

# The facets of AWALT

324 upvotes | 23 February, 2015 | by Archwinger

---

We get a lot of flack over our popular acronym “AWALT” – All Women Are Like That. It’s a great reminder, every time we’re surprised by how slutty a girl is, every time a woman lies, manipulates, and cheats, every time a woman leaves a man at his worst, and every time a woman leaves a man who gave her the world.

It’s an offensive phrase. Because it brazenly proclaims that all women (not some, not a few skanks, not even most, but all – every single one of them) are “like that.” We could argue semantics by pointing out that “like that” doesn’t necessarily mean “is that,” but instead means, “approximates that” or “trends in that direction.” But come on. We mean she’s really like that. All women, given the right circumstances, will slut, lie, cheat, and/or leave. And what constitutes the “right circumstances” is pretty much the same for every woman: Being a loser. Women hate losers. Everyone hates losers. The big difference between one woman and the next isn’t whether she’s like that, or what makes her act like that. It’s her threshold. Different women will tolerate different amounts of loser for different amounts of time before they break.

Some will have tolerance and patience that exceed the tolerance and patience of other women. But every woman has her threshold. Cross that, and she’ll be “like that.” It can manifest differently. Some will never cheat on you – they’ll just leave. Some will never leave – they’ll just cheat on you. Some won’t do either, at least at first, but they’ll start to resent you and treat you poorly. There are different colors of “like that.” But all women do it. All women are like that.

Really, we overcomplicate this thing. What does “All Women Are Like That” really mean? It means that if you don’t measure up, a woman will lose her respect for you. All women, all the time, will lose respect for you if you’re a loser. That’s not so offensive. It’s downright logical.

And a woman who loses her respect for you will treat you poorly, dump you, cheat on you, or any combination of the above. Not all women do all of those at exactly the same threshold of loser-dom. But all women have the potential to do any of those, in any order, depending on what their threshold is. All women will lose respect for you if you suck. And no woman, anywhere, is going to say, “Well, my boyfriend suddenly started sucking and became a total loser, but because we’re already in a committed relationship, I’m going to stay with him forever, never cheat, never leave, and continue to treat him with the utmost respect, no matter how big of a loser he becomes or how long this goes on.” Because there are no exceptions. All women are like that.

The far more offensive part of AWALT, however, doesn’t come up in discussion nearly as often: Women are malleable sheep. A woman’s threshold for loser-dom, and what constitutes the right circumstances to make her “like that,” are completely fluid.

You can be a little bit of a loser, and your girl might be okay with that for a long time. You might have a great relationship until something changes – something that’s not you. Your girl’s social circle might start badmouthing you. Or your girl might get a shot at another man.

Suddenly, her threshold changes, and what does and doesn’t constitute a loser in her eyes changes. Maybe your hobbies and your appearance and clothes and the way you act was fine by her until her friends started making fun of her for dating you. Maybe your devotion and love of cuddling was cute and charming until she met a hawt d-bag last night who tried to take her home.

Suddenly, she realizes she’s not happy and you’re a loser. You didn’t change. Her perception did. She moved the goalposts on you. On herself. A woman’s threshold changes based on her circumstances. If she has other options, her tolerance for anything less than the ideal from you is far less.

Some might see that as opportunism, but really, it's not that conscious. She really was happy five minutes ago. She didn't know there was anything to be unhappy about until she realized she was losing social status and that you were holding her back from getting fucked by a better man. Before then, she was great.

AWALT isn't just a reminder or warning. It's like a battle cry, reminding you to always be on the upward trend. To always be the best. And to always become better. Because if you're anything less, you'll lose respect.

AWALT is also our comfort. There's always someone better, and always just the right circumstances. Maybe your woman will surprise you by demonstrating a greater tolerance than you thought she had, but if she doesn't, and you know you did your best, and were the best version of yourself possible AWALT. Shit happens. She's not yours. It's just your turn. Or if things were beyond your control – you lost your job, you got sick, you were injured, you experienced a death of a loved one, and your woman left the weak man you became – AWALT. Shit happens.

AWALT is exactly what our detractors want. AWALT should be a feminist cornerstone. Don't expect things from women. Don't hold them to standards. They're going to do whatever they want. Accept it. It's their right to do what they want, and if you expect them to do certain things for you in exchange for things you do, that's entitled male privilege. You need to check that privilege and remember AWALT.

---

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

---

## Comments

---

NSA\_web\_spider • 56 points • 23 February, 2015 08:30 PM\*

Security, Status, Escape.

If these things are not on the increase, she's not happy. Every problem she has will be traced back to one or more of these three items. Every choice a woman makes is to advance one of these agendas. All women are like that and all women only really care about these three things in varying proportions.

Women developed the ability to rationalize any action that advances these agendas. They are not stronger, or faster, or in many cases smarter than men, but they will do the thing that needs to be done to advance their agenda without hesitation and be perfectly fine with it afterwards. Men can learn this (in some cultures Men practice this exclusively), but for women it's an innate survival mechanism. And it's a powerful skill not to be underestimated (even if you hear "hamster wheel" a lot here.) A dog may die waiting at his dead masters side, but a cat will eat your eyes if you die and don't fill the dish anymore. Amorally, which is the stronger survival plan?

And now you understand women. Be a player and appeal to her need for escape. Be a BB and give her security and advance her status. Whatever you want.

But know that the rules of the game are really not that complicated. I was thinking of getting the "3 agendas" as a tattoo.

TruckerJohn • 11 points • 24 February, 2015 02:00 AM

By escape do you mean typical escapism? A sense of adventure, perhaps?

NSA\_web\_spider • 9 points • 24 February, 2015 05:46 AM\*

A woman creates a cage in which she is secure, and a persona in which she maintains her status. Both limit what she can do, and come with a number of restrictions. These restrictions grate, and so she needs an escape. The escape itself depends on the woman, but generally they have to do with spending a lot of money and not really doing anything particularly useful.

TL;DR women both love and hate the BP secure, status driven life, and need periodic escape from it. If her motivation isn't directly tied to Security or Status, it's likely tied to escaping those things.

kingofpplives • 4 points • 24 February, 2015 09:30 PM

women both love and hate the BP secure, status driven life, and need periodic escape from it.

Haha I love it. There is literally no way to make a woman happy, because she is wired to hate the same things she is driven to secure.

Best course of action is to learn how to make her excited.

[deleted] • 6 points • 24 February, 2015 12:00 AM

Security and status is a no brainer. But could you elaborate on escape?

NSA\_web\_spider • 27 points • 24 February, 2015 05:38 AM\*

When a woman drinks, vacations, dances, goes out with the girls or "just buys the shoes" she is looking for an escape from the confines of her world.

If you are the escape from the confines of her world, you are likely the sex only relationship that takes her out of her world.

Security and status are what she needs in her life, but she also needs exceptions to those - the "fun" part of her existence.

If you are the fun part, then she comes to you for enjoyment. However, if you are the one providing the security and status, it's reasonable to think that her escape is escaping from you, and the life you represent.

When you hear the words, "I want to feel like we are dating again (LTR)", or "I need a spa day" or "I need a vacation somewhere warm", she's presenting a need to escape.

If you run everything a woman says through the trinity filter, you won't likely find much that doesn't fit these motivations. And many things will advance a combination of the motivations, not just one of them - women can be efficient like that.

I was lucky enough to fall in with a RP oriented counselor (though he never said the words RP, and didn't use RP words.) and he told me about the trinity of needs and the rationalization as a survival mechanism. I now apply the filter in even normal conversation with women, and it hasn't failed me yet.

[deleted] • 6 points • 24 February, 2015 01:41 PM

That's awesome. Just when I think I've heard it all on TRP.

GregariousWolf • 6 points • 24 February, 2015 12:17 PM

Interesting and novel analysis. "Security, status, escape." You should write up something longer and post it. I believe it to be worthy of its own thread.

TW\_RPAwake • 3 points • 24 February, 2015 05:38 PM

This is post-worthy. Please consider elaborating; I think the concept has tremendous use worth exploring.

RedPillLawyer • 3 points • 24 February, 2015 06:45 PM

Fantastic. You should write a separate post about the three rationales.

krakosia • 2 points • 24 February, 2015 08:03 PM

Don't these apply to men equally?

Stories\_of\_Red • 1 point • 18 March, 2015 02:55 PM

You need to put this up as a straight up post on the main page.

NSA\_web\_spider • 1 point • 23 March, 2015 05:14 AM

I elaborated on it in another post, shouldn't be difficult to find.

Dis\_mah\_mobile\_one • 16 points • 24 February, 2015 03:26 AM

Anything to avoid being bored. Drama.

Hoodwink • 3 points • 24 February, 2015 05:31 AM\*

It can be drugs. It can be concerts. It can be physical adventure. It can be drama ('omg stop cheating, omg did you hear about Stacey?', etc) if you've got a bunch of shitty girls that are friends/plates. It can even be

board games if you've got an entertaining group (people who know how to be funny and share stories).

Women generally take on the hobbies of their man. Sometimes they stick to an interest and continually date men of that hobby/interest, but most of them should just put down 'whatever my last boyfriend is into and probably whatever you're doing' in the hobbies and interest sections of dating websites.

Women want to ride the adventure. They really do want to be your 'second-mate', and they'll jump cocks for an exciting adventure with new and interesting experiences and people. It's a promise of status and thrill.

PlebDestroyer • 5 points • 24 February, 2015 04:19 AM

Smart analysis but your tattoo idea is stupid af.

NSA\_web\_spider • 7 points • 24 February, 2015 05:48 AM

It was a joke. I don't ink.

jb\_trp • 87 points • 23 February, 2015 05:44 PM

A woman's threshold changes based on her circumstances. If she has other options, her tolerance for anything less than the ideal from you is far less.

I remember my last LTR before swallowing TRP. She was this really outdoorsy girl--mountain biking, rock climbing, kayaking, etc. I wasn't really into any of that stuff, but we had other similar interests and I thought things were going great. We would go hiking or camping, or find hot springs, and she would climb/kayak/bike with her friends.

Well...

She found this kayaking group where she was the only girl. All of a sudden she was **not happy**. I thought, *this is crazy, she's doing all this shit and she's not happy??* She told me all this over dinner one night and I felt really insecure. And so I tried *harder* to initiate more outdoor stuff and make her happy.

Well, eventually she starts doing more outdoorsy stuff with ~~not me~~ one of the guys in her kayaking group. I felt *more* insecure, we break up, and POOF, two weeks later this guy is driving up with her to her family's cabin to spend the whole weekend with her and her family.

They've been together every since.

Now, this girl had good morals, she didn't cheat on me, but **as soon as she met this other guy that was "perfect" in every way I wasn't, she lost all respect/attraction to me.** AWALT.

Stories\_of\_Red • 146 points • 23 February, 2015 05:56 PM

she didn't cheat on me

Ahem. I have something to tell you....

TimeHo • 70 points • 23 February, 2015 06:02 PM

At least tag it "spoiler alert"

jb\_trp • 32 points • 23 February, 2015 06:05 PM

Nahhh, she didn't. They are dating now and hooking up, and we broke up *fast* after they started kayaking/climbing/mountain biking together.

The only difference between her and a cheater is she waited (AKA, branch swinging)

user\_none • 18 points • 23 February, 2015 11:23 PM

That's still branch swinging.

Had the other guy not come along (aka, an option), do you think she'd still have left you? Not likely.

cryptonoob123 • 2 points • 24 February, 2015 03:49 PM [recovered]

but I never seen any girl who does not do that.

Jaquestrap • 1 point • 14 April, 2015 03:51 AM

To be honest, even guys branch-swing sometimes. After me and an ex broke up about two years ago, part of the impetus for me was that I had recently connected with a girl I was much more interested in seeing. I only ended up seeing the new girl for a couple of months before I moved cities, but it was still branch-swinging. It's a normal human act--the only thing you can do is make yourself as attractive and desirable as possible (what you should be doing anyways).

twistedbrother2 • -2 points • 24 February, 2015 03:24 PM

What a good, sweet boy you must be. Bless your little heart.

surfjihad • 8 points • 24 February, 2015 03:47 PM

"Bless your heart" is Texan for "you are an idiot"

[deleted] • 2 points • 18 March, 2015 11:06 AM

I don't understand why this subreddit always assumes the worst. While AWALT, everyone has their threshold. There's a possibility that she hasn't cheated on him.

krakosia • 6 points • 24 February, 2015 07:56 PM

you were the B guy she settled for while keeping an eye out for her A guy. Once she found a few potentials for the replacement she started the counter. You either become better than the A guy she has in mind (without you knowing who he is or what you are competing with) or you are out by the time the counter runs out.

The counter ran out.

Female hypergamy 101.

kingofpplives • 2 points • 24 February, 2015 09:27 PM

you were the B guy she settled for while keeping an eye out for her A guy.

This.

Guys need to understand this dynamic so they can recognize when they have been pegged as a B guy.

Women always want to be in a relationship, so they will keep you around as a placeholder even they don't like you all that much.

SwissPablo • 3 points • 24 February, 2015 09:03 PM\*

I can relate to that. To cut a long story short, met a woman in my 20s, everything going great. Her penfriend from abroad visits the city, she offers to show the sights... all of a sudden she's saying I never do this with her or never do that with her, stuff she never had a problem with. I tried harder but found out she'd gone to Germany with this guy on holiday. LTR over.

EDIT: oh yes, forgot to mention she eventually married this guy and moved to another country with him. He'd come into some money, apparently.

[deleted] • 13 points • 23 February, 2015 06:06 PM

To be fair, this sentence in bold holds for genders reversed just the same, so what's the use? If you're together with a somehow-ok-women and you meet someone who's "perfect", you would just switch branches all the same.

MattyAnon • 36 points • 23 February, 2015 11:52 PM

Big difference here: women are passively given other offers, you are not.

You would have to go out and look for them. Which you don't when you're happy in a relationship. Meanwhile your girl is getting hit on every time your back is turned.

She can branch swing when the next better offer comes along. Meanwhile you're not gaming women. Your game is getting rusty. You're not getting validation outside the relationship. You're investing in her, she's investing in herself. Not hard to figure how this ends.

kingofpplives • 3 points • 24 February, 2015 09:25 PM

Big difference here: women are passively given other offers, you are not.

I think this is one of the hardest pills to swallow. Attractive women get offers all the time. To lock one down for a long time you need to keep your game at an extremely high level and remain ever vigilant.

[deleted] • 4 points • 24 February, 2015 06:59 AM

Nah, that's too simplistic and also describing a situation where men have failed already. Most men with an active & attractive life do meet new women on a regular basis. Work, sports, hobbies, social circle etc. You might not be given offers, true, but surely you know that some phonecalls, one or two nice nights out might lead to something more, if you wanted.

kingofpplives • 7 points • 24 February, 2015 09:24 PM

some phonecalls, one or two nice nights out might lead to something more, if you wanted

This is a hell of a hurdle. A woman has the opposite situation -- she does nothing, while the phone calls and nights out are offered to her.

Can't you see how much easier being unfaithful becomes when you literally have to do nothing? Women can test the waters passively, if a great offer comes along, it wasn't their fault. For a man to test the waters, he needs to form the intent and take action to cheat.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 11:43 AM

This is true, but exaggerated. Asking people you've already talked to out for a beer or a movie or some sportive activity should be a non-issue for any grown-up man, not a hurdle. The real hurdle lies in arranging your life so that you have many people within your extended social circle and that you can meet new people constantly while doing what you've always done. But this is something you should seek out not because of the girls, but because of having a social & exciting life is a reward in itself.

timesinkk • 3 points • 26 February, 2015 11:09 PM

This is exactly what the RP is about. Developing an abundance mentality. Ur describing something that guys on here are learning about as if it was common knowledge for betas and simply put it is not.

SwissPablo • 2 points • 24 February, 2015 09:08 PM

Right but even pretty unattractive women leading mundane lives with not much going on still get plenty of attention passively from men. Men of a similar level do not.

fake7272 • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 12:26 AM

my FWB gets hit on at least 5 times a day. she tells me, and some of them are attractive. She still hasn't given her number to one of them (which is why I allow her to be a FWB and not a plate). anyway, If a guy had 5 girls asking him out every single day then the roles in society would be different. Guys that slept around then would be "whores" so to speak but because it doesn't happen like that girls are held at a different standard.

you are right though in that guys should be going out and gaming girls even in a relationship but most guys rather invest all their energy into one consistent girl which always ends badly for the guy because AWALT.

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 March, 2015 11:08 AM

If branch-swinging is true, does that simply mean I could hit up any girl -- even if she had a boyfriend -- and know that by instinct, because AWALT, and because I'm better than his man, that she'd cheat on him with me?

I never really understood this concept of AWALT. Because that aforementioned example seems implausible, even if I'm Ryan Gosling.

jb\_trp • 20 points • 23 February, 2015 06:13 PM

I don't know about that. I think there is always a tendency to think *the grass is greener on the other side*. I'm not going to get into an LTR/marry a girl unless I think she's a really good woman (assuming I want to have kids or something).

If I did get married/have kids with that really good woman, it would be with the understanding that **we're both not going to be friends with people of the opposite genders**. I have friends who have this understanding in their marriage and it works. The guy has his guy friends, the girl has her girlfriends, and then they're friends with other couples. With that understanding you're not going to swing from an "okay" woman to a "perfect" woman and nor should she.

Granted, this is an old school style relationship and would take a certain type of woman. Which means I'll probably never get married or have kids.

DistantWinter • 13 points • 24 February, 2015 01:59 AM

You can take your time and make sure a woman fits to most of your perspective levels and 10 years down the road it will change and you will be out of luck. No matter how well you sift through the dirt and rubble to find your diamond she can turn to coal over time and there isn't anything you can do about it.

I've always said to my partner. "What do you need male friends for? Are you going to talk about knitting and kittens? You have a man you don't need male friends unless they are gay and I've met their husband/partner/boyfriend and even then they are suspect."

I had a good loyal and honest woman and created a family with her. 15 years later her entire personality changed and eventually felt the grass was greener somehow and downgraded to some loser that I wouldn't associate with if I seen him in public. She had a nice home and family life. I worked hard to give her a beautiful life and it was thrown away for a twice divorced, fugly, bald, skinny piece of trash that lives two states away. I don't have any sympathy for her or am I holding out for a reunion either. I hope this guy wrecks her life and uses her like a door. Props to him for working his game and avoiding her on Valentines day as well.

Not all women look at their SO and bail based on the reasons given in the above statement. Some just spin their hamster into overdrive and flake the fuck out.

Independentmale • 2 points • 24 February, 2015 11:25 PM

I worked hard to give her a beautiful life and it was thrown away for a twice divorced, fugly, bald, skinny piece of trash that lives two states away.

Man, I just don't get it. My coworker's wife left him in a similar manner. He's a great guy, excellent father with a six figure income, would never cheat on or abuse his wife. Classic nice guy. She left him for a loser in his late twenties with a fast food job and no driver's license. Over a decade of marriage and two kids, *poof*.

DistantWinter • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 01:35 AM

I feel that some of this has to do with the fact that they will rationalize in their head that they can leave, bang some scumbag and their ever loving husband will take them back if they pour enough charm on. They feel attractive and desired with a new sense of confidence. In the beginning the ones left behind grovel, cry and beg. The one leaving keeps that memory fresh in their minds and think it will carry them through.

The greatest thing are places like TRP. If you truly loved your partner and they left you broken without any closure it gives you a fantastic opportunity to work on yourself and become better than before. I am beginning to see it happen more times than not. The internet has fostered learning on many levels including how to manage through divorce, separation, abandonment, abuse, etc...

If the person left behind and broken repairs themselves properly they begin to see the dysfunction of the one who left and vow to never take them back or be the person they were before. With children involved they begin to understand that the child is fragile and all other responsibilities come second to the well being of the child. At least a well put together man will.

Once the person who left sees it's not all roses out there and comes back they are met with scorn and leave in disgust and the water of denial finally evaporates and they are either alone or with something less than what they left behind. Forever angry and wondering what if. Do an internet search for "Do you regret cheating on your spouse" and many of response are a resounding yes. Sometimes you will even find women saying that he has a beautiful life now and he wouldn't even waste his time on a woman like me... I wonder if that guy swallowed the red pill.

kingofpplives • 2 points • 24 February, 2015 09:26 PM

it would be with the understanding that we're both not going to be friends with people of the opposite genders

This should be the standard. All opposite sex friendships are always some variation of the orbiter/planet dynamic anyways.

jb\_trp • 1 point • 24 February, 2015 10:04 PM

Exactly. It's biology. I don't think you can have a guy-girl friendship without at least one of them wanting to hook-up *on some level*.

[deleted] • 4 points • 23 February, 2015 06:47 PM

I get your points. In my experience, finding someone with whom ALL of your desires, wishes, goals, ambitions etc. can be realized is impossible. No two people fit each other perfectly. So there's always room for improvement, and even more so, if you're more susceptible for projecting your own hopes into others.

So let's just face it: We're all seducible. Avoiding situations where you can be seduced - such as described in your middle paragraph - can be clever, but it can also be inconvenient, silly or even weak, depending on the people involved. You'll need to figure that out for yourself.

jb\_trp • 7 points • 23 February, 2015 07:03 PM

finding someone with whom ALL of your desires, wishes, goals, ambitions etc. can be realized is impossible

Exactly. You can't put all that onto a single person. You have to find it in yourself and your friends (for me that's my guy friends).

So let's just face it: We're all seducible. Avoiding situations where you can be seduced - such as described in your middle paragraph - can be clever, but it can also be inconvenient, silly or even weak, depending on the people involved.

I don't think it's that hard, but again, you have to find the right person. I have friends who have really good marriages--they got married young, came from good families, strong morals/religious, even share a facebook page. They have children and just have different priorities--finding situations where they might be "seduced" really aren't high on the list for them.

But then again, that's why I'm single. Those kind of relationships aren't the norm.

exmushatesils • 9 points • 23 February, 2015 07:58 PM **[recovered]**

AWALT (AMALT). All people are extremely selfish, ourselves included so to not expect it in others is of course ridiculous. But this is a ridiculous place, populated almost entirely by ex-pussy pedestalers and betas, the unplugging/matrix analogy used here for becoming aware of basic female nature, and the apparently worldview destruction it brings many, is telling how blind most users here were to male-female relations pre-trp.

ProductivityMonster • 2 points • 24 February, 2015 06:10 AM\*

AMALT

APeopleALT. The difference is that men generally have less opportunities with the opposite sex (Pareto principal) and more immediate consequences attached to their behavior so they can't just be selfish assholes all the time (unless they are part of that extremely attractive top X percent).

Mechbiscuit • 1 points • 24 February, 2015 04:10 PM [recovered]

Not trying to be a dick, but you sound a little dejected - as if you blame her for the collapse of the relationship. Do you?

jb\_trp • 3 points • 24 February, 2015 04:21 PM

Dejected? I was back then, but not anymore. This was several years ago. I think it's best we're not together anymore. I see now she's not the type of woman you'd want to be in a LTR with.

coluccicomment score below threshold • -5 points • 24 February, 2015 02:59 PM

Cry me a river. You'd do the same.

redpillbanana • 57 points • 23 February, 2015 06:17 PM\*

TRP does get a lot of flak for saying AWALT, and yet women love saying, "All men are pigs!"

The question is, are all men pigs? If a pig is defined as a man who wants to spread his seed in as many nubile women as possible, then yes, I'd say that all men are basically pigs.

AWALT simply means that all women have the same evolutionary motivations and responses to stimuli, just like men do.

Through ethics, reason, law, social pressure, and other external motivations, a woman can overcome her natural instincts, just like a man can overcome his seed-spreading instinct and remain loyal to one woman. But deep down inside that reptilian brain, they're all pretty much the same, and it's tough to overcome these basic reproductive instincts that have developed over millions of years.

HappyShopperJesus • 7 points • 24 February, 2015 12:43 AM [recovered]

All men are pigs. Except those guys that like slim girls. Because only dogs like bones, apparently.

GregariousWolf • 12 points • 24 February, 2015 12:13 PM

All men are pigs.

Feminist women are equal to men.

All feminist women are pigs.

QED.

Fine\_Cut • 16 points • 23 February, 2015 10:58 PM

I think you exclaimed a point that needs to be highlighted and maybe elaborated on:

AWALT simply means that all women have the same evolutionary motivations and responses to stimuli, just like men do.

This is what I think RP tries to get across, but people get hung up that this is a woman manipulating / hating group or something. To me RP is about realizing the true nature of people. That they will usually act for their own best interests within their individual circumstances. This includes both women and men, who can both have their own different circumstances, and also usually have a general circumstance provided by their gender.

I am hesitant to agree with the fact that men are all biological animals with a primal urge to "spread our seed" because that's just not true. It might apply to some men, but it doesn't others, and there are varying degrees to that which it can be true.

I think painting women with huge generalities in a similar vein is a mistake and is a huge reason why this place gets a lot of flak, but it is also not wrong to be aware of specific patterns of behaviour. You don't have to apply this RP mentality solely to 'how to deal with women', and if you are, I think you are missing the point of TRP.

People are different, have different life situations, pasts, and motivations. This includes men as much as it does women. You can't control other people, but you can control yourself and how you deal with others, and make yourself aware that others usually are not necessarily always acting in your best interest, and given set circumstances, there are usually specific patterns of behaviour that apply.

I think it all comes down to being a better person by taking care of and improving yourself, and through understanding the nature of others - not just women - which I think is sometimes focused on a little too heavily in this sub, I mean, a lot of the "RP truths" can be easily applied to same sex relationships as they can hetero relationships, and almost every non-romantic relationship (friends, co-workers, etc.).

rojo-pildora • 6 points • 23 February, 2015 08:34 PM

Wise words again banana. Another point to make though on the pig argument is that not all men are pigs. The typical BB is not an international seed spreader. He wants to be but he just isn't. However women don't experience this man because they want that international seed layer. Therfor that top 20% is the only group these women are talking about.

krakosia • 2 points • 24 February, 2015 08:00 PM

APALT - all people are like that.

Men will look around at different women because we have to spread our seed - that is the evolutionary purpose of our existence.

Women will try and find a better provider for her current or potential children because that is the evolutionary purpose of her existence.

We live in a society where the female perspective is by default the right one. So every male behavior is illegitimized or worse criminalized. Hence the common tropes in life/movies/tv - men are pigs, men think with their dicks etc. etc.

iamkarnath • 11 points • 23 February, 2015 08:52 PM

Mine was a cyclist. Different details, same effing story.

jb\_trp • 3 points • 23 February, 2015 08:58 PM

I feel you, brother. But isn't life better now? I know if that stuff didn't happen in my life, I wouldn't have found TRP, I wouldn't be doing all the cool things I'm doing with my life now, and there are at least a dozen different women I wouldn't have fucked. Eh.

iamkarnath • 2 points • 24 February, 2015 05:32 PM

YES! It led me right here. Focusing on myself and happier than ever.

stevredpill • 27 points • 23 February, 2015 06:25 PM

The far more offensive part of AWALT, however, doesn't come up in discussion nearly as often: Women are malleable sheep. A woman's threshold for loser-dom, and what constitutes the right circumstances to make her "like that," are completely fluid.

Most subtle, legit point I have heard on TRP in a while. Thank you for opening this new avenue of thought in my brain.

It's not unreasonable for people to not like a loser. It is unreasonable for your standards of loser to shift so easily. Men are not like that. Women are all like that.

[deleted] • 13 points • 23 February, 2015 09:35 PM

Women fear that men are also like that though, which is the essence of dread game. It's also why dread game works really well on women who change goal posts easily. They're keenly aware of how quickly it can happen.

Cyralea • 14 points • 23 February, 2015 06:17 PM

AWALT is a useful metric, because women honestly aren't very different when it comes to their core biology. They'll have unique quirks of personality, interests, goals, etc. but when it comes to what turns them on, they're remarkably similar.

It's all too easy to screw up independently evaluating each woman. A lot of men know at least one example of a good girl who "would never do that", only to find out the truth later. By assuming AWALT, you're pretty much right the vast majority of the time.

deadally • 23 points • 23 February, 2015 06:31 PM

[AWALT isn't just a reminder or warning. It's like a battle cry, reminding you to always be on the upward trend. To always be the best. And to always become better. Because if you're anything less, you'll lose respect.

AWALT is also our comfort. There's always someone better, and always just the right circumstances. Maybe your woman will surprise you by demonstrating a greater tolerance than you thought she had, but if she doesn't, and you know you did your best, and were the best version of yourself possible AWALT. Shit happens. She's not yours. It's just your turn. Or if things were beyond your control – you lost your job, you got sick, you were injured, you experienced a death of a loved one, and your woman left the weak man you became – AWALT. Shit happens. |

Here's a big problem with the whole mentality: it frames everything as about how women perceive you and your actions. This is the exact opposite of TRP philosophy, which has a golden rule that these changes you make need to be for yourself. "AWALT" as a concept is very often used to demonize women and project onto women you've never met.

So if I give you your point that AWALT is true, and the only difference is in womens' thresholds and response to you, then you can just as well throw the concept out on the grounds that, no, in fact, NOT all women are like that? Why? Because then you're going to run into enough women whose threshold is so high that they might as well not be like that, no matter what happens to them. So you approach them in a certain way with certain assumptions, hoping to catch the right fish, and you get shot down.

All of this works for getting hookups, but it does not necessarily work for your relationships. A recent post about marriage saw something I wrote gain some popularity, with fellows on here commenting that MY marriage must be an outlier, that my woman must be the perfect red pill woman, and I must be the ever-rare natural alpha. None of those things is true, not fully. There are aspects of red pill philosophy that do fit my relationship and my wife. But let me emphasize this: if I approached my relationship with the mindset that comes with the AWALT principle, then I would have a failed relationship.

Another problem with AWALT? It's safe; it's passive. It's bona fide cowardice. If I present you a dichotomous situation, which one sounds more manly?

1) You don't know this woman, and you communicate to figure out just how she is, working out details with

well-honed social skills.

2) You don't know this woman, and you approach her with a formula that, 60% of the time, it works every time. AWALT presents a safe mindset for men to retreat to, because it provides an easy answer.

Why did my girlfriend lose interest? AWALT. Why did my wife cheat on me? AWALT. Why don't women look at me? AWALT.

It's the go-to answer that never really answers anything. It could be that your wife cheated on you because you were absent and narcissistic.

Throwing a blanket over all women is not a useful exercise. All it does is provide an easy (possibly incorrect) answer to your questions about women.

Far more difficult is actually talking and engaging with women. Perhaps she fits the AWALT ideal. Or perhaps she's like my wife, who takes a few pieces of it but is generally not going to respond how you think she will.

AWALT as a concept is combative and is all about weakness. Pray to the gods for the answers to your burning questions! It's simple! AWALT!

How about we move forward assuming that people in general like to be around someone who has self respect, and if you supplicate yourself, nobody-- not your wife, not your girlfriend, not your boss, not your friends-- is going to gain respect. ALL humans, men and women, are irrational at the core.

boscoist • 9 points • 23 February, 2015 11:52 PM

From what I've seen here, AWALT is 99% followed up with a search for what OP/you did to trigger that response. So AWALT is less of a comfort and more of a "yes, all women are capable of that, what did you do to make it necessary?" AWALT is the beginning, not the end.

[deleted] • 3 points • 24 February, 2015 03:46 AM

I mostly use AWALT to remind me that there's no such a thing as "unconditional" or "true" love. I still long for love and companionship, but AWALT reminds me those are something I'll never truly get; the closest thing to it would be an emulated feeling, something that would never get close to the real thing.

[deleted] • 3 points • 24 February, 2015 02:37 AM

I needed to hear this right now so bad. thank you.

Razahir\_Khemse • 3 points • 24 February, 2015 05:53 AM

'She's not yours. It's just your turn. '

Man, you nailed it with this.

GregariousWolf • 3 points • 24 February, 2015 12:13 PM

I always enjoy reading your posts.

It is also true that AMALT. Men feel sexual urges for younger, hotter, tighter women. No public awareness campaign will ever change this. Detractors make it out that AWALT is some kind of bigotry, when all it really boils down to is a reminder to men of what drives sexual attraction in women.

traderjim151 • 10 points • 23 February, 2015 05:24 PM **[recovered]**

I think AWALT is a good approximation. Obviously some women are outliers, but there is certainly a large portion of women who are classically feminine and very similar to eachother.

The variability of IQ scores has been shown to be greater in men than women. There is a greater range of men at the bottom and the top, whilst most women fall into a smaller range. I realize this also applies to men and women overall. There are many different types of men with different personalities, whilst women fall into a smaller range.

But in the end I think it's really an APALT. All people are like this. All people are attracted to power and beauty and if given the opportunity would fuck everything and everyone they wanted if they did not have to face the consequences.

Ganadorf • 19 points • 23 February, 2015 05:41 PM [recovered]

AWALT is repeated on loop here because a lot of the newer people keep thinking they finally found a unicorn, or that their new crush/LTR could *nevverrr* cheat on them. AWALT is just a constant reminder.

JovianTrainWreck • 17 points • 23 February, 2015 06:42 PM

*"my new hawt plate is an exception tho! she's an 8.9356, takes it in the pooper, lieks teh same things i do and loves teh secks! remember guyz there are exceptionzzz! im 18 btw"*

Ya mean like that?

widec • 5 points • 23 February, 2015 11:18 PM

Can't count the number of comments I see that begin with "My unicorn..."

thrice\_as\_nice • 5 points • 23 February, 2015 06:03 PM

Agree. As I read through this I was thinking that, defined in this manner, AMALT, too. To me, the point is to know that women are not typically loving in an unconditional way, as their "softness" is portrayed, i.e. the pedestal doesn't usually exist. It doesn't mean it's wrong, per se, because men are the same way, IMO.

meet\_me\_at\_high\_noon • 2 points • 24 February, 2015 11:41 PM

I know everyone here understands what you mean when you say loser, but I think it's important to give a definition. To me, a "loser" in the context you are using it doesn't mean a bum necessarily, although it obviously covers that.

It's a cover-all term for guys who may in fact, be really funny, smart, nice guys, but who are perceived as weak or worthless to the girl(s) they might be chasing.

Case in point: a younger me chased a girl I loved with all my heart. She was dating a guy who raped her repeatedly (I asked him about it, and he admitted it) and threatened to kill her family. Why did she stay? Because despite his absolute failure as a man, she PERCEIVED him as an alpha. He presented himself that way, despite the fact that I knew he was actually just a loser. But because he presented himself in such a way, she chose to stay for a long time. It didn't matter that I was in college, had a job, and stayed in shape. I wasn't an alpha in attitude and perception because I pined after her. Thus, she chose him.

So I think when you say loser it's always important to clarify the meaning behind that term.

youhadanidea • 2 points • 24 February, 2015 12:54 AM

This is by far one of the most enlightening posts I've read on TRP. After beginning my TRP journey about three weeks ago, I suppose deep down I realized why my last LTR dumped me was because I was a loser. But it wasn't until I read this post that the idea finally sank in and I came to terms with the fact that she left me was entirely because I was a loser. Wow. I've had the moment of clarity you feel after having sex for almost an hour now because I've finally come to terms with this.

waynebradysworld • 5 points • 23 February, 2015 11:41 PM

Women - If they didn't have snatches there would be a bounty on em

Philhelm • 3 points • 24 February, 2015 09:00 PM

I can't believe that someone down-voted this.

waynebradysworld • 3 points • 24 February, 2015 10:10 PM

Some OG rp shit I heard from my uncle in like 2000. Kids these days... Maybe they dont know what a snatch is?

[deleted] • 5 points • 23 February, 2015 06:09 PM\*

Don't expect things from women. Don't hold them to standards. They're going to do whatever they want. Accept it. It's their right to do what they want, and if you expect them to do certain things for you in exchange for things you do, that's entitled male privilege.

I need an opinion on my thinking regarding this ^ quote. Recently I lent my school notes to a girl to make a copy for herself. I did it strictly because she asked and I thought why not (I didnt expect anything in return). A couple days after that, I asked her to ask someone on FB a question and then tell me what he answered. She started making excuses that she is on the phone and she can't really message him now, etc. etc. (there was no excuse really). I felt kind of angry at her. Not really angry, but mild anger / dissatisfaction. If I helped her, why is she avoiding to help me? I want to repeat myself, I didn't expect to return the favour, I was just dissatisfied that she didnt want to help me.

Is this AWALT or is she just a type of person, who doesnt return kindness with kindness?

EDIT: Why downvotes?

[deleted] • 10 points • 23 February, 2015 06:15 PM

Probably the latter, sounds like just one of those women who expect men to do everything they ask, but if a man asks for anything no matter how simple they flake out. Lesson learned here is to not do favors for random women; don't encourage that attitude. It's the "pussy pass", though I'm no expert on that.

Now if it's a friend/acquaintance/coworker that you genuinely have no amorous intentions toward and it's been established as a mutually beneficial situation, by all means, the gender isn't the factor there.

[deleted] • 0 points • 23 February, 2015 06:20 PM

She is somewhat a friend of mine and I helped her because it's nice to help friends/people, I didnt do it because "I'm beta, always trying to please women blablabla".

DRMMR76 • 3 points • 24 February, 2015 05:25 PM

Now I know nothing is ever 100%, but the vast majority of women lack something that most men do not: honor. If you are on cool terms with a guy and you helped him, he'll probably help you. Hell even if you didn't help him, he'll probably help you. Let's say you're at a gas station and your battery is dead. Who do you ask to jump start your car? A guy or a girl? The guy will probably say yes because that's just what guys do. A girl won't. Now let's say the guy who helped jump you leaves the gas station and you leave a few minutes later. You see him a mile down the road with a flat tire. Would you stop to help? Probably. He just helped you. Security concerns aside, guys understand honor, the sense of doing the right thing, repayment of debts even unspoken, and so forth. Women do not.

Something men need to understand. To all women men fit into exactly two categories: potential genetic material donors and resource donors. That's it. If you're not the first one, you're the second on by default. And if you're the second one, you're not really even a person to them. You are just one tool in a sea of tools to be used when they can and when they need, and to be discarded when they no longer need you. That's why she didn't help you after you helped her. You were a resource. You supplied the resources she expected you to supply. Once that one way transaction was complete, you went back to not existing in her mind.

This is why it's very unwise to be actual friends with women. Yes you can be colleagues, friendly, civil, and all that. But never put a women in the same real friend category you would another man, because she will never ever think of you on those same terms. You're either someone she wants to fuck(AF) or everyone else(BB). And women see nothing wrong with this. Many are not even consciously aware of this dynamic in their own lives. And the ones that are don't care. They see it as their right. And for arguably good reason: biology. It's in their genes. Women exist for procreation and men exist to do pretty much everything else. They need a man for procreation and thus search for their AF. If you're not one of those to them, you're just some thing that exists to make their lives easier on them and their children.

I'm not saying you shouldn't have given her the notes, though I think one could make the argument that women have fought this "we're equal, we can do everything a man can do" fight for so long they deserve to sleep in the bed they made and that you might have been justified in telling her no. But even if your own sense of honor drove you to give her the notes, not to appease her but to appease your own sense of doing the right thing, you were wrong to ever expect her to reciprocate or even acknowledge you helped. You were a tool doing what tools are meant for: assisting in a task and then being set aside until needed again.

Your biggest flaw is in thinking women are capable of the same level of genuine friendship with you that men are. They are not and they never will be. Even if you've been married for decades, there will always be that biological imperative that is forcing you into one category or the other. And that ties in directly with what the OP said about AWALT. If you're not a loser, you're probably a genetic donor (AF) to her. The minute you lose that status, you get defaulted to resource donor while she searches for another, better, genetic donor.

jb\_trp • 2 points • 23 February, 2015 09:04 PM

I agree that it's nice to help people who are your friends--but men and women are very different: Their biology, the way they're socialized, the way they're viewed/treated by society/media/the government, etc.

For all these reasons, I think men are *generally* more loyal, altruistic, and will repay your favor out of honor (not all men, but generally). Now, certain women might repay your favor, but it doesn't surprise me that even a friend of yours wont.

Men use tools. Women use men.

bohemian\_fappsoody • 3 points • 24 February, 2015 07:22 AM

This is AWALT. Specifically, this is an extrapolation of Briffault's Law, namely, "The female, not the male, determines all the conditions of the animal family. Where the female can derive no benefit from association with the male, no such association takes place." Now this does, as here, play itself out beyond determining the "conditions of the family."

In your situation, which is really quite common, the female gains a benefit from the male by asking for and

receiving a small favor. The naive male expects the female to behave the way a male would (or in his mind, they way a decent human being would), i.e., with a sense of duty and gratitude that would compel the male to return a like favor when requested (even if the original favor was freely given without such expectations). The female, however, does not feel a sense of obligation in that way. Perhaps she would return the favor if she felt like like it would benefit her down the road, but not as payback for a favor already given. She already got what she wanted. If there's no benefit from association with that male after having received the favor, she won't return the favor. It just doesn't compute, and she won't feel like doing the favor - and for women, that's the end of the discussion. (And here, it also suggests that she sees little or no value in a relationship of any kind with you, or she thinks all she has to do is ask for something else, and you will acquiesce.)

Now, let's be clear about what AWALT means, because there's a lot of nonsense being spit on this thread. It is not a useful approximation, it is not a generally applied shorthand, it is not usually true but with some outliers. It is a fundamental truth about the *nature* of all women, not the behavior of each and every woman. There's a difference. Of course there are outliers and exceptions as to behaviors, because civilization demands that men and women often act contrary to their animal natures (and there may be many other reasons why people have learned to repress their animal instincts). But do not doubt that regardless of how some women have learned to behave, it is their nature to treat you in a manner that reflects what value they believe they can get from you down the road, not what value you have already provided them. Does every woman behave like this? No. Some have been civilized. But even those that have been civilized possess this *nature*, and in more extreme situations, this nature will reveal itself, because AWALT.

RedPope • 2 points • 24 February, 2015 05:24 AM

This is a mild form of what we call a Covert Contract.

You're thinking: "I did a favor for this girl, she owes me a favor in return." But you never said that to her, and she never agreed to it. The contract exists only in your mind.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 February, 2015 05:26 PM

I know what you mean, I read No more mr. nice guy. I pointed out 2 times that this is NOT what I was thinking/doing. I didn't feel she needs to do me favour.

theoctopuss • 1 point • 24 February, 2015 02:14 PM

Take it as a lesson. If a girl wants something, immediately factor in several things:

1. "If she was a dude, would I do the same thing?"
2. "What do I get out of this?"

Never, ever, EVER expect a woman to return the favor. In fact, if you do things for her without getting anything (sex, time, etc.) out of it, she will see you as another orbiter. Personally, what I would do follows along these lines.

Her: heyyyyy, can you give me your notes to copy? Pretty pleeeaaassee?

Me: *Smirk* Too bad, my notes are already reserved for (insert girls name here). You'll have to do better than that."

This would change the frame from "business", where she is trying to manipulate (buy) your time and effort (notes) with the most gain for her, to a more playful frame with the ability to escalate. Either she's going to be down with it by this point, or she's not. You should already be moving on to the next girl, even if she seems interested. Girls can pick up on those things, and it is a good way to show preselection and to instill

dread.

If two different girls aren't interested in you, get them to compete with each other. There's a chance that at least one of them will become more attracted to you because "Oh, she's with him? He must have something good going. I want it, and I want it now!"

betaturningalpha • 1 point • 24 February, 2015 04:14 AM

you hit the nail dead on with that post. thanks for the insight.

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 February, 2015 09:30 AM

AWALT isn't just a reminder or warning. It's like a battle cry, reminding you to always be on the upward trend. To always be the best. And to always become better. Because if you're anything less, you'll lose respect.

Very nice post, i especially keep the quoted part. After a man encounters the truth on the way society works and the anger phase is over, he should embrace it and comprehend that it can be another driving force to stop him from becoming stale and instead let him become better.

It is like a woman settles in a relationship, becomes fat and then the man abandons her. She will cry AMALT! but in reality it was her mistake, not the mans.

5t3fan0 • 1 point • 16 June, 2015 01:00 PM

i think im painting awalt in big, bright letters on a wall in my room

mrgrowl94 • 1 point • 23 February, 2015 05:35 PM

I agree with the other poster in saying that even males are like that. If given the opportunity they would do the same thing a female does

Redrog1 • 1 point • 23 February, 2015 06:00 PM

I don't think AMALT is wrong, but our like that is different than the women's like that. We have different biological tendencies, but both sexes have tendencies.

evilquesadilla • -1 points • 23 February, 2015 11:42 PM [recovered]

Within the context of TRP, it's okay to say AWALT, even though the theoretical truth is not all woman are like anything. There will always be someone, at least one person, that's not like "that", whatever "that" may be, AWALT or All-Men-Are-Pigs, or whatever.

So really it's an issue about launching your point from a defensible position. When you use absolutes such as AWALT, you are immediately opening up a weakness for your opposition to launch an attack against. Whether you are successful in defending your platform or not (for example, redpillbanana did an excellent job at this), the discussion/argument has now just been degraded to semantics, and your point has been lost.

In TRP, it's fine, we agree. People should be treated as the most common denominator unless proven otherwise, so it is very practical to stick with AWALT, because chances are, you will get AWALT, and you better figure out how to deal with AWALT.

But outside of TRP, not such a good idea unless you just want to stir up an internet fight.

Just IMHO.

trplurker • 2 points • 24 February, 2015 03:11 AM [recovered]

No, AWALT

Women are AWALT for the same reason you were born with two arms, two legs, two eyes, one heart and a penis, because it's evolutionary advantageous. What we are discussing isn't some social construct, it's base female animal instincts. It's shit that's hundreds of thousands if not millions of years old, it's primal and it's omnipresent. The single biggest mistake any man can make is to assume that a woman has the same set of primal instincts that he does, they don't and theirs are rigged to fuck male homo sapiens over for the betterment of her children.

FukknPissd • 1 point • 24 February, 2015 12:37 PM

A couple years ago I was in a bar for Halloween. Fifty bucks all you can drink beer and cocktails. I head over to the bar, grab two drinks, one each for myself and my lady, and proceed onwards to the dance floor. On the dance floor, which is packed and pumping...I realize that the one drink I am holding in my hand is rapidly emptying out, through a crack in the plastic cup...and its pouring onto this girl, who is basically standing next to me, stationary, on the dance floor, like she is looking for someone.. She realizes, about the same time that I do, that my drink is pouring onto the jacket she has strung over her arm, and....just...like...that...she flips her shit, and throws her drink into my face. Well of course, I don't have one drink, I have two, so I empty the second, still wholly full drink into her frothing gape!!! She goes nuclear.....grabs my face with her nails, and pulls, down, hard... I grab her fucking arm, but in her other hand she already had the stiletto out... She nailed me 3 times in the pip, before one of my other lady friends grabs her, and another lady friend takes me outside to cool off. Fucking bitches. Having them grow up in a world where they don't face any real consequences, is a fucking issue.

waldener • 0 points • 24 February, 2015 01:36 AM

What does "All Women Are Like That" really mean? It means that if you don't measure up, a woman will lose her respect for you.

This is the same for everyone, regardless of gender. You have to earn respect, and you can lose respect.

[deleted] comment score below threshold • -6 points • 23 February, 2015 05:56 PM\*

For logical reasons alone, sentences like "all x always have the property y" are either tautological or unfounded guesswork.

And no woman, anywhere, is going to say, "Well, my boyfriend suddenly started sucking and became a total loser, but because we're already in a committed relationship, I'm going to stay with him forever, never cheat, never leave, and continue to treat him with the utmost respect, no matter how big of a loser he becomes or how long this goes on." Because there are no exceptions. All women are like that.

Wrong. I know at least three women like this. One of them, my grandmother, said such things almost literally on a daily basis. Reason: She was stoutly catholic and for her, divorce was a sin and just no option at all. Marriage was hell on earth after that, but yeah, women DO stick around with losers they despise sometimes.

I understand that AWALT makes some people feel superior, but it's feel-good-bullshit nonetheless. You even confess to that. But truth usually hurts and there's no sense in finding "comfort" in useless generalizations. If you need some *dogma* - and AWALT is nothing else - to believe in for "comfort", as you say, you need some serious work on your inner game.

**She left you** because **you** became unattractive by **her** standards - why do you need to talk about ALL women to explain this? You don't.

And now bring on the downvotes because I dare to suggest some *nuance*.

[deleted] • 4 points • 24 February, 2015 12:10 AM\*

What your grandmother had was principles.

What people, not just women, don't have today is principles.

Each partner in a relationship has to have standards to live up to, and principles they won't break.

Religion was a decent facilitator of principle, but it was based on a false premise. The most solid basis for principle is truth, but since there is no truth, it is up to each person to decide what is in their best interest.

What is in the best interest is where AWALT resides. AF/BB.

Cyralea • 9 points • 23 February, 2015 06:14 PM

Using religion is a bit unfair, as it's historically been the *only* effective limiter against hypergamy. The only way to make a woman Not Like That is to indoctrinate her very early in life, which is what religion does fantastically.

You can bet she would have been like that in its absence, which is OP's point.

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 February, 2015 06:37 PM

Depending on where you live, 20-80% of women are religious, most of the time being religious is so deeply culturally ingrained that it's not an exception but the rule. I have trouble understanding the complaints of some men about "sluts" who "ride the cock carousel" in their youth - why don't you go to church and find a girl who saves herself for marriage? It's easy and at least you share the same values. - I exaggerate a little bit for the sake of clarity. - Also, it's just an example. Other women "stick around" for the kids, because of hope, because of money, because of their parents, etc. etc.

TA\_2985\_A6E1\_9FC3 • 1 points • 23 February, 2015 08:22 PM **[recovered]**

I see you've never read Dalrock.

Dalrock has a relatively long series of articles on: 1) how most churches have noted that women are their core constituencies and now cater to them. That catering does not make her man "head of family", but the pastor now extols the virtue of "equality" in marriage. They go on to say that if she is "unhappy" she has earned the right to divorce him. 2) He gives chapter and verse, examples, of this very behavior. To wit: Jenny Erikson (<https://dalrock.wordpress.com/category/jenny-erikson/>); pastor Mark Driscoll (<https://dalrock.wordpress.com/category/mark-driscoll/>). So, for the Red Pill man, that she is a church-going woman is a RedFlag, not a positive indication that she'll be loyal.

See also: Sunday Morning Night Club --

<http://www.antifeministtech.info/category/sunday-morning-nightclub-exploits/>

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 February, 2015 06:59 AM

Actually Dalrock & Rational Male got me here in the first place, but I don't remember reading those texts. I'll check them out, thanks.

Cyralea • 5 points • 23 February, 2015 06:41 PM

Depending on where you live, 20-80% of women are religious, most of the time being religious is so deeply culturally ingrained that it's not an exception but the rule.

The problem is that if the culture doesn't back it up, like in the West, women revert to their base desires. What good are Christian morals about purity if society does nothing to punish sexual proclivity? That combination works until she's free of the house, at which point she'll try to make up

for lost time with excessive promiscuity.

why don't you go to church and find a girl who saves herself for marriage? It's easy and at least you share the same values.

Were I religious that would be precisely what I'd do. Instead I opted to pursue a woman from a culture that heavily frowns on promiscuity and divorce.

FatStig • 0 points • 23 February, 2015 06:26 PM [recovered]

I understand that AWALT makes some people feel superior, but it's feel-good-bullshit nonetheless. You even confess to that. But truth usually hurts and there's no sense in finding "comfort" in useless generalizations. If you need some dogma - and AWALT is nothing else - to believe in for "comfort", as you say, you need some serious work on your inner game.

It's not comfort or feeling superior you smug twat. It's resigned. Women aren't men. Men don't leave just because something hotter shows up.

mrp3anut • 9 points • 23 February, 2015 06:53 PM

Bullshit, Men jsut leaving because something hotter showed up was the driving force behind modern day alimony. Men would hit 40 or so, thier kids would be grown or mostly so then they would buy a red sports car, trade their 40yo wife for 2 20yo girlfriends and the wife would be left with nothing since she did trade all of her youth for the safety of his resources.

In our current age we are living in the exact opposite world where women are bailing because the state now guarantees that the man has to support them even if she leaves.

This whole men are angels while women are super evil pieces of shit is retarded. Men suck, women suck, basically everyone fucking sucks and you have to work to not suck and to find the few other people out there that don't suck.

FatStig • -1 points • 23 February, 2015 08:03 PM [recovered]

modern day alimony

Mmmkay. What was the divorce rate before that?

This whole men are angels while women are super evil pieces of shit is retarded. Men suck, women suck, basically everyone fucking sucks and you have to work to not suck and to find the few other people out there that don't suck.

They suck in different ways. You still think they're the same with different genitalia.

mrp3anut • 1 point • 23 February, 2015 10:22 PM

Comparing divorce rates may give insight to the rate at which men will leave compared to men if you control all other variables. That control does not exist though. Divorce was incredibly difficult by old laws so many of the guys that would have bounced back then just picked up mistresses instead. Whether that is better or not is debatable but not the point of discussion here.

No, I don't believe they are the same in every way but in this case men and women are not much different if at all. Men and women will both leave if they aren't restrained by law or social pressures which is why our old laws, traditions, and social pressures were so heavily anti divorce.

Either way being male does not automatically make you honorable. You must decided to be and

work to maintain it.

FatStig • 1 points • 23 February, 2015 10:30 PM [\[recovered\]](#)

You are missing the point. Women have no innate concept of honor. They don't love like men either. They can only "love" through admiration and they can only admire one man. Men can love many women. Hypergamy/polygamy.

<http://therationalmale.com/2012/09/10/men-in-love/>

<http://therationalmale.com/2011/12/27/women-in-love/>

mrp3anut • 1 point • 24 February, 2015 02:28 PM

I never said men and women love the same or that women have an innate sense of honor. The point was made that men will not bail on a relationship if a better option turns up which is bullshit.

While honor may be a male concept it does not mean that men are born with a sense of honor or that honor is even an evolutionary driver for men. With everything masculine you must cultivate that in yourself or don't. The male leaders of society have understood this for 1000s of years which is why patriarchal societies implement strict divorce laws and social pressures on both men and women to play by the rules.

[deleted] • 0 points • 25 February, 2015 03:44 PM

[\[permanently deleted\]](#)

mrp3anut • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 03:55 PM

You are confusing the male concept of status with the female version of status.

Men can be high status to other men as in trustworthy, hardworking, smart etc and never get laid.

Status to women is nonsensical when compared to the male values. You see this in the women that swoon over murderers.

Honor does not give tingles but it does build societies. Either way men have to force it on other men to make it work. It isn't some magic essence we are born with in fact the baseline is that most men are not honorable when given the choice.

[deleted] • 0 points • 25 February, 2015 07:43 PM

[\[permanently deleted\]](#)

[deleted] • 0 points • 23 February, 2015 06:30 PM\*

It's not comfort or feeling superior you smug twat

Maybe you didn't read the original post above, because OP wrote just that:

AWALT is also our comfort.

Also:

Men don't leave just because something hotter shows up.

Yeah, lol, I'd like to see some sources on that. Until then, I strongly disagree. The number of midlife-

crisis-men leaving their 40-something wives just because they found someone younger & hotter tells a different story. This "men are soooo loyal"-bullshit sometimes perpetuated here is just another ideological feel-good-fantasy.

FatStig • 1 points • 23 February, 2015 08:02 PM **[recovered]**

Polygamy vs hypergamy. Marriage was invented because men could be generally counted on honoring their contracts.

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 February, 2015 07:03 AM

Interesting idea, but without any background sources to back this up, I still doubt it. Marriage was invented to 1.) match Betas up with a female, 2.) secure the distribution of resources to the family. Adultery was common for both sexes and laws were developed to keep both males and females in check. -- Usually when men have to chose between a concrete option to get their dick wet and something abstract like "honoring a contract", they chose the former.

NaughtyFred • 0 points • 24 February, 2015 01:09 AM

I'm pretty sure you're a girl

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 February, 2015 07:50 AM

I wish I were! Being a girl must be awesome!

[deleted] • 0 points • 23 February, 2015 11:31 PM

I agree 100%. I do wish you had tied this into all people are like that. Humans have an intrinsic desire to better themselves and their positions. "Loser" applies just as well to people who wont do better as it does to people who can't. What you have described is the female expression of this human dynamic.