

Why PPD, while sometimes diverting, is ultimately useless.

December 23, 2014 | 63 upvotes | by [Whisper](#)

You're expecting me to say that no one will ever change anyone's mind.

But the issue runs much deeper than that.

RP and BP end up talking past each other because they cannot even agree on what they should be debating *about*. The sets of values they hold are completely disjoint. They cannot even agree on what a "debate" is, and what the goals of a "debate" are.

RP people generally bring the following assumptions to a debate:

- They believe that there is exactly one reality, and that truth is what accurately describes that reality. The better a statement describes reality, the more true it is. They are **factual absolutists**.
- They believe that whether something is "good" or "bad" is a matter of opinion, and that all systems of morality are things societies invented to get a result, and it is therefore pointless to argue about whether something is "evil" or not, instead of about what effect it has. They are **moral relativists**.
- They believe that the goal of a debate is to establish *what the facts are*, and how this knowledge can be used to *control outcomes*. They **argue about what is true**.
- They believe that debates are a cooperative process between two or more people who have the shared goal of achieving a more accurate picture of absolute reality, and that, while people may stick vehemently to their positions, they can also reverse them on a dime if new information comes to light, because the only real attachment is to the truth. They believe **debates occur between theories, not people**. Thus **questioning someone's character is off-limits**, because it is irrelevant.

BP people generally bring the following assumptions to a debate:

- They believe that reality is subjective, and what is "true" is simply a matter of who you ask. What is called "truth" is simply a codification of someone's perspective, and it is therefore pointless to argue about what is "true". They are **factual relativists**.
- They believe that there is exactly one set of moral laws, which human beings have gradually discovered in a historical climb towards ethical perfection. Certain people are ethically better or worse based not only on what they do, but also on what they believe. They believe that different ethical systems exist, but they can be ranked from ethically worst to ethically best based on a sort of meta-ethics whereby they can be tested for degree of compliance with the one absolute set of ethics that underlies reality. They are **moral absolutists**.
- They believe that the goal of debate is to establish what is morally better, and what everyone should do. They **argue about what is right**.
- They believe that debates are a competitive process between two people, who each have the goal of establishing their views about right and wrong by attaining a state of *moral ascendancy* over the other person. They believe that anyone who changes their views in revealing a flaw in their moral character (because their previous views were not morally correct), and must thereafter relinquish the moral high ground and submit their actions to the moral judgement of others (usually the person who won the debate). They believe **debates occur between people, not ideas**, for the precise purpose of establishing who should be allowed to set standards for the behaviour of others (because they are morally superior). Thus, **questioning someone's character is not only relevant, it's the**

whole point.

This is why BP think RP are "misogynists" or bad people. Because they cannot imagine an analysis that does not occur for the purposes of judgement, much less one that doesn't include any idea about what people "should" do.

This is why RP insist that BP are willfully blind. Because, to them, anyone who doesn't admit the truth must be unable to perceive it. They cannot imagine anyone not caring what the truth is.

This is why BP keep thinking that RP are trying to restore Dark Ages. They cannot imagine any group with shared views not having one moral agenda that they wish everyone to abide by.

This is RP think that BP must be hopelessly bad at understanding human social structures. They cannot imagine anyone not wanting to do things in the most effective possible way.

Here are some examples of this kind of misunderstanding in action:

http://www.reddit.com/r/TheBluePill/comments/2nvw9v/so_much_for_mens_rights/cmhox1d

Here we see an interaction between RP and BP regarding age of consent laws.

- RP's primary objective to propose an algorithm for making legal judgements about consent or lack of it, which he believes will best serve what the majority of people desire to see these laws do. He looks at the issue as an *engineering problem*, and he *proposes a solution*.
- BP's objective is to establish whether or RP is a bad person. If he can be gotten to agree to a statement which BP thinks of as diagnostic of "evilness", then the debate can be won, and anything RP says can thereafter be dismissed as originating from an evil person.

Thus RP and BP cannot even agree on what to argue about.

http://www.reddit.com/r/PurplePillDebate/comments/2pw76h/q_a_on_basic_trp_premise_everyone_welcome_to/cn20sx9?context=3

The debate is rather tedious up until BP's parting shot.

- BP says "All this so you can justify getting laid.". BP thinks RP is trying to "justify" something according a set of moral rules, because to BP, every act has a moral valance, and anyone who wishes to do anything must at least be ready with a moral excuse.
- RP has been arguing, meanwhile, about which metaphors best illustrate human social and mating dynamics. RP does not address the issue of right or wrong at all, and seems to believe BP is engaging with him on factual level.

Thus RP and BP cannot even agree on what the argument is about.

It is for this reason that PPD is pointless. RP thinks right and wrong are a matter of opinion, and BP doesn't care what the facts are.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

cxj • 37 points • 23 December, 2014 04:05 AM

Excellent analysis. So many times im arguing and someone basically says "youre a piece of shit" and im like yeah, so? How does this affect the truth value of my claim?

[deleted] • 7 points • 24 December, 2014 04:39 AM

For what it's worth, I don't think *you* are a piece of shit.

cxj • 5 points • 24 December, 2014 04:48 AM

<3

[deleted] • 4 points • 23 December, 2014 04:24 AM

We're not just saying youre a piece of shit, we're also saying the things you follow that make you a piece of shit are false

Absinthe99 • 14 points • 26 December, 2014 02:58 PM*

We're not just saying youre a piece of shit, we're also saying the things you follow that make you a piece of shit are false

Yes, you're *saying* that they are false, but you don't actually *believe* that they are false.

Because if they were actually false, then they wouldn't work... and you wouldn't care about it at all; it would be a non-issue to you (akin to say the beliefs about Mormons and their special underwear, you don't get all bent out of shape about the beliefs people have about that; nor do you get all riled up about people who believe in UFO's {at least so long as they don't advocate spending tax money to "investigate" them}).

No, it's because the RP beliefs are in fact TRUE, at least in so far as pragmatically speaking, they "work" -- that is what you hate, and why you denigrate them as "false" (and at the same time attack and label *them* as "pieces of shit" -- which again, you wouldn't do if the beliefs weren't actually functional -- if that were the case, then you would label them as "fools" and simply shake your head at their delusions).

OldGaffer • 5 points • 23 March, 2015 07:30 PM

Life right here. If only more people could understand this.

Cyralea • 9 points • 23 December, 2014 07:21 PM

That's precisely the same thing as far as we're concerned.

I don't think BP'ers have the capacity to understand how much more important truth value is to us than general morality.

cxj • 18 points • 23 December, 2014 04:59 AM

And im saying many of trp tactics have worked wonders in my personal life, since before trp had a name for them or even existed.

For the record, i am a piece of shit.

[deleted] • 8 points • 23 December, 2014 05:17 AM

I dont care about any of that im just saying theres more to our argument than just calling you shit

cxj • 8 points • 23 December, 2014 05:22 AM

There are many individuals arguing me. Some of them offer quite a bit of substance. Many are pure ad hominem

l ____ o ____ l • 4 points • 23 December, 2014 03:46 PM

CXJ you've repeatedly told us in PPD that you are a bad person, your friends are mostly bad people, Red Pill plate spinning has made you unhappy and empty, and you want to be a better person.

You've already made the BP argument for us better than we ever could. You have already turned to the light side, its just a matter of time before you cast RP aside completely.

cxj • 12 points • 23 December, 2014 06:02 PM

Well you are also proving the point of this post, which is that TBP argues on terms of "should" or character rather than truth. I never argued TRP makes one happy, but rather that its methods are highly effective for getting laid. Also, i prefer to refer to my lovers as fwb rather than plates. Plates seems to be people RP tries to spend as little time as possible with outside of sex. I usually enjoy non sexual activities with my lovers, although i do not deny the entire relationship revolves around sex, and that a few of them have devolved to "wham, bam, thank you maam." But that was the girls choice, not mine.

I was once dealing with a particularly entitled girl who was chill sober but a fucking mess drunk, which was her preferred state to have sex in. She finally said "look here is how this is going to be: we cant get along so im going to come to your place drunk, yes im driving no i dont care, we are going to fuck then cuddle for a while, then im going to drive home, probably drunk. No more interaction outside of sex" and i was like nope, peace. On paper this seems like a RP wet dream, but i am pathologically anti authoritarian and i just could not bring myself to let her dictate the terms of the relationship on her own, even if they were colossally in my favor.

l ____ o ____ l • -1 points • 29 December, 2014 11:52 AM

TRP is also 100% about "should", it just pretends superficially to be about "is". TRP wouldn't be opposed to feminism (or indeed, have any positive or negative stance on anything) otherwise.

On paper this seems like a RP wet dream, but i am pathologically anti authoritarian and i just could not bring myself to let her dictate the terms of the relationship on her own, even if they were colossally in my favor.

I feel really bad for anyone who considers that kind of interaction desirable in any way, whether dictated by the girl or not.

Isetfiress • -3 points • 23 December, 2014 02:58 PM

Ad hominem if we say you've already lost the argument because "you're a piece of shit."

The proof is in the pudding, so why argue? Which fallacy is that, and why does need to be pointed out if you know? You don't care. Some of you guys are ok, I'll give you that (not that

it matters). Yes, a few things are somewhat accurate, before the rabbit holes the ideas jump down- where they start to sound similar to the ideas held by the worst hate groups throughout history.

Yes, symmetry in a face is more attractive, women do become less sexually attractive once they age (men too), some low class/inexperienced women fall for guys who treat them like shit, etc.

However, some of you are the dregs of society, there was a thread the other day about how *awesome* eugenics could be- tell me that's not fucked up. Those guys make TRP look pretty bad. My advice: line them up for the firing squad, you'll look a lot better.

I'll agree though, ppd is kind of pointless, unless you're on the toilet or bored with a few minutes to spare, it is interesting reading material. It's also fun to analyze from a social and psychological standpoint.

So thanks for that.

stubing • 3 points • 9 February, 2015 03:45 AM*

However, some of you are the dregs of society, there was a thread the other day about how awesome eugenics could be- tell me that's not fucked up.

That's not fucked up. I need more context of the thread to know. It is definitely fucked up if people are suggesting we actually put eugenics into practice, but there is nothing wrong with theorizing about it. Theoretically, it would be great. We can get rid of all terrible genes to a degree, but everyone knows that any practical implementation will be horrible for many many different reasons.

My advice: line them up for the firing squad, you'll look a lot better.

You don't need to kill anyone for eugenics. You just need to have the "best genes" to pass onto the next generation while maintaining a diverse gene pool.

I'll agree though, ppd is kind of pointless

I disagree. I find that there are a lot of good ideas and post from both RPer and BPer on reality. I can't stand reading TRP or TBP so this is where I have to go to get mostly moderates who take the ideas without the horrible sexism. There are still a lot of sexists on here, but they are much easier to ignore than trying to ignore the sexism on TRP.

fiat_lux_ • 10 points • 23 December, 2014 03:54 AM

I knew we'd eventually reach the problem of universals.

autowikibot • 3 points • 23 December, 2014 03:54 AM

Problem of universals:

In metaphysics, the **problem of universals** refers to the question of whether properties exist, and if so, what they are. Properties are qualities or relations that two or more entities have in common. The various

kinds of properties, such as qualities and **relations** are referred to as **universals**. For instance, one can imagine three cup holders on a table that have in common the quality of *being circular* or *exemplifying circularity*, or two daughters that have in common *being the daughter of Frank*. There are many such properties, such as being human, red, male or female, liquid, big or small, taller than, father of, etc.

Interesting: Isagoge | Nominalism | Universal (metaphysics) | Conceptualism

Parent commenter can toggle NSFW or delete. Will also delete on comment score of -1 or less. | FAQs | Mods | Magic Words

drok007 • 3 points • 23 December, 2014 04:04 AM

This seems more epistemological than ontological.

chazzALB • 2 points • 23 December, 2014 03:39 PM

Easy there fella. Some of us are solidly purple and this is our home you're pissing on.

ianturpiesmoustache • 23 points • 23 December, 2014 04:39 AM

BP doesn't care what the facts are.

No, BP (and anyone else who is not RP) disagrees with RP on *what* the facts are. RP assumes a lot about women/personal interaction with no proof, and expects others to accept it's "truth" because... it's obvious, or something.

I also like how you assume RP to be "cooperative" debaters, and BP to be "combative" debaters. I see a lot of name-calling/shitposting from both sides, not just one.

[deleted] • 12 points • 23 December, 2014 04:33 PM

RP doesn't 'expect' others to accept it as 'truth'. We don't 'expect', we don't care.

We're telling people in our own subreddit, hey this is what we think about shit. This is how we think you should do with the shit. You don't like it? You're welcome not to accept it.

The OP is correct, PPD is useless.

I come here from time to time to enjoy the hamstering, mud slinging and satisfy my morbid curiosity.

ianturpiesmoustache • 5 points • 24 December, 2014 12:54 AM

We don't 'expect', we don't care.

Gosh, you're all so edgy and cool! Except this "truth" that none of you tell anyone bleeds into other subs, like (/r/relationships and /r/askmen) and then the rest of us have to deal with it.

I like PPD, it gives me somewhere to see people arguing against this nonsense. Or do it myself, even! It may be useless in terms of changing hearts and minds, but fuck it, it's fun.

[deleted] • 3 points • 27 December, 2014 07:12 AM

Except this "truth" that none of you tell anyone bleeds into other subs, like (/r/relationships[1] and /r/askmen[2]) and then the rest of us have to deal with it.

So we should be disqualified from giving our advice?

You don't have to accept it whether you see it there or not and most of us were members of those

other subs before theredpill. If it weren't for people complaining about theredpill every time I made a point in a relationship thread about having a little self-respect I would never have discovered the subreddit so early.

ianturpiesmoustache • 3 points • 27 December, 2014 07:20 AM

So we should be disqualified from giving our advice?

Not at all, what I'm saying is that the argument above (namely "We're telling people in our own subreddit, hey this is what we think about shit.") is crap. You can tell people about TRP as much as you like, but only your own sub will shield you from criticism. Don't be surprised when people outside the sub call you guys out on your "truth".

[deleted] • 4 points • 24 December, 2014 02:50 PM

[permanently deleted]

ianturpiesmoustache • 3 points • 24 December, 2014 03:09 PM

People like to have their beliefs validated, they also like to have their beliefs disregarded in an almost discovery channel type of way where they get to view the "enemy" in their supposed infantile habitat. They also like to share them because they honestly think they can possibly be useful.

We're telling people in our own subreddit

Seems legit.

You mean the tribe gets disgruntled, the agreed upon beliefs are challenged and you feel slightly uncomfortable that people don't agree with you.

There's no "tribe", just people who tell you that TRP is wrong. The more you guys try to teach it, the more you'll hear that.

[deleted] • 3 points • 24 December, 2014 03:18 PM

[permanently deleted]

ianturpiesmoustache • 1 point • 24 December, 2014 03:23 PM

Its a metaphor.

Considering "anyone who disagrees with TRP" is a *really* large bunch of people, they're less a tribe than TRP is.

The /r/theredpill only "teaches" people who decided to read it themselves

Right, except for what I just said about it leaking into other places. Which is what I'm talking about.

[deleted] • 0 points • 24 December, 2014 04:06 PM

[permanently deleted]

ianturpiesmoustache • 0 points • 24 December, 2014 04:13 PM

BP side are bred circlejerkers. While RP side come from an environment where starting shit or even

the minutest snark gets you banned.

I don't frequent BP, but on this sub I see the same level of jerking from all players.

If you ask the mods, most of the shit flinging from red comes after they're responding to blue or because BP teaches them there is no reason to do better here.

No they wouldn't, they'd tell you that the amount of snark and bullshit from both sides would surprise you. There's no monopoly on shit-flinging in PPD.

[deleted] • 17 points • 23 December, 2014 04:19 AM

RP thinks right and wrong are a matter of opinion, and BP doesn't care what the facts are.

I've noticed more BP members sourcing their claims than RP members. I've noticed more RP members throwing out ad hom at the first chance they get than BP members. I've noticed more RP members using anecdotal data to back up their world view instead of actual facts than BP members. I've noticed more close mindedness for RP members than BP members. Of course, any RP member who reads this will think the exact opposite, so I agree that PPD, while entertaining, is completely useless.

Cyrarea • 10 points • 23 December, 2014 07:16 PM

I've noticed more RP members throwing out ad hom at the first chance they get than BP members

That's the exact opposite of true. It's often BP'ers who are first to throw out the character attacks when an RP is asking for his stance on a matter of fact.

I've noticed more RP members using anecdotal data to back up their world view instead of actual facts than BP members

Anecdotes seem to be fairly equal on both sides. I think you simply dismiss any factual evidence RP'ers have supplied because it doesn't conform to your worldview. Confirmation bias.

I've noticed more close mindedness for RP members than BP members.

A useless term. Close-minded is typically slang for "disagrees with me".

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 07:24 PM

Notice how I used the words **I've noticed**. I used them for a reason, to signal that what I am about to say is a personal observation not a factual claim. Of course you, being a red piller, are going to disagree with me.

We_Are_Legion • 18 points • 23 December, 2014 09:55 AM*

I've been here on and off a while and noticed the exact opposite.

Furthermore, I notice how TBP completely invalidates any evidence that contradicts their world view. /u/Agharta15 put it best:

You will be blasted for spouting off "biotroofs." If you provide a link to a study, you will be told two things:

(a) you didn't read the study [because, you will be told, laymen just repeat the headline of a pop-news piece written by a journalist who only read the abstract], it didn't say what you think it says, and/or (b) The study isn't enough; there's a lot of people out there in the world and this one isn't representative. If there are more - same problem.

You will respond with something like: "well, I did read it and it does seem to support what I'm saying...and I'm not looking for drop-dead proof, like an airtight modus ponens on sex or something, I'm just saying it accords with all my anecdotal experience..."

You will again be told that everyone's different. And, if they're not, it's because of socialization.

There's no 'debate' here. No amount of evidence will count, no argument will count, no lived experience will count. Everyone's different. Some women/lots of women just want to wear short skirts and it has nothing to do with sexual displays. Right? somethingsomething misogyny.

I just saved you a ton of time on this sub.

You are basically told you probably didn't read the study by people who actually didn't read the study.

Here's an example from a few days ago.

Not only is academia biased against non-PC study, especially in this field, you're also never going to be taken seriously for saying something TBP doesn't already agree with.

exit_sandman • 9 points • 23 December, 2014 10:07 AM

Not only is academia biased against non-PC study, you're also never going to be taken seriously for saying something TBP doesn't already agree with.

Bingo. But you'll rarely get people who agree with that bias to agree with the fact that the bias is there.

STARVE_THE_BEAST • 1 point • 26 December, 2014 06:08 AM

Double bingo.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 February, 2015 02:43 PM

Thanks for the shout-out. I've been on an internet vacation for quite a while, nice to see this now that I'm halfway-back.

We_Are_Legion • 2 points • 15 February, 2015 05:24 PM

Not at all. I like your stuff.

In fact, I remember asking you to confirm if some posts by your previous account(agharta10?) were yours. Since before it was deleted I forwarded that account and another guy, /u/exit_sandman a few months ago to get you guys flaired on /r/theredpill. I thought the sub had something to gain by giving you guys visibility and incentive to post, especially with the population booming.

Although you're both liked, the reply was basically "it'll happen as they post on the main board". At the time, I completely forgot about it since I thought telling you guys would add expectation, especially if you didn't *want* to participate on TRP(as I don't, nowadays), but now that you mention it(and before I completely forget again), I guess it doesn't hurt to hint that its likely.

According to Cyralea about you: "posting well-written, lengthy, on-point comments on the main board" should do it, since you guys already contribute ideas on automatic.

It also *helps* to stay on the same page as the modding team. Usually it helps if you figure it out without having to be told, but if you ever have any specific questions on what that is, feel free to PM me.

I____o____l • -5 points • 23 December, 2014 03:43 PM

Um... MistressNatelie is a RPW not a BPer!

[deleted] • 5 points • 24 December, 2014 06:08 AM*

I'm neither.

And I maintain that these guys don't know how to interpret studies. We just had a thread showcasing this pretty effectively

http://www.reddit.com/r/PurplePillDebate/comments/2q546v/found_an_academic_paper_that_confirms_lots_of_rp/

I mean, look at the papers he cites (the actual papers, not the blogs, advocacy groups etc), it doesn't justify the hypocrisy of TRP and their views on women and sex. We are legion is no different

M_rafay • 5 points • 24 December, 2014 04:36 PM*

Nothing changes the fact that conversation with you is useless when one side is presenting evidence when asked for it, and the other simply saying the equivalent of "You don't know how to read that! don't gimme that! Put that away!"

i.e. you guys don't submit counter-evidence, you rely completely on invalidating the opposing evidence by saying "you didn't read that, never mind I cannot for the life of me demonstrate how". And its often in the form of trolls like you, who don't even try to say why. They just have this notion in their head that because it goes against their "team" it must be wrong.

PPD is really old. And most of the non-trolls have left. But we've had hundreds of threads discussing research on topics pertinent to us. And this is a pattern with you guys. You give few meaningful critiques.

As yet, we've yet to see a single shred of counter-evidence to say promiscuity in women is not an extremely reliable predictor for marital instability/unhappiness. We know because we've been down this road before. We've looked. The blogs he linked are linked because they're providing you insight behind the paywall. That's it. If you'd like to look on your own, go ahead.

And what hypocrisy? /r/TRP would openly choose advantage and winning to its benefit if it could get away with it. We're after no just state of the world. The sexes are not equal.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 December, 2014 04:40 PM

If you don't understand how to interpret the scientific studies that you cite, then your conclusions are going to be wrong. That's really the long and short of it.

Insulting me isn't going to change your ability to interpret the studies.

M_rafay • 4 points • 24 December, 2014 04:51 PM

Why don't you help me understand? When you say that phrase, why don't you prove I'm wrong. Via reasoning. Looking at the paper. Citing me/relevant person the error in his conclusion. Showing honesty in where the results are accurate. Changing your view and evolving the conversation honestly.

The Red Pill from 2007 to 2012 is not the same. From 2012 to 2013 it changed. It is a completely different beast and keeps introducing new ideas. We're more open-minded than you think. but we don't respond to this kind of empty defensiveness or appeals to morals.

for an example, most rp men accept(even without research done on the topic being unanimous) that promiscuity in men harms our chances for stable LTRs. i.e .some say it desensitizes you or makes you less able to settle. or causes problems with new SOs, or changes your personality, or etc and etc.

RP accepts the research that says that while DT is attractive and tends to give itself to highly risk-taking individuals who approach alot and do it successfully... DT traits torpedo LTRs. We discuss how to cultivate beta traits all the time, and when and how to apply them. Or how and when to temper RP behaviours with women we care about.

RP started out as vehemently against LTRs being utterly worthless, and then caved to its unique benefits. And we discuss it all the time.

and it goes on. i can absolutely give more examples of us changing our minds. quite recently, the mods are even reversing our stance on PR and starting to restrain people a bit.

You give us solid reasoning instead of your usual 'i don't believe you. im a princess. convince me.' trolling, we absolutely listen.

[deleted] • 4 points • 24 December, 2014 05:12 PM

You give us solid reasoning instead of your usual 'i don't believe you. im a princess. convince me.' trolling, we absolutely listen.

Some of you do. And that's when it gets interesting.

Some of you don't.

We just had a thread where I did precisely this:

Why don't you help me understand? When you say that phrase, why don't you prove I'm wrong. Via reasoning. Looking at the paper. Citing me/relevant person the error in his conclusion. Showing honesty in where the results are accurate. Changing your view and evolving the conversation honestly.

you said my replies were stupid. Verbatim. Okay, that's fine. I had some very good conversations with other people who didn't share your opinion.

If you'd like an example, then bring a paper that you think is demonstrative, and explain what conclusions you bring from it. I'll walk you through what is proven, and what isn't. Bring a paper about sex history and LTRs and why it justifies the TRP position.

But if I point out what is proven and what is conjecture, and you just say it's "stupid", like you did in the previous thread, then I won't waste my time. I just wasted my time with someone that didn't want to understand the peer review process and how a scientific consensus is reached.

M_rafay • 3 points • 27 December, 2014 08:57 PM

you said my replies were stupid. Verbatim.

The first of your criticisms. The one about picking what should be attractive based on what *you* **rationally** decide is beneficial for your children, is legitimately stupid. Nothing more needs to be said. Or deserves to be said. It displays a fundamental lack of understanding what evolution is. Instincts for what is attractive proliferate when a trait is beneficial enough that the individuals who prefer them(directly or indirectly) manage to propagate more and pass their preference on. It has nothing to do with what you decide should be.

I will repeat. Your criticism was stupid. It did not dispute the original study in any way. And the comment thread discussing it was competing for stupidity each

reply(especially the part where BP is not about feels because it is trying to redefine feels based on feels). Here is the link for anyone interested.

The 2nd criticism.

Next: there's no proof of the wall for women, or the lack of one for men.

Signs of aging (I'm assuming grey hair, wrinkles, sagging body) are unsexy for women. Therefore, women exercise, eat right, dye their hair, wear make up, wax mustaches, some get plastic surgery.

What wall?

What is proven here?

Not only does it sound like the person has no idea what the wall even means, the premise seems to be that women are getting worried and doing all these troublesome things for absolutely no reason. And that everyone knows of course you can entirely reverse aging.

There can be no definitive proof on the subject matter that there comes a definite point where women shift priorities but what the wall means in essence is simply that sexual capital declines rapidly.

the 3rd criticism was the most valid among the three(that's not saying much though). But still misguided, and its calls for proof are just lazy.

Possibly linked. That means - no proof of a link. As if feminized features on men make you more altruistic?

Yes, actually. Studies on facial features that are attractive and how they correlate with advantages are long-standing. Facial symmetry correlates with better immune systems, etc. Meanwhile, for males studies have determined that higher levels of testosterone **does** influenced development of facial characteristics, with lower levels of T correlating with feminized characteristics, and higher T levels correlating with masculine features. This was mentioned in the study cited by the article(Fink & Penton-Voak 2002). T also affects an individual's scent, and even their saliva while kissing. Both of which are proven to influence who women find most attractive.

let's go forward and make the leap that prosocial characteristics now include wanting to have children and raise them. Nope, there is no proof that feminine features make you want to be an involved dad. It's conjecture.

Having lower levels of T normally does not make you more likely to be a prosocial, less aggressive person?

We also have some talk about how some women prefer masculine men.

Complete willful misinterpretation of what the article talks about, which is: "Studies have shown that the higher a female perceives her own attractiveness, the more highly she favors masculine traits in her partners"

And lastly, the part which caused me to give this one "the most" valid is this one:

Where is the proof?

In regards to the statement that women must make a choice. (Did I really have to read through this much shit discreditign you before I get to something valid though?) If you're wondering though, the statement is a reference to sexual strategy theory(<http://www.bradley.edu/dotAsset/165805.pdf>), a fairly famous idea in the field of evolutionary psychology. This study makes a number of hypotheses and then attempts to test them. And re-tests them in subsequent papers. Its a fairly regarded study in a very reputable journal and cited about 2600 other studies and investigations directly, and is a good read too.

It doesn't make a case for the word "must" but it does make a case that this decision si being amde. consciously or not.

I just wasted my time with someone that didn't want to understand the peer review process and how a scientific consensus is reached.

Like yourself.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 December, 2014 10:37 PM

Lots of ad hom. What's the point?

The problem (well, not a problem for anyone *else*) is that RPs don't know how to separate what they want to conclude from what data actually shows.

The science is a lot less definitive than you'd like it to be.

So again I ask "where's the proof?"

You have to learn to differentiate between what studies are saying and what they *arent* saying. It's actually RP here that is operating on feelz.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 December, 2014 07:28 AM

then your conclusions are going to be wrong

The conclusions drawn in social science studies are usually a reflection of the authors political stance which is why you wont find too much truth in that field of study. Anyone who goes against the grain is ostracised from the community such as people liek Kevin MacDonald

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 December, 2014 12:24 PM

No, that's not the reason that RPs misinterpret. The reason is that they don't understand enough about these kinds of studies and how they're written to determine what has been proven and what has been inferred by the author.

And then they go and add their own bit of crazy to it which neither data has proven nor author inferred.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 December, 2014 09:09 PM

that's not the reason that RPs misinterpret

That's not my point. My point is that there are many ways to interpret those studies and the amount of "hamstering" and rationalisation that goes into explaining a finding that is not PC is insane.

| what has been proven

In social sciences usually nothing is proven fact. The studies are all empirical and can be used to support whatever theoretical framework fits. Read some studies on subjects like black underachievement and the you will see nothing but rationalisation about how it's the white mans fault and there's no other possible alternative. This is what social science have boilded down to as nobody is willing to say anything contradictory to the established PC line.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 December, 2014 11:03 PM

There is data. There is what you can conclude from the data, and what you *cant* conclude.

Whether it's politically correct or not, you *cant* conclude RP theory from the data. It may make sense, it may sound logical, but you're kidding yourself if you think it's scientifically proven.

drok007 • 9 points • 23 December, 2014 04:37 AM

Would you like some more haterade to wash down all your confirmation bias? Slow down, you might choke...

[deleted] • 8 points • 23 December, 2014 04:38 AM

Hey remember that part in my comment about ad hom? Well here it is in action. You feel better now?

drok007 • 4 points • 23 December, 2014 04:45 AM

I don't think you know what an ad hominem is.

[deleted] • 9 points • 23 December, 2014 04:48 AM

Okay.

drok007 • -2 points • 23 December, 2014 05:01 AM

Since you don't, I will educate you. You will be smarter after this, I am confident in facts I am about to give you. Don't let my confidence in the matter throw you into a tizzy however.

Things that are ad hominem: a logical fallacy where you attack the character of the one presenting the argument

Things that are not ad hominem: making fun of someone, attacking their argument

Considering I've done the latter and you claimed it was the former, that would make you incorrect, but in the future you know what to look for.

[deleted] • 10 points • 23 December, 2014 05:14 AM

Let's take a look at your comment shall we?

| Would you like some more haterade

Assuming I am a hateful person.

| to wash down all your confirmation bias?

Assuming I am suffering from confirmation bias.

Technically this is an ad hom.

drok007 • -1 points • 23 December, 2014 05:19 AM

Assuming I am a hateful person.

That's an assumption you made, not me. Your comment was hating on TRP which you've done in the past.

Assuming I am suffering from confirmation bias.

You are suffering from confirmation bias. It's not ad hominem, it's a relevant fact about your comment.

Technically this is an ad hom.

No, it's still not. I guess I will have to admit, I failed to make you smarter. You should read this anyway:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ad_hominem

[deleted] • 6 points • 23 December, 2014 05:26 AM

<https://yourlogicalfallacyis.com/ad-hominem>

Ad hominem attacks can take the form of overtly attacking somebody, **or more subtly casting doubt on their character** or personal attributes as a way to discredit their argument.

drok007 • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 07:13 AM

Exactly, and I have not done that, so I would still be correct.

I ____o____l • 5 points • 23 December, 2014 03:40 PM

Haha irony. You are calling him a hater as an attempt to dismiss his argument. That is a CLASSIC ad hominem fallacy.

drok007 • -1 points • 23 December, 2014 04:38 PM

You seem like a very simple person. I'll try to make it simple for you because you seem to understand very little.

Saying someone's argument is invalid because they are a misogynist or racist, like BPers often do is ad hominem. Joking around calling someone a hater is not. Even if it is was not a joke, it would still not be ad hominem as his credibility is called into question due to his beliefs on the specific topic at hand.

I understand debate and logic are not your forte, but try to learn here.

I ____o____l • 2 points • 23 December, 2014 05:02 PM

"guys guys I was just joking when I made all of those shitty fallacies"

A "hater" is someone who will criticise something because of their personal bias against it rather than any rational reason. Calling someone a hater is saying their argument is invalid as they are biased and not reliant on reason. Its about as clear cut an ad hom as its possible to make.

I ____o____l • 2 points • 23 December, 2014 03:40 PM

You are one of the worst offenders and here you are, proving his point.

waylandtherlayer • 8 points • 23 December, 2014 04:29 AM

Give me hard statistics on more BP mentioning sources and I'll happily accept it, but right now you are not sourcing your claims either (oh the irony). This is not a personal attack, just an observation.

And I'd like to point out that 'close-mindedness' is always subjective, but that I originally read TRP and *wanted* to have it refuted. I'd guess I'm not the only person on TRP who would *prefer* for the world to be BP, but since I can't control that I would rather face what I think is true (Red Pill) than what I would prefer to be true (Blue Pill).

[deleted] • 8 points • 23 December, 2014 04:36 AM

Give me hard statistics on more BP mentioning sources and I'll happily accept it, but right now you are not sourcing your claims either (oh the irony)

Which is why I said **I've noticed**. I'm not claiming anything, I'm making a personal observation. I wish I had time to tally every time an RP or BP member sources something but frankly I don't. It'd be a great idea for a bot though.

We_Are_Legion • 8 points • 23 December, 2014 10:05 AM*

The thing with sources is that whenever RP present them you get twenty people jumping down your throat shouting "le biotruths" or telling you that you didn't read the study or you don't know how to interpret it without any reasoning as to why.

Sometimes even the tiniest inaccuracy is taken to mean the entirety of results are fabricated. For example, I once posted a study showing women were far more sexually fluid. The post in question gave plenty of sources for that fact, but also made a reference to a study on Pornhub's userbase. Because they could point out that Pornhub had no way of knowing how users are male or female(they did, digital fingerprinting, what most markettors use and is plenty accurate), my evidence is completely thrown aside.

[deleted] • 2 points • 23 December, 2014 06:02 PM

The thing with sources is that whenever RP present them you get twenty people jumping down your throat shouting "le biotruths" or telling you that you didn't read the study or you don't know how to interpret it without any reasoning as to why.

I agree. From the RP members that I have encountered that have presented studies, I've noticed that they generally tend to jump the gun without taking into account the limitations of what they presented. For example, the OkCupid study is parroted a lot around here as proof of the 80/20 rule without taking into account its limitation of being an online dating site.

For example, I once posted a study showing women were far more sexually fluid. The post in question gave plenty of sources for that fact, but also made a reference to a study on Pornhub's userbase. Because they could point out that Pornhub had no way of knowing how users are male or female(they did, digital fingerprinting, what most markettors use and is plenty accurate), my evidence is completely thrown aside.

I remember that, and I agree that there was a lot of dishonesty going on in that thread.

exit_sandman • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 03:23 PM

Yeah, throwing aside entire reasoning chains because of small inaccuracies is often grasping at straws because they can't bring up anything with substance speaking against you.

I once had a debate (not on reddit, but elsewhere) where I quoted a well-known scholar of Islamic studies, but made the mistake to have some transposed digits in my transcription of the quote I presented (I said 194th surah instead of 149th or something like that). Boom, immediate dismissal of the entire argument by someone who couldn't stand that his position had been refuted.

fiat_lux_ • 5 points • 23 December, 2014 04:43 AM

I noticed a lot of bpers not even bothering to read their own sources. A lot of their sources have a number of problems, biases, clever interpretations/wordings. I pointed these out, and some of the more honest ones even ended up agreeing with me.

Such a bot would be useless because the bot itself doesn't read the studies and it doesn't confirm how bpers/rpers have interpreted them.

The longer I spend on ppd, the more I see that most people will just google up with ease whatever supports their own view. God bless and goddamn Google for this same reason.

[deleted] • 4 points • 23 December, 2014 04:48 AM

I noticed a lot of bpers not even bothering to read their own sources.

I agree.

Such a bot would be useless because the bot itself doesn't read the studies and it doesn't confirm how bpers/rpers have interpreted them.

Very true. I was just thinking out loud to be honest.

The longer I spend on ppd, the more I see that most people will just google up with ease whatever supports their own view.

I've noticed this as well. Confirmation bias and intellectual dishonesty is seen pretty equally from both sides in my opinion (I'll admit I'm no exception).

fiat_lux_ • 6 points • 23 December, 2014 04:52 AM

Well. I agree there.

I think your original comment though doesn't take into account that logical and insightful observations/comments can be made even without academic studies.

A good number of economic models, for instance, weren't build upon rigorous studies but rather theories based on existing knowledge and deduction + induction.

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 05:00 AM

I think your original comment though doesn't take into account that logical and insightful observations/comments can be made even without academic studies.

You're right, it really doesnt. Thanks for the observation.

A good number of economic models, for instance, weren't build upon rigorous studies but rather theories based on existing knowledge and deduction + induction.

No disagreement there.

steelpuppy • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 12:19 PM

A good number of economic models, for instance, weren't build upon rigorous studies but rather theories based on existing knowledge and deduction + induction.

Sexual marketplace anyone?

steelpuppy • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 12:18 PM

I'm not claiming anything, I'm making a personal observation.

So by the standards you yourself set we can safely ignore your top level comment.

[deleted] • 2 points • 23 December, 2014 04:56 PM

You can do whatever you want.

[deleted] • 1 points • 23 December, 2014 09:01 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 23 December, 2014 09:06 PM

I agree. This topic has rustled some jimmies, and the claws are out amongst other members.

I haven't seen anything comparable to that said by any RP person about any BP person ITT.

And you're right, in this thread. Outside of this thread I have seen my fair share of RP members jumping on the personal attack bandwagon as soon as they get the chance, more so than BP in my opinion but I could just be full of shit, which you are free to assume.

Absinthe99 • 1 point • 26 December, 2014 03:01 PM

I've noticed more BP members sourcing their claims than RP members.

Which is often little more than *Appeal to authority*.

[deleted] • 0 points • 26 December, 2014 06:08 PM

Sure, but if you're making a scientific claim, then backing it up with actual data makes you look more credible.

exit_sandman • 2 points • 23 December, 2014 10:24 AM

Good posts. One insight from me, though.

[Redpillers] believe that there is exactly one reality, and that truth is what accurately describes that reality. The better a statement describes reality, the more true it is. They are factual absolutists.

[Bluepillers] believe that reality is subjective, and what is "true" is simply a matter of who you ask. What is called "truth" is simply a codification of someone's perspective, and it is therefore pointless to argue about what is "true". They are factual relativists.

Actually, you can hold both views simultaneously.

On the one hand, there is such a thing as an objective reality because there is exactly **one** way everything in the

past has played out up to this point to produce the reality as it is - it's just that this way is so incredibly convoluted that it would be literally impossible to backtrack everything for trillions of lifeforms over billions of years.

Therefore, everything sapient beings (i.e. humans) know, believe and perceive is ultimately only a fraction of that reality (and in the worst case is outright opposed to said reality because they're falling for faulty premises) because they simply can't comprehend reality an all-encompassing way. What they *can* do, however, is getting closest with their assumptions to said reality.

We had a similar question a month ago.

17b29a • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 02:50 PM

there is such a thing as an objective reality

then you're not a relativist

exit_sandman • 3 points • 23 December, 2014 02:54 PM*

No, this is just common sense. However, no human being to grasp it in its entirety, and the concept as such is more complicated to explain.

You mentioned you're 16, so I start with something you may know - did you read 1984 (at school or wherever)?

l____o____l • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 03:49 PM

What you are describing is not reletavism. Relativism is rejection of the existance of objective reality.

17b29a • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 04:45 PM

No, this is just common sense. However, no human being to grasp it in its entirety, and the concept as such is more complicated to explain.

no, it's just not relativism. that's not what the word means.

did you read 1984 (at school or wherever)?

no it looks like a boring book and I wouldn't want to listen to some drawn-out analogy about it for some trivial concept anyway

[deleted] • 4 points • 23 December, 2014 07:28 AM

This person is absolutely right. This is not a place for actual debate, it's a place for fighting and arguing.

Some people just NEED to argue, and that's fine.

what's worrying is people's obsession with something as insignificant as gender dynamics.

exit_sandman • 3 points • 23 December, 2014 03:28 PM

what's worrying is people's obsession with something as insignificant as gender dynamics.

Maybe because it isn't?

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 05:21 PM

maybe, maybe not.

are we debating, or arguing here?

MakeTheSexyTalk • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 08:51 PM

what's worrying is people's obsession with something as insignificant as gender dynamics.

I used to think gender dynamics were insignificant too.

Tough lessons have been learned.

[deleted] • 0 points • 23 December, 2014 08:56 PM

Absolutely, I can understand that.

I just feel that in the grand scheme of things it is very unimportant.

Whisper[S] • 7 points • 24 December, 2014 01:50 AM

I suppose that really depends what you think *is* important.

I tend to think that the male sex drive is one of the fundamental forces that shapes the economy. Men do what they believe will get them mating privileges, and this leads to things like, say, the Roman Empire.

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 December, 2014 01:57 AM

absolutely. I will admit that my opinion on the matter is skewed towards a lack of empathy due to my own ineptitude on the matter.

however, when i see a lot of people complaining about their slice of the pie when most people aren't even invited to the table, it seems petty to me.

This is not to say I don't find it interesting, i am on this sub after all.

Whisper[S] • 9 points • 24 December, 2014 02:14 AM

however, when i see a lot of people complaining about their slice of the pie when most people aren't even invited to the table, it seems petty to me.

That's an interesting analogy, although I'm not really sure who are the complainers, who the people without a seat at the table, and what, indeed, the pie is in this metaphor.

However, the one thing that troubles me about "pie" metaphors is that they do tend to assume that this "pie" just sort of comes from nowhere, that there is a fixed amount, and that the fairest thing you can do, therefore, is share it equally.

That's kind of like the BP viewpoint I talked about above, which discusses what people "should" do in terms of moral behaviour, instead of goals.

You see, when BP thinkers talk about dividing up a pie, they tend to say "well, we have this pie. And no one is worth more than anyone else, so we all deserve an equal share, because that is fairest".

When RP thinkers look at the same pie, they tend to say something like "Look, we like pie. We want to maximize the amount of pie we get. But somebody has to bake these pies. So we need to incentivize baking behaviours. In order to maximize pie. Let us reward those who do more baking with more pie."

Once again, BP tends to see problems as ethical questions, and RP tends to see problems as engineering challenges.

So my immediate reaction (although I can't stand by it too strongly because I still don't quite understand your metaphor) is that it really doesn't matter if someone else gets less. What

matters is that people who produce that which we want, get rewarded. Otherwise, they'll stop. I believe this is why less men are going to college, why less men are pursuing career success, why there are all these news articles asking about why modern young men are potsmoking, xbox-playing slackers.

It's because hustling to get ahead no longer gets a man a pretty wife. Men don't want money and status for their own sake. They want money and status for mating privileges. And if you don't reward status with enhanced mating privileges, then a lot of men are spend their time doing something else.

Like practicing their seduction skills.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 December, 2014 02:32 AM

100% percent correct.

I believe this is why less men are going to college, why less men are pursuing career success, why there are all these news articles asking about why modern young men are potsmoking, xbox-playing slackers. It's because hustling to get ahead no longer gets a man a pretty wife. Men don't want money and status for their own sake. They want money and status for mating privileges. And if you don't reward status with enhanced mating privileges, then a lot of men are spend their time doing something else. Like practicing their seduction skills.

This is me. You have metaphorically reached threw the screen and seen me for who I am. And your assessment is the correct one. being a "man" in the traditional scene isn't something I look at with doe eyes and want to emulate. It gets me nothing. I'm aware I have male privilege, but I'm hoping against all hope it kicks in before the power get turned off.

As for my metaphor, I'm saying that when men complain about marriage rape, while I agree losing most your shit and you children is horrible, I still don't see them dying of starvation in a mud hut.

And when women complain about access to abortion, which I think should not only be legal but promoted, I don't see them living in the same mud hut raising three kids that are dying in front of them.

I don't see many western problems as that big of an issue and easily solvable, but are not due to human emotion and an unwillingness to bend. And I son't exactly *care* about those not getting enough of said pie because the physical world is a harsh place and luck has everything to do with your lot in life.

Your assessment has made me realize that I may in fact be BP leaning, so, wow on that. Your logic is much sounder than mine. If I had reddit gold I'd give it to you.

Whisper[S] • 5 points • 25 December, 2014 12:13 PM*

As for my metaphor, I'm saying that when men complain about marriage rape, while I agree losing most your shit and you children is horrible, I still don't see them dying of starvation in a mud hut.

How is that important?

The logical conclusion of this argument is that there one single most wretched

individual in the world, and he is the only one allowed to complain, or to strive to better his lot in life. This is ridiculous. The fact that someone else has it worse is a non-sequitur.

Think of it this way. If I stab you in the stomach with a box cutter, and you are bleeding profusely, then you have a problem.

If I stab the guy next to you twice, or three times, or fifty-seven times, does that do anything to fix your problem? Does that make it one iota more bearable? No, it does not.

I don't see many western problems as that big of an issue and easily solvable, but are not due to human emotion and an unwillingness to bend.

Foolish and naive. Knowing what to do is only half the solution. Getting people to do it is the other half, and usually the more difficult one. People have a lot less control over their behaviour than most people think.

And I son't exactly care about those not getting enough of said pie because the physical world is a harsh place and luck has everything to do with your lot in life.

You don't care because you've given up hope. You feel like you have no chance at a pretty and feminine wife, a stable job with enough money to raise a family on one income, two or three children who respect and obey you, and a close-knit community with friends and acquaintances who treated you with courtesy.

You don't feel like you are entitled to any of those things. If you were born in an another era, you would have. Not entitled to just *get* them, but entitled to chance to work hard and earn them. And if you did have that fair shot at those things, you'd be out there now, busting your tail to reach that goal.

THAT is why I say the male sex drive (along with, yes, the male urge to dominate or lead) is the engine that drives both the economy, and civilization. Men want high-quality mates for long-term relationships. Men want families and children, in societies where fathers are the respected head of the household, rather than a figure of derision.

You have given up on busting your tail to afford and support a family, because society was restructured to remove the rewards. Some very broken people looked at the *rewards* men got in exchange for their *responsibilities*, and called them "male privilege". Then they persuaded our society to remove them. It never occurred to these people that this was what motivated men to keep the power running, and the grocery stores stocked with food. That, to them, was just background stuff that happened automagically, because you had "an economy", which is their word for "somebody else does the dirty jobs, because I am doing the important work of complaining about the Patriarchy".

So the rewards of fatherhood vanished, but the expectations remained. Is it any wonder you don't want the job now? You're not *lazy*. You're *sensible*.

I don't want the job either, not under these conditions. Fuck that. I'm going to bang sluts, get high, keep my money, buy expensive toys, and not have or raise children, not bankroll anyone, not contribute to my community or my society.

Because "my" community and "my" society aren't *mine*. They never were. They see me as an ATM. A special, wicked kind of ATM that they insult as they withdraw

money from, because it's "privileged" and "greedy" for not giving them more.

My society does not give a fuck about one thing I want or one problem I have. Certain companies won't pay for women's birth control pills? Everyone loses their shit.

I want a job? I better figure out myself how to make that happen.

I want to get laid? The only thing my culture cares about is to make sure I am not "pressuring" or "coercing" anyone. Actually making that happen? That's my responsibility, and figuring out what I need to do is my responsibility, and when I figure out what I need to do, I'd better not say openly what it is, if that description hurts the feelings of *real person*.

Our society doesn't consider anything a problem until it starts hurting women. We have a metric fuckton of young men in their twenties living lives of involuntary celibacy, and our culture doesn't consider that a problem *until* they start reading something like TRP, and then it's a problem because, and only because, they *say mean about women and hurt their feelings*. We have a metric fuckton of older men in their thirties and forties, paying to support children they have been cut off from, and that's not a problem for our society *until* they stop paying, often because they no longer can, and *then* it's a problem because they are "deadbeat dads", and we need to hold them upside down and shake vigorously with a basket underneath them.

Some people need to figure out that if you give nothing to men, you get nothing from them.

That is why TRP exists. Our society has abandoned men, so we are starting to form our own social structures, our own communities, our own support networks. And we are loyal to the communities that support us, not the ones that just try to use us and cast us aside.

Now, if you tell certain people, most likely the SJW/feminist/BP crowd that, they say "oh, you're being overdramatic", "you have all this male privilege", "you have it good, because you live in America and aren't worried about where your next meal is coming from". (These are the same people who think overhearing a joke about dongles is a grave injustice that requires immediate action.)

But this is, ultimately, an excuse. They want to worry *about* men, never *for* men. Why?

Because men are the economic powerhouse. Men build things. Men produce wealth. If they admit men have problems, not just as people, not just as black men, gay men, or poor men, but *as men*, then there is a limit. They have to stop squeezing. They have to limit their demands. And their real goal is extract the maximum amount with a minimum of effort. Socialism, feminism, "social justice", arguments about fairness... it's all just a power play. They want more cookies. That's all.

The non-bakers want more pie. And the best way to do that is to gaslight the bakers. Make them feel inadequate. Guilty. Tell them they have "pie-baking privilege", and they better give away all the pie to cleanse themselves of this sin.

That is the real source of the rage against TRP. It supports men. Makes them stop feeling guilty. Makes them hard to control. Makes them not only want things for themselves, but feel like they can get them.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 December, 2014 04:46 PM

This is a manifesto. I could honestly read what you have to write all day.

MakeTheSexyTalk • 3 points • 23 December, 2014 09:05 PM

My lack of understanding of gender dynamics led to the end of my marriage, cost me my home, tore my family apart and brought me to TRP.

In the grand scheme of things that is certainly insignificant, but in my life it was pretty huge. Now I see other people who thought gender dynamics were insignificant make them same mistakes I made and suffer the same consequences.

[deleted] • 0 points • 23 December, 2014 09:18 PM

Again, I would champion the cause if someone I cared about died because of it.

Unfortunately, as bad as what happened to you was, and how backwards the laws are, You are insignificant. Don't take it as a slight, I am as well.

So in this case, red pilling is a great idea for you, If you use the core message of self improvement. Selfishness is survival. The word is not dirty.

[deleted] • 2 points • 23 December, 2014 03:42 PM

No. The problem is this. RP thinks BP is wrong, and BP thinks RP is wrong. The debate tactics are the same, as the quality of the debaters varies on both sides.

Scientific studies and confirmation bias.

Scientific studies:

RP brings forward a scientific study to support their beliefs.

BP points out they didn't interpret the study correctly. That the conclusions RPs make are not conclusions supported by the study. (We've had a few of these recently)

RP continues to posit that their beliefs are based on fact or science while BPs are based on feelings and emotion.

I think it would be very interesting exercise to see someone from the RP side take one of the papers cited recently, look at the conclusions we are "supposed" draw from it, and then detail exactly what the article proves and what the article *doesn't* prove.

Confirmation bias:

RP theory cannot account for everyone else who has experiences different from what RP states. To this, the defense of "AWALT shouldn't be taken literally", or we're just talking about "in general" is given, despite BP explaining that they are talking about "in general." RP does not exist when behavior contrary to their belief system is common.

BP *can* account for RP behavior without their belief system being compromised.

So, it's always going to be more difficult to be RP and prove it to others. And it's a hard position to be in. Having to prove your side when the other position is the default.

1) they have to prove that science supports it

2) they have to discount the experiences of everyone else in order for RP to be true

The rest is just details you can find on both sides.

This is why BP think RP are "misogynists"

that's pretty uncontested

This is why BP keep thinking that RP are trying to restore Dark Ages.

I don't know about actually trying to, but it's clear there are RPer's that'd rather go back to an earlier kind of society

Here we see an interaction between RP and BP regarding age of consent laws.

we see you trying to change the topic and then wondering he doesn't want to engage you on it

Thus RP and BP cannot even agree on what to argue about.

lol, puzzling

RP has been arguing, meanwhile, about which metaphors best illustrate human social and mating dynamics. RP does not address the issue of right or wrong at all, and seems to believe BP is engaging with him on factual level.

which they clearly were. I can e.g. think that some religious person is religious out of a fear of death or some other emotional investment and still engage them on a factual level, there's no inconsistency.

scallopkid • 10 points • 23 December, 2014 08:28 PM

This is why BP keep thinking that RP are trying to restore Dark Ages.

I don't know about actually trying to, but it's clear there are RPer's that'd rather go back to an earlier kind of society

You've both missed and proved his point.

17b29a • -1 points • 23 December, 2014 08:31 PM

How so?

Absinthe99 • 6 points • 26 December, 2014 03:16 PM

I don't know about actually trying to, but it's clear there are RPer's that'd rather go back to an earlier kind of society

There is a VERY interesting (and what ought to be blatantly obvious) series of inherently fallacious beliefs that you are demonstrating:

1. That society/culture somehow ONLY ever "progresses".
2. That therefore the current version of society is "the best there ever was".
3. But yet ironically... that there are things "wrong" with the current society...
4. And further you believe that (even *sans* any evidence whatsoever, in fact even in direct contradiction of the available evidence) those things which are now "wrong" must be caused by things left-over from previous iterations...
5. The end result of your belief structure -- as a result of the above -- is that the things which are "wrong"

cannot be amended by "backtracking" or "reversing" any of the changes from previous iterations of society... but only by proceeding FURTHER in the same direction that the (most recent) past changes did.

In other words, your proverbial "car" does not have a "reverse" -- and you sincerely (even if obliviously) believe that the changes you propose/agree with are "infallible" and incapable of even being labeled as the cause (partial or otherwise) of any untoward consequence (whether intended or not) -- in other words, you are a true believer who thinks that (current) society never errs, never missteps, and never has to be held accountable.

ONLY people who posit that something may have "gone awry" or "gone too far" and who propose that some "backtracking" or reversal is necessary -- i.e. that your proverbial vehicle has run up against a wall, or is about to head over a cliff, and that it NEEDS to "back up" -- they are essentially the ONLY ones you disdain & disparage.

17b29a • 1 point • 1 January, 2015 08:05 PM

Sorry about using that tone by the way, that was unwarranted

17b29a • -2 points • 26 December, 2014 03:31 PM

i think you were heading for the dork enlightenment, it's the other way hun

Absinthe99 • 3 points • 26 December, 2014 04:22 PM

Well, that certainly proved me wrong! I mean calling someone a "dork"... just an astounding display of irrefutable logic.

17b29a • -1 points • 26 December, 2014 05:28 PM

i mean you're just rambling, i made a claim about what some rpers believe and youre going on about id ont even know what, some imaginary liberal inside your head i guess? cuz ur def not arguing against anything i said

Absinthe99 • 3 points • 26 December, 2014 06:18 PM

LOL. Sweet cheeks, "logic" is not the same as "rambling".

I mean I understand that *to you* they appear to be the same thing (lots of fancy big old words and stuff, and with all that "high-falutin" proper spelling and grammar and stuff) but they are actually quite distinct.

Again, not that you will understand. (But hey, don't worry your silly little feminine brain about it... it's beyond you.)

17b29a • 0 points • 26 December, 2014 06:41 PM

i said

it's clear there are RPerS that'd rather go back to an earlier kind of society

from this you got

1. That society/culture somehow ONLY ever "progresses".
2. That therefore the current version of society is "the best there ever was".
3. But yet ironically... that there are things "wrong" with the current society...

4. And further you believe that (even *sans* any evidence whatsoever, in fact even in direct contradiction of the available evidence) those things which are now "wrong" must be caused by things left-over from previous iterations...
5. The end result of your belief structure -- as a result of the above -- is that the things which are "wrong" **cannot** be amended by "backtracking" or "reversing" any of the changes from previous iterations of society... but only by proceeding FURTHER in the same direction that the (most recent) past changes did.

it's you rambling against some imaginary set of beliefs inside your head, because I have not made any of these claims

Absinthe99 • 1 point • 26 December, 2014 08:26 PM

it's you rambling against some imaginary set of beliefs inside your head, because I have not made any of these claims

Actually sweetie pie, those beliefs are inside *your* head, and they are implied/revealed by a combination of the facts that: a) you are labeled "BluePillGirl" along with b) the inaccurate statement you made about your understanding of RP'ers.

The fact that you are unaware of those beliefs of yours (or that you deny having them) is not at all surprising; but is fundamentally irrelevant.

17b29a • 1 point • 26 December, 2014 08:50 PM

My flair only means I'm female and not red pill, and I think it's fairly indisputable that some RPer's think previous societies or cultures were superior, at least in some respects. I've seen many, many posts to that extent.

I could just as well make that claim as an RPer; it's a completely neutral, descriptive claim about some posts I've seen on the sub.

If you don't think any substantive number of RPer's believe that, you're welcome to that opinion, but it has nothing to do with me believing things like "society *only* ever progresses." That's patently irrelevant and does not follow from anything I've said.

I ____ o ____ l • 4 points • 23 December, 2014 03:36 PM

Your description of blue pill is utterly ridiculous. BP isn't factually relative (and I'm not sure anyone really is outside of some obscure philosophy grads and stoners) nor morally absolutist.

You are making a classic red pill classification error - black and white are the only options you see.

Red pill is a factual absolutist position which assumes all human beings of each sex behave functionally identically in given circumstances. Blue pill is simply a non-absolutist position that this is bullshit.

Also:

Thus RP questioning someone's character is off-limits, because it is irrelevant.

Is this a joke? Even the label "beta" is inherently questioning someone's character.

[deleted] • 1 points • 23 December, 2014 10:23 AM

[permanently deleted]

1 ____ o ____ l • 2 points • 23 December, 2014 03:48 PM

I love that you use kinkster and queer as an insult.

Like being gay or sexually experimenting makes you less of a person.

[deleted] • 0 points • 23 December, 2014 04:48 PM

[permanently deleted]

1 ____ o ____ l • 2 points • 23 December, 2014 04:56 PM

Class act.

[deleted] • 4 points • 23 December, 2014 04:15 AM

[permanently deleted]

TimeDoesDisolve • 6 points • 23 December, 2014 04:39 AM

In fact evolution has evolved empathy within humans! It's an intricate part of our brains and increases the survival of the human race. I would say that is evidence that humans are intrinsically good but you're not going to agree.

relationshipdownvote • 6 points • 23 December, 2014 04:49 AM

In fact evolution has evolved empathy within humans!

It also evolved hatred and all the bad things too.

TimeDoesDisolve • 7 points • 23 December, 2014 05:01 AM

Actually no! Hatred is systemic of not having enough and some other traits that are not physiologically in your brain. Though envy is part of the lower brain, the higher brain has kind traits (a theory that as we evolved empathy and kindness were a necessity in some cases to survive as a group.)

<http://wunc.org/post/how-does-empathy-make-us-uniquely-human>

<http://www.npr.org/2014/04/15/303172368/empathy-how-should-we-care-about-one-another>

steelpuppy • 5 points • 23 December, 2014 12:38 PM

Actually no! Hatred is systemic of not having enough and some other traits that are not physiologically in your brain. Though envy is part of the lower brain, the higher brain has kind traits (a theory that as we evolved empathy and kindness were a necessity in some cases to survive as a group.)

How does this refute what he said? His point stands that all of this shit you claim is a mark of a "defective human" was brought about via evolution. Unless you are going to claim divine intervention.

fiat_lux_ • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 05:19 AM

Neither of your links talks about the physical brain's involvement.

Here is a link that talks about hatred in the brain:

<http://psychcentral.com/news/2008/10/29/hate-area-of-brain-identified/3225.html>

Villaintine • 4 points • 23 December, 2014 03:59 PM

And again Bluepers downvote the same studies they demand for proof.

fiat_lux_ • 3 points • 23 December, 2014 04:08 PM

Count mentioned that he sees bpers providing more links than rpers. I don't even deny that. It's just that I see so many instances like this one where the bper's links have very little to do with what they claim. It gets upvoted anyway because it feels good to read.

I mean, just read it! No in depth explanation of hatred or envy.

What he says sounds truthy, but I'm interested in seeing a more in depth explanation.

exit_sandman • 2 points • 23 December, 2014 10:11 AM

I think hatred is directly tied to empathy.

I'd be really curious whether real psychopaths are capable of actual hate (well, maybe if they're narcissists on top of that).

We_Are_Legion • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 10:12 AM

His point is that sympathy is a mechanism. It means nothing except your own evolved bias to cooperate with the rules of the group.

There is nothing wrong or right about this. Its just a mechanism in us that the group thrive.

still_very_alive • 0 points • 23 December, 2014 07:50 AM

How does your belief account for the fact that Neanderthals has a higher capacity for empathy than *homo sapiens*, and some even attribute this as the reason why humanity became the dominant species and they are now extinct?

winndixie • 1 point • 24 December, 2014 09:51 PM

Agreed. PPD is useless.

sumant28 • 1 point • 14 March, 2015 08:10 AM

Holy shit, I'm late to this but this is the post of the century. Insightful, impartial, investigative, just everything you want and need it to be

somesamepill • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 11:07 AM*

RP are depressed insecure folk clinging to a pieced together "self - improvement" mantra (that at its core seeks to tear others down with MRA crybabyism).

And BP folk are the reaction to that. Some of them try to address the issues that RP posts, but most are there to make fun of RP jagweeds.

PPD is just a place where we all yell at each other.

Hope that cleared it all up for you.

:)

steelpuppy • 6 points • 23 December, 2014 12:10 PM

RP are depressed insecure folk clinging to a pieced together "self - improvement" mantra (that at its core seeks to tear others down with MRA crybabyism).

We found the /r/againstmensrights poster. No gender debate on reddit may happen without one.

somesamepill • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 12:46 PM

Oh lawd. Thanks for pointing that out to me. You've been here longer (perhaps) any other redds I may like.

I know sarcasm and sincerity are hard sells on the Internet and I know you didn't mean to be helpful but thanks again.

:)

steelpuppy • 3 points • 23 December, 2014 12:53 PM

No problem :)

I ____ o ____ l • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 03:47 PM

Oh comeon, everyone here must be able to admit that the MRAs are just a bunch of very very bitter (sometimes understandably) women hating cry babies.

Surely no-one legitimately contends otherwise?

steelpuppy • 9 points • 23 December, 2014 03:55 PM

Oh comeon, everyone here must be able to admit that the MRAs are just a bunch of very very bitter (sometimes understandably) women hating cry babies.

So you don't think that men have problems that need to be addressed?

I ____ o ____ l • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 04:15 PM

That's not what I said was it? I'm talking about MRAs as a self-identifying group, not men's rights (lowercase) and issues.

Steelpuppy I've noticed you tend to use strawmen, in the most bald and blatant way, near constantly on PPD. If this isnt deliberate, its something you should watch out for in your posting because it's annoying and ineffective.

steelpuppy • 8 points • 23 December, 2014 04:29 PM

That's not what I said was it? I'm talking about MRAs as a self-identifying group, not men's rights (lowercase) and issues.

And I was supposed to know that how exactly? I'm not aware of any other group that talks about men's rights in a systemic fashion.

You could also answer my question. Do you think that men have problems that need to be addressed? Irrelevant of MRM.

Steelpuppy I've noticed you tend to use strawmen, in the most bald and blatant way, near constantly on PPD. If this isnt deliberate, its something you should watch out for in your posting because it's annoying and ineffective.

How about you call me out if I strawman instead of making a sourceless claim.

l ____ o ____ l • -1 points • 23 December, 2014 04:33 PM

How about you call me out if I strawman instead of making a sourceless claim.

OK:

So you don't think that men have problems that need to be addressed?

steelpuppy • 8 points • 23 December, 2014 04:43 PM

That's not a strawman. That's a misunderstanding. To me when you talk about men's rights you are talking about MRAs not specific rights outside of organized communities.

I also don't know why you simply refuse to answer my question:

Do you think that men have problems that need to be addressed?

I even said that you can ignore the context of MRAs aka just answer about (lowercase) men's rights.

l ____ o ____ l • -1 points • 23 December, 2014 05:01 PM

Its literally putting words I didnt say or even allude to in my mouth, it couldnt be more of a straw man.

steelpuppy • 9 points • 23 December, 2014 05:10 PM

I'm not putting any words in your mouth. I'm now asking you a question after I said we just had a misunderstanding.

A question you apparently have a great deal of problem answering.

LordFishFinger • 2 points • 26 December, 2014 04:03 PM

Bitter? Sure. Woman-hating? Maybe as venting, sometimes. Not legitimately.

The MRM has plenty of women amongst its **leaders**. The kind of group that not only hears out but also follows female-created ideas can't be too misogynistic, right?

l ____ o ____ l • 1 point • 29 December, 2014 12:16 PM

No, that doesnt follow at all. There are plenty of misogynistic women

[deleted] • -1 points • 23 December, 2014 05:34 AM

Well the most aggressively argued stuff in here from the blue pill is that AWALT - can't possibly cover the 80 year old grandma in a 3rd world country and therefore you are wrong. It's like no shit, no one in the red pill is concerned with picking up a grandma in the third world.

I mean if they can't get their head around that, I don't know how they think they can win any argument.

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 05:18 PM

"The entire sky is always orange."

"No, it's only orange sometimes."

"Duh I know that you idiot. I didn't LITERALLY mean the entire sky is always orange. You're stupid for thinking that's what I meant. Use your brain!"

that's AWALT

drok007 • 4 points • 23 December, 2014 05:47 PM

"Operate under the assumption the sky is blue"

"It isn't always blue"

"It is enough of the time"

that's AWALT

Cyralea • 1 point • 23 December, 2014 07:28 PM*

RP: "Man, I always lose"

BP: "You won once 4 years ago. I don't understand why you would say that. "

RP: "Well, I mean that most of the time I lose, with that one exception 4 years ago. We've played weekly games since then and I haven't won"

BP: "Then why didn't you say so?"

RP: "Because it's mostly true, you pedant"

AWALT is a directive that's not literally 100% true. It's true frequently enough that it's a useful directive.

[deleted] • -2 points • 23 December, 2014 06:59 AM

BP doesn't care what the facts are.

lol