

Generalizations and truth.

54 upvotes | 1 August, 2015 | by Whisper

If you have a controversial or unpopular opinion, and you say or write it, sooner or later, someone is going to accuse you of "generalizing", as if this were somehow a refutation of what you have said.

It's pointless to argue with them. Debates are won, in the long term, by action, not words. But it helps us to understand why people would say such a thing.

Some people think generalizations are not "true", or, at least, not "true" enough. And yet everything we ever say is a generalization, whether it is that objects on earth fall at 9.8 m/s^2 , or that women are shorter than men, or that I weigh 210 pounds.

So what does it mean to be "true"? What does the word *truth* mean? To say "accuracy" or "representation" means nothing, these are just other words for truth. The question to ask is why we *care* about truth. Why do we argue about what is true? Why do we seek to find it out? When we ask this question, we would in danger of disappearing up our own ass... except that there is a simple straightforward answer.

We care about what is true because it enables us to predict what will happen. Knowing the law of gravity lets me predict the orbit of planets, knowing someone's address lets us predict where we will find them.

Simple enough, and so much for philosophy. **The word "truth" means "predictive power".** This is how we test truth, and why we care about it, so this is how we define it.

Whenever someone asks you if something is true, ask yourself what it empowers you to predict, and what that empowers you to do. You do not need to possess the absolute truth, the perfect model that would allow you to predict *everything*, to say something is "true". It is enough that something be true *enough* to help you.

Are *ALL* women like "that"?

Who can say? To perfectly describe all women would require more words than can be printed on every flat surface in the universe, in microscopic print. We're not here to perfectly describe women, or ourselves, or humans in general. We're here to describe them *well enough* to get done what we need and want to get done.

Red Pill "truths" are not absolutely true, because nothing we have is. They are *true enough to help us do what we need to*.

Related reading:

[Asimov's Axiom.](#)

[Wittgenstein's Ladder.](#)

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

trpSenator • 15 points • 1 August, 2015 04:24 AM

I have a question. Why is it that women tend to HATE generalizations, while men have very little problem using generalizations for simplicities sake. I never hear strong men say, "Don't say that. Not ALL men are like that!" But I hear all the time women say, "Not ALL women are like that!"

I mean, it should be common sense that obviously there are exceptions, yet women tend to get annoyed by it. Maybe it has something to do with self esteem? As in, "Well yeah, men don't like sluts because they are unbalanced and come with tons of baggage. But not ALL sluts are like that. I mean, I'm a slut, and I'm pretty mentally sound. I don't want men thinking I'm one of those bad sluts; I'm a good slut!"

I dunno. I'm just flinging shit at walls at this point.

[deleted] • 22 points • 1 August, 2015 06:09 AM

Women hate generalizations when they don't fit the woman's narrative, in these cases they bring out anecdotes and examples to counter your points.

Women LOVE generalizations when they fit the woman's talking points. Like the undying wage gap myth.

Women do not argue to make sense of and resolve the argument, they argue to win. They will use fallacies, they will lie, they will omit facts, they will even cry if they have to. All just to get the consensus on her side, regardless if anything actually makes sense.

They are mercenary.

trpSenator • 9 points • 1 August, 2015 06:16 AM

I think it has more to do with their desire to be a special snowflake. That for some reason they must be unique and special, and must push relentlessly from being painted under a broad brush.

For some reason, they don't want to be "like all the rest of the women." That when they feel like they are just another dot in the noise of society, that all of a sudden they lose all value. Almost like they all must feel like their are unique princesses who shine out among the vast noise of pussy that exists in the world.

They can't just be a good woman. They need to be a unique woman. A rare breed. Something better than the rest.

But really, why is that? Guys have no problem with that. A guy will be very happy admitting he's the top 10% of men. Where a woman almost feels like she has must be the .0000001% of women.

[deleted] • 6 points • 1 August, 2015 06:24 AM

I have noticed this too. The biggest insult I can give to my girlfriend is to call her a "basic bitch". Even though she really is like 90% of girls, she hates being reminded of this.

pophatpill • 9 points • 1 August, 2015 06:54 AM

Why is it that women tend to HATE generalizations

They don't. Women only hate "generalisations" when the generalisations don't benefit them. Women love "generalisations" when the generalisations benefit them.

Women simply support things that benefit them, and oppose things that don't benefit them. The idea of supporting or opposing something on principle is totally foreign to women.

unassumingusername7 • 1 point • 3 August, 2015 08:03 AM

The idea of supporting or opposing something on principle is totally foreign to women.

This is a truth worth forcing into your skull. It's a completely alien mindset to men, so it can be hard to remember. But it's necessary.

[deleted] • 3 points • 1 August, 2015 05:41 AM

"Not all women are like that." I see an implicit agreement that MOST are like that. Where is the most in their statement? Yep. They're agreeing. Not all women are like that, which ones aren't? If they flat out deny it then they're defending their self and giving merit to the thought that they are part of the group showing negative traits.

[deleted] • 1 point • 3 August, 2015 05:33 PM

They are thinking of themselves when they say that..

oldredder • 3 points • 1 August, 2015 04:49 AM

Women love generalizations as long as only women are making them.

RPSigmaStigma • 3 points • 1 August, 2015 08:47 AM

Women hate generalizations because they fear those generalizations being applied to themselves.

Solipsism + personalization = defensiveness

HelperBot_ • 3 points • 1 August, 2015 08:48 AM

Non-Mobile link: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cognitive_distortion

HelperBot™ v1.0 I am a bot. Please message /u/swim1929 with any feedback and/or hate. Counter: 4074

[deleted] • 3 points • 1 August, 2015 10:42 AM

IMO machiavellianism. They use generalization only when it makes them look good.

I never hear strong men say, "Don't say that. Not ALL men are like that!"

Yeah, strong man don't say that, but we've all seen betas say to their oneitis girls "Yes, some men are assholes, but I'm not like that".

Primemale • 3 points • 1 August, 2015 05:25 PM

Effeminate men do this too, it tends to be insecure people who don't like generalisations, I think this just goes hand in hand with the political correctness movement in the west, and masculine men often buck the trends so to speak, whereas everybody else tends to go with the herd, i.e. generalising is not PC. "Everyone is different" when in reality there are clear differences between men/women, races, cultures etc. with some overlap of course.

redpillschool • 2 points • 3 August, 2015 06:54 PM

Solipsism. They can't hear a generalization without putting it through the me-filter first.

"All women do this."

...but wait.. I don't do this...so it can't be true!

Di-onyos • 5 points • 1 August, 2015 04:59 AM

"Generalizations" are necessary to comprehend the universe in any meaningful manner. The human brain lacks the capacity to consider every possibility and option in real time. Hence, "shorthands" are needed. Every person uses them, especially the ones who claim that they don't. What generalizations you use to extrapolate events are extremely important for your success in this world. You want to find and use the generalizations that lead to correct deductions as often as possible, while minimizing risk.

For example, is AWALT always, 100% of cases, correct? Probably not. Unicorns might exist. But in long term, assuming AWALT all the time leads to better results because the negatives of a false positive unicorn are far higher than missing an unicorn if you run into one. You lack the capacity to evaluate every single woman you meet in a thorough manner, therefore always assuming AWALT is safer.

"Spergs", who hate generalizations, live in the cognitional delusion that it is possible to evaluate every situation individually and completely. If you tried, you would be paralyzed by inaction because you would spend far too long collecting data before making a decision. In real world you barely ever have the complete data on hand, you must act on incomplete information, and without generalizations, hypotheses, beliefs that allow you to make deductions from the incomplete data, you wouldn't be able to act.

The trap of generalizations is simplifying the data too much. We could call them "stereotypes". If you are chained to stereotypes, you make wrong decisions because you cannot identify exceptions, leading to mistakes. Less intelligent/developed people rely on "stereotyping", they can't see the trees from the forest(not to mention that their "shorthands" often lead to wrong deductions). Overly intellectual people, "spergs", don't get shit done because they overconsider things, even when the data is clear.

In short, generalizations are a tool to understand and act in the world better, more efficiently. Having the right generalizations is very important to be able to make the right decisions.

NineInchPitchfork • 7 points • 1 August, 2015 04:39 AM*

Predictive power is of limited value if assessed empirically. One must also account for specificity and sensitivity too in order to develop a reliable method of evidence-based testing.

For instance, phrenology was a once popular theory of a science for the mind based upon physical measurements of the skull. It had fairly potent predictive value because it was based on and measured by experience. Subjects proclaimed it accurate in the form of testimonials (field reports) which were compiled and shown as proof of its validity. However, when skeptical observers developed evidence-based tests it was rapidly uncovered as a psuedo-science.

The Red Pill is based on theories based mainly on social sciences (evolutionary psychology, anthropology, sociology, philosophy, gender studies). This poses some difficulty with evidence-based testing. There are certain theories that are amenable to testing, yet we have not shown either a diligence or enthusiasm for discovering it.

Briffault's Law is the perfect example of a social science theorem (anthropology) perfectly capable of being assessed in an evidence-based manner which we refuse to look at it. We prefer its predictive power so we overlook its sketchy origins and rejection by experts in the field. (Inb4 you say that SJW scientists discredited it as an unpopular theory for political correctness reasons. It, in fact, was dead in the water - rejected upon its publication because it failed evidence based review in the 1930s). *Briffault's Law* was predicated on a past history of primitive matriarchal cultures which is not born out by anthropological or archeological evidence.

Briffault's Law was picked from the ashbin of history and reanimated by manosphere bloggers. It suited a narrative that certain writers were presenting. It has predictive value because it is based wholly on experience. Too bad its plain wrong.

We do ourselves a disservice if we blindly accept theorems that accord with our world view. If we are going to

base life decisions on them, we need to do better. An improvement of the self needs a firm foundation.

veritas vos liberabit (truth shall make you free)

Edit: close brackets + a date

[deleted] • 3 points • 1 August, 2015 10:11 AM

Could you go more into on why Briffaults law is wrong. Interested to hear it.

NineInchPitchfork • 3 points • 2 August, 2015 01:36 AM

The fallacious nature of Briffault's work was exposed in a review by E.M. Loeb. Edwin Meyer Loeb was an American anthropologist, whose works helped form the field now known as psychological anthropology. His most famous work is *The Blood Sacrifice Complex*, about cannibalism and human sacrifice.

The review may be found here: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1525/aa.1929.31.1.02a00150/pdf>

Note: it's a pdf file and requires a (safe) download

MattyAnon • 1 point • 3 August, 2015 04:18 PM

Briffault's law (and the corollary, that men genuinely love) would predict that in a divorce, the man will generally be fair and reasonable, and the woman will usually take the man for every last cent that he owns.

I have never gotten anything back from a woman, no matter what I've put in. Most women get much more from men, than the reverse. This is most men and most women's experience. Women ditch men and move on faster than lightning when they branch swing, attempting to take as much with them as possible and leave nothing for the man.

The same happens in friendships. Women have little loyalty and little concept of indebtedness to friendships. Men will repay a favour. Women won't even say thankyou, nevermind repaying it.

Briffault's law has much predictive power and holds true as a valid generalisation.

[deleted] • 3 points • 1 August, 2015 04:07 PM

What we use here at TRP is called "inductive logic." It is effective but not as easily argued for as deductive logic.

throwawayyourliberty • 1 point • 9 September, 2015 12:00 PM

Thanks for sharing me this - i googled this term and first hit was plato.stanford. After 2 minutes my self-perceived intelligence dropped significantly. Amazing cause i experienced more and more arrogance lately in myself. Thanks ;)

oldredder • 2 points • 1 August, 2015 04:49 AM

If people want to be so specific as to need numbers and error-bars so be it - if the context calls for it. Most living, spoken languages aren't built for that for general conversation. People have to accept which context matters.

[deleted] • 2 points • 2 August, 2015 07:43 AM

Exactly. Another term that can be used instead of generalization is 'social construct'. And the idea that if something is a social construct, therefore it is bad or artificial, or worse yet - oppressive.

This is the core of the issue for me. Like when fem bots or SJWs say 'gender is a social construct' attempting to imply that it is false or artificial, because only 99.3% of humans fall squarely into one gender or another (male or female) and therefore, because its not 100% absolute, its all fake and everyone is actually 'trans'. This is the most

irrational argument ever. Everything in our life, as humans, is a social construct. We are limited by our senses and our knowledge. We create predictable patterns that are consistent with how things are in our world, MOST of the time. Like we say that a year is 365 days- but it isn't REALLY. That's why we have leap years, that's why every once in a while we need to add an extra second to a year, for our calendar to match our observation of Earth's orbit around the sun. We call a male human a Man and a Female human a Woman, because that is how it is for the vast majority of people, the vast majority of the time. It's not arbitrary or a system of oppression. There are exceptions to every rule, but we have to base our society and our lives on what is objective and consistent MOST of the time.

And I think for fem bots/sjws they simply refuse to hear things that they do not want to hear. Like that 'transgender' or gender dysphoria is a PROBLEM. It is a deformity, and not healthy. It is not good and it should not be celebrated. These people need help and we need to find a way to alleviate the dysphoria without mutilating their bodies and forcing society to engage in a collective delusion and forced accommodation. It is not oppressive to say that 99.3% of humans are born without gender dysphoria, and therefore that is the norm and considered healthy. The idea that somehow .3 - .7% of the population being an exception to the rule is a redefinition of this basic evolutionary biology is somehow a "social construct" and "oppressive" is just infuriating for me to have to hear all the time.

geology_socks • 1 point • 1 August, 2015 04:22 AM*

RedPill truths are found within the world through experience. If you're not confident in the truths that veteran members preach, put yourself in a position to observe it and then try to disagree. Watch the Disney fantasies of friends turn to ash. Enjoy the harem of plates you've harnessed through self-improvement. Achieve your goals and understand your interactions, weaknesses, and failures. It takes experience to be confident in a redpill truth and have the audacity to hand it off to others.

edwardhwhite • 1 point • 1 August, 2015 01:02 PM

Generalizing is basically non-argument. Just say most in front of these statements and you usually will be fine. Always have examples to back your shit up. The less you argue with people about how the world is, the better.

[deleted] • 1 points • 1 August, 2015 05:48 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 2 August, 2015 08:28 AM

It's kind of mind blowing. The idea that whatever claim someone makes about themselves becomes automatically true and skepticism is bigotry. Resenting generalizations/social constructs is just the 'special snowflake' syndrome on full amplification.

NeoreactionSafe • 1 point • 2 August, 2015 01:07 PM

And simple truths are the most painful for those seeking to indoctrinate us into seeing abstractions that are not truth.

The system is being designed to make people unable to think.

By making a simple, but true statement it wrecks the elaborate illusions that are being spun to rob you of your natural identity.

We break the system when we think... we are supposed to just go along.