remotely concerned with what makes you sad about a woman's relationship VS sex prospects with you.

I don't care if you don't want to marry me because I am what even a liberal and generous culture would call a "slut". I'm more worried that naked pictures of me can be weaponized against me, that police and other people charged with protecting me will blame me for bad things that happen to me, and I am somehow evil because I enjoy and share my sexuality.

I mean really, you think attractiveness is what I care about? Jesus, I'm in a LTR with a guy I'm so cock whipped by I get a cross eyed stupid happy look just thinking about him. I've never lacked for guys explicitly aware of my sluttiness who want me for the long haul.

What bugs me is that having a huge ass has been used as a justification for why men thought they could touch it and try to force intimacy on me because it was up to me to protect and downplay it while they got to see their desire as a measure of how much I was willing. I'm bothered that I have to dance a line between dowdy and frumpy and hiding my sexual aspect because I live in a culture that simultaneously uses what I am to define sexy and tries to beat me over the head about it. I hate that I have to protect my online identity because humans are so fucked up about sexuality that I have to deal with people who will prey on me, but that the reward for my honesty would be to be told that if I just didn't do the slut thing I'd be safe.

Sure slut shaming and discrimination and even slut bashing are all things that are not remotely within your orbit, but it's not about defining "attractive".

Cyralea[S] • 5 points • 25 August, 2015 01:42 PM

You're kind of all over the place here. It's hard to address this when you're making multiple different assertions.

Sticking with the Slutwalk, it has everything to do with women absolving responsibility. Women do not want to admit that they have agency over their safety, they want the world to rubber-pad itself rather than have them wear a helmet.

Things like "Don't get drunk around unfamiliar men" is pretty good advice if you don't want to get raped -- instead, women want to shift the narrative onto one that absolves them of all responsibility: teach men not to rape. You might as well fire the police department and have them teach men not to murder and steal too.

MissPearl • 0 points • 25 August, 2015 02:36 PM

that they have agency over their safety

The "protect your candy" advice is a problem because it doesn't help or allow you to function, because wherever you set the boundary becomes fungible. Part of this pushback is because the parameters of safety are what make some cultures swathe you in fabric and put you in the custody of male relatives.

If you've ever done anything nudist related, you'll very quickly get an idea of how un-erotic the body can be and how contextual sexuality it. But even beyond that, the advice "don't be sexy" is again frustratingly vague.

As far as the education about sexual assault, there's very different attitudes around jacking someone's wallet VS raping them. You also don't get the same "but it's a coooooompliment" about other aggressive behaviours the way sexual aggression does.

And my expectations and freedoms are certainly variable and based on the education the guy has about appropriate conduct towards me. Just being me doing my shit gives me responses varying from demanding I owe them for being desirable to ignoring me completely.

"Don't get drunk around unfamiliar men"

Terrible advice, I'm more likely to be assaulted by familiar men.

Put the point remains that this has NOTHING to do with trying to define what men find attractive and does not belong in your example.

Cyralea[S] • 4 points • 25 August, 2015 02:44 PM

The "protect your candy" advice is a problem because it doesn't help or allow you to function, because wherever you set the boundary becomes fungible

That's not true at all. You can make a cost-benefit analysis. There are lots of ways to lower the risk of getting in a car accident, in increasing levels of severity: wear a seatbelt, drive carefully, don't drive, look both ways before crossing the street, never leave your home. At some point you accept a tolerable level of risk.

The same is true for anything risky. Rape is a reality, just like theft and car accidents are. You can be proactive.

You also don't get the same "but it's a coooooompliment" about other aggressive behaviours the way sexual aggression does.

That's largely a strawman, very few people who oppose slutwalks bear this notion. The real argument is that you can be proactive about your safety, exactly the same with theft.

Terrible advice, I'm more likely to be assaulted by familiar men.

Then act accordingly. Learn how to give clear, unambiguous removal of consent. Take self-defence. There's always something you can do aside from absolving yourself of responsibility.

MissPearl • -1 points • 25 August, 2015 03:09 PM

Learn how to give clear, unambiguous removal of consent

I am, I'm interested in making sure that society actually understands the concept of consent and can't hide behind "sometimes men just get horny" or "that's how women show they are interested".

Going on a march is the exact opposite of absolving yourself of responsibility. It's disagreeing with you on the fundamental source of the problem.

Cyralea[S] • 5 points • 25 August, 2015 04:10 PM

Can't say that I've ever seen a large proponent of people who suggest what you're suggesting. The Slutwalk originated in my city; it's most definitely not about what you're suggesting, it's about absolving responsibility. Specifically, "I should be able to wear whatever I like and do whatever I want and never be raped".

MissPearl • -1 points • 25 August, 2015 04:24 PM

I should be able to wear whatever I like

Yes. Yes I should be. Assuming consent from a pair of pants is moronic and arbitrary, and establishing a social norm that there's no such thing as a consent costume is a good thing.

Certainly burka/chador cultures don't exactly experience better outcomes.

Cyralea[S] • 4 points • 25 August, 2015 04:26 PM

Yes, you should. But you don't. I should be able to leave a bike unlocked downtown while I grab a quick coffee and expect it to be there. But it won't be. That's the world you live in.

When someone gives you advice on how to be proactive, it's because they're being a realistic, not an idealist.

MissPearl • -1 points • 25 August, 2015 04:30 PM

Terrible metaphor, unlike a bike, my sexuality is grafted to my body and is an impossible thing to actually remove from consideration. You saw how stupidly thirsty guys got just at the idea of my picture when there's loads of prettier women on /r/realgirls.

Cyralea[S] • 3 points • 25 August, 2015 04:33 PM

You misunderstand the metaphor. Crime is a reality. There is no "eradicate all X crime". That's idealism. We do what we can to punish those criminals, but they're not going away.

You live in a world with crime. You can't control anyone but you, so make inward changes, rather than outward.

Dat anger phase.

Carkudo • -2 points • 24 August, 2015 04:43 PM

Rather than make the change necessary to become attractive

Not everyone can make those changes. And that alone is a good reason to resent those standards.

The game is rigged. It isn't fair. It favors those who are born with good genes and into good environments, or who have the resources to raise themselves up. It's not a level playing field, and it leaves ample room for some people to be completely disqualified from happiness. Of course it would be fucking nice if those standards were eliminated.

Cyralea[S] • 8 points • 24 August, 2015 04:45 PM

*Everyone* can make changes to become more attractive. Not everyone can become top 1%, but nothing is stopping you from propelling yourself to a place where you're more desirable than most men.

Blaming luck and circumstances is defeatist.

Carkudo • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 04:59 PM

Everyone can make changes to become more attractive.

Not if they're already at their top threshold for attractiveness and that still isn't enough to attract anyone.

nothing is stopping you

How do you know that?

Cyralea[S] • 7 points • 24 August, 2015 05:01 PM

I've rarely met anyone that couldn't vault themselves to be marginally attractive. You have to have some serious disfiguration or mental disease to truly be a hopeless case. I've known some serious omega types.

Carkudo • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 02:27 AM

That doesn't really answer my question, though. I figured as much. Just like any other terper, you presume to know something you don't actually know, because you're just more comfortable that way. Pathetic.

Cyralea[S] • 2 points • 25 August, 2015 01:00 PM

Spare me the passive aggressiveness. Are you saying that you're so hopeless that you can't even work yourself up to average?

Carkudo • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 05:33 PM

Yes. And you seem to believe that such a situation is impossible. So how do you know it's impossible?

Cyralea[S] • 2 points • 25 August, 2015 05:57 PM

No, I only stated that it was rare. In most cases, many who thought they were hopeless in fact ended up being able to do something about it.

In any event, if you're convinced you're a lost cause I have no real incentive to

convince you otherwise.

Carkudo • 0 points • 25 August, 2015 07:14 PM

Everyone can make changes to become more attractive. Not everyone can become top 1%, but nothing is stopping you from propelling yourself to a place where you're more desirable than most men.

So you admit the quoted statement is bullshit. Good.

Cyralea[S] • 2 points • 25 August, 2015 07:16 PM

I've already stated that there are outliers and exceptions. Pedantism isn't an attractive trait.

ManRAh • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 05:44 PM

Most people can always improve their physique, finances, lifestyle, etc in some way. There is ALWAYS room for growth.

Why are you arguing from the most extreme point possible?

Carkudo • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 02:25 AM

Why are you arguing from the most extreme point possible?

Because **ALWAYS** implies **ALWAYS**. And also because I am one of those extremes.

Why are you arguing from a point that requires some people that exist, to not exist?

ManRAh • 2 points • 25 August, 2015 04:06 PM

You believe personal growth for yourself is an impossibility?

Carkudo • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 05:31 PM

I believe that increasing my attractiveness is an impossibility. Most people who know me agree.

ManRAh • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 06:10 PM

What are your limiting factors?

Carkudo • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 07:14 PM

Lots and lots of unfixable physical flaws.

Maoist-Pussy • 4 points • 24 August, 2015 04:53 PM

Of course it would be fucking nice if those standards were eliminated.

But then everyone would be gross. Nobody wants that.

Carkudo • 1 point • 24 August, 2015 04:57 PM

You know, it's been years since I resigned myself to the fact that no woman could ever feel attraction to me. That doesn't mean I've stopped taking care of my body. I haven't regained any of the weight I lost back in college (I'm 31), I still brush my hair, use skin care products etc. Hygiene and grooming is not

just about attracting the opposite sex.

Lonny\_zone • 4 points • 24 August, 2015 06:05 PM

Maybe your problem is that you resigned yourself to this "fact."

Carkudo • 1 point • 25 August, 2015 02:24 AM

No, it isn't. My problem is lack of attractiveness.

Lonny\_zone • 3 points • 25 August, 2015 02:37 AM

As long as you are not severely deformed or disabled you should be able to get somewhere.

Resigning yourself to failure guarantees failure. You gave up years ago during your mid-twenties!? When is the last time you made an approach?

You are wasting prime years wallowing in defeat.

Carkudo • 0 points • 25 August, 2015 02:40 AM

As long as you are not severely deformed or disabled you should be able to get somewhere.

Because you said so?

Resigning yourself to failure guarantees failure.

Being incapable of succeeding also guarantees failure. I agree that it takes either very severe factors or a very unlucky combination of numerous factors (as in my case) to get to that, but it is possible.

When is the last time you made an approach?

Last Sunday actually.

You are wasting prime years wallowing in defeat.

Because you said so?

Lonny\_zone • 3 points • 25 August, 2015 02:51 AM

Because you said so?

I have seen moderately deformed and disabled men with decent women and you are only 31, so you still have a good decade (or two depending on your lifestyle capabilities and ability to self-improve) to enter single woman social spaces and convince somebody you are worth a try. If you approach thinking you are worthless, women's superior social graces will detect that.

My curiosity is piqued: what is so wrong with you (besides your bad attitude) that women don't want any part of?

Carkudo • 0 points • 25 August, 2015 02:59 AM

I have seen moderately deformed and disabled men with decent women

...so?

If you approach thinking you are worthless, women's superior social graces



will detect that.

This is the typical thinking of putting the cart before the horse. It doesn't work that way, in my experience. Before feeling worthy or worthless, what really matters is having actual worth. If you don't have that, no amount of confidence will make you attractive. Conversely, *feeling* worthless means nothing in terms of attractiveness when you have worth. Somebody is going to like you anyway.

And the only reply to this that you can manage is to plug your ears and scream "Lalala I can't hear you" because you can't counter it any other way, yet you are desperate to protect you little magical worldview.

Lonny\_zone • 3 points • 25 August, 2015 03:30 AM

And the only reply to this that you can manage is to plug your ears and scream "Lalala I can't hear you" because you can't counter it any other way, yet you are desperate to protect you little magical worldview.

LOL...wow. This is actually what you are doing to me and essentially all of TRP.

You are basically telling me you are a 1. 1s are seriously rarer than Chad.

Why can't you raise your value? You have a micropenis? 3rd degree burns on your face? (Edit: that would be a zero in most cases.) You are a filthy homeless person posting from the library?

What can't you fix to at least be a 2 and own up on some chub-in-need-of-love somewhere?

Ah...maybe you are overshooting your SMV like a brutal incel. Judging from your delusional reaction to my replies this may be the case.

Maoist-Pussy • 3 points • 24 August, 2015 05:05 PM

Is there a point to this story?

Carkudo • -1 points • 25 August, 2015 02:26 AM

If you're not seeing it, you're probably not intelligent enough to see it.