

Young women are less likely to intend to use a condom with a more facially attractive male partner, and over 50% of non-virgin women report having intentionally employed a tactic (excluding other preventative birth control methods) to prevent/inhibit effective condom usage

December 9, 2020 | 305 upvotes | by [RSDevotion1](#)

A study by Eleftheriou et al. (2019) found that:

- The more facially attractive a man was judged to be, the more likely it was that participants were willing to have sex with him ($r = 0.987$, $p < 0.001$).
- The more facially attractive a man was judged to be, the less likely women were to intend to use a condom during sex ($r = -0.552$, $p = 0.007$).
- The average perceived STD likelihood for a man had no significant association with his average perceived attractiveness or with participants' average willingness to have sex with him.
- The more attractive a participant judged herself to be, the more she believed that, overall, men are likely to have a STI.
- Women showed significantly higher condom use intentions with men who they rated as less attractive ($p < 0.0005$), men who they rated as less likely to carry or transmit an STI ($p < 0.0005$), men with whom they were less interested in having sex ($p < 0.0005$), and when they estimated that fewer of their peers would also have condomless sex with him ($p < 0.0005$).
- Women with a higher lifetime sexual partner count were more likely to have employed a "condom resistance tactic" ("Since the age of 14, how many times have you successfully avoided using a condom with a man who wanted to use one?").
- Women with a higher lifetime sexual partner count were more likely to have had a STI.

In other words, whether a man is facially attractive was the most important studied predictor of whether women will use a condom during intercourse. **It is worth noting that none of the "condom resistance tactic" options involved using other forms of preventative contraceptive (oral, IUD, etc.), and a few were inherently deceitful in nature.**

Study statistics:

- 480 (English-speaking female) participants
- Average age = 20
- 89.1% of participants reported that they were exclusively attracted to men
- Average lifetime (heterosexual) sexual partner count = 3.7
- 8.8% of participants reported no lifetime sexual partners (virgins)
- 4.6% of non-virgins reported having had a STI
- 0% of women with only 1 lifetime sexual partner reported having had a STI

- 23.8% of women with at least 15 lifetime sexual partners reported having had a STI
- 54.8% of non-virgins reported having employed a "condom resistance tactic"
- 29.5% of non-virgins reported "getting him really aroused and then starting to have sex without a condom"
- 18.3% of non-virgins reported "getting him so sexually excited that he agreed to have sex without a condom"
- 17.8% of non-virgins reported "reassuring him that she was clean (did not have any STIs) so that he would have sex without a condom"
- 16.7% of non-virgins reported "telling him she didn't want to use a condom because sex doesn't feel as good with one on"
- 2.7% of non-virgins reported "preventing him from getting a condom by staying on top of him"

[lifetime sexual partner count vs prevalence of a condom resistance tactic](#)

[lifetime sexual partner count vs prevalence of having had a STI](#)

These results can be regarded as evidence for the sexy son hypothesis, proposed by statistician and geneticist Ronald Fisher (1930). His theory—expanding upon Darwin's much overlooked emphasis on the sexual selection for male traits by females—states that beauty may have evolved by a feedback loop (Fisherian runaway) to become so attractive to females that they are readily willing to copulate with a beautiful male irrespective of other considerations (his ability or willingness to provide for and protect the female), because the male's beauty—which is partly heritable and a possible indication of high genetic quality (genetic diversity/low inbreeding index/heterozygosity)—confer on their offspring a potential reproductive advantage. The same does hold true for the opposite case (males more readily copulate with beautiful females), but males can afford to be much less selective/more promiscuous because they do not need to pay the cost of carrying and giving birth to the offspring (Bateman's Principle of differential parental investment). Hence, women's behavior of disregarding the ability to provide merely at the benefit of better looking offspring has much more drastic implications.

As the authors mentioned, these results may be more easily explained when we consider the work of Fishbein et al. and Williams et al., who found that risk information about a partner is sometimes ignored when the partner is attractive.

Because the mean age of the study is very young (20), it is entirely possible that an older demographic of women past their reproductive years (40+) would report an even higher likelihood of having employed a condom resistance tactic.

It could very well be argued that the tactic of "preventing him from getting a condom by staying on top of him" despite him wanting to use one (which 2.7% of non-virgins reported employing) is rape. This could share relevancy to the fact that [as many American men \(1.1%\) report being "forced to penetrate" each year as women report being raped](#), despite the fact that a much smaller percentage of men than women report victimization over a lifespan, which is mathematically only possible if a smaller group of men than women are being victimized repeatedly, perhaps providing evidence for exclusive selectivity (based on a man's facial attractiveness) in women's choices of which men they sexually victimize.

References:

- Eleftheriou A, Bullock S, Graham C, Skakoon-Sparling S, Ingham R. 2019. *Does attractiveness influence condom use intentions in women who have sex with men?* PLoS ONE. 14(5): e0217152.

Archived from [theredarchive.com](https://www.theredarchive.com)

Comments



thelajestic • 153 points • 9 December, 2020 08:44 PM

Yes, the same group did the same study with men (on attraction condom intention) and and got the same results. And a different study talked about male tactics for condom avoidance, of which physical aggression was an admitted tactic. People are shitty all over, isn't exactly news.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3859530/>

SOWED • 22 points • 10 December, 2020 04:30 AM

At the very least, it's news in the sense that most people don't think this type of thing is common in women.

[deleted] 10 December, 2020 05:53 PM*

[deleted]

SOWED • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 07:26 PM

Sure they do, but I think the assumption is that the man either doesn't mention a condom or resists it, not that the woman resists it.

RSDevotion1[S] • 10 points • 9 December, 2020 08:52 PM

I don't believe that study tested condom resistance versus attractiveness though.

The obvious reason for men avoiding condom usage is sexual pleasure (which I believe that study clarifies), whereas I don't believe condom usage significantly lowers women's experienced pleasure (even though 16.7% of non-virgin women reported telling men otherwise).

thelajestic • 43 points • 9 December, 2020 08:59 PM

I don't believe that study tested condom resistance versus attractiveness though

The study I linked didn't, but the study you discussed - the same people who did that study did the same study on men, to discuss condom resistance versus attractiveness. It found men were less likely to intend to use condoms the more attractive the women were, even though they believed them more likely to have STIs.

It doesn't matter what the reason for it is, whether it's sexual pleasure or not - it's still stupid of either party.

RSDevotion1[S] • 8 points • 9 December, 2020 09:14 PM

Can you link the study you're referring to?

thelajestic • 20 points • 9 December, 2020 09:15 PM

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27315834/>

RSDevotion1[S] • 18 points • 9 December, 2020 09:27 PM

That's interesting. For some reason they only got 51 participants in that study as opposed to 480 for the women's.

In application, if a man was certain he could not impregnate a woman or receive a STI from condomless sex with her, he would most likely opt for condomless sex for increased pleasure. From an evolutionary perspective, there is little cost to a male for impregnating a female of lower genetic quality (attractiveness) because he doesn't have to bear the pregnancy, and it's likely increasing a male's fitness to impregnate any female so long as he doesn't provide for her/the offspring afterward.

[deleted] 10 December, 2020 02:06 AM

[removed]

redditme789 • 10 points • 10 December, 2020 05:34 AM

I don't agree with OP's made-up reasons, but one thing I will use is the difference in sample size. 51 is an extremely small number that would render the credibility of the study insufficient. 480 is a fairly decent sample so I believe the results found would be a relatively accurate indicator for the sample provided (as per demographics and other variables accounted for)

Mrs_Degree[M] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 11:28 AM

Don't make things personal

funlightmandarin • 15 points • 9 December, 2020 09:21 PM

I don't believe that study tested condom resistance versus attractiveness though.

Because men literally don't care, and women have higher criteria to begin with when it comes to casual sex. *Don't care, had sex.*

RSDevotion1[S] • 12 points • 9 December, 2020 09:29 PM

Because men literally don't care

Actually, the second study she linked says otherwise. But from an evolutionary perspective, there is very little risk for a male impregnating a female of lower perceived genetic quality (attractiveness).

funlightmandarin • 9 points • 9 December, 2020 10:29 PM

Men literally don't care about the rate of condom use associated with *attractiveness*. If they get the option to fuck without one, they ALL *want* to take it (whether they're so stupid that they actually do is another topic, some men actually use *both* brains).

They'll want to forego it anyways for the sole reason that it feels better without, irregardless of the attractiveness of the female partner (as long as she's willing).

RSDevotion1[S] • 4 points • 9 December, 2020 10:49 PM

Again, I'm not disagreeing with this, I'm telling you that the second study she linked (albeit having a small sample size) suggests otherwise. What you're arguing (and what I already mentioned) has a more applicable evolutionary basis.

Zonkey_Zeedonk • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 04:52 PM

As a woman I can attest to the fact that condom use makes sex less pleasurable for women as well, but

really it's still fun and it's a lot of fun to not get STDs.

JameisBong • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 02:08 AM

A few Women swear it feels better without it, they will actually insist not to wear one.

Zonkey_Zeedonk • 3 points • 11 December, 2020 02:14 AM

It does feel better, it's also irresponsible if you're not in a monogamous relationship or regularly being STD tested.

Yes, some women are irresponsible. Some men are also irresponsible. Some people are irresponsible. Not news.

free_speech_good • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 05:13 AM*

I swear to god people should actually read the studies linked instead of falling for misleading descriptions.

and got the same results

What same results?

That study didn't report that men's condom use is influenced by their partner's attractiveness, and didn't report the prevalence of certain condom resistance tactics.

The elephant in the room is that this study you linked is inferior by far because it was a qualitative study using interviews. The study OP linked was quantitative, with clear statistics and results.

of which physical aggression was an admitted tactic

Where does it say that the men admitted to using physical aggression?

All I could find was this:

"While some participants did report that some men may use physical or verbal aggression to obtain unprotected sexual intercourse, the participants who spoke about these tactics uniformly rejected the notion that aggressive behavior was normative."

They acknowledged that it happens, that's not admitting to doing it or endorsing it.

People are shitty all over

The fact that you somehow interpret this as him attacking women demonstrates a severe victim complex.

He was using this research to support a theory in evolutionary biology.

thelajestic • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 07:12 AM*

What same results?

That study didn't report that men's condom use is influenced by their partner's attractiveness, and didn't report the prevalence of certain condom resistance tactics.

Read the comment, and the thread. I never once said that study did. I said the same group that he referenced did the same study about men. It is linked farther down.

Edit to add: If you can't find where men admitted to using physical aggression you're going to have to read it again, I'm not spoon feeding you. It references another study. I find it amusing that you're accusing me of not reading when you haven't read any comments or read the study properly.

free_speech_good • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 08:23 AM

You haven't addressed my other points.

And the research doesn't indicate the absolute values the respondents gave for willingness to use condoms, which also matters in determining their attitudes.

Willingness to use condoms that negatively correlates with partner attractiveness can mean

"I will be more compliant with requests to wear a condom if they are less attractive"

or it can mean

"I will insist that they use condoms if they are less attractive"

depending on the exact values given for willingness to use a condom.

Asking people to choose an opinion that best describe theirs instead of just giving a number might be better.

Say, with "insisting that they use a condom" on one end to "insisting that they don't use a condom" on the other end. And everything in between.

thelajestic • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 08:38 AM

Did an edit to address your other point before I saw this, must have been writing at the same time.

Alguyaeda • -1 points • 9 December, 2020 09:34 PM

THIS

SteveSan82 • -1 points • 10 December, 2020 12:52 AM

Whataboutism

TheBookOfSeil • 89 points • 9 December, 2020 08:16 PM

It's sort of funny that despite people's claims to sex being "for fun," this shows that there is some conscious intent by women to want to be impregnated by men who are attractive enough.

ffbtaw2 • 17 points • 9 December, 2020 09:20 PM

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sexy_son_hypothesis

TheBookOfSeil • 28 points • 9 December, 2020 09:34 PM

Precisely.

I have a feeling that the whole "sex is for fun" thing is merely an attempt to normalize promiscuous behavior. The people that say it don't exactly have knowledge of biology beyond their own bodies and whatever the textbook at school told them about cells.

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 10:44 PM

[removed]

[deleted] 10 December, 2020 07:24 AM

[removed]

Mrs_Drgree[M] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 11:49 AM

Be civil

[deleted] 10 December, 2020 10:07 AM

[removed]

[deleted] 10 December, 2020 02:25 AM

[removed]

redditme789 • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 05:40 AM

Care to explain why so many women seem to think having sex of first date is an indication of feelings? That the man must be attracted to them as a LTR prospect then?

Men have and will always admit that there is a difference between LTR and fling material.

More often than not, first date hookups are an indication of the latter. Yet, women seem to

demand that men disregard their own criteria and vetting notions to accommodate the women?

That somehow, men ought to find these women desirable for LTR?

EsauTheRed • 3 points • 11 December, 2020 12:16 AM

Men must always accommodate women, men are always wrong

Mrs_Drgree[M] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 11:27 AM

Be civil

merlinscalculator • 8 points • 10 December, 2020 01:01 AM

So men are also having sex with the intention to impregnate women. It's not for fun, they're spreading their seed. Therefore they should always be happy if a woman they've been with is pregnant. That's literally what they were trying to do.

TheBookOfSeil • 12 points • 10 December, 2020 01:09 AM

So men are also having sex with the intention to impregnate women

The overall intention of sex is reproduction. That's the motivator of sex and orgasms feeling good.

Therefore they should always be happy if a woman they've been with is pregnant. That's literally what they were trying to do.

They'd be fine with it if they weren't financially tied to the woman like in modern times. Before that dynamic, it was all touch and go, so that part isn't exactly true that men should be happy with someone being pregnant anymore.

darkredpintobeans • 11 points • 10 December, 2020 01:36 AM

Actually shotgun weddings are a tradition so old it's in the bible. Except there was a lot less consent involved. [Link](#)

TheBookOfSeil • 0 points • 10 December, 2020 01:40 AM

Yeah, I'm talking about much older prehistoric times, though I did see Pirates of the Caribbean so I know what you're saying.

darkredpintobeans • 4 points • 10 December, 2020 01:58 AM

How much older than the bible? You mean like pre agriculture nomadic tribes? They were pretty egalitarian it's hard not to be when every member plays a role in survival.

TheBookOfSeil • 0 points • 10 December, 2020 02:18 AM

I'm talking about in tribes and possibly even before that. Women had the ancestral role of child-care and the women in the tribe communally raised and cared for the offspring. Sexual selection at some point favored men who pumped and dumped and left the women with the children because that was more efficient in terms of investment and energy expenditure. A man could be out looking for and impregnating more women instead of being locked to the first woman that he found.

darkredpintobeans • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 02:38 PM

It would have to be even farther back in our evolution then, maybe fish stage? Because tribal dads are really good at being dad's even better than modern dads in some ways. I doubt my dad ever would've breastfed me.

Mkg102216 • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 07:51 AM

The overall intention of sex is reproduction. That's the motivator of sex and orgasms feeling good.

Then why the fuck is there a clitoris??

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 08:13 AM

You mean the mini dick? It likely atrophied/shrunk because it became less and less necessary/relevant to sex over time, so women with smaller ones became the norm in sexual selection.

merlinscalculator • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 10:22 PM

Source?

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 10:27 PM

Yeah let me grab a picture real quick. I keep all of my prehistoric clitoris photos stashed away in the garage /s

merlinscalculator • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 11:22 PM

I mean where'd you get that information from? Because that's not what I've learnt

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 06:51 AM

have a feeling that the whole "sex is for fun" thing is merely an attempt to normalize promiscuous behavior.

More bourgeoisie UMC liberal rationalisation that what feels good is rational. Also they like to feel like they're above biological determinism.

Most women think this way. And a high proportion of college educated men.

TheBookOfSeil • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 06:59 AM

I noticed that too. "We've conquered nature" is also a common thought that they appear to share.

Just goes to show that going to college and having a degree isnt what makes someone smart. They need to take the DMT pill.

Maleficent-Kaiba • 16 points • 10 December, 2020 12:28 AM

1. Some men won't have sex if a woman insists on condom usage.
2. Not using a condom is not the same as trying to get pregnant.
- 3.the morning after pill and the pill are the most common form of pregnancy prevention
- 4.most women use condoms to prevent STD not pregnancy
- 5.chances are she is lowering standards to raise her chances of sleeping with the more attractive guy. Not because she wants to be impregnated but because she wants to have sex for fun with him. Men who never wear a condom would put one on if an attractive woman demanded it.

GridReXX • 5 points • 10 December, 2020 12:45 AM

This is what I got from that too. Women are not "consciously" trying to get pregnant because they want to fuck the hot guy.

[deleted] • 4 points • 10 December, 2020 01:01 AM

Then they need to be more conscious.

Maleficent-Kaiba • 6 points • 10 December, 2020 03:54 AM

You could argue a man is not consciously trying to get a woman pregnant when sleeping with her. Sex is for reproduction. Contraception is not a part of nature ☐☐☐☐

GridReXX • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 08:00 AM

Yeah I don't think men are lol

JameisBong • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 11:53 AM

The welfare state incentivices her to get pregnant. A woman with low inhibition wouldn't mind getting pregnant by a hawt guy.

redditthrowaway1478 • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 05:43 AM

Actually agree. Get requests from my gw acct for this from time to time

JameisBong • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 07:35 AM

Don't do it. If nothing else always remember a woman will always change her mind. She will want you to be an involved father at some point in her life.

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 12:51 AM

but study says that women were more likely to intend using condoms when they thought their partner was less likely to have std.

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 12:47 AM

Some men won't have sex if a woman insists on condom usage.

Some, yes, because they might not prefer wearing a condom. I remember one girl who even said that she had sex without condoms because it didn't feel as good, and also while claiming that it was the guy's responsibility to hold it in.

Not using a condom is not the same as trying to get pregnant.

That's a logical conclusion when there is observable effort to prevent the usage of one in this situation.

the morning after pill and the pill are the most common form of pregnancy prevention

This study doesn't account for birth control usage and it specifically says that. Point is that those women wanted to be inseminated by facially attractive men though.

most women use condoms to prevent STD not pregnancy

Yes, which is probably the mistake that leads to "accidents" and their use of morning after pills and abortions. Edit: Also, women don't use condoms. If you're referring to women making men use condoms, then that would be more accurate.

chances are she is lowering standards to raise her chances of sleeping with the more attractive guy.

Women don't need to lower their standards to sleep with men unless they're viscerally unattractive and/or their standards were too high to begin with. Men lowering standards to sleep with women is more common than the other way around.

Not because she wants to be impregnated but because she wants to have sex for fun with him.

So wait.... sex without condom is "for fun?" Does that mean that sex with condom is for business/reproduction? I think you have it backwards because the logic doesn't really add up. Sex without a condom only increases the probability of becoming pregnant. Is the increased risk what makes it "fun?" If so, then that's just foolish.

Men who never wear a condom would put one on if an attractive woman demanded it.

Yes, because men are usually the ones who want it more, and will lower their standards to get it far more often than women actually need to.

Mimoxs • 6 points • 10 December, 2020 03:41 AM

A lot of girls have impreg kinks. Like, do I actually wanna get pregnant? No. But is the idea of pregnancy itself hot? Also yes. So if you're not all that attracted to the guy, you're not gonna really be into it enough for that.

The idea of being impregnated by an ugly/undesirable guy has its own defilement/degradation/corruption kink value to it, though, there's definitely an appeal to be made

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 03:48 AM

A lot of girls have impreg kinks.

Being pregnant isn't any more of a "kink" than a guy wanting to ejaculate inside of a woman is. These are both natural and normal parts of sex. Kinks are deviations from the norm and often synonymously used in place of the word "fetish."

The idea of being impregnated by an ugly/undesirable guy has its own defilement/degradation/corruption kink value to it, though, there's definitely an appeal to be made

Yeah we're not talking about sexual deviations/kinks/fetishes here. This is normal sexual behavior discussion.

redditthrowaway1478 • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 05:45 AM

The idea of being impregnated by an ugly/undesirable guy has its own defilement/degradation/corruption kink value to it, though, there's definitely an appeal to be made

□ based. wtf

wtknight • 24 points • 9 December, 2020 08:52 PM

Who says that it's conscious? She might be so turned on by the attractive guy that her mind might not really logically be thinking about the consequences of him not wearing a condom. There doesn't seem to be an "intent of pregnancy" question provided by the OP and I haven't read the study to see if there is actually one.

TheBookOfSeil • 51 points • 9 December, 2020 09:05 PM

Who says that it's conscious? She might be so turned on by the attractive guy that her mind might not really logically be thinking about the consequences of him not wearing a condom.

It says right in the title that "over 50% of non-virgin women report having *intentionally* ("*consciously*") employed a tactic to prevent/inhibit effective condom usage." There are no other significant desired consequences of sex that could result from ejaculating inside of a woman. It's not like they have a chance of giving birth to a PS5 or a Samsung Smart Fridge or they're automatically entered into a raffle to win a new car.

There doesn't seem to be an "intent of pregnancy" question provided by the OP and I haven't read the study to see if there is actually one.

There isn't. This is utilizing good ol' critical thinking skills.

liquidswan • 15 points • 9 December, 2020 11:26 PM

I almost choked after the PS5/Samsung Smart Fridge/Car Raffle part.

[deleted] • 13 points • 10 December, 2020 12:58 AM

It's not like they have a chance of giving birth to a PS5 or a Samsung Smart Fridge or they're automatically entered into a raffle to win a new car.

Dude I live for your comments on this sub lmaooo!!!

TheBookOfSeil • 6 points • 10 December, 2020 01:12 AM

Glad to be of service :D

[deleted] • 5 points • 10 December, 2020 12:25 AM

This goes back to the Discussion section of the study. They didn't control for hormonal contraceptives. So it's more about fallacious judging of STI safety.

It's 'critical thinking skills' but it's also jumping to conclusions, which even very smart people do every so often.

TheBookOfSeil • 6 points • 10 December, 2020 12:35 AM

This goes back to the Discussion section of the study. They didn't control for hormonal contraceptives. So it's more about fallacious judging of STI safety.

I'm not sure if you can control for that because it's a matter of "I took my pill this week/month or I didn't" so there's less of a chance that women can devise a tactic against it, though there is always lying about taking it when they really didn't, but this is more likely to happen in the context of a short-term relationship than a hookup because it likely wasn't planned weeks in advance.

It's 'critical thinking skills' but it's also jumping to conclusions, which even very smart people do every so often.

Even if I were to be jumping to conclusions, this is a conclusion that I'm fairly certain about. The intention to be impregnated/inseminated is a logical conclusion with the topic and information provided.

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 12:53 AM

Or you know, you can have other methods of contraceptives. I'm always gonna be positive and spread the good word about IUDs instead of the pill.

The lie would then be measured as 'I've lied about using contraceptives'. The study didn't even take hormonal contraceptive use into account. So someone protected against pregnancy would be more positive to forgoing the condom if they're ignorant about STIs. The study discusses this in their limitations section

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:24 AM

Or you know, you can have other methods of contraceptives. I'm always gonna be positive and spread the good word about IUDs instead of the pill.

The implication of this study is that women still do require some men (presumably the less facially attractive ones) to use a condom even if they're already using other methods of birth control, though it says in parenthesis that other forms of birth control were excluded so this is specifically about tactics related to condom usage.

The lie would then be measured as 'I've lied about using contraceptives'. The study didn't even take hormonal contraceptive use into account.

Correct. The focus, though, is still on women and certain men's condom usage.

So someone protected against pregnancy would be more positive to forgoing the condom if they're ignorant about STIs. The study discusses this in their limitations section

"Protected against pregnancy" is a phrase that is casually thrown around too often. There is no "protection against pregnancy" unless parts of the body have been removed that relate to reproduction, like hysterectomies and whatnot. Anyway, if the women were "protected" in this case, then they should not really care about whether a man uses a condom or not. I could make the assumption and say that these men had provided proof of being disease free like you assume that the women were on other forms of birth control, but the point is rather crucial that women were actively trying to prevent condom usage with more facially attractive men. Now the question is, even if they were on birth control, why would they do that? The only conclusion I can logically think of relates to the possibility and willingness of/acceptance to becoming pregnant with those men's children.

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 01:54 AM

Near *protected from pregnancies* then, sorry.

Now the question is, even if they were on birth control, why would they do that?

I'd say it's that people have a fallacy where they think they can judge someone having a STI, and are more likely to fallaciously give an attractive person the benefit of the doubt + the person they'd have a condom on for maybe wouldn't even be someone they'd fuck in the first place. It follows similar lines for men in other studies, I wrote a response here, i'll try to add a link to it here

I'm not talking about hamstering hypotheticals here, the study literally wrote about this in their discussions section. If they'd have asked for contraception use we might've gotten a fuller testing of whether women that used contraceptives had been engaging in condom avoidance to a larger extent.

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 02:28 AM

I'd say it's that people have a fallacy where they think they can judge someone having a STI, and are more likely to fallaciously give an attractive person the benefit of the doubt + the person they'd have a condom on for maybe wouldn't even be someone they'd fuck in the first place.

Nah. If they were that concerned about STI's they wouldn't take on the risk of being infected by an attractive person. I'm still pretty certain that the main function of this is related to reproduction and not some gap in logic or judgement due to them being *soooooo attracted* to the guy. It wouldn't be as widespread if that was the case, in my opinion. Those women just want to be creamed in.

If they'd have asked for contraception use we might've gotten a fuller testing of whether women that used contraceptives had been engaging in condom avoidance to a larger extent.

Yes, so we can only go on the info that we have and make logical inferences from that. Mine isn't some hamstering-in-the-moment/benefit-of-the-doubt hypothetical. I'm inclined to think that the numbers would only make a minor shift though we can't know for certain until we see them. As far as I'm aware, women mostly give exceptions to condom usage to relationship partners and, according to this study, handsome hookups.

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 02:58 AM

Considering they're 20-year-olds whose sex ed we don't know of, I think we often overestimate how ignorant people are of sexual health. For gods sake, people think that pulling out or having sex during menstruation is safe sex. These two are the common myths, but in the grand scheme adolescents believe some really dumb stuff.

At the heart of it is whether we find it believable that women want to get impregnated by specific people, even when it's unsuitable. Considering how sex ed reduces young motherhoods, I'd say that isn't the case. Do men want to impregnate good-looking women or just impregnate in general? I don't think that's the motivation either.

wtknight • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 02:03 PM

They intended to at the time they were turned on and not thinking straight, sure. What I am questioning is that they were going into the encounter thinking "I want this man to get me pregnant and I want to have his child." To me it seems more likely that it's some lizard brain thing rather than something that many women are intentionally planning out before their sexual encounters.

aphel_ion • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 05:44 PM

Your logic doesn't make any sense. That's like saying people that employ a tactic to get an extra slice from a pizza are intentionally and consciously trying to fuel their bodies. I mean, they could be I guess, but consciously they're probably just trying to satisfy their desires.

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 05:53 PM

Desires don't exist apart from reason. You don't have to consciously know the reason either, but yes, they are still connected, so logically it does make sense.

When you feel thirsty, you wouldn't just be drinking water "to satisfy a desire." Same concept here.

aphel_ion • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 02:16 AM

our desires and appetites exist for biological and evolutionary reasons. Consciously people can do things just to satisfy the desire/appetite, or just to fulfill the biological obligation, or some combination of the two.

Especially when it comes to sex, people don't usually do what they do because of a conscious decision to have a baby.

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 02:21 AM

our desires and appetites exist for biological and evolutionary reasons.

Yes.

Consciously people can do things just to satisfy the desire/appetite, or just to fulfill the biological obligation, or some combination of the two.

Yes.

Especially when it comes to sex, people don't usually do what they do because of a conscious decision to have a baby.

They do what they do because of a conscious decision to not have a baby though, and that runs counter to what we're seeing in this post, so that warrants some questioning. If women are preventing certain men from using condoms, that's a behavior with some intent behind it.

aphel_ion • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 03:20 AM

They do what they do because of a conscious decision to not have a baby though,

Not always. I mean, men love cumming inside of women. This survey could be about men who employ tactics to cum in women without a condom, or say they will pull out and then don't. They might consciously employ the tactics, but that doesn't mean they

consciously are doing it because they want a baby.

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 03:41 AM

Not always. I mean, men love cumming inside of women.

Yes, sex functions a number of ways to get animals to continue doing it.

This survey could be about men who employ tactics to cum in women without a condom, or say they will pull out and then don't.

No, this survey is specifically about women. Someone noted that the same was done with men and they showed similar tendencies, but it's a little different because of the implications. Men don't want to wear condoms because the sensation is dulled a little bit, while women want men to wear condoms because of the contraception and risk of STI's, so if women are actively preventing certain men from wearing condoms, that behavior warrants questioning.

They might consciously employ the tactics, but that doesn't mean they consciously are doing it because they want a baby.

The default position for sex is pregnancy. There isn't really a choice, which is why we had to create choices. They might not be saying in their heads "I want to have this man's baby," but their actions are through preventing them from using a condom (and borderline raping them).

[deleted] • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 10:00 PM

Pretty damn hot (r/breeding (NSFW) !) and people say casual sex gets old lmao at the end of the day nothin better than

She might be so turned on by the attractive guy that her mind might not really logically be thinking about the consequences of him not wearing a condom.

wekacuck • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 03:26 PM

You understand that choosing a form of birth control is a conscious rational act, right? If she's on the pill or whatever then why would you think condoms are any part of her pregnancy calculus at all. She may well be thinking about the "consequences" and she's willing to roll the dice on the STD risk.

When we've reached the point that we're bitching about women craving STDs from Chad, I'm out.

free_speech_good • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 08:25 AM

I don't think that's a reasonable conclusion.

Evolved behaviour often times isn't conscious decision making.

It could just be that women are more eager to have sex with attractive men and that includes foregoing the condom. Whereas sex with unattractive men may be more transactional in nature, what redpillers would call a "betabux".

TheBookOfSeil • 0 points • 10 December, 2020 09:16 AM

Where exactly would condoms fit into evolution? The first one wasn't invented that long ago in human history.

"Forgoing the condom" is a pretty important behavior to note. Simply pretending like it's not the main focus here is pretty obtuse.

free_speech_good • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 09:49 AM

Condoms per se don't fit into evolution, but sexual desire and attraction does. I am suggesting that women are more willing to engage in more risky/costly sexual acts with men they are strongly sexually attracted to.

Sexual acts such as condomless sex, anal, and blowjobs.

To put it into simpler terms more suited to this subreddit, women want to do these things with "chad" but not with their "betabux".

ConsultJimMoriarty • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 08:11 AM

I would assume the women who avoid protection *want* to get pregnant.

People who don't want children are pretty strict on condoms.

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 08:17 AM

The point is that this is actual evidence of sex not really being "just for fun." That's only a line used in the other cases as a setup for the pro-choice narrative.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 05:09 AM*

Sex isn't for anything. Purpose is associated with an act driven by an intention, but sex was not developed with intention (and even if it were, the purpose would only exist in its creator's mind; it would be on those performing the act to decide what its purpose is).

It is an activity that can cause pregnancy, but to say it is for that would be to imply an intentionality to nature that simply doesn't exist.

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 05:30 AM

Sex isn't for anything.

According to what?

Purpose is associated with an act driven by an intention

You're confusing "purpose" with "function." I never implied that there was some conscious intent driving nature and our actions. Religious arguments usually include "purpose" while this one does not. Our bodies have functions just as nature does to sustain itself. One of those things is reproduction via sex.

but sex was not developed with intention (and even if it were, the purpose would only exist in its creator's mind; it would be on those performing the act to decide what its purpose is).

Sex was "developed" because it's what worked. Life changed from making copies of itself to merging copies with others because that proved more beneficial in survival. You're already speaking as though a conscious mind "developed" nature, so you're projecting your thoughts/assumptions onto my argument.

It is an activity that can cause pregnancy, but to say it is for that would be to imply an intentionality to nature that simply doesn't exist.

Sex is multi-faceted, but being that we didn't "develop" or create it, we don't decide what it's for. We have millions (possibly billions) of years of neural and biological programming and wiring that shows a

very distinct and observable cause and effect relationship with sex and reproduction.

Again, you're the one projecting your "intentionality" onto the argument when all I'm saying is that there's a number of cause and effect relationships showing that sex has the specific effect of reproduction, and our intentions don't alter or change that relationship/observation.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 05:56 AM

According to an understanding of what purpose is.

You've slipped into teleological thinking to suggest that sex for pleasure, without regard to reproduction, is a falsehood. Considering your previous focus on pregnancy as a consequence of sex, and your view that saying sex is for fun is to normalize promiscuity (something you have expressed considerable distaste for) I venture that this is a moralistic consideration for you, which means it's innately teleological. It's Natural Law without the courage to be stated as such

The statement "it was not developed" does not suggest it was developed.

We decide what any given instance of engaging in an activity, or what any instance of an activity is for by virtue of our own subjectivity. However the intrinsic reality of an action remains unaffected by these judgments and the consequences can still not play out to our expectations.

Reproduction is a possible outcome of sex. However it's one of those bits of trivia that's so self-evident, and so wrapped up in popular morality, that it's virtually never brought up without an agenda. So here's the question: what's your angle?

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 06:32 AM

According to an understanding of what purpose is.

You're the one arguing for "purpose" here.

You've slipped into teleological thinking to suggest that sex for pleasure, without regard to reproduction, is a falsehood.

Not "a falsehood." It lacks a greater understanding of the situation, so in other words, it's narrow-minded, not "a falsehood."

I venture that this is a moralistic consideration for you, which means it's innately teleological.

Saying that sex is for pregnancy is a moral argument? How? Unless you're projecting your views again, I don't see how you're going to explain that one. You're also trying to falsely previously made arguments with current ones. I have my own reservations about sex and it's "consequences," but this is a pretty standard observational argument that doesn't include feelings. When people argue against sex and reproduction, they usually use the word "should," which is applying their own intent and morality onto it, so people are well aware of sex and pregnancy sharing a distinct cause and effect relationship as being factual, plain and observational truth that their thoughts and feelings aren't going to be changing anytime soon.

We decide what any given instance of engaging in an activity, or what any instance of an activity is for by virtue of our own subjectivity.

Do we? This implies that our subjective wants outweigh whatever we want to change, which would be a foolish thought to say the least. It's as dumb as saying "I don't consent to dying" after jumping out of an airplane and thinking that your own subjective desire is enough to change the physical constraints that are at play. These types of thoughts mostly come from people who think

they're part of a species that's more intelligent than it actually is.

So here's the question: what's your angle?

I think I've been pretty clear on what my "angle" is. You're the one bringing "subjectivity" into the argument, which includes morality and personal opinion that may or may not align with actual reality.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 11:12 PM

I think perhaps I jumped the gun a bit. My apologies.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 December, 2020 03:53 AM*

By which I mean I think I read things in my initial interpretation of your post that weren't there. I'm sorry for wasting your time and taking such a hostile tone.

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 12 December, 2020 03:56 AM

No worries

Alguyaeda • 20 points • 9 December, 2020 09:36 PM

One thing to note: the average age of the women is 20. So probably quite a lot of them are late teens. Probably mid 20s at the very oldest. And the study describes characteristics of being immature imo.

RSDevotion1[S] • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 09:40 PM

https://www.reddit.com/r/PurplePillDebate/comments/k9yyxt/young_women_are_less_likely_to_intend_to_use_a/gf7j4s6/

JohnDoe9564 • 138 points • 9 December, 2020 07:49 PM

Women make rules for betas and break them for alphas

LeadInfusedRedPill • 79 points • 9 December, 2020 07:59 PM

Change that flair bucko

Ecocavalry • 42 points • 9 December, 2020 08:44 PM

This is better, he leaves everyone confused.

[deleted] • 13 points • 9 December, 2020 08:06 PM

Lol

HOLYREGIME • 10 points • 9 December, 2020 10:19 PM

That's what I was going to say. A walking fraud lol.

Sid_Insidious • 7 points • 10 December, 2020 03:10 AM

"He's beginning to believe."

Scripting-is-a-crime • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 05:20 AM

Yeah, no way this commenter is a bloop.

Women make rules for betas and break them for alphas

Bro, this is your troll account. Switch back.

JohnDoe9564 • 18 points • 9 December, 2020 08:31 PM

Being Blue Pilled doesn't mean I'm blind to the reality of dating

TheBookOfSeil • 52 points • 9 December, 2020 08:53 PM

That's exactly what being blue pillled means. "Blue-pillled" = asleep/unconscious or lacking in awareness. You're mostly repeating what you've seen written in here already.

dickfarmcpoopus • 6 points • 9 December, 2020 10:28 PM

why would anyone willingly label themselves as 'blue-pillled' then?

TheBookOfSeil • 22 points • 9 December, 2020 10:38 PM

Because in this sub, identifying as "blue pill" means "I disagree with TRP." The purpose of this sub is for others like Bloops to debate what The Red Pill believes and how they choose to respond to claims and stats like the one in the OP.

LeadInfusedRedPill • 24 points • 9 December, 2020 08:41 PM

Yeah it does lmao

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 09:55 PM

Sounds like signing up for the slaughter on purpose. at least people who don't know have the excuse of Not knowing lmao

_yolo_tomassi_ • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 10:49 PM

got me curious (genuinely) - what does it mean to you if not that?

passepar2t • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 10:46 PM

I'm sure it's Beachedredwhine's latest incarnation.

LittyKitsune • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:20 AM

We know it's BRW if he starts bragging about how young his wife is and posting pics of her underwear.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:45 AM

Nah, not enough drunk rambling and mentioning of his 80 pound wife

_yolo_tomassi_ • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 10:48 PM

lol

LittyKitsune • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:16 AM

Assuming he's for real my theory is that he flairs blue because a. married and doesn't regret it and b. actually likes his wife. I can count the number of Reds who fit that criteria on this sub on one hand.

Bandit174 • 15 points • 9 December, 2020 08:10 PM

Perfect summary of the study

Alguyaeda • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 09:33 PM

Not all alphas are facially attractive. But probably a little more likely to be, as I think alphas are more likely to go to the gym. But everyone knows a weak minded guy with a Ryan Gosling face.

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 09:42 PM

[deleted]

GridReXX • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 12:39 AM*

He's right. I know a lot of ppl at work who look like this:

<http://cdn01.cdn.justjared.com/wp-content/uploads/headlines/2007/11/ryan-gosling-loses-the-fat.jpg>

And this :

https://lh3.googleusercontent.com/proxy/uXI6ljSffotNPkQr8sqR-uqkh3BmPSRtmu5N5M5c3pdZuMfrwm9OsugL5X5q1sXg19y6CGDOXtU_P5AKyM2wy_CCPQ4hzi_5eJzW_13B2K-GlyEEGZ3jk16v3N5mtpL0EbZa6Mwg88G8HWc-i8ZZIEY2POWmWrwoG0R8ifZ8jONSONEmVlehmP7on0pthnTg8MoOBjSh-rQw6Lw2Q4SRW8BFPxQ0uA

Just like, normal looking.

[deleted] • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 12:56 AM

That's just fatter Ryan Gosling

Take any alpha chad and add 30 lbs to him and he'll look like an average schmuck too.

That's why TRP's advice is to hit the gym and focus on nutrition. That's key to attractiveness.

Also buzz cuts only work on certain face shapes, Gosling got that oval face going on he looks like an egg lmao.

GridReXX • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 12:59 AM

The second one is fat him. The first one is "I don't work out" but not necessarily fat.

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 01:13 AM

Yes and you're comparing "I don't work out average schmuck" Ryan Gosling with a buzz cut that doesn't suit him to "10% bodyfat Chad" Ryan Gosling.

My point is that even a Chad can be average schmuck if you add some bodyfat to him and give him a bad haircut and that weird fuckin pedo goatee lmao

GridReXX • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 01:15 AM*

I thought of Ryan gosling for a reason. He seems to look like an average guy who looksmaxes well to me.

He has more moments when I think "is he cute?" Than most. But overall I think he's cute and his personality seems charming. He has the genetics to be cute when and if he wants. But he can default to average quicker than other guys IMO □□♀□□□♀□

[deleted] 10 December, 2020 12:49 AM

[deleted]

GridReXX • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 12:52 AM

Ryan reminds me of me. Some days I look hot and some days I look average.

Ryan is the guy I think of when I think of “looks maxxng”.

Because when he “looks max” and “presents with intent” he gives this

<https://external-preview.redd.it/Hdc-IGHTBDloKhQuZKlVZ2vcc9qVjS2Ahqh-a7PV24E.jpg?auto=webp&s=17c24b5898efba70ee74b9adfd9a4a8849c970f7>

and this

<https://www.usmagazine.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Ryan-Gosling-Stupid-Crazy-Shirtless.jpg?w=900&quality=86&strip=all>

willreignsompotent • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 01:20 AM

But pobably a little more likely to be, as I think alphas are more likely to go to the gym.

Your face doesn't give a shit what you can bench lol

Aside from maybe the notion that leaner faces are more attractive, I'm not sure there's a huge correlation there.

Alguyaeda • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:56 AM

If you got to the gym you're a lot more likely to worry about your body fat percentage than the average man. And of course more leaner faces are more attractive.

And I only said they're a little more likely to be.

[deleted] • 15 points • 9 December, 2020 08:20 PM*

Smart me always use a condom. I've had a vasectomy and I still use a condom unless were in a LTR and have both been screened. I've made it this far in life without any STDs. I don't plan on getting one now with all of the dating app promiscuity out there.

Maude2010 • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 05:20 AM

I grew up during the AIDS crisis so we had condom usage drilled into us. I never had sex without a condom outside of a LTR. A woman would have to be crazy to not demand a condom IMO. I don't care how hot the guy is.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 10:55 AM*

You'd be surprised. I'm a straight guy. I used the apps in the early 2010s. I fucked a bunch of girls without one. Now, these are what I classified as "high quality" girls. Teachers, pharmacists, even a therapist.

Edit: 2010s.

Maude2010 • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 04:21 PM

Oh I know it happens but it blows my mind. I haven't always made brilliant choices but I've always always been adamant about condoms.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 03:06 AM

Smart choice. I typo'd, too. I meant early 2010s.

[deleted] • 7 points • 9 December, 2020 10:28 PM

For context:

In comparison to a male sample (M age = 24.5, SD = 2.78) using the same Condom Resistance Tactics questionnaire, the amount was 80%, compared to 54.8%. [Link to study here](#).

They're however *not* perfect comparisons, but it was the study cited as using the inventory in the context of credibility.

Similar tendencies in regards to perceived attractiveness with condom use intentions have been indicated in a heterosexual male sample in a previous experimental study by Eleftheriou et. al.; "the more attractive a woman was judged to be on average, the more likely participants would be willing to have sex with her and the less likely they were to intend to use a condom during sex.

INB4: I also don't want to do a 'men worse' type of reading here, if anything my intention is to add to the post to counter some potential fallacious conclusions people take. At the core of it is problematic ideas about partner safety and the public health consequences of that.

1. Condom resistance tactics correlates

Women with a higher lifetime sexual partner count were more likely to have employed a "condom resistance tactic".

That part was on previously employed resistance tactics, wasn't it? It was not done on willingness. Thus, a part of it can be self-explanatory, meanwhile, the relation to those that the CRT was done towards wasn't investigated. Which relates to the next part of the post.

2. CRT and other preventative contraceptives

It is worth noting that none of the "condom resistance tactic" options involved using other forms of preventative contraceptive

The study explicitly writes (under section *Discussion*) that it did not *investigate* the presence of contraceptive use, and the inventory does not *address* or *mention*. The questionnaire doesn't even take that into account.

"Moreover, **the fact that some women might have been using hormonal contraception, which might affect condom use intentions [35], was not investigated**. A consistent finding in the literature is that when people are in committed relationships, there is often a shift from condom use to hormonal contraception [36]."

Overall, interesting one even if I wouldn't boil it down to the same potential hypothetical causes as you do. Having problems with my basic ass data software so I haven't yet looked into the complete dataset, although I have saved it and will look into it.

AttackOnTightPanties • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 11:57 PM

Maybe I'm only skimming, but did anything in either of these studies look at the education level of the people sampled?? The first things that popped into my mind was how educated the individuals are, what were their socioeconomic situations growing up, and how much education did they acquire over the course of time in comparison to their behaviors with condoms and the opposite sex. It might be an interesting analysis on sexual risk taking in regards to attraction and how that plays out against education. I highly suspect that we'd see less sexual risk taking for people of higher education of both sexes, especially over time, as opposed to those of less education.

[deleted] • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 12:06 AM

The first one I linked did!

Considering most young people, e.g. in the US, are embarrassingly undereducated on reproductive- and sexual health, I'd not be surprised.

AttackOnTightPanties • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 12:08 AM

As a Midwestern American who attended nine years of Catholic School, I can confirm that some of us were embarrassingly undereducated. I really think the key to a lot of this is awareness and thinking ahead. I was innately nervous and future oriented anyway, but I feel like a combo of for-the-moment mentality with bad or limited education really plays into some of these dynamics.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 12:12 AM

It's gonna get better sooner or later! Where I've lived we had sex-ed since the 50s (first in the world to have mandatory sex ed, I think?) so we've come a bit more far, but it's not ideal yet

AttackOnTightPanties • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 01:46 AM

Ah, a Scandinavian country?? Or Europe. I once saw an article on how the Netherlands handles sexual education and thought it was very good.

TBH, my biggest problem with some of the discussions on here are that a lot of the women don't sound educated. Not to make implications on individuals of course, but the general trend tends to be that lower socioeconomic environments foster gender role preferences in my experiences. I don't think a lot of this has to do with "biological" elements (as a lot of the people here tend to favor) so much as it has to do with the attitudes imparted on us in childhood, particularly in relation to whatever economic bracket we were raised in. I reflected on my own upbringing and how my mom impressed in me to find someone who has a stable line of work; she said he didn't have to be rich but he had to be able to put something on the table and lend to taking care of us as a couple or any future children. In the same sense, my parents observed that I was above average in intelligence like my older sibling, so they raised us to aim for an education because they wanted us to do better for ourselves. I feel like these things shaped my preferences more than biology ever has.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 02:44 AM

Sweden, to be exact!

Yes, people tend to brazenly give post-hoc explanations for modern contexts, not realizing that they're exaggerating the extent of it. Both of my parents were raised with the backsides of the sole-breadwinner nuclear family: my grandmother on my mother's side got widowed very early and had a tough time sustaining the family even as she was relatively well-earning for a USSR worker, I can't imagine how bad it would've been if she was a SAHM; my father's family were a classic unhappy nuclear family marriage, and I know my father has said that his mother and father both are lovely people, but when one part is fully dependent on the other, with age differences, and one feels as materially less important, any abusive tendencies get exaggerated. I think seeing my both parents, who grew up with somewhat broken families, made me see the value in their equal and complementary roles and the love they have for each other. That has always been my ideal, and I lean on the side of caution of being a SAHM, because I'd have a hard time making me and my children's wellbeing solely dependent on one person materially.

That's a really interesting and insightful take from both of your parents. Thinking on it, I always like to hear what the people from previous generations have to say in favor of and against how stricter gender roles played out in their lives. My father comes from a traditional Catholic family where my grandmother did work a little but my biological grandfather (who died when my dad was one) and then the man she remarried took care of the finances. She has openly stated though that she had always really wanted to be a lawyer and attend college, so I think she lives vicariously through myself, my sister, and our female cousin. This particular grandmother never really liked it when any of us girls dated, was lukewarm when my sister got married after getting a secondary degree in a health discipline, and then really disapproved of my cousin's husband all while they dated before begrudgingly accepting their marriage last year even though my cousin is fresh out of occupational therapy. I think she truly loved my grandfather and step-grandfather, but I think even in modern times she perceived marriage as a threat to the autonomy of my sister and cousin. I think to her, especially since they were traditional German Catholics, marriage means children which are the "woman's responsibility" so she wanted to see us thrive and define ourselves out of the home in ways that she never got to attempt. Needless to say, even though I've fucked up a lot, she's a lot more willing to give me a break than my cousin because I still have the potential to fulfill her dream of thriving in autonomy because I'm neither married nor attached at this time.

I think the other major factor outside of socioeconomic upbringing is the culture that one grows up in. A lot of red pill men on here discuss hypergamy as achieving the best of all worlds (wanting someone super hot for sex on the side with an average Joe that you're not attracted to bringing in the dough), and when I thought about it, that mindset is very much an American attitude. I've joked that we're a nation of car salesmen trying to pitch ourselves to climb the ladder so we can live bigger, faster, harder, better. Our culture is excess and exaggeration incarnate, so our gender issues are going to border on cartoonish. In mating, mammals do tend to strategize in the fashion of males going for quantity of mates and females going for quality, which does have the capacity to reflect in human behavior; however, I argue that because humans are capable of perceiving the world in a logical manner, our preferences follow a fashion that mimics biology but is a result of observation instead of inherent, subconscious instinct. Attraction is hugely a biological mechanism, which is why we all have a general concept of "hot vs not", but it also fails to leave room for preferences that don't always reflect this "natural instinct." With all of this said, circling back to culture, I think that American thinking inflames whatever logical and biological tendencies exist in people because our nation kind of functions on survival of the fittest and racing to get what is perceived in the public eye as the "best" as opposed to what the individual might prefer or understand to be the best for themselves. A rich husband is status. A hot wife is status. "Feminist college sluts" will bang the hottest guys because why not they're hot but also because newly acquired sexual autonomy is also going to be subject to the sense of competition that permeates our culture; it makes a person feel special when they've climbed to the top of the ladder and outcompeted others trying to get there, but I think Americans in particular take this fetish of "being first place" a little too far. We're at a point where the gender roles

and values related towards mate selecting are impressed into the generation trying to break away from them, so we still tend to select partners that give us some form of status our culture has taught us to desire but not as strictly as previous generations. This isn't always, and I really think that some of the men on here underestimate the genuine sense of love formed between married people. But I would say that these tendencies are trends that will change as we integrate more developed views of gender into the upbringing of children in the generations to come.

Sorry, that was a novel. I've just had a lot of extra time to think on a lot of the points brought up on here. I cannot stand the bizarre evolutionary psychology arguments on here since they only function to provide some of these guys with a "concrete" reason to believe that the previous way of life was better and to justify their misogyny.

RSDevotion1[S] • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 11:05 PM

Yes, another user brought up this second study. Frankly, I am more surprised that men report selectiveness of condom use based on female attractiveness because there is less of an evolutionary incentive for a man to avoid impregnating a woman of lesser genetic quality. The sample size of that study is notably smaller than the women's though.

Furthermore, in a theoretical risk-free situation, most men would obviously forgo condom use for increased sexual pleasure, regardless of how attractive the woman is (men tend to have sex with a wide variety of women if possible for the explicit purpose of pleasure).

"Moreover, the fact that some women might have been using hormonal contraception, which might affect condom use intentions [35], was not investigated. A consistent finding in the literature is that when people are in committed relationships, there is often a shift from condom use to hormonal contraception [36]."

Yup, and if they also tested for pill usage they might find that women also report dropping their dosage as a tactic in an effort to be impregnated by a (physically attractive) man, possibly without his knowledge.

[deleted] • 6 points • 10 December, 2020 12:01 AM

if they also tested for pill usage they might find that women also report dropping their dosage as a tactic in an effort to be impregnated by a (physically attractive) man, possibly without his knowledge.

That's rather nonsensical. You can't 'lower' the dosage, that's not how most oral contraceptives work. You have a pill map of the month, once per day. You can't just 'lower the dose' as if it's a pain pill lol

If you mean that they lie about contraceptives that's a different thing.

RSDevotion1[S] • 0 points • 10 December, 2020 12:13 AM

You can't 'lower' the dosage, that's not how most oral contraceptives work.

I was suggesting "dropping" the non-placebo pill cycle entirely. The placebo cycle is already inherently doing that in a regulated manner in order to have a withdrawal (but not long enough to start ovulating).

But for what it's worth, lowering the dosage is entirely possible. The pills are just a systemic progestin and/or estrogen supplement to reach simulated early pregnancy hormonal levels to inhibit ovulation.

Running a therapeutic dose of progestin/estrogen for therapeutic purposes without inhibiting ovulation is not uncommon.

[deleted] • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 12:16 AM

It just seems like a weird lie. Why'd someone that uses the pill somehow want to get pregnant suddenly

RSDevotion1[S] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 12:22 AM

Maybe because she recently has the opportunity to be impregnated by a man of high genetic quality and/or he has the potential to pay out significant child support.

[deleted] • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 12:48 AM

Why would such a hypothetical woman just not go off the pill then? This is like the most complicated and illogical way of getting pregnant with a suddenly found mate lmao

Bear in mind, this discussion is mostly for fun to me, because I do think people have deluded themselves into thinking that women are somehow calculated fertility charlatans that can't wait to cuck a poor guy.

The likelier case is that women who are on contraceptives would use CRT because they know that they're protected and think they won't get/don't care about STIs. Then again a larger and larger amount of people come to their senses and just get IUDs

RSDevotion1[S] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:48 AM*

Why would such a hypothetical woman just not go off the pill then?

She would. That's what I was suggesting.

This is like the most complicated and illogical way of getting pregnant with a suddenly found mate lmao

If she was on the pill prior to meeting said man then she would obviously stop taking it if she wanted to get pregnant...

Then again a larger and larger amount of people come to their senses and just get IUDs

IUDs do not provide an easy on/off switch for fertility. If we're going to talk about coming to senses, that would involve hysterectomy/vasectomy, but that's another tangent...

_yolo_tomassi_ • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 02:20 AM

I feel like the most likely answer here is either simple ignorance of the mechanics and/or the flimsiness of "rationality". I've been with extremely educated women in their 30s who have displayed staggering dismissal of contraceptive success rates in the heat of the moment.

anecdotal examples of extremes on either side (royal you):

you're in charge of lawyering out billion dollar mergers and a lifelong childfree die hard but the calendar method's rock solid?

or on the other extreme I'm pretty sure IUD and *two* condoms is overkill babe - you

have a postgrad math degree from one of the best universities in the world how can you not see that?

a consistent thing across these and in between was a matching warmth of demeanour. anecdotal for sure but in terms of practical use it consistent with the notion that people's capacity for rationality is more a tool to get what they want than it is a generator of truth, though mercifully there's plenty of overlap.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 03:01 AM

Two condoms is a perfect metaphor for being *overkill*— because that will risk tearing by being too safe to even read the basic instructions. A condom and IUD isn't a bad idea if you've not known your partner for a while though.

I think people often hide their neuroses and fears in rationality, but in the case of over-thinking it becomes a self-consuming snake. Like two condoms.

_yolo_tomassi_ • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 03:43 AM

For sure - where it gets interesting for me is that rationality is a garbage in garbage out process that's entirely shaped by purpose and intention and perspective. That is as opposed to being a capacity that people have to just, see the truth.

For me understanding all the "extra rational" landscape is super important for separating capability from intent. Explaining gender differences in terms other than capability. Or why that super smart person did that super dumb 'looking' thing that time that risked everyone's jobs or whatever.

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 12:04 AM

>Frankly, I am more surprised that men report selectiveness of condom use based on female attractiveness because there is less of an evolutionary incentive for a man to avoid impregnating a woman of lesser genetic quality.

Yes, but the motivations aren't particularly discussed as a part of that. They're more so relating to 'being able to judge if someone has an STI/STD', which is reported with certain correlates.

RSDevotion1[S] • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 12:28 AM

Perceptions of facial attractiveness are largely based on recognition of genetic quality (facial attractiveness is positively correlated with heterozygosity, or a lower inbreeding index). It should come as no evolutionary surprise that women are more likely to engage in pregnancy-prone behaviors with men of high genetic quality.

[deleted] • 4 points • 10 December, 2020 12:50 AM

being a young (and usually single) mother usually isn't on most young women's ideal life-checklist

RSDevotion1[S] • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 01:49 AM*

Maybe not, but that depends on the woman and the quality of man she's going/about to have sex with.

That still doesn't change women's innate submissiveness/sexual urgency/permissiveness

toward men of high genetic quality.

[deleted] • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 01:58 AM

Well, that hypothesis of yours is an interesting one, if you made a proper empirical study of it I would certainly read it.

But it wouldn't explain that men do it too in a similiar tendency, although in even higher rates

RSDevotion1[S] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 03:04 AM

But it wouldn't explain that men do it too in a similiar tendency, although in even higher rates

You're referring to men forgoing condom usage with a more sexually attractive partner?

It's worth noting that the average man has less sexual access to a woman of high genetic quality than the average woman does to a man of high genetic quality.

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 03:46 AM

Yes, I wrote a comment with the sources

Well, the study measures hypothetical responses. In specific, the more attractive the likelier they're willing to have sex, and the likelier they will forgo condom use. But CRT isn't measured on respondents evaluation of past partners, but a questionnaire including pictures.

Men not having access to women of "high genetic quality" (sounds like 40s social darwinism but w/e) hasn't been empirically measured in any of these, anyways. Hasn't even been discussed in any of the extens of limitations, if I spent my hour reading these casually correctly.

RSDevotion1[S] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 04:15 AM*

The higher rate of condom resistance tactics in men than women is not particularly surprising because condoms limit sexual pleasure more significantly for men.

Further, the more attractive a man was judged to be, the less likely women were to intend to use a condom during sex ($r = -0.552$, $df = 478$, $p = .007$).

versus

Furthermore, the more attractive a woman was judged to be, the less likely men were to intend to use a condom during sex, Embedded Image ($r = -0.785$, $df = 18$, $p < 0.0001$).

The men's survey does show a stronger negative correlation, but I'm wondering why the degrees of freedom is only 18 (the sample size is 51) whereas the women's df is the full 478 (sample size of 480). I'm assuming the df of 18 is referring to the 20 images shown, but that was supposed to be consistent between the studies...

[deleted] • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 08:07 PM

I'm shocked.

medlabunicorn • 26 points • 9 December, 2020 11:03 PM

From the link in the references: **"The study data were collected using an online questionnaire."** □□□□

90% chance that a significant proportion of the respondents weren't even women, much less representative of most women's practices.

quilir • 12 points • 10 December, 2020 06:57 AM

It's was not a fucking public questionnaire, like you probably think it was, lol

What's the great difference between that and an in-place paper questionnaire? Yes, would reduce the chances of some fraud. That's not a great risk, however. There are verification processes. Participants get paid and may have to pay taxes from received money on provided credentials

YtBlue • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 04:26 PM

As you can see by this reddit and TRP. People like to lie about their conquests and ideas. 99% of these people would be the opposite in real life.

Willow-girl • 0 points • 10 December, 2020 01:34 PM

What's the great difference between that and an in-place paper questionnaire?

Not much. Social "science" lol.

YtBlue • 0 points • 10 December, 2020 03:18 AM

All I needed to hear. Throw the whole thread away..

SonicBackScratcher • 25 points • 9 December, 2020 08:01 PM*

A turned on woman is even more stupid than a turned on man. They get that glazed look in their eye and their brains are off into sex only mode. If the dude is hot shes probably turned on more, and more likely to just give into whatever.

The study data were collected using an online questionnaire.

Fail IMO. I use such data only as a vague starting point for discussion.

ChibsFilipTelfordd • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 11:15 PM

The study data were collected using an online questionnaire

Not to mention those who actively respond to online surveys are likely higher extroversion and sociosexually than non respondents. Did they weight for extroversion?

This is the same problems the election polls have had the last two years. The pollsters poll a biased sample of the electorate and then *shocked pikachu face*

hippiefromolema • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 12:08 AM

The data for men was the same.

SonicBackScratcher • 5 points • 10 December, 2020 12:18 AM

Men were more likely to not use a condom with more attractive male partners?

SniXSniPe • 18 points • 9 December, 2020 09:02 PM

I'm not surprised by this study, but:

Average age = 20

I know many of us at that age were a lot less... "responsible" than say, 30

RSDevotion1[S] • 11 points • 9 December, 2020 09:09 PM

The study assesses lifetime experiences, so the reported counts of lifetime sexual partners/resistance tactics/STIs should only increase with an older mean participant age.

[deleted] • -1 points • 9 December, 2020 09:59 PM

Bingo

[deleted] • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 09:52 PM

alphas fuck pussies, betas fuck latex

Fuego213 • 31 points • 9 December, 2020 07:54 PM

Why is finding out that women like and are more open to men they're attracted to always treated as a newfound revelation on this sub?

Would you rather them not use condoms on guys they think are ugly? Like what's the point here?

TheBookOfSeil • 63 points • 9 December, 2020 08:18 PM

I think it's more the fact that we have to point these things out to women because they're either unclear or intentionally dishonest about it.

Example: "Looks don't matter/Personality matters more."

This post:

LeadInfusedRedPill • 48 points • 9 December, 2020 08:28 PM

Agreed

women online: OMG all these men keep trying to fuck me without a condom I would never do that
eeewwwwww

women irl:

death_by_1000_cats • 16 points • 9 December, 2020 09:06 PM

It's funny because I think the same thing about men being anti condom.

Men online: *Condom sex sucks, I never wear a condom, I'd rather just not have sex at all*

Men irl: *Put on a condom if you tell them you won't have sex without one*

YasuotheChosenOne • 20 points • 9 December, 2020 09:47 PM

Sex > no sex.

death_by_1000_cats • 9 points • 9 December, 2020 10:13 PM

Yep that's been my experience but a lot of guys online say no sex > condom sex.

YasuotheChosenOne • 8 points • 9 December, 2020 10:45 PM

I feel it. It's honestly not worth the risk but...

I can't lie, I've fucked many bitches raw that I probably should not have, but they were hot, and I was young. Luckily I never caught anything, but now days I save the raw poundings strictly for LTRs.

HighTMale12 • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 11:49 PM

Damn son you're an alpha chad

YasuotheChosenOne • 4 points • 10 December, 2020 01:41 AM

More like Tyrone-Lite. It gets the job done though lol.

Alberic2092 • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 12:41 AM

Unlikely. He is on r/PurplePillDebate after all. And he's named after a LoL character - that's a pretty damning indictment right there.

[deleted] • 6 points • 10 December, 2020 01:01 AM

He's black though, I actually believe that he fucks

I don't know any black dudes that don't fuck. I got a few black friends and they all fuck.

YasuotheChosenOne • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 01:50 AM

Oh I'm a big ole nerd. Grew up playing Pokemon, Magic the Gathering, Yugioh. Love animes/mangas too lol.

That said, I only really struggled with casual sex in my mid 20s. Super random, all of a sudden I couldn't pull bitches for shit which led me to the Redpill. My N-count was already in the low triple digits by then though ☐☐♂☐

[deleted] 10 December, 2020 12:32 AM

[removed]

[deleted] 10 December, 2020 12:40 AM

[removed]

[deleted] 10 December, 2020 12:43 AM

[removed]

[deleted] 10 December, 2020 12:45 AM

[removed]

Atlas__B__Shruggin • 5 points • 10 December, 2020 12:46 AM

lots of men refuse or cajole out of condom sex, IRL

Mrs_Drgree[M] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 11:47 AM

Be civil

Mrs_Drgree[M] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 11:47 AM

Do not invalidate user's experiences or feelings.

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 08:37 PM

[deleted]

TheBookOfSeil • 11 points • 9 December, 2020 08:43 PM

It's not necessarily to save face. Women sometimes seem like they have two different brains working against the other, so they can think that they're speaking the truth/be unaware of it on a conscious level but respond the opposite way in the moment.

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 08:45 PM*

[deleted]

upalse • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 09:28 PM

It's still very poor anxiety coping mechanism. Same with pathological liars being a joke to everyone as they hang themselves with a rope they've made, yet don't even need. "I just want people to like me" is not a good reason to be dishonest.

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 09:29 PM

[deleted]

redditthrowaway1478 • 4 points • 9 December, 2020 11:42 PM

Now if that ain't a red pill truth, I don't know what is

TheBookOfSeil • 0 points • 9 December, 2020 08:55 PM

There might be some women who use it to deflect, but there are others who really don't know and are just saying what they think is the right answer. They haven't consciously linked their behavior with their thoughts about it so they end up being opposite of each other.

Fuego213 • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 08:25 PM*

Ehh idk about that. Women are usually upfront about their preferences-especially in looks-and aren't afraid to pretend otherwise.

As for the whole personality thing, there's like billions of women. Personality def matters more to a good portion of them.

edit: Jesus. do women not open up to y'all?

TheBookOfSeil • 16 points • 9 December, 2020 08:33 PM*

Women are usually upfront about their preferences-especially in looks-and aren't afraid to pretend otherwise.

Where? Maybe online where they can openly speak the truth, but they don't say these things to men's faces unless they don't respect those men at all.

As for the whole personality thing, there's like billions of women. Personality def matters more to a good portion of them.

From my observation, context is what determines what matters. Virtue signaling online? Yeah, personality matters more. Older women? Again, yeah. Younger women IRL? Nope. They're just as superficial as men are.

edit: Jesus. do women not open up to y'all?

Women will more typically open up to their friends and random people online, and the only times that the women in my life have "opened up" to me were when they were angry at me or no longer respected me. Otherwise it's the usual "Nothing's wrong. Everything is fine" -*Initializing Passive-aggression sequence. . . Passive-aggression mode: activated-*.

GridReXX • 6 points • 9 December, 2020 09:16 PM

It's more "looks matter too."

What I mean is if you take a lame acting model looking man vs a charismatic model looking man... the amount of pussy the latter would get would eclipse the former. The former would actually turn off women once he opened his mouth.

So women are never lying when they say personality matters. It's the more active agent in that "attraction equation."

TheBookOfSeil • 8 points • 9 December, 2020 09:20 PM

It's more "looks matter too."

What I mean is if you take a lame acting model looking man vs a charismatic model looking man... the amount of pussy the latter would get would eclipse the former. The former would actually turn off women once he opened his mouth.

Yes, more is always better, but there are plenty of women who would still sleep with the former. He'd only be ruled out for something more long-term.

So women are never lying when they say personality matters. It's the more active agent in that "attraction equation."

Like I said, context matters. A lot of times, it's only half of the truth when women say "looks don't matter/personality matters more."

GridReXX • 4 points • 9 December, 2020 09:23 PM*

I don't think I agree. If he's a lame he's not getting that much pussy at all. No matter how physically attractive he is.

Maybe you don't know what "lame" means but imagine a socially awkward / inept person who doesn't at all pick up on social cues and makes everyone else around him uncomfortable because of it

I know dudes like that. They aren't getting laid despite having faces like Chris Hemsworth. This guy would turn off a even a drunk woman within 30 seconds at lasciviously-charged bar. He's not getting "hook ups." Men who hook up with ease are charming. Because men still have to be the ones to push through LMR. A socially inept man can't do that in a way that won't turn off a woman and make her change her mind immediately.

So yeah, for a man. Personality or game or presence or swag or sociability is THEE determining factor when it comes to frequency of casual sex.

TheBookOfSeil • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 09:53 PM

Maybe you don't know what "lame" means but imagine a socially awkward / inept person who doesn't at all pick up on social cues and makes everyone else around him uncomfortable because of it

Sounds like a personal definition because this is more autism spectrum than lameness. Someone who's "lame" is unfunny, unexciting, uninteresting, etc. They are otherwise normal, and if they're attractive, women will still sleep with them. Being funny isn't a requirement for sex.

I know dudes like that. They aren't getting laid despite having faces like Chris Hemsworth. This guy would turn off a even a drunk woman within 30 seconds at lasciviously-charged bar. He's not getting "hook ups."

So they're very socially awkward and have a face like a model? What about the people outside of those extremes who are socially normal and more attractive than average? Those guys get hookups and relationships.

A socially inept man can't do that in a way that won't turn off a woman and make her change her mind immediately.

I think extremes wouldn't be relevant in these cases because any negative extreme is going to turn someone off.

GridReXX • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 09:56 PM

Growing up in my community "autism" wasn't diagnosed. So people who acted like that or anything even close to it all fell into a "lame" category. That category had dweebs (socialized into autistic tendencies) and autists (actual but perhaps undiagnosed).

I also realize "corny" and "lame" are perhaps black American parlance and not a thing for you.

But yeah there were plenty of corny and lame dudes with handsome faces who couldn't win over women with ease. They were swaggerless.

In fact looking back on it a lot of the "players" weren't even the cutest guys. So the more I think on it the more I truly double down that personality and charisma and sociability is what separates men who get a lot of pussy from those who don't.

TheBookOfSeil • 4 points • 9 December, 2020 10:35 PM

They were swaggerless.

I think what you're alluding to is that confident "I'm hot shit/bIg DiCk EnErGy/DGAF" attitude that women like because it says to them "I won't back down from a fight/challenge and I have the energy to scrap" so women feel more secure around them as it implies protection. Thus, women like that and are more receptive to these men as a result, so even if they're not as attractive or not very funny, they know that these are the guys to be around in case something goes down.

So, even then, it's not necessarily about "personality" but the implications of it.

IceC19 • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 05:01 AM

Hm, I disagree. A guy who's good looking will have a really hard time repelling a girl who's attracted to him and already wants to fuck him. He would have to be very unattractive in his behaviour in order to change her mind, instead of needing to be particularly charming to get with this DTF girl.

Of course it is possible for the guy to fuck it up and the girl lose attraction, but basic socialization and moving things forward will be enough to convert. Hemsworth-faced guy would have to be really awkward and really under average when it comes to social skills to lose the girl like that haha

On the few ONS I had, I wasn't nothing special at all in terms of charm or "game", just talked and moved things forward with girls who had already shown they were attracted and repeatedly stated how physically attractive (they thought) I was.

So yeah, for a man. Personality or game or presence or swag or sociability is THEE determining factor when it comes to frequency of casual sex.

For the average looking guy? Yes. But being found hot by a girl who's into casual sex (which happens more with good-looking guys lol) is something that makes it really easy and basic on the socializing part and IMO determines more of casual sex success, if the guy's into that.

GridReXX • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 08:04 AM

“For a girl who’s into casual sex”

Yeah I think the guys countering me are thinking of super horny chicks who go out for the sole purpose of trying to fuck or something. That’s a minority of women. And I say that as a person who has partied.

Most women need to feel a connection with him outside of “he’s cute.” That connection might be laughing and twirling on the dance floor. But it’s something other than objective good looks.

glintglib • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 10:10 PM*

Yes, more is always better, but there are plenty of women who would still sleep with the former. He'd only be ruled out for something more long-term.

Correct. In these discussions quite a few people like to use the example of the dumb or uncouth or the poor/lazy or the racist/arrogant/jerks or the party animal good looking man as an example of personality trumping looks and they would get ruled out by majority of women. These guys still get laid plenty and can get STRs/flings with women that would be embarrassed to introduce him to her parents. These guys all find attractive women, and where I will disagree with you is that and most have kids, and many get LTRs (it might not last the distance but women are willing to give it a go). Beyond just the sex aspect there are plenty of women out there who will also share similar traits and find him a compatible match as well.

As for definition of 'lame' in regard to this situation, I'm sure people will have their own definitions. I don't know too many that are classic lame, plus what happens as studies have shown is that people confer unearned positive traits & downplay negative traits in

attractive people and do the opposite for unattractive people, so while a guy might see another good looking dude as lame, a try-hard, shallow or a suck-up, women who have the hots for his looks are much less likely to. Like I say before there are plenty of similar women out there who won't see those traits in the same light as others.

Marketing_Baboon • 11 points • 9 December, 2020 08:46 PM

Not really no, unless they're a statistical anomaly. In all the recent studies on this they've found that unattractive men were not seen as good mates even when they had perfect personality trait profiles, compared to more attractive men with less favourable personalities. It seems like there's some kind of minimum attraction threshold, and if you're below it your personality can't compensate. Good looks can compensate for a shit personality on the other hand. This study even had the women's mothers rank them too and found the same preference:

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40806-017-0092-x>

Fuego213 • 4 points • 9 December, 2020 09:06 PM

Rely on studies or refer to my ugly (obvs mean this in a lighthearted way) friends with girlfriends Decisions..

Marketing_Baboon • 4 points • 9 December, 2020 10:21 PM

Studies have more power when discussing populations or trends. Anecdotes only reinforce confirmation bias. Since you're being lighthearted your friends are probably not as ugly as you think.

IceC19 • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 05:08 AM

Or maybe you could learn to properly interpretate what's being said (if that's a possible decision in your case). Nobody said 'ugly guys never get girlfriends'.

GridReXX • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 08:34 PM

It's like none of these men had sisters or interacted with their female peers. Ever. Boys had Biggie on their bedroom walls. Girls had "Lil Fizz and Justin Timberlake" when I was a kid.

There's a reason girls had more attractive men hanging above their beds at night ☐

[deleted] • 4 points • 9 December, 2020 08:40 PM

Lmao why would guys have Biggie on their walls??

It's either hot girls or exotic supercars

GridReXX • 4 points • 9 December, 2020 08:47 PM*

I'm black. Black boys had men on their walls: that iconic photo of Ali over that dude in the boxing ring, an action photo of Iverson crossing someone over or Jordan/Kobe/whomever dunking, a thug life photo of Tupac, and this photo of Biggie./cdn.vox-cdn.com/uploads/chorus_asset/file/21885701/Screen_Shot_2020_09_16_at_1.38.30_PM.png) lol and for the black boys who liked rock sprinkle in Slash or Jimi somewhere on the wall.

Maybe this is why black men do better with women lol. They don't idolize them. They idolize whoever they value as "great men." Female romantic interests and male friends follow from there.

death_by_1000_cats • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 09:02 PM

I'm white and my brothers had men on their walls (I remember one had a Jim Morrison poster and the other I think had the Beastie Boys or something?). And I remember one of my cousins had a lot of sports posters in his room.

I wonder if this is a generational thing? Do kids even hang posters in their rooms anymore? I have no idea!

GridReXX • 8 points • 9 December, 2020 09:07 PM

Maybe they don't anymore ! Sad!

Saw a funny tweet from a gay guy who said when he was younger his dad was in denial and told everyone "my son is going to be a lady killer he has nothing but women on his walls"

The guy tweeted his kid wall and it was all "the divas" Whitney, Mariah, Aretha, Cher, Madonna, Dolly Parton ☐☐☐

death_by_1000_cats • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 09:09 PM

Nooooooooo lmao

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 09:00 PM

Lol fair enough! I would totally have that Ali poster too that's iconic

Maybe this is why black men do better with women lol.

Damn you throwing some shade though??

GridReXX • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 09:00 PM

Had to! ☐☐♀☐

Fuego213 • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 08:39 PM

Did not expect to randomly laugh at Lil Fizz today lmfao

GridReXX • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 08:41 PM*

☐☐

hail_galaxar • 0 points • 9 December, 2020 08:51 PM

Can confirm. I met two guys a few months ago. I literally just picked the 7 over a 9.5. He will be just as sweet and funny at 80 years old.

YasuotheChosenOne • 6 points • 9 December, 2020 09:56 PM

Or perhaps you were just less sure of your capacity to keep the 9.5.

[deleted] • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 01:03 AM

This

If he was actually a 9.5 and she's not in his league then most likely would have ended in a pump and dump

People date people in their league for long term relationships

hail_galaxar • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 12:19 AM

If 9.5's are pursuing me, I'm probably not a 1 or 2. (Maybe my personality bumps me up to a 3/4□.) Why is it so hard to believe that the hotter guy wasn't better relationship material? Have you never met a gorgeous girl that was stuck up?

YasuotheChosenOne • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 01:53 AM

I never said he was, just giving a plausible reason for why you'd choose a significantly less attractive mate for an LTR.

Fuego213 • 0 points • 9 December, 2020 08:59 PM

A real world example. Oh my lol

GreatRedYonder • 0 points • 9 December, 2020 08:51 PM

This is only for women who sleep around though

TheBookOfSeil • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 08:56 PM

Ummm no? This applies to all women.

GreatRedYonder • 0 points • 9 December, 2020 09:06 PM

There are literally virgins surveyed.

TheBookOfSeil • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 09:09 PM

Doesn't that contradict your previous comment then?

GreatRedYonder • -1 points • 9 December, 2020 09:11 PM

.....no?

TheBookOfSeil • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 09:15 PM

You said: "This is only for women who sleep around though," and then said that virgins are also surveyed, so you would be saying that those virgins are sleeping around too.

This applies to all women, not just "women who sleep around."

RSDevotion1[S] • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 09:11 PM

I adjusted the dataset to exclude the virgins in the statistics.

geometersbane • 21 points • 9 December, 2020 07:48 PM

Women are logging in to play the "Sexual Liberation" game without reading the fine print. Too bad they don't get to respawn.

TheBookOfSeil • 7 points • 10 December, 2020 12:03 AM

That's what abortion is for, man. They've rigged the game in their favor now.

geometersbane • 0 points • 10 December, 2020 01:10 AM

Should we really be surprised that so many of them make awful choices when given autonomy? Even the

ones who know the risks going in still throw caution to the wind and simply cannot resist their hedonistic urges.

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:37 AM

And that's why we have abortion. The government is still very much interested in population control and abortion was a way to achieve that without the government actively sterilizing people against their will or putting endocrine disruptors in our food and water containers and potentially facing backlash if they were found out.

<https://www.nature.com/scitable/forums/genetics-generation/america-s-hidden-history-the-eugenics-movement-123919444/>

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2757926/>

<https://www.pbs.org/independentlens/blog/unwanted-sterilization-and-eugenics-programs-in-the-united-states/>

It's also not really a coincidence that the beginnings of Planned Parenthood are linked to eugenics either.

geometersbane • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 06:43 PM

Thanks for the reading material.

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 10:43 PM

□ □

[deleted] • 4 points • 10 December, 2020 12:27 AM

... and dudes come to conclusions like yours without reading the normal-sized print, so who are people to judge

geometersbane • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:23 AM

This comment makes no sense. You're not really saying anything. Care to elaborate?

[deleted] • 5 points • 10 December, 2020 01:56 AM

That people aren't reading the study prior to taking a fragment of it as confirmation of their idea of rather pointed ideas about women or men. :/

No seriously, it's a good study. People should read it in full, or at least skim some of it

geometersbane • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 06:43 PM

I didn't even read the study. I'm drawing conclusions from personal experience and testimonies. My comment is still relevant though.

ihatehijabuwearit • 19 points • 9 December, 2020 08:06 PM

Whats wrong with that? Everyone wants their child to have good genes. To the men here: yall shit on ugly women all the time and just use them for pumps and dumps. You would never try to start a family with one so don't be hypocrites.

Asbelowsoaboveme • 7 points • 9 December, 2020 08:24 PM

Preaching truth

WomenHavItHarder • 13 points • 9 December, 2020 08:40 PM

This type of reasoning is why there are so many single mothers.

ihatehijabuwearit • 0 points • 9 December, 2020 10:47 PM

nothing wrong with single mothers.

WomenHavItHarder • 13 points • 9 December, 2020 11:14 PM

Not according to crime statistics. Children raised by single mothers are 3 times more likely to end up in jail than children raised by two parents

ihatehijabuwearit • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 11:20 PM

That's men's fault. They shouldn't be deadbeat then. It's not the woman's fault for staying for the kid. It's the man's. Also, why do you think at sperm banks, white 6ft educated athletic sperms of men are the most popular? It's biological to get the best genes. Most men do the same thing. Look up ugly girl memes, then you will see how ugly girls really live like. I was bullied so bad by men for being an ugly short fat curry girl with frizzy hair, acne, and glasses.

WomenHavItHarder • 12 points • 9 December, 2020 11:27 PM

It's the woman's fault for choosing to fuck a man without a condom based on his physical aesthetics (or in your words "good genes") and not on actual merit. The woman chose to be impregnated by a deadbeat because he looked good, not because he was willing or capable of raising a child.

Hallowbin-Skin3329 • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:20 AM

So it's everyone's fault (and more the mans), the woman made one bad choice the man made more than one

WomenHavItHarder • 8 points • 10 December, 2020 01:28 AM

It's the responsibility of the woman to choose the "best genes" and clearly she chose wrong if she's a single mom lol

Hallowbin-Skin3329 • -1 points • 10 December, 2020 01:31 AM

So you don't believe in general taking responsibility just women taking responsibility understood.

While the mans fault in the situation is there(it can never not be there as both parties had to make an active decision for the woman to get pregnant) they just aren't considered responsible as they don't "pick genes"

WomenHavItHarder • 7 points • 10 December, 2020 01:33 AM

Who's the one carrying the baby? The woman. Who's the gatekeeper of sex? The woman. The burden falls on the woman sorry if you don't like reality

ihatehijabuwearit • -1 points • 9 December, 2020 11:45 PM

Well, tbh there are many beta men willing to take care of that child and adopt him/her as his own

fuck_you_dylan • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 05:36 AM

Chad really hurt you huh ? I suggest therapy. You'll never be in a healthy relationship with that out look

fuck_you_dylan • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 05:34 AM

You havent read the statistics on that have you ?

innocent_butungu • 11 points • 9 December, 2020 09:35 PM

To the men here: yall shit on ugly women all the time and just use them for pumps and dumps
tell me when did chad ghost you

watermelonicecream • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 08:56 PM

Wait, you guys are having sex with ugly women?

Avocado_Pears • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 06:00 PM

Wait, you guys are having sex

Monkitail • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 06:37 PM

what i don't understand is how we have had literally no advancements in condom technology

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 10:04 PM

No disagreement. I'd only say that if you're a guy and you wanna hit it raw and she doesn't, don't waste you time...discard immediately and find one who *is* willing ☐♂☐

redditthrowaway1478 • -1 points • 10 December, 2020 02:01 PM

Probably for the millionth time we've had to say this in this sub

We know - we're tired of having to pry these truths out of women over the years because it's seems to be a fucking natural tendency for them to hide shit, tell half truths, obfuscate reality, and when we finally pull up a studies like this one, we show them the proof, and like clockwork, the overwhelming responses are:

"Oh you mean you guys didn't know? I thought it was obvious? Never mind the last 15 posts where I contradicted what I'm saying now and for whatever reasons, I seem to be unable to remember that situation the way it actually happened now."

It's shit like this that makes me actually wonder if women really do have agency or not. Like, can we *really* trust them to be fully independent *adults* when they can't even remember what happened yesterday with clarity of mind?

Can we really trust to be fully fledged individuals with individual rights when they seem to be wired to manipulate men and only be open about it to their female friends?

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 08:06 PM

[deleted]

thelajestic • 15 points • 9 December, 2020 08:24 PM

I just keep male condoms on hand at all times. Never seen a female condom in the shop tbh and it's always male condoms when picking them up free at boots etc. Plus female condoms are less effective!

EusticeSymington • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 09:17 AM

Why though? Don't you have a fella?

thelajestic • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 09:48 AM

I do, I just mean in general when I was single etc. However, we still currently keep a stock of condoms on hand too as hormonal contraception doesn't agree with me and I don't fancy an IUD.

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 08:31 PM

[deleted]

thelajestic • 16 points • 9 December, 2020 08:47 PM

Again: male condoms are *more effective*. What matters to me is using the more effective method. I don't need to rely on a man to provide the condoms as I always have them, I'm perfectly capable of putting them on a guy. It isn't a question of reliance unless the guy is going to stealth, but he could theoretically remove a female condom just as easily as a male one.

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 08:58 PM

[deleted]

thelajestic • 7 points • 9 December, 2020 09:01 PM

No, that's why I said theoretically. However, in my experience of using male condoms and being stealthed - if you're very wet you can't feel the condom so you can't tell if it's on or not. I assume it would be similar with a female condom.

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 09:28 PM

[deleted]

thelajestic • 12 points • 9 December, 2020 10:06 PM

No, because in all the time I've had sex I've only been stealthed once, and I've never accidentally got pregnant or ever contracted an STI, all the while using male condoms. Female condoms are statistically less effective than male condoms so to me, it is not being responsible to use them.

I have now answered this question three times and you've yet to give me any further information as to why you think differently - all you're doing is repeating the question.

[deleted] 10 December, 2020 07:10 PM*

[deleted]

thelajestic • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 07:54 PM

It's still taking responsibility for contraception - I'm providing a suitable contraceptive. It isn't a difference between men and women as plenty men feel they're being responsible about contraception just cos they've asked a woman if she's on the pill or not.

So now you run the risk of having condoms that may not work with the guy you're with

Well then there'd be no sex. I'm perfectly fine with that outcome, since it's so

very rare to happen. I've only ever been with one guy who felt he needed different condoms so it's never exactly been an issue. 3% is a lot if I'm the one who might end up pregnant. Again, it's not just the efficacy - they are more expensive and much harder to find. I've never seen one in a shop so why would I buy one, when male condoms are readily available?

not wanting to carry your gender's condoms and wanting the man to deal with it.

Again, plenty men are perfectly content to try and rely on the woman being on some form of contraceptive that they can't even see - you can't tell if someone has missed a pill or are lying about an IUD. Providing condoms, whether they're male or female, is not the same.

ChibsFilipTelfordd • 0 points • 9 December, 2020 11:19 PM

just keep male condoms on hand at all times

Dude no offense im assuming youre a girl so you don't know this but condoms are NOT one size fits all. I thought i was normal size but i am above and i thought everyone had problems getting soft during sex, as well as breaking condoms a lot.. And my ex said her ex had like 3 condoms slip off inside her, it's just wack.

Just fyi condoms are not 1 size fits all (and magnums are only 2mm thicker at the base... Smh great marketing terrible product. MyOne is where its at)

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:07 AM

It's time to bust out the lambskin condoms bro lmao

thelajestic • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 07:10 AM

They are one size fits most. They're perfectly fine the vast majority of the time.

GrumpyOldHistoricist • 10 points • 9 December, 2020 09:05 PM

The female condom is awful. Like fucking a trash bag. Used one once just to see what it was like. Never again. 0/10. Would not recommend.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:14 AM

Imagine how men feel

GridReXX • 8 points • 9 December, 2020 08:36 PM

I'm not convinced those things stay secured in place. I always imagined it getting jammed up in there and the STDs and baby juice entering the vagina despite efforts. Male condoms seem more foolproof.

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 08:40 PM

[deleted]

GridReXX • 7 points • 9 December, 2020 08:55 PM*

Most women who carry condoms just carry the male ones and convince him to put it on.

If he says no. She can choose to have sex with him or not. Most women who ask and the guy says no, will simply not have sex though.

That said, internal condoms are great in that the woman (bottom) is in total control. So that's good for them.

death_by_1000_cats • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 08:53 PM

I mean I used to carry male condoms/keep them in my nightstand and so did other women I know. tbh I've never seen a female condom

TheBookOfSeil • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 12:06 AM

It's basically the same but is put on/in like a mini garbage bag.

death_by_1000_cats • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 04:09 AM

Yeah I know what they are, just haven't encountered one outside of a sex ed class

Notsonewguy7 • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 08:12 PM

I've never even seen a women specific condom. I saw a dental dam once.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 09:04 PM

dental dam

mmmm

[deleted] • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 12:33 AM

They're less efficient, harder to get a hold of, and more difficult to use in comparison. I just have male condoms on me instead + contraceptives

[deleted] 10 December, 2020 07:09 PM

[deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 07:59 PM*

I'm raised around obgyns family friends!! Don't try and out-sexual health virtue signal me, this is my forte lmao

I have an IUD already. I just have male condoms in my nightstand because they don't look like a vulva diaper and don't require a small 'down' time after inserting. Buy one once and try it with a partner, you'll understand. Condoms are much more frequently used for a reason— and no, it isn't female laziness or machiavellian fertility scheme

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 09:24 PM

Only sex workers use female condoms.

thetruthishere_ • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 12:30 AM

They are usually only used for duos and old men with ED.

drew8311 • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 02:16 AM

Having condoms on them ruins the illusion they "don't usually do this sort of thing".

thelajestic • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 09:09 AM

Except he's talking about female condoms specifically and not condoms in general - many women will just buy male condoms as they're cheaper, more reliable, easier to get hold of than female condoms. Not the same thing as just not having any.

_mwk • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 06:54 AM

ive never seen a female condom sold anywhere tbh

[deleted] • 7 points • 9 December, 2020 07:43 PM

CMV: condomsex is fake sex

screamingIn2_theVoid • 4 points • 9 December, 2020 08:07 PM

CMV: condomsex is fake sex

Had a girlfriend half my age for almost 5 years: condoms every time, and it was AWESOME.

SonicBackScratcher • 17 points • 9 December, 2020 08:18 PM

5 years: condoms every time

Wow, after my GF now wife and I got serious she got on the pill in like a month. Condoms are awful.

simeneta • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 08:41 PM

Yeah the only time my partner and I use condoms is if we're camping since it makes cleanup easier. IUDs are awesome.

SonicBackScratcher • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 08:45 PM

IUDs are awesome.

Poke...poke...poke. Didn't work for us.

simeneta • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 08:48 PM

I was afraid of that when I got mine but fortunately didn't end up being an issue

SonicBackScratcher • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 08:53 PM

We have a combination of a big dick and smaller vaginal canal so it was awful. Her's was also non-hormonal so I was worried about failure as it was so I wasn't too upset it didn't work out.

YasuotheChosenOne • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 10:03 PM

I feel your pain here. My GF has an IUD and I can feel it jabbing my dick sometimes. It's very uncomfy when it lines up in my thrusting path lol.

ChibsFilipTelfordd • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 11:22 PM

Omg you had that problem too!?!?!?! I thought it was only my ex and i

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 09:50 PM

[deleted]

simeneta • 4 points • 9 December, 2020 10:24 PM

I'm not worried about him cheating so no

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 10:44 PM

[deleted]

simeneta • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 11:05 PM

I think in most normal relationships people trust their partners not to cheat (unless they start showing some obvious red flags)

ChibsFilipTelfordd • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 11:23 PM

If in a committed Relationship its not a big deal, if your partner cheats you have a lot bigger problems than a small risk of std

FlwrPowr • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 08:22 PM

Based

Notsonewguy7 • 6 points • 9 December, 2020 08:10 PM

5 years: condoms every time, and it was AWESOME

You guys were popping other people at the same time? Condoms every time really, that feels like that get old real fast.

screamingIn2_theVoid • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 08:43 PM

Every time. She was fucking hot, it was fine.

Notsonewguy7 • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 08:45 PM

And you were exclusive you guys weren't like you know tagging other people in the background? It just seems so weird to me cuz after a period of time you think that there'd be some sort of trust like "I don't think you're cheating on me and you've been tested let's do this."

simeneta • 7 points • 9 December, 2020 08:53 PM

Some women can't use birth control. My best friend still uses condoms with her husband because hormonal BC gives her month long periods and she nearly passed out trying to get the copper IUD.

abqkat • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 10:25 PM

I have never been on birth control, and wouldn't. I used condoms exclusively before I got my bisalp. The "just get on The Pill™" that gets thrown around is really tiresome, especially considering the many reasons I didn't want to.

Notsonewguy7 • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 08:56 PM

That's fair I often forget about that. I guess I've just never ran into a girl that had that problem.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 09:52 PM

Well, there's no doubt that helps, but also indisputable that it would've felt way better without it!

Notsonewguy7 • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 07:46 PM

I mean.... you're not wrong but it is safer.

Sufficient-Ad-3586 • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 09:58 PM

Breaking news: Woman lets man she finds attractive nut in her.

JameisBong • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 11:26 AM

Lol anyone who's had enough one night stands will tell you this. Most women simply don't care about condoms. That has been my experience.

As a side note , I've never seen anyone cheat using condoms. Typically it's unprotected and it happens a few times. If someone does cheat on you, you should probably leave.

CandleLess • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 12:52 PM

As a dumbass who's gone raw with 2 girls I shouldn't have gone raw with, yes, men are dumbasses

Willow-girl • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 01:26 PM

Hi Dad!

CandleLess • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:32 PM

Trust me I got pretty lucky. One of these girls told my friend he got her pregnant, then a week later said she miscarried. Made her send me a video of her taking the plan B for good reason. To make this even funnier, both girls I hit raw were best friends, and they were my 1st and 2nd time

[deleted] • 4 points • 9 December, 2020 08:15 PM*

This could share relevancy to the fact that as many American men (1.7%) report being "forced to penetrate" each year as women report being raped, ...

The post compared to, according to their screenshots, male *lifetime* to female annual rape statistics. So, unfortunately, I think this point and the post is, unfortunately, making very hasty conclusions in speculating.

One reason for victims not reporting is likelier the fact that rape myths, including victim-blaming for either gender and the misconception that men can't be raped, are so present in investigation processes that victims expect themselves to be treated as untrustworthy upfront.

ETA: Will read the study before responding to this one in particular.

RSDevotion1[S] • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 08:18 PM*

The post compared to, according to their screenshots, male lifetime to female annual rape statistics.

That's a typo on my part. The correct statistic is 1.1% for annual forced penetration rather than 1.7%.

Women's annual reported rape frequency in the 2010 survey is 1.1% as well.

<https://i.imgur.com/fpYxx3B.png>

<https://i.imgur.com/JEwqH6t.png>

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 08:59 PM*

There are a lot of problems people have pointed with that cdc statistic, that the op likes to keep citing, for one

it defines rape too broadly to the point where many people labeled rape victims by the cdc would not consider themselves such:

Both critics and supporters of the CDC's methodology note the striking disparity between CDC figures and the Justice Department's crime statistics based on the National Crime Victimization Survey (which includes crimes unreported to the police). While the CDC estimates that nearly 2 million adult American women were raped in 2011 and nearly 6.7 million suffered some other form of sexual violence, the NCVS estimate for that year was 238,000 rapes and sexual assaults.

And

Few would deny that sex crimes in America are a real, serious, and tragic problem. But studies of sexual violence should use accurate and clear definitions of rape and sexual assault, rather than lump these criminal acts together with a wide range of unsavory but non-criminal scenarios of men—and women—behaving badly.

And

It is safe to assume that the vast majority of the CDC's male respondents who were "made to penetrate" someone would not call themselves rape victims—and with good reason.

Also wtf is this comment:

perhaps providing evidence for exclusive selectivity (based on a man's facial attractiveness) in women's choices of which men they sexually victimize.

There is no evidence that sexual attractiveness plays a role in who is raped or not raped wtf.

RSDevotion1[S] • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 09:55 PM

for one it defines rape too broadly to the point where many people labeled rape victims by the cdc would not consider themselves such

It defines rape as being the subject of penetration, which women cannot commit on men due to their lack of a phallus (unless they are using another object...).

It is safe to assume that the vast majority of the CDC's male respondents who were "made to penetrate" someone would not call themselves rape victims—and with good reason.

Yes, they literally cannot call themselves "rape victims," according to the CDC, because the CDC defines rape as being forcefully penetrated (explicitly excluding being forced to penetrate).

There is no evidence that sexual attractiveness plays a role in who is raped or not raped wtf.

If you consider "'preventing him from getting a condom by staying on top of him' despite him wanting to use one" to be rape, then, yes, facial attractiveness does play a factor considering that women report being more likely to prevent condom usage with more facially attractive men.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 10:41 PM*

The cdc uses the same survey questions for both men and women to measure if they have been 'raped' or 'force to penetrate.'

I mean this an example of some of survey questions they ask participants:

How many people have verbally harassed you while you were in a public place in a way that made you feel unsafe?

So if some asshole shouted at you public, in a way that made you feel unsafe, that could according to the cdc be labeled as **sexual violence**.

When you were **drunk, high**, or unable to consent, how many people have ever had vaginal, anal, or oral sex with you, or put fingers or an object into your vagina or anus?

So if you were drunk while having sex or high on marijuana even if the sex was consensual, that would be labeled as rape by cdc.

How many people have you ever had vaginal, oral, or anal sex with, after they pressured you by wearing you down by repeatedly asking for sex or showing they were unhappy?

So if you are horny and repeatedly beg your partner to have sex, and they give in, that makes you guilty of rape by cdc standards.

There is a reason why several social scientist have criticized the cdc for its methodology as the questions they ask are leading, too imprecise and inflate the statistics.

If you want an accurate measure on sexual violence it's better to use the National Crime Victimization Survey, which is conducted by the Justice Department. It uses a much larger sample size (it interviews more than 100,000 people and has a response rate of above 80 percent. The CDC interviewed fewer than 20,000 people and had a response rate of around 30 percent.)

The questioning in the NCVS is also much better as it forces its participants to focus on criminal acts while cdc offers more broad and vague questions in that department.

An example of NCVS questions:

Has anyone attacked or threatened you in any of these ways (exclude telephone threats)

- (a) With any weapon, for instance, a gun or knife
- (b) With anything like a baseball bat, frying pan, scissors, or stick
- (c) By something thrown, such as a rock or bottle
- (d) Include any grabbing, punching, or choking,
- (e) Any rape, attempted rape or other type of sexual attack
- (f) Any face to face threats

OR

(g) Any attack or threat or use of force by anyone at all? Please mention it even if you are not certain it was a crime.

The NCVS which is viewed as more accurate by social scientist since closely matches police arrest records, has a much larger sample size then CDC as well as a more precise definition of rape, shows that victimization is nowhere near as high as the cdc models predict it as:

The numbers from the CDC survey are far higher than those reported by the Justice Department's National Crime Victimization Survey, which in 2010 found an annual risk of rape or sexual assault of 1.3 per 1,000 females 12 or older, or 0.13 percent. In the CDC study, by contrast, 1 percent of women 18 or older "reported some type of rape victimization in the 12 months prior to taking the survey." That rate is nearly eight times as high—a huge gap, even allowing for the difference in the ages of the respondents. While the CDC survey counts 1.3 million rapes of women in 2010, the total number of rapes and sexual assaults (of males and females combined) in the Justice Department survey was 188,380

<https://www.reason.com/2011/12/16/what-counts-as-rape-in-the-cdcs-survey/%3famp>

If you consider "'preventing him from getting a condom by staying on top of him' despite him wanting to use one" to be rape, then, yes, facial attractiveness does play a factor considering that women report being more likely to prevent condom usage with more facially attractive men.

This is something you are inferring women do, at no point did the study make a connection between lax condom usage with a man and the likelihood to rape him wtf.

RSDevotion1[S] • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 10:56 PM

I don't understand what you're trying to argue with the questionnaire examples, especially if they were kept consistent between the sexes. And yes, I'm aware that any form of intoxicated sex could be considered rape, according to the CDC.

This is something you are inferring women do, at no point did the study make a connection between lax condom usage with a man and the likelihood to rape him wtf.

The only inference I made is that "'preventing him from getting a condom by staying on top of him' despite him wanting to use one" could very well be considered rape. Do you disagree?

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 11:11 PM*

I don't understand what you're trying to argue with the questionnaire examples, especially if they were kept consistent between the sexes. And yes, I'm aware that any form of intoxicated sex could be considered rape, according to the CDC.

It's been shown that questions they ask are leading ones, imprecise and vague which inflated the statistic. Do you honestly think that begging your partner for sex and then them unenthusiastically agreeing to sex with you should be labeled as **rape** because the cdc does. That's why numerous of organizations dealing with sexual violence and social scientist have criticized the cdc for eliciting misleading numbers.

The only inference I made is that "'preventing him from getting a condom by staying on top of him' despite him wanting to use one" could very well be considered rape. Do you disagree?

The study literally just says women are less likely to want to use condom with men they find attractive, you are making a wild jump from that to raping him to prevent condom usage, at no point does the study make a connection between using physical violence to prevent condom usage with a potential partner which is why your scenario seems very out there. If you have study that shows this which is why you are making this connection, then post it, otherwise connecting women's less willingness to use condoms with their likelihood to rape is asinine especially when you try to frame it as men with attractive faces as being more likely to be raped wtf.

Why are you ignoring my point regarding the NCVS, if you are so interested in studying sexual violence why doesn't a survey with much larger sample size (100,000+ vs 20,000 for the cdc) a higher response rate (over 80% vs 30%) and a more precise gender neutral definition of rape with straightforward questioning interest you?

RSDevotion1[S] • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 11:31 PM*

It's been shown that questions they ask are leading ones, imprecise and vague which

inflated the statistic. Do you honestly think that begging your partner for sex and then reluctantly giving in should be labeled as rape because the cdc does. That's why numerous of organizations dealing with sexual violence and social scientist have criticized the cdc for eliciting misleading numbers.

Again, if their questionnaires were kept consistent between the sexes then both sexes were exposed to the same problems you are suggesting.

I don't want to argue rape semantics. If you're asking for my personal opinion, I think rape laws could be more effectively covered by physical assault/threat/coercion/etc. laws regardless of the sexual aspect of the crime.

The study literally just says women are less likely to want to use condom with men they find attractive, you are making a wild jump from that to raping him to prevent condom usage, at no point does the study make a connection between using physical violence to prevent condom usage with a potential partner which is why your scenario seems very out there.

You're avoiding answering my question. The study found a strong correlation between condom resistance tactics and physical attractiveness. If that tactic involves "forced penetration" then a link can be established between physical attractiveness and acts of forced penetration.

Why are you ignoring my point regarding the NCVS, if you are so interested in studying sexual violence why doesn't a survey with much larger sample size (100,000+ vs 20,000 for the cdc) a higher response rate (over 80% vs 30%) and a more precise gender neutral definition of rape with straightforward questioning interest you?

Feel free to link it. The CDC survey has value because it explicitly leads men to report acts of "being forced to penetrate." If men were only asked to report instances in which they were raped, they may actually fail to report instances in which they were forced to penetrate.

Furthermore, if the NCVS only focuses on lifetime victimization, that would not contradict the point I have already made. A larger percentage of women than men report lifetime victimization because women are inherently more selective with their acts of sexual misconduct.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 12:42 AM*

Again, if their questionnaires were kept consistent between the sexes then both sexes were exposed to the same problems you are suggesting.

Yes which is why they are misleading and have been heavily criticized by social scientist and organizations that specialize in sexual violence prevention.

I don't want to argue rape semantics. If you're asking for my personal opinion, I think rape laws could be more effectively covered by physical assault/threat/coercion/etc. laws regardless of the sexual aspect of the crime.

So you think catcalling someone in public or name calling someone in public should be treated as **sexual violence** because under the cdc definition of **sexual violence** it is:

How many people have verbally harassed you while you were in a public place in

a way that made you feel unsafe?

This should be treated as sexual violence according to you?

Begging your partner for sex is also considered **rape** according to cdc:

How many people have you ever had vaginal, oral, or anal sex with, after they pressured you by wearing you down by repeatedly asking for sex or showing they were unhappy?

So basically pretty much everyone who has ever been in a long term relationship should be tried and convicted for rape according to you.

You're avoiding answering my question.

Because your question has **nothing** to do with the study, this is a leap you made that the study does not measure. You still haven't shared a link showing the connection you are making between less willingness of wanting to use condom with a man and raping him.

Feel free to link it. The CDC survey has value because it explicitly leads men to report acts of "being forced to penetrate." If men were only asked to report instances in which they were raped, they may actually fail to report instances in which they were forced to penetrate.

NCVS unlike the cdc, uses a gender neutral definition of rape.

The NCVS has a broader definition of rape. **It includes male and female victims and offenders.**

Here is the link I find it interesting how someone who seems to be very interested in sexual violence wouldn't want to look at survey which has a larger sample size(100,000+ vs less than 20,000 for cdc) a higher response rate(over 80% vs 30% for cdc) and most importantly is considered the most accurate by social scientists since it closely matches the arrest numbers of violent crime every year.

Furthermore, if the NCVS only focuses on lifetime victimization, that would not contradict the point I have already made. A larger percentage of women than men report lifetime victimization because women are inherently more selective with their acts of sexual misconduct.

Jesus Christ, this shows you have no understanding of why people commit rape and sexual psychology. Rapists who commit rape do so because they get a sense of power which is what arouses not the attractiveness of the victim. If that were the case then we wouldn't have cases of elderly women getting raped if it was all about attractiveness.

And no the NCVS does **NOT** measure lifetime prevalence.

The NCVS does not capture lifetime prevalence rates, but estimates annual incidence rates of victimization.

RSDevotion1[S] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:41 AM

I already mentioned in my previous post that:

The CDC's National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey defines "rape" similarly to the Justice Department—as forced penetration of a person's body:

Rape is defined as any completed or attempted unwanted vaginal (for women), oral, or anal penetration through the use of physical force (such as being pinned or held down, or by the use of violence) or threats to physically harm, and includes times when the victim was drunk, high, drugged, or passed out and unable to consent.

Rape is separated into three types; completed forced penetration, attempted forced penetration, and completed alcohol or drug facilitated penetration. To complement this definition of "rape," they define "being made to penetrate someone else" as:

Being made to penetrate someone else includes times when the victim was made to, or there was an attempt to make them, sexually penetrate someone without the victim's consent because the victim was physically forced (such as being pinned or held down, or by the use of violence) or threatened with physical harm, or when the victim was drunk, high, drugged, or passed out and unable to consent.

Those definitions are practical enough to observe trends between the sexes, assuming questionnaires (regardless of how individually flawed they are) are kept consistent between the sexes.

I skimmed through the 2019 BJS report and could not find statistics of rape/sexual assault split by sex. Maybe you can find it for me.

Rapist who commit rape due to so because they get a sense of power which is what arouses not the attractiveness of the victim.

Humans tend to have sex with individuals they're sexually attracted to (with female sexual attraction being much more selective). From an evolutionary perspective, an androgenic hormonal profile drives males to engage in sexual intercourse, facilitated by female submission. However, in many cases (not restricted to just humans), females will resist the sexual advance. In select cases, females will be far more submissive to males of high genetic quality, and may even aggressively sexually pursue them. That is the larger picture of mating, regardless of isolated cases of "power" dynamics in rape.

If that were case then we wouldn't have cases of elderly women getting raped if it was all about attractiveness.

As I've explained, men are far less sexually selective than women. There's a reason why elderly men are likely not highly represented victims of "being forced to penetrate" women...

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 05:46 AM

Those definitions are practical enough to observe trends between the sexes, assuming questionnaires (regardless of how individually flawed they are) are kept consistent between the sexes.

Why do you keep ignoring the survey questions I posted as examples from the **cdc** that they use to measure sexual violence? They are not just outright asking participants if they were ever raped, they are asking leading questions with vague imprecise definition and labeling it rape at their own discretion.

How many people have verbally harassed you while you were in a public place in a way that made you feel unsafe?

If you answered yes to this question that makes you a victim of **sexual violence** according to cdc, so if somebody catcalled you public once and it made you feel uncomfortable that makes you a victim of **sexual violence**, do you see how using vague imprecise questions like will elicit a flawed methodology?

When you were drunk, high, or unable to consent, how many people have ever had vaginal, anal, or oral sex with you, or put fingers or an object into your vagina or anus?

So if we're at any point ever drunk or high while having sex according to the cdc even if it was consensual that's rape.

How many people have you ever had vaginal, oral, or anal sex with, after they pressured you by wearing you down by repeatedly asking for sex or showing they were unhappy?

If you ever begged your partner for sex you are guilty of **sexual coercion** by the cdc standards.

I skimmed through the 2019 BJS report and could not find statistics of rape/sexual assault split by sex. Maybe you can find it for me.

Here is a report that breaks it down.

As I've explained, men are far less sexually selective than women. There's a reason why elderly men are likely not highly represented victims of "being forced to penetrate" women...

This still has nothing to do with why people rape, rapists get aroused at overpowering their victim not their attractiveness. You seem to be one of those people who think people only rape to have sexual access to others and pass on their genes. If that was true why do rapists often kill their victims after their crime?

Jaktenba • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 10:40 PM

As OP said, the CDC's definition of rape is the problem, though I guess it's more appropriate to say the difference between the legal and colloquial definitions of rape, is the problem. The CDC also asked leading questions, and then there's the whole problem with how memory is actually all but completely unreliable, especially the older it is.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 10:52 PM

Yes exactly which is why it's better to use the NCVS conducted by the Justice Department, it uses a larger sample size, and a more precise definition of rape.

Jaktenba • 1 point • 12 December, 2020 04:42 PM

Except the Justice Department has the exact same problem, maybe even worse considering your choice of "precise". The UK has a very precise definition of rape, so precise that it's impossible for a woman to ever be tried as a rapist (with one caveat being if she partakes in a gangrape of another woman, with several men involved). That does nothing to shed light on male victims of female perpetrators, and it obscures even female victims of female perpetrators. We just get into the same loop as with domestic violence, pretending it's something men do to women, and occasionally to other men, but never is a woman the perpetrator of anyone.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 December, 2020 07:06 PM

The justice department has a gender neutral definition rape.

Jaktenba • 1 point • 12 December, 2020 08:52 PM

Pretend I put a sighing emoji here.

Not really, because the definition of rape is being penetrated, an act that just so happens to be something primarily done by men. This literally just circles back to my original comment about the difference between the legal definition of rape and the colloquial definition of rape. The legal only involves penetration (and depending on where exactly you are it may be limited to vaginal penetration, and only when done by a penis), the colloquial is any forced sex act.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 December, 2020 09:01 PM

Definitions of rape always include physical force or threats of physical force as tactics to obtain sexual intercourse (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1995; Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2001).

Jaktenba • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 10:36 PM

Victim blaming is a rape myth. 90% of the time it's evidence gathering and saying a rape didn't take place. At best you could call it "rape denial" but that's not as catchy as pretending people are saying "yes you were raped, but you deserved it"

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 11:58 PM

Nope. Officers go against guidelines of investigation of rapes and are influenced by their biases, like believing that a majority of rape reports are false. The results end up compromising the integrity of investigation.

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1466802504042222>

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1077801210387747>

Jaktenba • 1 point • 12 December, 2020 04:49 PM

Mind linking something I don't have to pay \$100 for?

That aside, the abstract of the first one already shows the bullshit bias of the researchers

The article argues that many rape complainants must still battle to gain credibility in the eyes of some police investigative officers

This is called police work. You think you can just go into a police station and say "So-and-so just

stole \$5,000,000 from me." without having to provide any evidence towards the credibility of such a claim?

And the second is just as bad

Of the 136 cases of sexual assault reported over the 10-year period, 8 (5.9%) are coded as false allegations. These results, **taken in the context of an examination of previous research, indicate that the prevalence of false allegations is between 2% and 10%.**

Literally repeating the same bullshit as is typical in this discussion. Yes, only 2-10% are **PROVEN** false, but newsflash it works the same way around for **PROVEN** true (though this is pretending the cases that are overturned later don't actually exist), which means that the **VAST** majority of cases are never proven either way. But most people aren't thinking critically when hearing these numbers, they hear "10% are false" and predictably their mind fills in the blank "that means 90% are true", when we all know that's unproven at the least.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 December, 2020 05:31 PM

Sorry, I usually try to give access-links but I've debated these exact questions like 5000 times already. Uploaded PDFs:

1. <https://docdro.id/Tr1yksJ>
2. <https://docdro.id/JR9HtE3>

This thing with ascribing unfair bias to anything that doesn't tickle your fancy or that doesn't confirm what you already believe is bullshit though. That's like the ultimate cop-out (badumtss) for a leveled discussion.

Jaktenba • 1 point • 12 December, 2020 10:03 PM

I'll tackle number 2 first, since it's shorter.

For centuries, it has been asserted and assumed that women "cry rape," that a large proportion of rape allegations are maliciously concocted for purposes of revenge or other motives. Most famously, Sir Matthew Hale, a chief justice of the court of the King's bench of England, expressed this view in a form that became the basis for special jury instructions that would be used late into the 20th century (Schafran, 1993). Hale (1847) wrote, It is true rape is a most detestable crime, and therefore ought severely and impartially to be punished with death; but it must be remembered, that it is an accusation easily to be made and hard to be proved, and harder to be defended by the party accused, tho never so innocent.

Already off to a terrible start, go ahead and try to tell me this isn't feminist-biased bullshit. There is literally nothing false nor wrong with what Sir Matthew Hale wrote here. It's all 100% factual, rape is hard to prove, words are easily spoken, and defending against such allegations are difficult in a number of ways (if sex did occur then it's even harder to argue against; but either way it's hard to fight when there's been a time gap between supposed occurrence and the time of reporting).

Side note, these damn PDFs keep causing pop-ups, but I'll try to wade through.

It sure is weird just how much leeway must be given to **ACCUSERS** (the fact that this "study" continually conflates accusers with victims is simply another nail in its coffin of bias) before a case can be classified as false.

A case in which the victim decides not to cooperate with investigators. Victims make such decisions for many reasons (Jordan, 2004; Lea et al., 2003).

A case in which investigators decide that there is insufficient evidence to proceed toward a prosecution. Rape cases, particularly nonstranger cases, are very difficult to investigate and prosecute, and many investigations are aborted because of these difficulties and because of the perception that successful prosecution is unlikely (Clark & Lewis, 1977; Frazier & Haney, 1996; Frohmann, 1991; Spohn, Beichner, & Davis-Frenzel, 2001).

A case in which the victim appears to make inconsistent statements, or even lies about certain aspects of the incident. Traumatized individuals tend to recall events in a fragmented fashion, which makes apparent inconsistencies likely (Halligan, Michael, Clark, & Ehlers, 2003); victims may well try to hide certain facts, for example, use of an illegal drug or a particularly humiliating act they suffered—out of fear that they will be treated with suspicion or simply because of the intense shame they experience (Jordan, 2004).

A case in which a victim makes a delayed report of the incident or in which a victim was extremely intoxicated. Delayed reporting is extremely common in rape cases (National Victim Center and the Crime Victims Research and Treatment Center, 1992), and there is evidence that intoxicated individuals are at increased risk of being targeted by sexual predators (Abbey, Zawackia, Buck, Clinton, & McAuslan, 2004; Macy, Nurius, & Norris, 2007; Ullman, 2003)

On its own, this isn't actually a bad thing, the problem arises when you assume that every case that isn't found to be outright false, is actually a true case that was tragically derailed.

The researchers are right about one thing

Rape is unique. No other violent crime is so fraught with controversy, so enmeshed in dispute and in the politics of gender and sexuality.

And this is no clearer than in instances like this

, the UCR stipulates that the category “unfounded” is reserved for “a complaint that is determined through investigation to be false or baseless. In other words, no crime occurred. If the investigation shows that no offense occurred nor was attempted, UCR Program procedures dictate that the reported offense must be unfounded . . .”

...

but only 3% were classified as false allegations by social workers who applied the UCR definition, “investigation shows that no offense occurred nor was attempted”

It is not up to the accused nor the officers to prove no crime was committed, in any other crime. In fact it is literally the opposite, it is the **accuser** and the police who must prove that a crime **DID** occur.

Going to admit, I'm skipping the rest of these old studies. They literally just repeat the same nonsense that any crime that isn't proven false beyond a shadow of a doubt (once again, not what the law is supposed to do in the first place) then it must be true. You know, that exact thing I mentioned before I even started reading this.

Fucking **LOL**

False report: Applying IACP guidelines, a case was classified as a false report if there was evidence that a thorough investigation was pursued and that the investigation had yielded evidence that the reported sexual assault had in fact not occurred. A thorough investigation would involve, potentially, multiple interviews of the alleged perpetrator,

the victim,

If the report was false, there was no victim. Good Lord, even here they can't do the right thing and properly refer to them as an accuser. (Sidenote, these pop-ups are really starting to grate on me.

Such assertions not only under-mine rational discourse

You know what else undermines rational discourse, just sweeping over the fact that only 35.3% of your studied case could be classified as rape, even ignoring the 5.9% that were found to be completely false, you literally can't say one way or the other about 58.8% of the cases. It's incredibly misleading to only mention the ones proven false, and ignore all of the cases that are still unknown.

Good lord, that was an absolute garbage "study"; let's recap. It is not the job of the police nor the accused to prove a crime didn't occur. All claims are quite literally assumed false unless proven otherwise. The accuser and the police must prove their claim, if possible. The absolute majority of cases are never proven either way, so while we can't definitively say most rape accusations are false (though let's be honest, these accusers are being treated with top of the line kid gloves, allowed to lie as much as they want and just excuse it with "muh trauma", yet at the same time I thought trauma made you remember things more clearly, which is why a woman should be believed when she brings forth a 50 year old allegation, hmmm), we also can not say that most of them are true.

Considering the pop-up problem with these documents, I'm going to need your word that the first article isn't as garbage as the second before I dedicate my time to it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 December, 2020 11:50 PM

The study describes a certain phenomenon dating back throughout history, I think you're reading things between the lines rather frivolously and based on your own caricature. The language of calling people filing the report as victims in studies isn't anything exclusive to these studies on investigatory conduct on sexual violence, but can be found in other criminological studies.

Criminology discusses the fact that rape survivors often report that their account of events get altered and misrepresented, so maybe you can see the issue of *police investigations* (i.e. before anything goes to trial) being compromised. The police is there to take in the report and conduct investigation. When police officers let their bias affect the investigatory process, such as going against guidelines on how to investigate e.g. male victims of sexual abuse, it's a case of going beyond their professional limitations.

I have discussed and made a better effort post in a very similar discussion on this here

And regarding the pop-up thing, I haven't yet found the best site for uploading PDFs and engaging in small-scale academic piracy yet. If Imgur had a upload .pdf function that would be my shit, but unfortunately that isn't the case.

_yolo_tomassi_ • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 10:50 PM

Anecdotal true - have experienced women (die hard childfree professional types) being startlingly cavalier

about contraception if they're into me and others insisting on condom on top of the pill within LTRs when not (strikes & gutters man). Never really saw the other way round.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 10:51 PM

(strikes & gutters man).

Forreal that's why it's so important to discard immediately when not getting what you want

Willow-girl • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:35 PM

have experienced women (die hard childfree professional types) being startlingly cavalier about contraception

Probably on the pill or had an IUD.

_yolo_tomassi_ • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 07:37 PM

nope, both cases were well into ltr and there was much discussion - these weren't 1 night stands

Alberic2092 • 4 points • 10 December, 2020 12:34 AM*

Anyone who still denies the sexy son "hypothesis" is a brainlet. Good genes trump literally everything else.

[deleted] • 9 points • 10 December, 2020 03:47 AM

Every woman whose brain IMMEDIATELY goes: "But Men do it too" are children throwing a tantrum to avoid accountability.

To learn anything you have to bear as much of the responsibility as you possibly can, and it's going to hurt. If it doesn't, you're doing it wrong.

These women Will NEVER be self aware. They are narcissists with 5 tactics to avoid accountability. Deny, Deflect, Distract, Diminish, and when all else fails - Damsel. "Men do it too" is both a deflection and a diminishment. These same women think they should be in charge of educating children.

"Men do it too" is the same fucking argument as "Billy gets to stay out past 11" and your parents always said what in return???? "If Billy jumped off a bridge would you do it too?"

That is exactly the level of the "men do it too" argument. These are the very women that this study exposes. ZERO ability to abstract. ZERO accountability. ZERO self awareness. ZERO agency. Frozen in time from 15 years old. Perpetual children. NPC's.

_mwk • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 07:00 AM

wtf what accountability for what other random people do???? do you bear accountability for the reversal study?

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:12 PM

r/notliketheothergirls

Thank you for proving my point.

_mwk • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 06:02 PM

???????

redditthrowaway1478 • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 02:09 PM

Remember guys - if she's got enough Ds, you don't need to give her yours

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 04:55 AM

But men do it too

Willow-girl • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 01:28 PM

Haha, beat me to it!

Nobody likes condoms.

redditthrowaway1478 • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 02:07 PM

But why male models?

Asbelowsoaboveme • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 05:42 PM

But there's nothing wrong with wanting to be impregnated by good genes, there's nothing to deflect. It's basic biology, not something anyone should be demonized for.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 09:32 PM

Good genes? Oh, so there aren't any good looking men that are stupid or lazy or criminal? Looks are only skin deep. And I'm not demonizing anyone. I'm just pointing out how so many women lack any insight to their nature. So many are in full blown delusional denial and will fight like crazy to keep living the delusion. I've accepted female nature. I'm no more demonizing women for their nature than I would demonize a feral cat in heat. Pointing it out isn't hate. It might 'feel' bad but quite often that's what truth does.

On a side note: Feminism didn't change women it just exposed their nature. I'm just tired of all the denial and deflection. The day men aren't shamed for their nature is the day I'll stop shaming women for theirs.

Asbelowsoaboveme • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 11:40 PM

Good genes are genes that increase chances for reproduction, good looking men have good genes by that definition.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 December, 2020 02:04 PM

Well, you've got a great point. I guess I'm the fool for granting them special abilities that they clearly don't have. Seems women are more concerned that their bloodline continues no matter the quality. Seems to me that, to women, beauty is everything. Everything else is secondary. Or as Nietzsche said;

"From the beginning, nothing has been more alien, repugnant, and hostile to woman than truth -- her great art is the lie, her highest concern is mere appearance of beauty."

BROWN-TOILET-PAPER • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 08:31 PM

Never used a condom with a chick. Bust in the them every time. They were all on the pill. (I think) Glad I never caught any nasty, or baby.

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 09:55 PM

[deleted]

BROWN-TOILET-PAPER • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 10:09 PM

True. There are two chicks I'll for sure never know if they got preg or not

majani • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 08:07 AM

You may be infertile or low sperm count bro

BROWN-TOILET-PAPER • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 09:47 AM

Good.

Probably just them being on the pill though.

SaBahRub • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 08:18 PM

I suppose data is good, but it wasn't really necessary, was it?

funlightmandarin • 11 points • 9 December, 2020 09:18 PM*

Let's flip the genders on some of these.

The more facially attractive a man was judged to be, the more likely it was that participants were willing to have sex with him

And that doesn't work the other way around? Hell, she doesn't even need to be pretty, men will happily volunteer. Worst case scenario, there's a paper bag involved.

The more facially attractive a man was judged to be, the less likely women were to intend to use a condom during sex

And men are different? Hell, she doesn't even need to be pretty! Men are happy to forego condoms as long as *she doesn't end up pregnant*, then she's a golddigging whore.

In my experience, men have always expected me to be on the pill (or be willing to start on the pill), and that they would therefore be guaranteed condomless sex. "*Oh, I thought you said you were on the pill?*", "*yes, so?*", "☐", "☐ *get out please*".

Women with a higher lifetime sexual partner count were more likely to have employed a "condom resistance tactic" ("Since the age of 14, how many times have you successfully avoided using a condom with a man who wanted to use one?").

You'll find the exact same result in men, except that they'll be happy to forego condoms irregardless of lifetime sexual partners. "*But it feels betterrrrrrr without ☐*"

Women with a higher lifetime sexual partner count were more likely to have had a STI.

As opposed to men? ☐ And thats not even covering that there's a physiological reason for women being more susceptible for STIs (micro-tears in mucuous tissue as the penetrated party, as opposed to the penetree).

[deleted] • 6 points • 9 December, 2020 09:58 PM

None of what you wrote is incorrect but it seems like you're missing the point of why this is interesting.

The conventional wisdom is already "men will fuck anything raw".

However, the conventional wisdom thereby implies/strongly suggests that it's *only* men who make or advocate for impulsive sexual decisions.

The pertinence of this study is in demonstrating that women do it too, but for the *right* guys. Maybe that's why you're upset? Imagine a world where every man knows that the woman he wants to fuck raw isn't

willing but would, odds are, be willing to fuck some other dude raw who is hotter.

If a man isn't getting what he wants, whatever that is, he ought discard the girl immediately. On to the next one.

funlightmandarin • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 10:08 PM

So by virtue of men as a whole being *fucking naive* about the human condition (guess what, both men and women are capable of being trash humans), it's womens fault for being dishonest. That's actually quite hilarious. Women learn the truth about the male nature the second they enter puberty from their sisters, mothers and grandmothers as a matter of fact. No blame game needed.

But nah, y'all need to create a bloody *movement* for the same purpose. ☐ Y'all need *studies* to quantify facts girls learn at age 12.

Even if you dont win in the dating market, you guys sure do win the oppression olympics.

Imagine a world where every man knows that the woman he wants to fuck raw would, odds are, be willing to fuck some other dude raw who is hotter.

Imagine a world where every woman knows that the man she wants to fuck raw would, odds are, be willing to fuck any other woman raw.

And we do, and adjust. Our adjustment is that we just bother fucking the hottest we can obtain to begin with.

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 10:12 PM

Well ok it's not men's fault that other men (ie teachers stare down girls' shirts and some other dude fuckin follows them home when they're 14) "redpill" women to male nature early on while men don't have analogous foundational experiences from which to glean reality, and honestly I'd trade having those negative experiences (which are societally understood and recognized, at the fucking least) rather than the negative experiences I had as a result of naivete. Grass is always greener I guess ☐♂☐

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 10:13 PM

Face it the reason it's kept hidden is to exploit the worker bees. What will happen when it's discussed all over the mainstream and all the guys know? Gravy train over....all the money and emotional support and attention (such as such men have to offer) will go directly to whores, do not pass go, do not collect \$2000.

funlightmandarin • 6 points • 9 December, 2020 10:22 PM*

Exploit the worker bees? Please, they still work and pay their taxes, how else will they fund their computer games, porn and hookers?

Women don't even need men nowadays for children, if she wants one. And men will still simp and offer emotional support, because hookers won't fix the intimacy issues which is the crux of their pain. Video games, porn and hookers won't be enough to numb that one, seeing as men nowadays put their entire emotional life in their female partner. It's why they remarry so quickly after the death of a spouse, they have few friends to share that level of intimacy with.

Gravy train is going full steam ahead. ☐ Choo choo ☐, my dudes. And so the wheels turn.

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 10:30 PM

It's brainwashing. They don't realize that what they're filling the hole with is misery and

they'd be better off turning their money over to a whore. Let's see, we can revisit once all the guys know how much of the gross submission of today (already diminishing, but persisting despite not benefit) remains.

Women don't even need men for children

Hopefully they'll all realize the empowerment of getting turkey baster so they stop suckering unaware men into taking on the burden of their increasingly aging, boring face

Tldr: the market will become whores and casual and little else.

RemindMe! December 9, 2024.

RemindMeBot • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 10:30 PM

I will be messaging you in 4 years on **2024-12-09 00:00:00 UTC** to remind you of **this link**

CLICK THIS LINK to send a PM to also be reminded and to reduce spam.

Parent commenter can delete this message to hide from others.

Info Custom Your Reminders Feedback

funlightmandarin • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 10:46 PM

I don't *mean* to insult, but

Men are the victims of evil wimminz because now they are free to happily fuck the men they actually want (*and I was never one of them, AND THESE PAPERS CONFIRM THAT WATER IS INDEED WET*), buhuu.

is what I'm reading. *Brainwashing*, jesus, take some responsibility for once. The self-pity is repugnant.

they'd be better off turning their money over to a whore.

Maybe, but it won't make them happy.

Hopefully they'll all realize the empowerment of getting turkey baster so they stop suckering unaware men into taking on the burden of their increasingly aging, boring face

The empowerment lies in not being dependent on men, as women historically have been (be it financially/rights/protection). They'll still want to share their lives with a man, but now they don't have to. Now they can choose to build a life with a man they find attractive to *burden with their increasingly aging, boring face*. A man who will also *burden them back with their increasingly aging, boring face too*. And they'll care for each other "despite" of it. That's a... partnership.

Damn, I wish y'all had healthier relationships.

[deleted] • 0 points • 9 December, 2020 10:48 PM*

Damn, I wish y'all had healthier relationships.

This is current year brah everyone is replaceable, and ought to be.

Men are the victims of evil wimminz because now they are free to happily fuck the men they actually want, buhuu.

is what I'm reading. Brainwashing, Jesus, take some responsibility for once.
The self-pity is repugnant

Oh yeah?

"Women: slay kweenz do whatever you want"...

"(Mostly middle class) Men: keep abiding by false middle class morality while women and wealthy men, and to a certain extent poor men do as they please"

As with the previous oppressors, the current oppressors won't understand their privilege until it is GONE

Clock's fucking ticking. As I said in another comment, we're only a few years away from the majority of the pairings consisting either of casual sex or straight up hookerdom with little in between.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 10:33 PM

Exploit the worker bees? Please, they still work and pay their taxes, how else will they fund their computer games, porn and hookers?

And not one dime of that should be spent on the patriarchal ritual of sacrificing the desire to spread the seed for carrying some aging increasingly ugly worthless burden.

funlightmandarin • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 10:56 PM

If you don't want *all* sides of the societies (that unfortunately includes the parts you perceive as good AND *bad*, read: single moms apparently), just leave then.

I'd prefer if my tax money didn't fund the *mostly male* prison population, but ☐ ♀ ☐ inb4, "single moms create criminals!". Or deadbeat fathers shirking their responsibilities, leading to more future criminals having few healthy male figures in their lives? Let's add economic problems to the pot too, that will surely not lead to more criminals. ☐

I'm sure there's still active monasteries out there for you.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 10:58 PM

If you don't want all sides of the societies (that unfortunately includes the parts you perceive as good AND bad, read: single moms apparently), just leave then.

I was talking about marriage (specific aging ugly burden) not taxes funding single moms lol I support social democracy

funlightmandarin • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 11:09 PM

Well, marriage specifically offers stability for the children. Society does well to have a stable population, so it'll still be the norm and pushed. I, as a woman, would not risk years of career development and wage rises to bear a child for a man (who would not be risking the same, bear in mind). With marriage, I will have certain rights (alimony, child support) that will not leave me penniless and with gaps in my CV that'll make it difficult to get back in the career trajectory I

would've had without children.

And so marriage will still be the norm for the middle and upper classes, and so the wheels turn.

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 09:23 PM

[deleted]

funlightmandarin • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 10:30 PM

They sure have evolved since the MSN-era.

Computer_Love7 • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 08:46 PM

So what What's the big shock here ? Why are these makes acting so outraged? Lol

HeThatGreetsWithFire • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 09:07 PM

So basically women will let you hit raw if they like you

Alberic2092 • 4 points • 10 December, 2020 12:35 AM

No, they'll let you hit it raw if you're hot.

HeThatGreetsWithFire • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 12:58 AM

My ex begged for Raw Dog alot, I thought she wanted to trap me lol

[deleted] 10 December, 2020 12:59 AM

[removed]

HeThatGreetsWithFire • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:02 AM

This just in: Man claims to get vagina, but also surfs the internet.

Alberic2092 • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:06 AM

While men who fuck do actually "surf the internet", they're not on r/PurplePillDebate. I can tell you that with confidence.

HeThatGreetsWithFire • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:10 AM

It's not hard to find women, just put yourself out there

Alberic2092 • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:10 AM

I literally can't tell if that's meant to be a joke or not.

HeThatGreetsWithFire • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 01:17 AM

Cuz you're a bitter incel

xFallacyx69 • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 10:25 PM

Yeah, I don't really use condoms unless she's on birth control. But I also don't finish inside of chicks that don't have their own career/life

ivy176 • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 01:32 AM

Where are they getting their samples from? I feel like this type of study would attract certain people as well. No one's ever asked me to participate in any survey like that

The more attractive someone is, the more likely they are to pursue or be in a relationship with them too. Which would be linked to less condom usage or trying to get pregnant.

extrachromozomes • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 07:51 AM

Condoms don't feel good

Garapal • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 09:14 AM

Makes sense. My gf used to be wary of not using one until she started offering not to use it. Maybe I'm cute after all. Got her pregnant once though and she miscarried sadly. :(

Diamond-Breath • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 11:01 AM

And men are attracted to ugly women? Hypocrites.

hotelactual777 • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 12:35 PM

Increased sexual pleasure effects both men and women when condoms aren't used. Skin to skin contact is the most pleasurable form of sex for both the giver and the receiver.

Farrenkorr • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 01:25 PM

correct me if I'm wrong here but it's been my experience that the vast and overwhelming majority of women from the age of 12 upwards parrot the same line of "looks aren't important, we don't care about looks, personality is what we find attractive, etc." while starfishing bareback for Chad...

only now that I've reached my 40's have women my age stopped saying this... funny that... guess I'm just fugly huh...

Notsonewguy7 • 5 points • 9 December, 2020 07:45 PM

Oh cool that means I'm attractive or maybe they're after money but I've never been asked to use a condom. Not once. I use them but never been asked.

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 08:30 PM

[deleted]

Notsonewguy7 • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 08:40 PM

Welcome to the club apparently.

hail_galaxar • 8 points • 9 December, 2020 08:42 PM

And apparently I'm attractive because I assume all men have Sti's, lol.

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 09:23 PM

Same but I always use them anyways

Don't wanna get baby trapped

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 08:11 PM

You should be flattered. :)

Notsonewguy7 • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 08:16 PM

Women are my part time so it's nice but it's not my focus.

hail_galaxar • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 09:01 PM

This must be a survey of women with no kids. Nine months of puking my guts out cured me of the inconvenience of condoms forever.

abqkat • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 10:29 PM

Well, and the whole having a baby thing that comes after... No thanks. I relied solely on condoms before I got my bisalp, and have never ever been, risked, or wanted to be pregnant. It used to be weird to me how many women get unintentionally pregnant, till I saw people attempting to wear masks on their faces. But for me, hormonal birth control was never an option and condoms were never a question

hail_galaxar • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 10:46 PM

Until I saw people's mask wearing abilities □□□□. Isn't that the truth. I saw a guy take his mask off to sneeze because he didn't want it to "get gross". Wtf, That's like wearing a condom, taking it off to finish and then putting it back on. □♀□

innocent_butungu • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 09:29 PM

>Average age = 20

>Average lifetime (heterosexual) sexual partner count = 3.7

wow

Alberic2092 • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 12:36 AM

It's not surprising. The average partner count for most people is like 6 or 7.

MasterTeacher123 • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 08:41 PM

In the last 2-3years I've smashed 9 girls. 2 were hookers so they don't count. But of the 7 that I pulled either through game/swag/looks only ONE demanded I used a condom, And that one that was only the first two times, after that she was down for unprotected sex.

And mind you, these are women all across the socioeconomic and political spectrum. One was a social worker, another was a HS principle, another was unemployed but her family came some money, another worked at Chick Fila etc.

Yo if a girl Is feeling you she'll let you do whatever. This is one reason I'm not shocked at unplanned pregnancies or STDs rising. And again, I ain't shit, I'm no "chad". Are there some good things about me? Yeah, I'm tall have a great head of hair, well above average salary for my age(90% of the time though she doesn't know what I make before I smash). But I have about an average face(huge nose) and I'm not some really funny or overly charismatic guy, I just go after what I want.

existentialhack1 • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 08:14 AM

Having unprotected sex, as a guy, unless you've had the snip, is about the most stupid thing you can legally do. You're handing a woman control of the next 18 years of your life. I'd rather be castrated.

Sage_Planter • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 08:37 PM

Women with a higher lifetime sexual partner count were more likely to have employed a "condom resistance tactic"

I don't know any woman who's asked for condomless sex without the goal of getting pregnant.

SteveSan82 • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 12:52 AM

Almost every woman Ive been with who was between 27-35 tried to get me to not use condoms. Beta bucks.

willreignsompotent • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 01:19 AM

Is *that* why girls never ask me to wear a condom? lol

Well shit...

[deleted] 10 December, 2020 03:16 AM

[deleted]

Farrenkorr • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 01:40 PM

"her body, her choice"... ok then, if it's her body, her choice then she alone has to face the responsibility and the consequences of her actions. she just happened to choose to go bare back with him, she happened to choose to do it almost bang on her ovulation date like she conveniently forgot that, she chose to not go for the 'morning after pill' because she wanted a 3 week lay in? no idea... she chose to talk him out of wearing a condom because it doesnt feel as good. she then falls pregnant and she chooses to carry it through to its completion even though he doesn't want a child... he doesnt want to have any part of it... ok then, who's fault is it again? who made the choice?

CatchPhraze • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 02:26 PM

He did to agree to go bare. Whoops.

redditthrowaway1478 • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 02:13 PM

You just realized this *now*?

this is the study that did it for you?

AutoModerator[M] • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 07:42 PM

Attention!

You can post off topic/jokes/puns as a comment to this Automoderator message.

For "CMV" and "Question for X" Threads: Parent comments that aren't from the target group will be removed, along with their child replies.

If you want to agree with OP instead of challenging their view or if the question is not targeted at you, post it as an answer to this comment.

OP you can choose your own flair according to these guidelines., just press Flair under your post!

Thanks for your cooperation and enjoy the discussion!

I am a bot, and this action was performed automatically. Please contact the moderators of this subreddit if you have any questions or concerns.

LeadInfusedRedPill • 9 points • 9 December, 2020 08:01 PM

women want Chad's babies

More news at 6

[deleted] • 6 points • 9 December, 2020 08:36 PM

Aw sweet, something else to be insecure about!

allweknowisD • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 08:52 PM

Colour me shocked that an online questionnaire resulted in high results of saying yes to risky behaviour lol

Christian_Kong • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 10:18 PM

I lived with a chad for a couple of years. Dude would have roughly 1-2 new women a week in his rotation for hooking up. One day he comes bitching to me about how this one new girl wanted him to use a condom. I'm thinking to myself how it isn't a big deal and he is just whining(which he was) but this adds a bit more insight to how the conversation came to be.

With this said I don't think many girls are into condoms, especially those that are in the hook up scene.

lemme_tell_you • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 09:36 PM

I think this what they refer to as the blackpill

Anthony-waltzs • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 07:46 PM

Off-topic but did Mrs_Degree get demoted? I cannot find her name in the mod list anymore someone let me know, please.

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 December, 2020 07:50 PM

I demoted her because she wouldn't marry me

Mrs_Degree • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 08:51 PM

No I'm still here, probably on the second page of the mod list.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 09:17 PM

Are you still married to automod?

Mrs_Degree • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 02:18 AM

Obviously, I just needed a minute to simp for the greatest murdering gay pedophile clown that ever existed.

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 December, 2020 02:51 AM

Ugh, I'm just waiting for an opportunity to shoot my shot

jdobrila • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 07:48 PM

I know.

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 08:50 PM

[deleted]

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 08:57 PM

[deleted]

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 09:00 PM

[deleted]

GunnzzNRoses • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 09:44 PM

Yea condoms suck

existentialhack1 • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 08:16 AM

So get snipped. It's a very simple procedure.

GunnzzNRoses • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 09:20 AM

Nah man I want like ten sons down the line

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 09:55 PM

Can confirm. I've always been super careful about condom use and only wait until at least a year of monogamous dating and after negative results to stop using a condom, but my current partner has the most handsome face of all the guys I've dated and I stopped using condoms with him 2 months in. I just couldn't help myself for some reason.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 09:57 PM

Okay.....?

Sultmaker_9000 • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 10:28 PM

I've been asked once, by a lesbian on a rogue night since they don't take the pill, that is it.

orbitaldecayed • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 08:53 AM

This is rape, per the new definitions.

SUEDE2BLACK • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 09:56 AM

Interesting I only had one female tell me to use a condom and that's because she knew I was sleeping with her friend. I always thought it was strange that they never asked me to use a condom I always do and many have questioned why I use one. One girl told me she was on birth control so I don't need to..rite.

There was a time when a female wrapped her legs around me and wouldn't let me out. I stayed calm and told her I had to piss I'm not gonna cum. Soon as I got out I came on her face. But now I always put on a condom halfway into it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 03:20 PM

Interesting. Maybe I'm more attractive than I give myself credit for. It's rare that a woman will insist we use a condom. When it does happen, it's usually because they're not on birth control, but even then they usually don't ask me to use one.

Zonkey_Zeedonk • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 04:45 PM

Wait where does that graph give info on attractiveness?

Zonkey_Zeedonk • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 04:59 PM

This isn't responsible but I think the fact that women who have had more partners may use condoms less might have to do more with just feeling less scared of unprotected sex due to having done it however many times without any bad luck.

So a virgin, depending where she grew up, probably got a whole lot of horror stories in sex Ed about STDS etc and is probably more afraid to take the risk. Someone who has had more sex, maybe tried it a few times unprotected and found that nothing bad happened, might be more carefree about it.

I don't think that's surprising at all. I also don't think it has anything to do with men vs women, it's probably just the case that in any risky situation (whether it's unprotected sex, drunk driving, jumping off something high, whatever else) once you've done it once and survived without consequence, it makes it easier to take the risk a second time, especially if the risk comes with some reward as it does with unprotected sex.

moneygang4life • 1 point • 10 December, 2020 10:35 PM

Oh so women do in fact want to abuse abortion laws? Oh and men who sleep around before marriage are in fact being reckless??? Wooooowwwwwww

Samiam0911 • 1 point • 11 December, 2020 03:54 PM

I can't speak for everyone but for myself I've never cared how attractive for hookups/casual sex a man is...condoms on deck...I've never understood the rational behind risking the possibility of sti's or unwanted pregnancy for hookups it's insane!! Then people are surprised/blasé about the single mom/deadbeat dad epidemic!!!

neonroli47 • 1 point • 17 January, 2021 06:33 PM

When participants were asked to answer the question of how likely they are to use condom on a scale of 1 to 100, the least attractive man scored 88.4 on average and the most attractive man scored 87.8 on average. How significant is this difference?

RSDevotion1[S] • 1 point • 17 January, 2021 07:23 PM

The more facially attractive a man was judged to be, the less likely women were to intend to use a condom during sex ($r = -0.552$, $p = 0.007$)

Women showed significantly higher condom use intentions with men who they rated as less attractive ($p < 0.0005$)

neonroli47 • 1 point • 17 January, 2021 07:38 PM

Will you please tell me how it is "significantly higher"? Cause the average difference between the least and most attractive man is 0.6 on a 1-100 scale (from the first table).

RSDevotion1[S] • 1 point • 17 January, 2021 07:41 PM

That's a good question. You should contact the study authors.

rivertorain- • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 11:27 PM*

The method of the study says that the women only saw facial photos of the men..

I guess I don't think that this is enough to say that women are less likely to use condoms with more facially attractive men in real life...?

There are so many other factors of attraction for women IMO (as a woman) and even more factors as to why you wouldn't choose to use a condom. Hell, make all these virgins drink half a bottle of vodka and let's see the

results then □

RSDevotion1[S] • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 12:36 AM

https://www.reddit.com/r/PurplePillDebate/comments/k9yyxt/young_women_are_less_likely_to_intend_to_use_a/gf86hbo/

But yes, using real men rather than pictures would be a preferred method. However, that would have increased the cost and limited the sample size of the study.

Alberic2092 • 3 points • 10 December, 2020 12:38 AM

There are so many other factors of attraction for women

Can you make your score visible just so I can downvote this comment?

wildpsychoanalyst • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 11:38 PM*

Make a post about a research and not read it through? Well... Meanwhile, in the "limitation" section of the article stands, that "Moreover, the fact that some women might have been using hormonal contraception, which might affect condom use intentions, was not investigated.". Which is a game changer that throws your hypothesis to link it to Fisher out of the window. Possibly people care more about not getting babies, than they care about not getting STIs. Totally different image.

Technicalities (some, I didn't check all) : from sexually active ones "the median number of lifetime sexual partners was 2", not sure where did you find 3.7. But you also write about average, so I'd ask, where did you find a full data of a study? And I didn't find anything explicitly about virgins, but this: "The majority of participants (89%) reported at least one sexual partner." That makes for 11% of virgins, not 8,8%. The whole "non-virgins" repeated by you several times makes for a weird impression, though. They are at the focus of the study, you know.

The study says nothing about their intentions to get pregnant, it says about reckless behaviour. The one, just as often found in men, here is another study by the same authors.

<https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/6/6/e010883.full> It is even less representative, but it shows basically the same thing about men. So stop vilifying sexually active women, we are all stupid animals when it comes to sex and it takes learning not to be.

As you shortly noted and to quote intro from the study: "These findings fit well with other work indicating an association between facial attractiveness and perceived health". People trust their guts more than logic. Women vastly ignored what they themselves were considering that pretty guys have more sexual partners who would also have more unprotected sex. Stupidly, we are also social beings, so "if all these people see him as safe, than he's safe" might mentally work too. Can it be that the more attractive a man is, the more hedonistic women get in relation to him? And for some, absence of condoms is perceived as more pleasure. That remains to be verified, that's just my hypothesis. Simply for alternative to that "evolutionary" thing.

Study is kind of ok, but you add some very shaky interpretations. Chill a bit, a woman is not a succubus, she is a stupid homo sapiens, just like a man. Unfortunately, everyone (including women) need to learn more about consent.

I do share your concern about manipulation when it gets to not using condoms. Not using condoms when partner indicated that they'd prefer it, is a form of sexual violence or even rape. Obligatory note: Consent is sexy. Safer sex is awesome.

RSDevotion1[S] • 2 points • 9 December, 2020 11:58 PM

Make a post about a research and not read it through?

It doesn't seem like you did.

"Moreover, the fact that some women might have been using hormonal contraception, which might affect condom use intentions, was not investigated."

I already mentioned in the post that none of the condom resistance tactics offered other forms of contraceptive as the reason to forgo condom usage. Thus, the rates of tactics used are not skewed higher by women reporting their hormonal contraceptive as a tactic.

Furthermore, because this study did not analyze hormonal contraceptive, it opens up the point that women may also drop their contraceptive use as a tactic to be impregnated by a (more attractive) man, possibly without his knowing.

Technicalities (some, I didn't check all) : from sexually active ones "the median number of lifetime sexual partners was 2", not sure where did you find 3.7.

I calculated the mean myself using their provided dataset.

"The majority of participants (89%) reported at least one sexual partner." That makes for 11% of virgins, not 8,8%.

Their calculation of virgins included participants who left their sexual partner count blank in the submission, so I excluded those members from the calculation because conclusions could not be drawn from them.

The whole "non-virgins" repeated by you several times makes for a weird impression, though. They are at the focus of the study, you know.

Allowing virgins to influence condom and STI rate statistics was not useful because they aren't having sex.

The study says nothing about their intentions to get pregnant, it says about reckless behaviour.

Reckless behavior which can result in pregnancy...? You're also making an assumption that women forgoing condom use is strictly reckless behavior when it's entirely possible some are making a calculated attempt to be impregnated.

Can it be that the more attractive a man is, the more hedonistic women get in relation to him? And for some, absence of condoms is perceived as more pleasure.

Possibly. The broader evolutionary basis is that women are more prone to sexually associating with men of higher genetic quality and are thus more susceptible to being impregnated by them.

wildpsychoanalyst • 1 point • 12 December, 2020 03:50 PM

Manipulating data to present better for your thesis is just polemics. Whatever, you do you. Study didn't concern itself neither with "virginity" nor with pregnancy. And in order to connect those you had to jump few steps and assume a lot of things, that are simply not presented there. Practices like morning after pill, calendar method, pull out method or in case of all going by chance- abortion, were not considered here. How women justify such behaviour to themselves could also be a factor including hormonal contraceptives, we simply don't know. Equating "no sex partners" with virgin is also technically incorrect, there are various sexual practices. I assume, the overlap is big, of course. But study didn't ask about that. And fantasy is a good thing, but it remains to be tested with reality.

Some women surely do try having unprotected sex to get pregnant, but how many? It would be an interesting study, but you are not suggesting to research that, you just go for it as if it's like that already.

Evolution doesn't work like that, by the way. It simply passes on genes of people that survive long enough to be of a reproductive age and lucky enough to get laid and provide a fitting environment for the offspring, that they survive on their own. Most women are not into eugenics and don't choose men by "higher genetic quality". That's some incel stuff. The whole study tries to say that pretty doesn't equal healthy, it's a mistake in thinking a lot of people have. While "pretty" is a cultural concept. Evolution gave us brains that are capable of learning and culture and that's what influences our choices. That goes way beyond looks.

What we see in the society is often a reflection of our own beliefs. If your beliefs would be a bit more humanistic, you'd see more variety there. What you see in this study, says more about you, than about women.

DesertSweat • 0 points • 9 December, 2020 08:49 PM

Wooo!! Guess that's good news for me back when I was dating. Rarely used a condom, because they let me. I was so reckless. But luckily came out unscathed.

[deleted] 9 December, 2020 09:00 PM

[deleted]

DesertSweat • 1 point • 9 December, 2020 09:02 PM

Yeah I was, but yolo.