Men and women are more similar than RP people often think, and more different than BP people often think.

145 upvotes | 11 February, 2021 | by purplepilldthrowaway

I say this as someone who started out BP and had to unlearn that men and women were the same psychologically; and then found RP, saw a lot of truths, but also saw a lot of people describing traits of women that are also found in men.

BP people often don't realize:

- Women are uniquely attracted to strength, confidence, and other "alpha" traits. It turns them on at a primal level. Men can think confident women are cool, but a woman acting or speaking confidently does not generally arouse us at a visceral level.
- Women are uniquely attracted to sexually successful men *in virtue of* being sexually successful (i.e. preselection AKA mate choice copying, found in studies to be much more of a phenomenon in women than in men)
- And other important differences that would be useful for a man to be aware of for his dating life. (For this reason, I identify as red pilled, not purple pilled... taking the red pill in the TRP context is about acknowledging important sexual differences between men and women that actually exist, that mainstream society generally ignores or outright denies. Even if I disagree with certain perspectives that many TRPers have, that doesn't mean there's not a red pill to take.)

RP people often don't realize (or at least acknowledge; I often see things framed as if they're unique to women):

- Both women and men can be "hypergamous" (depending on the definition) branch swing. (Edit: even though I've seen "hypergamy" used this way by other TRPers, the correct term for this is "branch swing"; thank you for the comments correcting me.) We're all trying to get the best option we can, within reason. Above a certain looks threshold, neither women nor men would probably give up a good relationship for the sake of having sex with someone slightly hotter. But we both have the inborn wiring to, within a certain range, seek out the highest SMV mate we can; I've definitely dumped a great girlfriend (personality-wise) before because I didn't feel the "fire" of desire for her that I did feel for another girl I ended up dating.
  - By this token, Rollo Tomassi is wrong when he says women can't love men in the way that men can love women. Neither sex can truly "love" each other unconditionally in the way he describes; romantic love requires sexual attraction in the first place. We're biological creatures designed to optimize our chances of carrying on our genes.
- "Women are the gatekeepers of sex, men are the gatekeepers of relationships" is bullshit. Both men and women have standards for every type of sexual/romantic relationship. Both casual and romantic relationships are mutual engagements where both parties have decided the other person is attractive / high value enough to fuck or date.
Flightlessbirbz • 19 points • 11 February, 2021 09:10 PM

I agree with this for the most part. Men and women are different, but we also have a lot in common as humans. I consider myself red pilled in the sense that I believe in significant gender differences, but I can’t stand the “women’s nature = bad, men’s nature = good/neutral” narrative in red pill communities. Some of it is also pretty out of touch with reality and way too reliant on elaborate theories trying to make women look bad.
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I consider myself red pilled in the sense that I believe in significant gender differences, but I can’t stand the “women’s nature = bad, men’s nature = good/neutral” narrative in red pill communities. Some of it is also pretty out of touch with reality and way too reliant on elaborate theories trying to make women look bad.

Then let’s change that narrative :) we can be wholesomely red pilled

ElderDark • 2 points • 13 February, 2021 02:13 PM

I agree with this. Pretty balanced if you ask me.

jackandjill22 • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 08:16 PM

The title of this thread sounds like an absurd Alice & Wonderland proposition.

Flightlessbirbz • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 09:01 PM

It makes sense to me, but yeah it does have kinda an Alice in Wonderland sound to it lol

wtknight • 20 points • 11 February, 2021 04:53 PM

These are generalizations, of course. The problem that BP has is that RP often thinks that these things are universals.

Men can think confident women are cool, but a woman acting or speaking confidently does not generally arouse us at a visceral level.

Many men are attracted to confident women. There are several reasons for this that make evolutionary sense.

Women are uniquely attracted to sexually successful men in virtue of being sexually successful (i.e. preselection AKA mate choice copying, found in studies to be much more of a phenomenon in women than in men)

Many women aren't as attracted to sexually successful men. These concerns likely are dependent upon that individual woman's confidence level and how much she is concerned about said man cheating because of his past sexual success, and thus potentially not providing needed resources for her offspring as well as emotional support.

Studies can show that women *tend* to be attracted to certain things, but these are generalizations that aren't going to apply to every woman, which is why Red Pill inevitably only works as an heuristic. Ideally, the psychology of every individual woman should be considered in order to determine what attracts her.

Both women and men can be "hypergamous"
You're misunderstanding the way that TRP uses the term "hypergamy," which refers to sexual hypergamy, and women usually only being attracted to men who they consider "better" than them or admirable in some way. On the other hand, a man can still be sexually attracted to a woman who he finds completely inferior to him in every way. However, when it comes to relationships, men do want to optimize the quality of the woman who they commit to long-term.

"Women are the gatekeepers of sex, men are the gatekeepers of relationships" is bullshit.

Most men would have sex with almost any woman if they could and they had no other choices, so in this sense women are the gatekeepers of sex, since they do not behave in this way.

Men are the gatekeepers of relationships in situations where a woman is already sexually attracted to said man and where said man has other sexual options. However, men who are not sexually desirable to women or who do not have other options are not the gatekeepers of relationships, although I suppose that there are men out there who would rather be alone than be in a committed relationship.

These are generalizations, of course. The problem that BP has is that RP often thinks that these things are universals.

Nothing is universal and I don't think any sane RP man would argue there can never be exceptions. TRP is about generalizations and patterns. There are multiple posts on "AWALT" describing that it's not meant to be taken literally; it's more like "treat all guns as loaded". And personally TRP generalizations have proven to be very accurate in the women I've dated.

Many men are attracted to confident women. There are several reasons for this that make evolutionary sense.

I disagree with this but unfortunately I'm not sure how either of us can really provide concrete arguments on either side; I'm just surprised you'd argue men can be attracted to confidence in the same primal way that women can be attracted to confidence. The confident quarterback gets laid because women find his alphaness and strength hot. I've never seen a confident girl sway eyes like that and have guys want to hook up with her because she's such a leader.

Many women aren't as attracted to sexually successful men. These concerns likely are dependent upon that individual woman's confidence level and how much she is concerned about said man cheating because of his past sexual success, and thus potentially not providing needed resources for her offspring as well as emotional support.

That's long-term partnership, not primal sexual attraction. The alpha/beta dichotomy has to do with short-term vs long-term partnerships. A player might turn girls off of wanting to be his girlfriend because they suspect he'd cheat on her, but that doesn't make him less sexually attractive (e.g. in a hookup context, or even in general).

You're misunderstanding the way that TRP uses the term "hypergamy," which refers to sexual hypergamy, and women usually only being attracted to men who they consider "better" than them or admirable in some way.

I've seen hypergamy used in this context and I agree with you under that definition. I've also seen hypergamy used to refer to branch swinging to a higher-value partner (than the original partner) and I think that's something that can easily apply to both sexes.
Most men would have sex with almost any woman if they could and they had no other choices, so in this sense women are the gatekeepers of sex, since they do not behave in this way.

Nah, I think on a desert island both men and women would go for their "best option" i.e. the only other person left on earth. I don't think a woman would rather be celibate for life than go for her only sexual option.

Men are the gatekeepers of relationships in situations where a woman is already sexually attracted to said man and where said man has other sexual options. However, men who are not sexually desirable to women or who do not have other options are not the gatekeepers of relationships, although I suppose that there are men out there who would rather be alone than be in a committed relationship.

Agreed. But those are rather nuanced points to explain an oversimplified "women are the gatekeepers of relationships". Especially when TRP is made for men who have (or will have) options, not for MGTOWs / incels who don't have other sexual options.

I disagree with this but unfortunately I'm not sure how either of us can really provide concrete arguments on either side;

I'm attracted to women who are intellectually confident and who I can have good discussions with. I'm also attracted to women who have have talents and skills that impress me. I'm also attracted to traditional feminine qualities, sure, but I think that a woman's accomplishments help me to respect her more and to therefore increase my attraction. I realize that all men don't think this way and some just want a pretty face and hot body to have sex with, but I don't think that I'm the only guy who is like this.

That's long-term partnership, not primal sexual attraction.

I think that primal sexual attraction in many women is queued in many women by both alpha and beta qualities. Women who lack self-confidence and are not going to want sex with men who they think will just abandon them and any potential offspring to go off and have sex with some other woman. I think that this is an evolutionarily sound theory, and that it matches up with my real-world observations in which many women have no sexual interest in purely alpha men with no beta qualities at all.

Nah, I think on a desert island both men and women would go for their "best option" i.e. the only other person left on earth. I don't think a woman would rather be celibate for life than go for her only sexual option.

Lots of heterosexual women give up on men. I don't know why things wouldn't be any different on some deserted island.

You're not the only guy who's like this, I'm like this too. I got a crush on one of my past girlfriends when I heard her reciting poetry for the first time. But again, that's the romantic partnership type of
attraction. Different from the visceral / primal sexual attraction that I'd feel from seeing her naked even before I got a crush on her, or that a woman would feel for a confident guy on a date / a confident quarterback at a party.

wtknight • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 08:09 PM
Okay, well I don't really experience this and I usually have to get to know a woman and have feelings for her before I want to have sex with her. Yeah, I'm probably among a minority of men who are like this, but my point is that one of the big reasons that BP is against RP is because of the large number of generalizations that are being made about the sexes. I do agree that RP can work as a general heuristic to attract women, although I always debate that the type of women that it attracts are more likely to be ones of lower psychological quality, and that RP is therefore a better tool just to find casual sex rather than to maintain a respectful relationship with a contemporary woman.

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 08:14 PM
Okay, well I don't really experience this and I usually have to get to know a woman and have feelings for her before I want to have sex with her.

Are you unable to masturbate to hot women in porn you've never met? Whom you choose to have sex with is different from what you're sexually attracted to.

I do agree that RP can work as a general heuristic to attract women, although I always debate that the type of women that it attracts are more likely to be ones of lower psychological quality, and that RP is therefore a better tool just to find casual sex rather than to maintain a respectful relationship with a contemporary woman.

Women are women. If women in general are attracted to confidence and strength, then displaying those attributes within the confines of a healthy relationship with a high quality girl can make her even more attracted to you regardless of her psychological health. RP is a toolbox that can be used as desired for any situation with a woman; you don't have to use all the tools on every girl.

wtknight • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 02:16 PM
Are you unable to masturbate to hot women in porn you've never met? Whom you choose to have sex with is different from what you're sexually attracted to.

That’s different to me. I’m not physically touching those women. I only want to actually be intimate with someone whom I have feelings for.

Women are women. If women in general are attracted to confidence and strength, then displaying those attributes within the confines of a healthy relationship with a high quality girl can make her even more attracted to you regardless of her psychological health.

Yes, I think that women want men to be confident and strong. I don’t think that all of them need men to be in control, though. Egalitarianism works too. I think that the Red Pill insistence upon always maintaining frame and “gaming” women in tends to attract women of lower psychological quality and will often turn off the women of higher psychological quality.
That’s different to me. I’m not physically touching those women. I only want to actually be intimate with someone whom I have feelings for.

You’re missing my entire point. I’m trying to demonstrate to you the difference between your romantic preferences (e.g. "I like being a boyfriend to intellectual women") vs what makes you sexually attracted to women (e.g. signs of fertility like wide birthing hips / youthful skin, which you find in the porn you jack off to, and you find in the women you are romantically attracted to as well). The way that you’re attracted to confident women is not analogous to the way that women are attracted to confident men.

I think that the Red Pill insistence upon always maintaining frame

That is one RP "rule" made by one single RP man (Rollo), and I disagree with that rule. If you've spent more time in TRP you'd have read that TRP is a tool box; it's a "praxeology, not an ideology" (i.e. it describes, not prescribes). You don't need to use every tool in the box. Use what you want. I don't use that tool.

The way that you're attracted to confident women is not analogous to the way that women are attracted to confident men.

I think that it is somewhat. I might be aesthetically attracted to certain traits, but it doesn't mean that I'm sexually attracted to them. The majority of women might just jump on any woman sexually if they had a chance if she consented and he knew that there would be no potentially negative consequences like pregnancy of STDs as a consequence of having this sex, but I don't think that all men are wired like this, even if the majority are.

It's really not. Confidence is arousing to women. In the extreme case, even cockiness can be arousing to women in a hookup context. I didn't get a boner when I saw my ex reciting poetry, I just got a crush on her and wanted to be her boyfriend. I got a boner when I saw her naked. Long-term vs short-term attraction. Beta vs alpha traits. It's a thing for both men and women. Short-term, sexual attraction traits have to do with "who would be a good person to have sex with even if I wasn't their boyfriend/girlfriend". Long-term, romantic attraction traits (e.g. how you like intellectual girls) are different. You don't jack off to poetry readings.

Many women say they aren't as attracted to sexually successful men.

Ftfy. I remember just recently in the discussion a women finally admitted this point because "the violence from men if we admitted it would be too much to bear" or some similar false diatribe.
I've met a lot of women who say that they don't like playboy guys because they aren't as likely loyal and have no desire to start relationships with them because of this. These women are also the type who exclusively want relationships and aren't into casual sex.

One_Appointment7731 • 3 points • 11 February, 2021 07:59 PM
These same girls also fantasize about being the one to "fix" the playboy to get him to settle down. Have seen it dozens of times.

wtknight • 4 points • 11 February, 2021 08:03 PM
Not every woman is like this. This is my whole point. Many women, even the majority, might be like this, but that doesn't mean that they all are. I've met plenty of women who have no interest in playboys. These women usually get labeled by the manosphere as "nerdy" atypical women.

One_Appointment7731 • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 08:38 PM
Enough of them are like that I believe those that aren't are likely suppressing that urge consciously or unconsciously. And to be clear I'm not talking about *all* playboys but the top whatever percentage that girl is into.

wtknight • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 02:07 PM
Some of this supposed attraction is just coincidental because the sexually successful man has desirable traits independent of his success. A man who is physically attractive, confident, gentlemanly, romantic, etc., but who abstains from sex with most women is going to be just as attractive to most women as one who chooses to be sexually successful with many women. And, in fact, I think that he would be more successful among women who are not confident about their ability to keep a high value man’s loyalty.

The women out there who are attracted to high N, sexually successful men are a subset. They may be a majority even, but there are enough women who are not like this that I think that it’s safe to say NAWALT.

RidiculouslyFarOut • 2 points • 12 February, 2021 04:43 PM
This is probably true but generally this man does not exist
If you are a man with those alpha/chad traits you are sexually successful, most of the time with a string of women or rarely a LTR. Men with those traits do not generally choose to abstain from sex.
So what different does it make realistically if women are attracted to them because of a high N count or because of the traits that allow them to have a high N count?
The man you are talking about is a unicorn

wtknight • 1 point • 13 February, 2021 02:24 PM
A religious woman who is looking for an alpha guy would prefer the alpha man who is *not* sexually successful rather than the one who is. These men may be unicorns in the west, but they are not in countries that are still traditional.
The difference it makes is that it's wrong that all women want a man who is sexually successful, and it means that all women are not some kind of monolith who all want exactly the same thing in a man.
Sexual dimorphism is deeply embedded in human biology — there are clear cognitive, psychological, and obviously physical differences that evolved a certain way to serve a set of functions that are suggestive of the benefits they may have held for our ancestors. Men have more spacial intelligence and are superior in their physical abilities / strength and other characteristics that define them and their role in early society as the “hunter” or “bread winner”. Physical appearance is more important to men because it shows youth, fertility, health, or to put it more simply, a better chance at giving birth to a healthy offspring.

Women care less about a man’s physical appearance (to a certain extent — during ovulation, they prefer more masculine strong men) and focus more on status, success, resources, and basically what he can provide for her child. Men tend to be less discriminating in terms of their choice of sex partner because evolutionarily, he has an unlimited amount of sperm to the day he dies and instinctively desires to spread his seed.

Women have to be more picky because they can only get pregnant once a year which is a big investment on her part. However, while men tend to desire many sexual partners, they prefer a chaste and faithful woman to reduce the possibility of her becoming impregnated with a child that is not his. It’s certain that the child belongs to the mother but there may be doubts as to who the father is.

Evolutionary psychology is one of my favorite topics to read about. Someone tried to tell me that the only difference between the sexes were their genitalia and that everything else is socially constructed. This is clearly counter to numerous pieces of scientific evidence that show otherwise. They even go so far to say what I am claiming is “biological determinism”. Books that I read which are good at explaining this: Sexual Nature/Sexual Culture by Steven D Pinkerton, The Evolution Of Desire: Strategies of Human Mating by David Buss, Sex and Cognition by Doreen Kimura, and The Red Queen: Sex and the Evolution of Human Nature by Matt Ridley

You should check out “The Blank Slate” by Steven Pinker if you haven’t already. That would be right up your alley.

I have to ask where are these statements coming from? I see more talk of both genders being almost identical and I really scratch my head as to where it’s coming from. Is it coming from feminists or..?

People who ignore scientific evidence to support their ideological convictions. The area where men and women are roughly similar is in IQ, except for the fact that men display greater variance.

Women care less about a man’s physical appearance (to a certain extent — during ovulation, they prefer more masculine strong men) and focus more on status, success, resources, and basically what he can provide for her child.

Not really when women are capable of providing for themselves. Hot guy making 70k a year is going to
attract vastly more women than an average dude making 120k.

Of course, changing circumstances definitely factor into it. However, there’s no universal quantifier applied to my statement. There are exceptions to the rule but I am simply claiming on average women prefer this. Being tall comes into play in a woman’s attraction in the sense that it shows he can offer protection. Not saying that physical appearance isn’t important to women, just like I’m not saying men don’t care about a woman’s status, financial situation, etc. My point is that men prioritize the value of physical appearance more than women.

Plus, 70k is by no means poor. What would a woman choose if the hot guy was unemployed or made 20k a year and the ugly / average guy made 120k?

I think the descriptor "to a certain extent" threw me off. Even if physical attraction is a bigger part of the equation for men than women, it is still by far #1 for both genders.

Plus, 70k is by no means poor. What would a woman choose if the hot guy was unemployed or made 20k a year and the ugly / average guy made 120k?

I choose those numbers on purpose, not girl would ever have to choose between 120k/ugly vs 20k/hot.

« So the stage was set for women to evolve a preference for men with resources. But women needed cues that signified a man’s possession of those resources. These cues might have been indirect, such as personality characteristics that signaled a man’s upward mobility. They might have been physical, such as a man’s athletic ability or health. They might have included reputational information, such as the esteem in which a man was held by his peers. Economic resources, however, provided the most direct cue. »

« Professionally and economically successful women in the United States also value resources in men. My lab’s newlywed study identified women who were financially successful, measured by their salary and income, and contrasted their preferences in a mate with those of women with lower salaries and income. Many of the financially successful women earned more than $100,000 per year in today’s dollars. These women were well educated, tended to have professional degrees, and had high self-esteem. Perhaps surprisingly, the study showed that successful women place an even greater value than less successful women on mates who have professional degrees, high social status, and greater intelligence, as well as desiring mates who are tall, independent, and self-confident. These women also express an even stronger preference for high-earning men than do women who are less financially successful.

In a separate study the psychologists Michael Wiederman and Elizabeth Allgeier found that college women who expected to earn the most after college placed more importance on the financial prospects of a potential husband than did women who expected to earn less. Professionally successful women, such as medical students and law students, also assigned great importance to a mate’s earning capacity. Furthermore, men who were low in financial resources and status did not value economic resources in a mate any more than financially successful men did. »

« Moreover, many circumstances create shifts in women’s mate preferences—her personal...
resource acquisition ability, whether she is seeking a long-term mate or a casual sex partner, close
kin in proximity, the sex ratio in the mating pool, and the presence of other women who are
attracted to a particular man. »

« Because of the bounty of fertility cues conveyed by a woman’s physical appearance, and
because male standards of beauty have evolved to correspond to these cues, men have evolved to
prioritize appearance and attractiveness in their mate preferences. [...] these physical cues to youth
and health, and hence to reproductive capacity, constitute key elements of male standards of
female beauty. Because physical and behavioral cues provide the most powerful observable
evidence of a woman’s reproductive value, ancestral men evolved a preference for women who
displayed these cues. Men who failed to prefer qualities that signaled high reproductive
value—men who preferred to marry gray-haired grandmothers lacking in smooth skin and firm
muscle tone—would have left fewer offspring. [...] Men tend to see attractiveness as important,
whereas women tend to see it as desirable but not very important. The gender difference in the
importance of attractiveness remains constant from one generation to the next. Its size does not
vary throughout the decades. Men’s greater preference for physically attractive mates is among
the most consistently documented psychological sex differences. [...] But human males have
faced a unique set of adaptive problems and so have evolved a unique sexual psychology. They
prefer youth because of the centrality of marriage in human mating. Their desires are designed to
gauge a woman’s future reproductive potential, not just the chance of immediate impregnation.
They place a premium on physical appearance because of the wealth of reliable cues it provides to
the reproductive potential of a potential mate. »

— The Evolution of Desire by David Buss

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 2 points • 12 February, 2021 01:54 AM

Men who failed to prefer qualities that signaled high reproductive value—men who
preferred to marry gray-haired grandmothers lacking in smooth skin and firm muscle
tone—would have left fewer offspring.

I really wonder how this ties into older couples. AFAIK nursing homes are notorious for old
people fucking like rabbits, and I’m also aware of old people who date each other just like
younger people would. If dating / romantic love / etc were so tied to fertility and reproduction
(which it definitely does seem to be, for younger men), I really wonder how an older man can
still enjoy being with a woman around his age who’s probably long past her fertile years,
instead of him just being celibate at that point and at most being friends with old women.

GrandRub • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 12:25 PM

I really wonder how an older man can still enjoy being with a woman around his age
who's probably long past her fertile years, instead of him just being celibate at that
point and at most being friends with old women.

cause sex is fun?

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 02:59 PM

A 25 year old man would be disgusted at the idea of having sex with an 80 year old
woman. I’m wondering how/why we evolved to have our sexual preferences stay in
line with our ages.

But maybe I just answered my own question. Evolution isn't pretty and what works,
works. That could've just been what worked to keep the human race alive - a mutation that made us attracted to those our age, to keep society functional while also allowing us to reproduce when the time is right (fertile years).

RidiculouslyFarOut • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 04:49 PM
It's called settling, not exactly some mystery
These nursing homes are notorious for sexual harassment, the young girls and even guys that work there all have stories of old people being absolute creepers.
If these old people could get younger sex partners they would

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 05:17 PM
Interesting point

oulipost • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 02:51 PM
I mean, sex’s purpose isn’t purely reproductive. Another aspect of its evolution is the pleasure of the orgasm. As someone says, they have a lot of sex because it’s fun.

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 03:08 PM
I understand that old people enjoy sex lol, my confusion was why they enjoy sex when old women are no longer fertile, when for the rest of their lives they’re disgusted by the idea of having sex with a non-fertile old woman.
Like, imagine when you’re 90 years old you suddenly want to have sex with suitcases.
I ask, "I wonder why that's the case", and you just reply, "Because it's fun to orgasm"

LaChoffe • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 07:51 PM
I don't care about random evolutionary psychologists. The vast majority of research on this topic has women prioritizing physical attractiveness far above anything else.

LilithOfBabylon • 25 points • 11 February, 2021 04:04 PM
Depends on how you define Blue Pilled. I know Men and Women different, but most of them act the same way. The differences between genders is smaller than the differences between beliefs, personalities, and cultures.
For example, a whiny entitled man has more in common with a whiny entitled woman than he does with the average man.

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 16 points • 11 February, 2021 04:39 PM
For example, a whiny entitled man has more in common with a whiny entitled woman than he does with the average man.

 Depends on the context. They will still be attracted to very different things. There are similarities and there are differences. Both sexes are attracted to fitness and health. But women aren't attracted to wide birthing hips in men (as a trivial physical example). I think TRP gets a lot right when it comes to what women are uniquely psychologically attracted to, and saying they mostly behave the same (e.g. a whiny woman and a whiny man will both be whiny) doesn't help much.

LilithOfBabylon • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 05:18 PM
They will still be attracted to very different things.

Well, if we’re talking about attraction, that’s different. Even then, are we strictly talking about sexual/physical attraction? Strictly physical/sexual, I’m sure most people agree there’s differences in what males and females find attractive.

What a lot of the TRP miss is that romantic standards vary a lot among both genders depending on culture, personality, and beliefs.

Well, if we’re talking about attraction, that’s different. Even then, are we strictly talking about sexual/physical attraction? Strictly physical/sexual, I’m sure most people agree there’s differences in what males and females find attractive.

Yeah I’m mostly talking about sexual attraction (that's the main thing TRP is concerned with: the sexual marketplace). It's already mostly obvious to mainstream society that men and women are attracted to different things physically. So I'm mainly talking about psychological sexual attraction (which manifests in physical desire). To me, the main thing TRP serves men well in, is describing how to be a more arousing partner in the visceral primal sense (which has a lot to do with the alpha qualities listed here in the PPD wiki). Since short-term mating for women mainly relies on that visceral desire (and not on the romantic standards you reference, which can vary across people, and which can also be similar across both sexes), TRP tends to focus on traits that would make men more desirable for hookups (e.g. spinning plates) - muscles, confident personality / good flirting skills, etc. Those alpha qualities still do impact the dynamics in long-term romantic relationships since sex (and sexual chemistry / attraction) plays a large role in them, though. Personally I love intimate relationships (although idk if I'll ever get married, who knows), so I got into TRP to increase the quality of those and my ability to navigate intersexual dynamics within a relationship, which the short-term alpha qualities and knowledge of female psychology can also help with, IME.

but most of them act the same way.

The differences between genders is smaller than the differences between beliefs, personalities, and cultures.

And this is where over 300 years of scientific inquiry into the behavioral nature of sexually reproducing animal species on the planet would beg to differ.

What other animals than humans have created various distinct beliefs and cultures?

Beliefs we can’t really tell, but pretty much every species of social animals has the equivalent of distinct culture.

There are species of ants that have what appear to be nation state levels of societal organization, complete with vast geographical boundaries between the nation states and open states of warfare and territorial annexation.
This is the assumption that humans are uniquely different from every other life form on the planet and are thus not subject to the same natural laws that govern the processes and behaviors of those other life forms. Which we know is not true.

It’s also a belief that has led to some of the greatest human atrocities in history.

Every cultural and sociological development has been created to facilitate our biological imperatives. You may be capable of abstract thought, but your brain is wired to draw attention towards what will help you achieve your imperative.

You don’t love sugar because you subjectively like the taste. You love sugar because you’re wired to love sugar.

Leebeebee • 2 points • 12 February, 2021 12:24 AM

You know that animals have culture, too?

In this study, a baboon troop had all the adult males wiped out by tuberculosis. When females ran things, there was much less fighting, much less stress, and significantly more grooming behavior. Several years later, the researchers returned, and in spite of the fact that none of the original troop were still alive and the gender balance had returned, the same behavioral changes—less fighting, more grooming—persisted. There were physiological changes as well—the baboons in the group had significantly less stress markers in their blood compared to the control group.

So yeah, even in baboons, it’s possible that the behavioral differences between genders is largely the result of cultural conditioning.

SeemedGood • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 12:28 AM

Yet they probably still found that the males and females of that troop behaved more differently from each other in matters of mating and sexual selection than they did from the males and females of other troops.

Tongue37 • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 09:53 PM

Yeah I get very confused when I hear people trying to claim there is very little difference between the two genders. I mean, come on people! Lol

Throwaway1643 • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 10:53 PM

For example, a whiny entitled man has more in common with a whiny entitled woman than he does with the average man.

Lol, all else being equal:

A whiny entitled man will never get sex.

A whiny entitled woman will get sex on tap.

LillthOfBabylon • 3 points • 11 February, 2021 10:57 PM

And? I can’t sympathize because I don’t put sex on a pedestal and I have 0 respect for those that do.

Throwaway1643 • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 11:33 PM

Sure, but that’s the key difference between the genders.

Even though they might act the same, one gender has much easier access to sex and relationships than
the other.
So there are fundamental biological differences, irrespective of culture, personality, etc.

LillthOfBabylon • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 11:38 PM
that's the key difference between the genders.
I highly doubt most men are simps who think all their problems will be cured with pussy.
once gender has much easier access to sex and relationships than the other.
Because women have more of a tendency to be monogamous and couples have more sex than single people. Even then most men are monogamous too, just less than women.
So there are fundamental biological differences,
Only if we look at extremes.

throwaway1643 • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 12:44 PM
I highly doubt most men are simps who think all their problems will be cured with pussy.
Agreed, but most men, like most women, want sex. It's part of the Maslow hierarchy of needs.
It's just that women have much easier access to sex with much less effort.
The two sexes are fundamentally different in that way (even in the median, not just the outliers)
Is it really that hard to accept the reality that women have it easier in getting access to sex? I'm not saying they have it easier dating overall, both genders have their own issues.
I'm just saying the two genders are biologically different in their lived experience of dating.

LillthOfBabylon • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 04:12 PM
It's part of the Maslow hierarchy of needs.
SEXUAL RELEASE is a need. You have your hand. Now get some lotion and tissues.
It's just that women have much easier access to sex with much less effort.
That doesn't mean we're ready to bounce on every cock that comes our way. It's called self-control and having better things to do.
No one respects a desperate simp.

throwaway1643 • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 04:55 PM
No, sexual release is not the same need as sex with another human being.
Fyi, sex with another human is on the Maslow pyramid, not masturbation.
That doesn't mean we're ready to bounce on every cock that comes our way.
Yes, and nobody's asking you to. Doesn't take away from the fact that the median woman has much easier access to sex.
Men and women are fundamentally different that way in their lived experience.
sexual release is not the same need as sex with another human being.

Not sex entitled to sex.

Fyi, sex with another human is on the Maslow pyramid,

People paraphrase and misinterpret all the time. People have also used sex and procreation interchangeably.

Yes, and nobody's asking you to.

Then why is sexlessness being blamed on women? The only solution women would have to offer is having sex with more men.

Doesn't take away from the fact that the median woman has much easier access to sex.

Who cares?

Men and women are fundamentally different that way in their lived experience.

No, they're not. A whiny entitled man is very similar to a whiny entitled woman.

Sigma1979 • 3 points • 11 February, 2021 08:17 PM

but most of them act the same way.

Bullshit. If you're a chick, inject testosterone in yourself and you will change drastically.

LilithOfBabylon • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 09:53 PM

inject testosterone in yourself

There's something called SELF-CONTROL. If you expect to be treated like a human and not a wild beast, you better learn it.

ex_red_black_piller • 5 points • 11 February, 2021 09:59 PM

There's something called SELF-CONTROL.

A woman saying this lol.

LilithOfBabylon • 3 points • 11 February, 2021 10:45 PM

Talk about the soft bigotry of low expectations. At this point you're agreeing with SJWs that men should be treated differently.

Oh, A man violent committed heinous acts?

It's not because he's a psychopath, it's because HE'S A MAN. You know how men and their testosterone cause them to be absolutely monster!

Sigma1979 • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 10:02 PM*

Actually, i take TRT and my testosterone is way higher than a normal man my age. Funny enough, i'm more calm and focused and less moody than i used to be (go to r/testosterone a lot of men will attest to this, HIGHER testosterone makes us feel more calm, confident, and focused). The fact that you think Testosterone makes men turn into animals is pretty stupid.
My sex drive is way up though.
When i was fat, my estrogen was way higher (and thus moodier) due to excess fat converting testosterone to estrogen (a process called aromitization). So i kind of have an insight into how women feel. Maybe women should learn self control and stop blaming your 'hormones' for your illogical outbursts.

LillthOfBabylon • 4 points • 11 February, 2021 10:50 PM
The gender that commits the most violent crimes is lecturing society about outbursts? Really?

Sigma1979 • 0 points • 11 February, 2021 10:53 PM
You made a comment that has no basis in fact. My testosterone is at a slight superphysiological range at roughly 1200 ng/dL (the normal max range is like 1000 ng/dL) and my emotions are way more in control than when my testosterone was lower and my estrogen was higher. You assume increasing testosterone = more violence. That's like the opposite of the case most of the time. To say women aren't moody (and illogical, COUGH) is pretty funny.

LillthOfBabylon • 5 points • 11 February, 2021 10:56 PM
You made a comment that has no basis in fact. You mean my comment about stop using hormones as an excuse? Unless someone's hormones are insanely abnormal, that's not an excuse.

Sigma1979 • 0 points • 11 February, 2021 11:08 PM
No, the comment about you have no idea what you're talking about with respect to how women and men behave. Men and women are NOT the same. You haven't even begun to walk in a man's shoes. I, at least, have a little insight into how women feel due to being overweight years ago and having elevated estrogen due to higher fat.

Women who inject exogenous testosterone have a pretty good idea what it's feels like to be a man (not completely as they are still women and the outside world still treats them as such, but inside they have a better understanding, especially with respect to sex drive and sexuality)

LillthOfBabylon • 3 points • 11 February, 2021 11:15 PM
Men and women are NOT the same.

They're 95% the same. We only see big differences when looking at job choices, family dynamics, and extreme behaviors like law breaking and mental illness.

You haven't even begun to walk in a man's shoes.

I talk to men instead of treating them like a different species.

Sigma1979 • 0 points • 11 February, 2021 11:19 PM
They're 95% the same. We only see big differences when looking at job choices, family dynamics, and extreme behaviors like law breaking and mental illness.

No, we are not. Stop it. Many of our differences aren't even socialized or due to
hormones. For example, between newborn babies, if you show them pictures of people or objects, male babies will pay more attention to the pictures of objects while female babies will show more attention to people. This has been replicated NUMEROUS times in studies.

I talk to men instead of treating them like a different species.

There's nothing wrong with acknowledging that men and women are different. It's crazy but other species of animals the males and females are different and they get along fine too. FUCKING WEIRD.

Sigma1979 • 0 points • 12 February, 2021 12:17 AM
I mean, lots of species of female spiders eat the male spiders after mating, but not vice versa. Are you going to say female and male spiders are the same?

Tongue37 • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 09:57 PM
Haha yes. I know several women that take steroids. They told me the effects steroids had on their personality was vast. Not all of these effects were positive btw but big changes were noticed. But no, guys and women feel and are the same.

mydikishomofobik • 12 points • 11 February, 2021 04:26 PM
Hypergamy to me means wanting someone who is above you. Wanting the best partner you can get is a no-brainer for anyone. But women tend to want men who are above them in some way (especially in terms of status). Men aren't like that. They just want someone they find reasonably attractive. A woman doesn't need to make more money than them or have a more prestigious job title or degree than they have.

Definitely, this is another definition - that's why I specified "depending on the definition" in my post. I've seen hypergamy being used in some cases in TRP to refer to branch swinging to a higher value partner, and in other cases being used to describe the seeking of higher-status partners as you describe.

The two definitions aren't entirely unrelated. One can also formulate female hypergamy like this: a woman's ideal outcome is having a highest possible value partner. Notice that this formulation more-less implies the other two. Namely, it implies she wants a partner above her (unless she considers herself "better" than the entire male population available to her), and that she will have a tendency to branch swing to a higher value man.

Compare with this formulation of male polygamy: a man's ideal outcome is to have a lot of partners with value above a certain threshold. This predicts that over time men will get bored with any one particular partner, no matter how good she is, and seek new ones which are not necessarily better, just good enough.

Compare this formulation with male polygamy: a man's ideal outcome is to have a lot of partners with value above a certain threshold.
That's one type of sexual strategy a man can undertake. Another kind, is getting into a long-term relationship with a single woman and starting a family with her. Most of my male friends prefer having an exclusive girlfriend over having sex with multiple women.

The two definitions aren't entirely unrelated.

But they're not the same. Say she's dating guy A, and she finds he's higher status than her (hypergamy). Then she branch swings to guy B, who's even higher status than guy A. That's not because of "hypergamy" the way you defined it, because guy A was already higher status than her. That's trying to get the highest value partner she can get, which guys also do.

I was only attempting to define the concept of male polygamy, I wasn't claiming all men are like that. The degree of polygamy of any particular male is purely individual, as you say. Same with female hypergamy. It's just that the two phenomenons are common enough that they can be frequently observed in various forms and hence warrant a special name and definition and are used as a prediction heuristic with some success.

Also, the concept of male polygamy is consistent with fact that men want a "locally highest value" female. Meaning the man would likely prefer the hottest/most valuable girl among a group of girls. However, the man will soon nevertheless switch to a completely different girl.

Say she's dating guy A, and she finds he's higher status than her (hypergamy). Then she branch swings to guy B, who's even higher status than guy A. That's not because of "hypergamy" the way you defined it, because guy A was already higher status than her.

I exactly defined female hypergamy as women wanting to converge to a highest possible value man. Your example of branch swinging A -> B precisely demonstrates this behaviour and is not explained by women only wanting a guy of higher status than her. This concept of hypergamy should encompass both wanting to date above and branch swinging.

I pretty much agree with your statement that we can observe branch swinging as a separate phenomenon in both sexes. This recent thread actually pretty much discusses branch swinging, and not hypergamy:

https://www.reddit.com/r/PurplePillDebate/comments/lghhl5/hold_upisnt_everyone_hypergamou s/?utm_source=share&utm_medium=web2x&context=3

However, in the context of TRP they seem to be explained through different mechanisms: women want to date vertically and men horizontally across the value hierarchy, which leads to branch swingings in different directions. Women tend to branch swing upwards, and men tend to branch swing sideways (and upwards as a secondary goal of course, if possible).
name and definition and are used as a prediction heuristic with some success.

Well, you said it's a man's ideal outcome, which I disagree with - it's just one type of sexual strategy that some men enjoy. Other men prefer to go the monogamous intimate relationship route.

I exactly defined female hypergamy as women wanting to converge to a highest possible value man. Your example of branch swinging A -> B precisely demonstrates this behaviour and is not explained by women only wanting a guy of higher status than her. This concept of hypergamy should encompass both wanting to date above and branch swinging.

Yeah my bad, forgot you weren't the original person I replied to. In any case that definition is incorrect, and the actual definition of hypergamy is the original commenter's definition: a woman wanting a guy who's higher status than her. Branch swinging =/= hypergamy and I've now corrected my original post in that area.

However, the man will soon nevertheless switch to a completely different girl.

Any evidence for this? I've certainly heard of the 7-year-itch in marriages but that seems to apply for both men and women. But I am very interested in this concept and in the idea that neither men nor women are designed to be with one person for too long. For men, though, I imagine this could be explainable by the woman losing her fertility after she gets too old, rather than him growing tired of the girl simply due to time alone independent of her attractiveness / youth.

matomasa • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 01:25 AM

Well, you said it's a man's ideal outcome, which I disagree with - it's just one type of sexual strategy that some men enjoy. Other men prefer to go the monogamous intimate relationship route.

Not to be misunderstood, I absolutely agree. I defined a male to be polygamous if his ideal outcome is to have a lot of partners (above a certain value). I don't think that all or even most men are like that. As to the evidence, the usual argument appeals to evolutionary psychology (lots of sperm compete for a smaller number of egg cells and such).

A quick search actually also gives a bunch of arguments in favour of monogamy in both males and females:

https://www.reddit.com/r/AskAnthropology/comments/1ikk7d/why_are_monogamous_relationships_the_norm/?utm_source=share&utm_medium=web2x&context=3

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 01:44 AM

Ohhh I gotcha. Thanks for the clarification and thanks for that link too, interesting read

Purple5091 • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 10:07 PM

no the female/woman's ideal outcome is a main man who provides for her offspring and then during ovulation she copulates with another more attractive man for casual sex as sex is more easier for women to obtain - rinse and repeat where the main man is the same while the side cocks are different attractive men >>>> this is spem competition in evolutionary biology... also pussy has more value than dick
also studies show women's attraction to their partner decreases the more longer she spends with him so makes sense to cheat

matomasa • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 01:06 AM

Not sure if you are serious but anyway, this could be a downgraded goal from trying to find the highest possible value man if the woman realizes she can't have both the provider and the attractive man as one person. So she is financially or socially forced to settle with a more stable but less attractive man and pursues her hypergamous desires through casual sex.

The fact that these side guys are all different is not directly implied by hypergamy as I defined it, this could be a purely practical matter, or you need a different argument from evolutionary psychology to explain it, as you said. Or more interestingly, it can be a consequence of male polygamy, as these attractive men will quickly move on to a different woman so she will be forced to find another. So far everything is still consistent.

also studies show women's attraction to their partner decreases the more longer she spends with him so makes sense to cheat

This can also be explained by hypergamy in the sense that men's value can decline in long term relationships as they tend to let themselves go, so the woman stops being as attracted to them. If the man's value declines enough to offset the cost of breaking a relationship or getting a divorce, the woman will find a new partner as predicted by hypergamy.

Purple5091 • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 03:02 AM

1) of course women are forced to settle as human society is largely patriarchal
2) I never wrote the side guys being different as having anything to do with hypergamy - its simply a mating strategy to have the main/husband and the side men
3) yes if the main men let themselves go their is a possibility that women leave although many just stay and continue cheating to if they dont want to 'rack-up' too many husband/exhusband "better the devil you know"

Zonkey_Zeedonk • 6 points • 11 February, 2021 07:38 PM

See I just disagree that men don’t do this...I see so many men who are overweight (for example) turn down women based on their bodies. It’s all over dating apps, and also real life.

There are a lot of shallow/picky people in the world: men and women both. “Pill” guys on here just get meet a bunch of them (probably on tinder/apps which sort of lend themselves to shallowness) and then want to make claims about woman-kind based on it. Since they are straight men, they’re only meeting straight women: they don’t see that what they’re describing is exactly the same from the other side, and when as a women you voice that, they tell you you just don’t understand how much worse they have it because girls they know get so many swipes online....so there’s no winning...the experience of a woman is invalid if she says she’s seen hypergamy in men, and men who believe RP only factor in the experiences of women that fit with their ideals.

Tongue37 • 3 points • 11 February, 2021 10:05 PM

True, most men are pretty simple when it comes to what they want in a woman. We want them to be feminine, attractive and fun. That’s it, they don’t need to even have a job or be intelligent or have the perfect body, just be feminine and fun and in decent shape. That’s it
Zonkey_Zeedonk • 3 points • 11 February, 2021 07:27 PM

Yeah I don’t agree with every one of your specifics but I agree with your overall statement:

Men and women ARE different psychologically/biologically...they are also not different SPECIES and similar in more ways than they are different. Moreover, neither men nor women are a monolith... WOMEN are different from each other, MEN are different from each other...and not just a little different, HUGELY different depending on their culture/upbringing/life experiences. Some women have more in common with many men than other women, and visa versa with men.

The big problem with any “pill” (red, blue, or otherwise) is that they all try reduce something that’s really complex and nuanced down to an oversimplified version of itself and refuse to see it any other way.

How and where someone lives/has lived and what’s happened to them in their life determines how they interact with the opposite sex MUCH more than whether they are male or female and “pills” downplay that way too often.

purplepillldthrowaway[S] • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 08:09 PM

Men and women ARE different psychologically/biologically...they are also not different SPECIES and similar in more ways than they are different.

Sure? This isn't about saying whether men and women are more similar or more different on the whole. This is about specific generalizations about differences in sexual attraction between the sexes, for example that women are attracted to confidence on a primal level while men are not.

I am aware that both men and women breathe, eat, sleep, poop, etc. and are more similar on the whole than they are different, lol.

Zonkey_Zeedonk • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 08:19 PM

Yeah, I was referring to those differences...they come from psychology and biology, and that’s the way they’re usually explained by “pill” people.

And I’m not talking about basic functions...I’m talking about specifically in the way they interact with members of the opposite sex/what they want/how they think

unholymunchkin • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 10:50 PM

Completely agree with you. It also for the most part ignores everyone who is not cis and hetero.

Zonkey_Zeedonk • 3 points • 11 February, 2021 10:54 PM

Very much does that too, and when it doesn’t it’s kind of offensive.

801735 • 3 points • 11 February, 2021 07:45 PM

It's almost as if we're all only human...

purplepillldthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 07:52 PM

Well yeah of course we're all human. That statement doesn't really say much about the fact that there are some generalizable statements we can make about men and women.

801735 • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 07:53 PM

That statement doesn't really say much about the fact that there are some generalizable statements we can make about men and women.
"On average 2 arms, 2 legs and 1.5 heads."

Or, you know, the statements in the first half of my post?

Or that, too, yes.

SolarTortality • 3 points • 11 February, 2021 08:35 PM
1) In terms of sexuality and sexual strategy: men and women are very very different.
2) Bell curves. Men and women are similar across many dimensions with small differences, however at the ends of the bell curves this is very different. This is why, at the extremes, all the strongest individuals are mostly men, all the shortest individuals are mostly women, all the most violent criminals are mostly men, ect.

JohnDoe9564 • 5 points • 11 February, 2021 03:38 PM
Women are uniquely attracted to strength, confidence, and other "alpha" traits. It turns them on at a primal level.

Every normal functioning adult knows this. TRP isn't providing groundbreaking info by saying this.

Sometimes I wonder about the social lives of men who used to believe otherwise

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 13 points • 11 February, 2021 03:47 PM
I was taught growing up that women were attracted to kindness, respect, gentleness, etc. Those can all be good traits for a romantic partner but they are not sexually arousing. I was taught that to win a woman's heart, a man should do things like buy her flowers and be polite, not flirt confidently on a date and act like I know she wants to have sex with me already.

Tongue37 • 4 points • 11 February, 2021 10:24 PM
Many guys were taught when younger that to attract women we had to be nice and sincere and be a good listener. So we try that in 7th grade and we find out it just doesn’t work lol. So we adapt and find out what truly works
Many of us have found out to our disappointment what truly turns women on and attracts them to us. Imo once you find out what really works in terms of attracting women, it loses almost all of its enjoyment. It has for me

So we try that in 7th grade and we find out it just doesn’t work lol.

What kind of relationship exactly did you expect in 7th grade? What would your dating attempts "working" look like to you, if you were a 12 year old boy trying to date a 12 year old girl?
I'm trying to picture what your criteria for "doesn't work" is here, and what your expectations were when you decided that women are bad for not dating you over being nice. Because 7th graders are pretty well known for like... having minor, non-serious "relationships" where nothing happens beyond hand-holding or a kiss on the cheek. Just seems like an insanely young age to give up on humanity and try treating girls like "plates".
This right here. In modern society many men are raised by their moms. And what they say is good (eg: be the nice boy) but it doesn't necessarily actually translate to success in dating.

LaChoffe • 3 points • 11 February, 2021 08:16 PM

You can be kind, respectful, gentile etc and as long as you are good looking then it wont hinder you at all. And it increases your odds of finding a woman with similar traits.

purplepilldthrowaway[S] • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 09:15 PM

I never said those qualities were mutually exclusive with attracting women. Just that it misses out a large part of the picture of what's primally attractive to women, which TRP captures.

Emervila • 8 points • 11 February, 2021 03:47 PM*

both parties have decided the other person is attractive / high value enough to fuck or date.

The criteria or parameters used to determine to have sex and when, that's were the gatekeeping works. I'll use my own experience as example

I was an avg to ugly guy. After 25-27 I got a decent job and found RP, started to improve myself and now at 33 I like how I look and dress with a decent life.

When I was 20-25/27. I was completely ignored by several women, they didn't give me the time of the day. They are my age... now that I'm 33 at least 4-5 of them have shown confirmed interest to marry me, to have an LTR pointing to marriage. I asked one of them (34) "why now? nothing happen between us when we were 22" she replied: "because we didn't get to know each other" If I were blue pill and if I hadn't known about Rollo and the sacred RP, I would have been dumb enough to believe in that woman, I'd be marry by now BUT I found RP so I know her answer is bullshit. It's true, we didn't get to know each other but not because there was no chance but because she didn't like me, when we were 22YO she could do better she thought and didn't give me any attention, that's fine but NOW I can do better than her.

IME experience a lot of women who were hot during 20 and found me ugly AF, they know look like rotten milk and miracle of God, they now show interest on me. Makes me angry if I'm honest because I'm not a dumpster to pick them up when they're garbage old. They all want to marry me but I know they don't truly feel attracted to me. What do you think?

purplepilldthrowaway[S] • 7 points • 11 February, 2021 03:50 PM

Your experience makes sense, but I don't really see how that proves that women are the gatekeepers of sex / men are the gatekeepers of relationships. All that proves is that you are now higher value than those women and wouldn't want to marry them anymore. You still wouldn't fuck an ugly woman, and they still wouldn't date the 22 y/o version of you. You both still have standards for who you would date and/or fuck, and you'd both filter many prospects out of each category.

Emervila • 6 points • 11 February, 2021 03:57 PM

Sex gatekeeping: They give sex to who they like(hottest possible) in their 20's and use it to bargain in their 30's to find husband. They thought I would marry them in hopes of having sexual life secured, since they know ugly guys don't have a real sexual life

Relationship Gatekeeping: None of the men they fucked in their 20's cared or intended to keep them, none of those men tried to marry these women, now I also close the marriage door on them.

The gate idea works in the sense of "allowing entrance".
Relationship Gatekeeping: None of the men they fucked in their 20's cared or intended to keep them, none of those men tried to marry these women

How do you know this is true? What if the woman was the one to dump the man she dated in her 20s (which is usually the case actually - most breakups are initiated by women)?

now I also close the marriage door on them.

Sure, but you wouldn't have back in the day, right?

They all want to marry me but I know they don't truly feel attracted to me.

Okay I guess this may be an important part I missed. For you, the reality is that the circle of women you'd fuck (which includes these women) is larger than the circle of women you'd marry; whereas for these women, they'd marry you but they still wouldn't find you attractive enough to have casual sex with you. Fair enough, but then it's an oversimplified and misleading statement to simply say "men are the gatekeepers of relationships / women are the gatekeepers of sex" since both circles/gates exist for both sexes; it's just that their relative circle sizes differ.

Another counterargument would be that this is the key factor:

when we were 22YO she could do better she thought and didn't give me any attention, that's fine but NOW I can do better than her

I.e. it comes down to "can I do better", not "which gate am I the gatekeeper of".

And finally it seems that we're defining relationships here in the context of marriage; which is a pretty narrow definition IMO, and would exclude any temporary exclusive relationships the woman may have had in her 20s. But fair enough, maybe that's just an intentional oversimplification for the sake of the easy-to-say "rule".

What if the woman was the one to dump the man she dated in her 20s that's exactly sex gatekeeping. LTR for men are 1. sex "regulated" and 2. descendants. When a woman dumps you she is closing sex for you.

you wouldn't have back in the day, right?

of course not, in their prime they were pretty and young, they're not bad people, they could be good wives. It's doesn't proof anything but that I manage that door for them. They were not looking for marriage back in the day

For you, the reality is that the circle of women you'd fuck (which includes these women) is larger than the circle of women you'd marry; whereas for these women, they'd marry you but they still wouldn't find you attractive enough to have casual sex with you

EXACTLY

it's an oversimplified and misleading statement to simply say "men are the gatekeepers of relationships / women are the gatekeepers of sex"

It doesn't need to be complicated to be true thou. It's more about who has the upper hand. They all granted me all the sex I could want but they wanted within the context of LTR, they were there
ready to have sex with me IF I could assure them the wedding ring, they would even concede sex if LTR with marriage as goal was set up but I declined. They got really pissed off when I told them I just wanted casual sex. I could have lied and still have sex then leave but I decided not to lie.

I.e. it comes down to "can I do better", not "which gate am I the gatekeeper of"

It's the same actually, you open the door to who you want when you want. Sex door was closed for me in their 20's because they didn't want to, and now LTR is closed for them because not just me but a lot of men don't want to LTR them.

it seems that we're defining relationships here in the context of marriage;

Nope. I told you it's my experience since I'm early 30's that the world I'm in, women after 30's become bonkers and obsessed about marriage and I'm husband material, they get really mad when rejected and nobody else wants to marry them.

In their 20's those relationships are less meaningful, they don't really want LTR, they can have simps to provide food, tools and support hence they can focus only on getting Chad only

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 05:47 PM

Fair enough. I guess unfortunately the truth is that for you, the saying may be more true since you're not attractive enough to pass through the casual sex gate with these women (although I'd also argue hope is not lost, if you did want to go the TRP route and improve your physique and learn game to have more sexual options). Meanwhile for more attractive men, it's more possible to be the gatekeepers of both sex and relationships, and be allowed through the "sex" gate with women but not the "relationship" gate.

that's exactly sex gatekeeping. LTR for men are 1. sex "regulated" and 2. descendents.
When a woman dumps you she is closing sex for you.

Eh, not necessarily. I got dumped a couple months ago in a relationship context and now we've reconnected and I'm just FWB with her. However, again, depending on your definition of "relationship" you may explain this away too under your perspective, since I never intended on marrying her and that was one of the reasons for the dumping. Meanwhile from my perspective, I wanted an exclusive relationship with her (just not long term i.e. marriage) and can no longer pass through that gate, only the sex gate.

Emervila • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 05:54 PM

I wanted an exclusive relationship with her

1. sex "regulated"

Now you have unregulated sex. Yes she opened the door for you without any restriction. It's the best scenario a man can have. It's also related to her age. I bet all-in she's not in her 30's.

Meanwhile for more attractive men, it's more possible to be the gatekeepers of both sex and relationships

Yes, unfortunately for me they just open the relationship gate which I don't want because
as you said they are not really attracted to me, that's why I declined both sex and relationship with them.

I believe we have similar thoughts but there's a difference. You seem to think in a solid stance, my standards my rules but I argue the stance is dynamic on our SMV which can increase or decrease, those standards are just the reflex of how high in the SMP you are, not just your "choices" specially when your SMV is low

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 06:16 PM

Yes she opened the door for you without any restriction. It's the best scenario a man can have.

Depends on the man and the girl, no? In this case my ideal situation would be the "regulated" sex you talk about, i.e. let into the short-term relationship gate where I can be exclusively with her e.g. for a couple years. Which is different from my actual situation where I'm only let into the casual sex gate, but also different from your situation where you're only let into the long-term relationship gate. I think the gatekeeper statement would only be true in my situation if you think of "relationship" as being in the context of long-term / marriage; otherwise, if you consider what I would ideally want to be a relationship (e.g. a STR), then she is indeed a gatekeeper of relationships and will not let me into that gate, only the sex gate.

And yup we're both in our 20s; are you saying that also makes a difference to the truth of the "gatekeeper" statement?

Yeah I do think we agree in a lot of ways, but it just depends on phrasing and still seems quite nuanced to me (so I'd still be hesitant to support the gatekeeper statement in its original form without multiple qualifying explanations).

Emervila • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 06:56 PM

And yup we're both in our 20s; are you saying that also makes a difference to the truth of the "gatekeeper" statement

Totally. In 20's LTR is more like an option and doesn't have that much weight in life. In 30's you do realize you either start to make a family or forget about it for sure.

qualifying explanations

Sure, it's case to case basis but the general rule stands valid enough. I forgot to mention gates are pivots because as you claim which is true the power balance between men and women do change.

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 07:00 PM

Fair enough. Good talk man, you were nice to discuss with

One_Appointment7731 • -1 points • 11 February, 2021 03:59 PM

If any non obese women asked a man for sex directly 75%+ of them would say yes and the rest would be flattered. Now flip the script and a good chunk of those men would have committed a federal crime. What does that tell you?
If any non-obese women asked a man for sex directly, 75%+ of them would say yes and the rest would be flattered.

Key word "non-obese" - you're still acknowledging that men have standards for sex. As for being flattered, I'd agree, but that's only because men tend to receive less compliments and advances than women; I wouldn't say it has anything to do with men not being gatekeepers of sex.

RidiculouslyFarOut • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 05:05 PM
This is pretty much the only standard most men have and a not insignificant portion of men don't even have that standard.

NarniaFox • 3 points • 11 February, 2021 04:40 PM
One doesn't have to be redpilled to know when they are the second option for someone.

Cobra_x30 • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 06:19 PM
One doesn't have to be redpilled to know when they are the second option for someone.

I think it's the natural instinct of most men to lie to themselves about this sort of thing. Women as well have this issue it's just men rarely feel like they settled.

So, with that context you can understand that being RedPilled helps a lot in battling against our own tendency to lie to ourselves.

NarniaFox • 2 points • 12 February, 2021 04:21 AM
And I think most people who at least have some ideas about healthy relationships and self-worth wouldn't date partners who use them as their last option.

Cobra_x30 • 1 point • 13 February, 2021 12:19 AM
We all like to think that we know when this is happening, but in my experience emotions almost always get in the way of reason and people wind up not realizing the other person is settling for them until well after the damage is done.

NarniaFox • 1 point • 13 February, 2021 04:27 AM
Overall it depends on a person and I think there are healthier ways to learn to respect yourself and your boundaries than TRP.

Emervila • 0 points • 11 February, 2021 04:59 PM
true, but one does need to be Red pilled to understand and act upon correctly

NarniaFox • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 04:22 AM
I really doubt it. Anyone with at least some ideas about healthy relationships and self-worth would opt out from dating people who use them as their last option.

Think4Yoself • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 10:11 PM
I disagree with both of the areas where you critique what you believe to be redpill ideas.

First, both men and women aren't hypergamous. Hypergamy is marrying up the social hierarchy. Men are not
hypergamous, they are perfectly willing to marry down. Women are not. Men and women are both capable of branch-swinging, which is what you are describing and is entirely different than hypergamy. What you're doing is the equivalent of a man getting punched in the mouth by another man, and the one who got punched declaring himself a woman and saying the attacker is sexist. Words have meanings. Just because you're using them incorrectly doesn't mean the actual definition of the word isn't objectively correct.

Second, that is not bullshit. Historically men offered commitment and women offered sex. That was the transactional nature of their relationships. It's still true today in the sense that men withhold commitment from women who they perceive as beneath them, and women withhold sex from men they perceive as beneath them. Now there are certainly women who value themselves as entirely unworthy of almost any man and therefore have sex with a lot of men and there are certainly men who pedestalize women and believe that he isn't worthy of a relationship with any of them and so will jump at any opportunity for a relationship, but the rule still holds.

Yeah I agree. I guess I've just seen the word "hypergamy" incorrectly used in TRP to refer to branch swinging (hence why I said "depending on the definition"). In that case you can just replace "hypergamy" with "branch swinging" in my post and my point still holds (which you agree with) - that it can apply to both men and women.

Disagree. Both men and women withhold both commitment and sex from people whom they perceive as beneath them. A normal man won't fuck an ugly woman, and a normal woman won't date an ugly man.

Men are perfectly willing to fuck women they would never dream of marrying and women are perfectly willing to marry men they are absolutely not interested in fucking.

Men are perfectly willing to fuck women they would never dream of marrying

As are women

women are perfectly willing to marry men they are absolutely not interested in fucking

This is extremely rare, most marriages involve enjoyable sex for both parties

Men and women both have standards for who they date and fuck. Thus they are both gatekeepers of sex and relationships.

You're ignoring the nuance because it's inconvenient for your position. It's sort of like how men are more disagreeable than women on the average and on the extremes, but if you took a random man and a random woman out of the population there would be a 40% chance that the woman is more disagreeable. There are commonalities and there is significant overlap between the genders, but the differences are still there and still noticeable. It's not men who put pressure on their partners to get married and it's not women who put pressure on others to have sex on the first date. Yes, both have standards, but that doesn't change the accuracy of the idea presented.

Ah not at all, if you specify that there's a lot of nuance and required qualifying statements then
I'd agree with the gatekeeper statement. It's just that on its own (and I have certainly seen it used by TRPers on its own, as an absolute rule) it's not true. E.g. I've seen TRPers warn against a man asking a woman to be exclusive with him because "women are supposed to be the gatekeepers of relationships, not men".

But if all you're saying is "men tend to be more open to casual sex than relationships, and women tend to push for marriage more than men", then yeah I could agree with that. Pretty far from the original statement though. Kinda like "AWALT" requiring whole posts describing that it just means that a woman could branch swing and to be ready for it, rather than something like "all women love to ride the cock carousel and will leave as soon as a better option comes along".

Think4YoSELF • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 01:52 AM

See, that's the point. Instead of acknowledging the actual intent behind the saying, you've decided the reinterpret it in a way that is clearly different from the intent and then claim the whole statement is wrong. It's a terribly dishonest way to discuss anything. What was your point exactly?

Basically what you're doing is the equivalent of saying men can't be sexist because men and women are so much more alike than different. It's petty, pointless, and intellectually dishonest.

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 01:58 AM

Instead of acknowledging the actual intent behind the saying, you've decided the reinterpret it in a way that is clearly different from the intent

No, it's that I've seen that saying being used mostly with a different intent than you're describing. Like I said:

> E.g. I've seen TRPers warn against a man asking a woman to be exclusive with him because "women are supposed to be the gatekeepers of relationships, not men".

And that's actually the main sort of context I've seen the saying used in.

Think4YoSELF • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 02:15 AM

Except nobody has ever said women are the gatekeepers of relationships. You've got it backward.

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 02:25 AM

Yea it was a typo / mind slip lol, should say "men are supposed to be the gatekeepers of sex, not women". Cmon man you should be able to tell that based on context, look who's being intellectually dishonest now ;)

Gamedragon345 • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 10:47 PM

Men being hypergamous is alpha males choosing the hotter younger woman. Not everyone is an alpha man though. Women being hypergamous is leaving the guy for a richer, hotter guy. "Monkey branching". It seems like women get this opportunity to be hypergamous more often. I mean women always marry up, and the benefits they get from being hypergamous seem more tangible than what a man gets. But oh well its a hopeless argument.
IMO no one knows exactly how much of our attraction is genetic and how much is cultural. But we have what we have. For men, how a woman looks is a bigger issue than how a man looks for a woman. For women, how a man projects "alpha-ness" is a bigger issue than how a woman projects "alpha-ness" to a man. But it's not black and white, since men are still attracted to strength in women and women are still attracted to good looks in men.

I definately have a certain type of women, someone who is confident, sunny, has her professional life together, but is also an artistic "dark girl". But that is probably more just me as a person than me as a man. Either way, I notice the irony that seductive and highly desired women have many "alpha" and "bad boy" traits.

But as a man, I learned more about how to look attractive to women over time. A large part of it is just not making such a big deal about it and learning how to relax and be fun. Being involved in your life, pursuing your goals and ambitions, seeing women as enriching your life and not being your life, goes a long way.

That is where a lot of the "just be confident" stuff comes in. It's less about being confident and more about not putting power in the other people's hands (in this case, women you like) to make or break you. If you know your standards, know your goals in life, know your worth, then you make potential partners have to prove their worth to you. That puts power in your hands and makes you more attractive. And more importantly, makes you much happier.

As an asexual, I strongly disagree that sexual attraction is required for romantic love.

I admit that I’m of a rare breed, but I see love like a Disney romance. All the PG gushy romance stuff without any of the sex.

I also find strong women attractive specifically because it feeds into my innate desire for competition. I don’t want a strong woman to control me. I want a strong woman to test me, and push me to be greater than I would have been otherwise.

I do have to admit that my ultra competitive streak doesn’t always mesh well with relationships. I see losing as more incentive to try harder. But a lot burn out and get inferiority complexes. Either way — it’s not healthy long term lol.

Suffice to say, I am still attracted to the fire.

Man, people are so complex, lol!!

As an asexual, I strongly disagree that sexual attraction is required for romantic love.

Interesting, I don't know much about asexual people. Do you not have physical preferences at all for the people you desire to be romantic with? Would you be equally likely to want a relationship with an ugly woman (e.g. facial deformities) as a pretty woman?

I have strong aesthetic preferences. I am attracted to certain looks.

The best way I usually describe asexually is like someone who loves the smell of coffee, but hates to drink it.

I’m an art, photography, poetic type guy, so aesthetics are always important to be.

But for some reason I’ve never really enjoyed sex. I used to think I just never had the right women. But
I'm in my 30's with experience with 5 different partners and it's never been anything more than an incredibly boring and drawn out game of going through the motions.

I get urges and need to release. But I don't enjoy the process. Like eating to live. I eat to survive, but I don't specifically care about the process lol.

purplepilldthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 07:55 PM

I have strong aesthetic preferences. I am attracted to certain looks. The best way I usually describe asexually is like someone who loves the smell of coffee, but hates to drink it.

I see. To me this would qualify as sexual attraction - sexual attraction, to me, isn't just about the act of sex. Sounds like you have sexual preferences, but the act of sex for whatever reason (perhaps a genetic mutation in your psychology or something) isn't enjoyable for you.

Thanks for sharing though. Always cool to hear unique perspectives.

Naus1987 • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 12:57 AM

Sexual attraction and aesthetic attraction are two unique things.

purplepilldthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 01:20 AM

For sure, they can be. I just get the sense that the aesthetic preferences you describe in your romantic partners are a similar type of sexual preference that a non-asexual person might have.

The best way I usually describe asexually is like someone who loves the smell of coffee, but hates to drink it.

... But I don't think I would get they close to someone if I didn't find them inherently attractive to some degree.

... If I met a pretty woman in a wheel chair

Sentences like these give me that sense. That you have the wiring in your brain for being attracted to women with compatible genes, but you just don't enjoy the act of sex. I could be wrong though.

Although if you're straight (which it sounds like you are), that would lend even more credence to my hypothesis that your aesthetic attraction is a kind of sexual attraction, even if you don't enjoy sex with the women you're attracted to. Otherwise you'd also be romantically attracted to e.g. hipster guys with cool aesthetics.

Naus1987 • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 02:08 AM

Shrugs. I dunno. People are confusing. I used to just think I never got with the right woman. But 5 women over 2 decades and it just never clicked. Always felt like boring work.

I love the romance part though.

purplepilldthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 02:28 AM

I love the romance part though.

Same man. I wonder if I can actually understand how you experience relationships too.
because I've had one before where we barely had sex for the last few months but I didn't care at all, I just loved cuddling and kissing and being with her :)

Yeah I’m a huge sucker for the romance part.
I actually didn’t even realize I was asexual until my early 30s. Because I was so normal it never occurred to me lol!
The only real difference is that I just never cared for sex enough to initiate it. So if my partner at the time didn’t initiate herself — then we just didn’t engage in the activity.
Unfortunately for most of my exes, they actually needed sex to be happy, but we’re always too shy to actually admit it. So they always waited for me to initiate, and became bitter when I didn’t.
Meanwhile I’d go months without ever realizing anything was ever amiss, because no one ever told me. I always just assumed I had a low sex drive. I even got my testosterone levels checked, and I’m perfectly good there. So I have no idea what’s up.
I don’t hate sex. It’s just not something that excites me enough to actively chase it.
Now that I’m older and realize that woman actually want sex, but often don’t want to express it or initiate— I’ve held off from dating. Kinda treading my own way type vibes at the moment.
I don’t really enjoy hookup culture at all, so I’m just doing my thing

Edit. It’s also possible my exes were so bad at sex that it could be a reason too, but doubtful. 3 of the 5 were virgins, so they didn’t have experience, and I just didn’t care enough to get creative. So eh!

Doubtful. Sex is very enjoyable for me even when the girl has no idea what she's doing, assuming I'm properly into her. Nowadays I actually do 100% of the work during sex lol (except once in a while I let her ride to change things up) and I love it
And yeah girls usually prefer when the guy initiates sex
I wonder if you could experiment with a one-way open relationship? So that you could still date a girl and she could still have sex? How would you feel about that

Also, I wouldn’t inherently be drawn to someone with deformities or injuries. But I wouldn’t love anyone less if they were scarred. I believe in that soul-love. That you love someone’s soul above their body. But
I don’t think I would get they close to someone if I didn’t find them inherently attractive to some degree. But once I’m committed. I’m all in. (Unfortunately that kind of loyalty doesn’t bode well in modern relationships, lol).

I’m also not attracted to people who are unhealthy. I’m fit and I exercised. So someone who let themselves go looks bad. But if I met a pretty woman in a wheel chair or she was missing an arm or she had a big facial scar. Those things don’t affect me. I see beauty past damage.

AutoModerator[M] • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 03:33 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!

---

geyges • 3 points • 11 February, 2021 03:52 PM

I was going to compliment you on your use of bullet points, then you totally lost me on the 3rd one. Don't write novels about yourself, stick to the point.

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 03:56 PM

A paragraph about how it doesn't make sense to be purple pilled is a novel?

geyges • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 04:05 PM

Yes. Keep it short and sweet for bullet points.

If you need to use paragraphs to explain something, actually use paragraphs. But these are just presentation complaints. I don't really disagree on the content.

superlurkage • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 04:30 PM

Of course the pills do this. Red pill wants reasons to treat women differently, blue pill wants reasons to treat them the same.

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 04:36 PM

Red pill wants reasons to treat women differently

Lol no, TRP is about learning about female psychology so we can improve our dating lives. The goal is truth. I'm just disagreeing with how I often see TRPers frame certain observations. But I don't think they're making observations for the sake of having an excuse to treat women differently.

superlurkage • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 05:29 PM*

Sure it is. Most of society believes that sex is bad for women but not for men, because we are
sooooooooo different. All attitudes regarding cheating, n counts, virginity, dating, etc, stems from this desire to see the sexes as completely different, with two different standards of morality and conduct.

All of red pill terminology is aimed at defining gender neutral phenomena as something only women do.

Both genders play games and manipulate to their advantage, but red pill thinks only women “shit test”, requiring “game” and “holding frame”

Both genders become dissatisfied and complacent, but only women are “hypergamous” and “all like that”

Both genders try to justify their actions as neutral instead of self-serving, but only women “hamster” and “solipsistize”

Sure it is. Most of society believes that sex is bad for women but not for men, because we are sooooooooo different. All attitudes regarding cheating, n counts, virginity, dating, etc, stems from this desire to see the sexes as completely different, with two different standards of morality and conduct.

Well, there are evolutionary reasons for why sex is seen differently across the sexes. Paternity certainty can be compromised if a woman has sex with multiple men, but a man having sex with multiple women doesn't compromise the women's ability to secure his genes.

All of red pill terminology is aimed at defining gender neutral phenomena as something only women do

I agree with you that some red pill truths apply to both women and men (hence the last half of my post). Do you disagree that other red pill truths (the first half of my post) only apply to women?

I disagree. There’s tendencies, some weaker/stronger than others, not truths. And the rigid stereotyping/generalizing that red pill loves is a form of bigotry, which is why blue pill/mainstream attitudes reject it. Modern society as a whole is not in favor of bigotry, because of its limitations

Well by "truths" I mean "generalizations that tend to be true for most women".

And I completely disagree that generalizations are in themselves forms of bigotry. Is it bigotry to say that women are generally attracted to male model type faces (or, in my post, to say that women are generally more sexually attracted to confident men)? Or that men are generally more physically attracted to youthful (e.g. early 20s) and fertile women than e.g. 50 year old women?

To me, something becomes bigotry when it's a form of treating a group worse. I have no intention of treating women worse than men; I love women and treat them well, even if I can also observe common patterns in their behavior that seem to apply to most of them in dating contexts.
Saying women are attracted to models? Yes, that’s very mild bigotry, because 1) that’s still a generalization and 2) it’s not a positive trait. It’s considered “bad” and shallow to be attracted to physical attributes, especially for women.

Bigotry is prejudice + negativity, particularly against people different from you; it doesn’t have to translate into actions/treatment to exist. And the red pill is rife with both generalizations and negativity against women, who they take great pains to paint as separate, alien creatures with different mental functions, biological functions, social functions and morality than men.

You’re having a conversation with me here (not other TRP users whose posts you may have seen), and I have not taken any great pains to paint women as alien creatures or paint them with negative qualities. As I stated above, the goal of TRP as I see it is simply to observe truths and patterns. And yes, women are different from men. It's not a bad thing. It just is. Women tend to have boobs. Men tend to have penises. Women tend to be attracted to confidence. Nothing wrong with it. It's fine. It's nature.

It is an issue when major tenets of your philosophy are:

- All Women Are Like That
- Women: The Oldest Teenager in the House (i.e., immature, selfish, emotional, irresponsible)
- Enjoy the Decline
- Women Can’t Love (Like/But Men Can)
Nobody should need a pill or claim they are pilled, its just being self aware.

You can learn much of this just living life and basic dating videos...

majani • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 04:29 PM
The differences between the sexes are small but the effects of these differences is significant. For example the balls are small masses that secrete mere milligrams of testosterone. Scientifically speaking, you could interpret balls to only be a small difference between the genders, but we all know the effects of that are massive.

LPNinja • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 08:54 PM
What I don’t get about how any time someone is referring to studies, they do not take time to critically go through empirical work. RP, BP and PB tend to make generalized statements based on studies that simply describe average tendencies from thousands of samples that have to be critically analyzed.

Any college/university student who had one class in empirical research methods can tell you that these studies usually describe correlation and tendencies. But they do not describe, explain or PROVE causality. Even the tendencies are not proven, they are just being described.

That's why peer reviews and doing experiments over and over again are so important because one research group can come up with a different results each time.

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 09:34 PM
That's why peer reviews and doing experiments over and over again are so important because one research group can come up with a different results each time.

The paper I linked was a meta-analysis

Acceptable_Parking96 • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 11:06 PM
For most RP people it's common knowledge that every human trait varies between humans. RP content often emphasises the words "most" or "more often that not" etc. Not all women and some men practice genetic hypergamy. BP people are usually mostly unfamiliar with the nature of women/men etc. More often they follow the flawed narrative of feminism which labels men and women as identical in every way and choose not to believe in RP philosophy.

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 2 points • 11 February, 2021 11:11 PM
Agreed. I just find many RP men talk about things like branch swinging as if they're unique to women. But I agree with your comment.

DiCateRedPill • 1 point • 11 February, 2021 11:20 PM
Hypergamy by definition is a woman's desire to seek a man above her level. The best man she can get. Men do not seek women that are above their own level. You don't see men looking for a rich woman to take care of them. Men are not hypergamous. Sure, a man would leave a woman for a better option, but a man is not seeking a woman above his level. A man usually instinctively puts himself as the head of the relationship. People who say men are hypergamous are flat out wrong. I can't believe Rollo has spent countless hours explaining this across 4 books and hundreds of hours of video and people still seem to not understand it. It makes perfect sense.

leebeebee • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 12:04 AM
Though I can’t read the study you posted due to the paywall, I don’t think it supports your point.

“Women were more likely to rate male targets as more desirable when presented alongside a female while no
obvious effects were detected with male choice. These sex differences disappeared in studies that ‘augment’ cues, as both sexes rated targets as more attractive when in the presence of more desirable others. We also detected high levels of heterogeneity in effect sizes and a moderate publication bias in favor of positive reports of MCC.”

So: women like men more when they’re presented with other women. Couldn’t the presence of a woman be an indication that the man she’s with is safe, and probably less likely to hurt you? Like a subconscious vetting process? If this is the case, couldn’t men achieve the same effect in other ways (e.g. having a pet or doing volunteer work)? Again, I can’t read the full text, but the conclusion that women like men who bang a lot of women seems like a stretch.

The publication bias thing is interesting, too. Studies like this tend to be encourage sensationalism, so IDK how reliable they are.

Beyond that, my biggest problem with TRP et al is that the differences between genders are presented as the result of evolutionary biology rather than cultural conditioning—as nature rather than nurture. There’s really no way to prove that these kinds of gender differences are the result of biology (at least, not yet), and the idea that these traits are somehow hardcoded into us is often used as a rationalization for the oppression of women. (It’s also used as an excuse for men behaving badly—“boys will be boys” is bullshit.)

So yeah, the differences that you’ve mentioned may exist, but that doesn’t mean they can’t change or that we should perpetuate them.

purplepillthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 12:48 AM

A bit too lazy right now to find a study I'm remembering, but it showed headshots of men on their own, and then showed headshots of those men alongside headshots of women and told the female raters that the two were a couple, and found that the men were rated more attractive in the couple context.

Also the fact that the attractiveness of the female "partner" was an important factor, implies it's not just about safety (not to mention that the man was rated on attractiveness, not safety / comfort).

Meanwhile here's a study done on gay people I just found that seems to imply the same thing: gay men found other gay men attractive in the presence of others, and lesbian women found other lesbian women less attractive in the presence of others. I will admit I'm also a bit too lazy to dive into this one, but the PDF is here if you'd like to. For now it seems to corroborate this theory that a man being taken shows he's attractive, while a woman being taken lowers her attractiveness due to decreased paternity certainty.

But this is also a phenomenon many men experience in real life (including myself) and have commented on this sub (and in e.g. PUA forums) describing this phenomenon. E.g. a guy going to a party with a hot girlfriend and suddenly getting sexual attention (e.g. flirty arm touches that even bothered his girlfriend) from a girl who previously ignored him. I'd be very surprised if this wasn't a biological phenomenon due to nature, with nothing to do with nurture / societal conditioning.

I would never advocate for treating women worse for any reason. These are just facts / patterns / etc that we can observe. Personally the extent to which I use TRP to benefit my dating life is things like acting more confident on dates, playfully teasing girls on dates to show I don't take them too seriously / imply I'm successful with other attractive girls and am confident treating them casually, being confident sexually escalating (implies the same thing - I'm used to being with hot girls), being dominant in bed (girls like sex with me way more now), etc. I go for win-win situations with girls where everyone is treated well and is
happy.

Skevin • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 02:40 AM

On point

kay_mckinsey • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 03:23 AM

This is the only PP post I’ve seen in a long time on this sub. Honestly thank you for the break from thinly veiled RPs haha

purplepilldthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 04:57 AM

Haha I still consider it to be red pilled, just my version of red pill. But no problem

loudbeat69 • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 04:05 AM

My experience with dealing with most Men and Women is that they think all this RP/BP/PP is all bullshit. Only the extremes of either gender go to their crazy pill side.

purplepilldthrowaway[S] • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 05:13 AM

Most men aren't good with girls, and most women aren't very consciously aware of what they find most sexually attractive

CentralAdmin • 1 point • 12 February, 2021 04:06 AM

Yes we are more similar than we are different.

But those differences are quite stark.

But we both have the inborn wiring to, within a certain range, seek out the highest SMV mate we can

Yes but hypergamy refers to a specific female sexual strategy. If women were like men, they would have multiple husbands at once. Yet there are many cultures where men marry multiple women. In matriarchal societies you don't see a female chief with five husbands. Women get attached to one man and desire his offspring, provision and protection. When they do have multiple partners they tend to exhibit serial monogamy, not polygamy. They are hypergamous.

women can't love men in the way that men can love women.

I believe he said women cannot love men in the way men want to be loved.

Women will never give up their lives to protect men in the same way they would children. Men are more likely to put themselves in harm's way for women. Men have to earn loyalty and often have to navigate women's love like some elaborate game. In fact, men have to learn 'game' to attract women!

Women also enjoy and prefer a parent-child dynamic where the man leads/is the parent. If her husband is like a father figure, making decisions, providing and protecting her and the kids, all is well. Women do not enjoy a parent-child dynamic where they are in the role of parent. As hypocritical as it is, it does destroy the relationship. Some women will even call their partners 'Daddy' and see no problem with it. A man who sees his wife as a Mommy is weak or has psychological issues.

A woman can show vulnerability and not lose the attraction of her partner. A man cannot do the same reliably. A woman can lose her job and being a stay at home mom is seen as a viable role for her. A man cannot shirk his gender roles without it causing problems in the relationship.

It doesn't have to be unconditional love. But women have more conditions for love to happen and they increase
their demands and expectations as the relationship grows.

Both men and women have standards for every type of sexual/romantic relationship. Both casual and romantic relationships are mutual engagements where both parties have decided the other person is attractive/high value enough to fuck or date.

Women being the gatekeepers of sex has to do with supply and demand. It also, once again, has to do with gender roles. Men desire sex more than women. If this were not true, women would pay for sex and a greater proportion of them would enjoy casual sex without feeling used. Women generally do not approach men. Men are expected to initiate and escalate, showing greater commitment as the relationship grows. This includes initiating sex.

This means women are almost always in the position of choosing, or saying yay or nay. If you're in the position to make the decision on whether something is happening or not, you are the gatekeeper.

AttackOnTightPanties • 1 point • 14 February, 2021 06:45 AM

This is one of the most sane posts I've seen here. Thank you.