

Too concrete, too literal, take a step back.

26 upvotes | 29 July, 2013 | by Whisper

Have you noticed it yet?

Every couple of days, a woman wanders in here with a throwaway account, and she's had twenty different sexual partners. Or she doesn't want kids. Or she has a degree in engineering. And she either whimpers that her life is over, or defies us to explain her in particular, as if her very existence disproved everything we know about men and women.

And it's not just the one-off, in-and-out posters, either.

You're taking this all way too literally.

The red pill is some information. Not instructions. And that information is about basic principles, not universal specifics.

There's a basic red pill truth in effect here, and it's impacting how you interpret the other information.

Women are generally more submissive than men. Not always, not entirely, but generally and mostly.

That's why you are all treating this as a list of instructions. It's not. It's information for *you* to use in figuring and planning out your life. Yes, there things you need to do. Yes, you're inclined to ask what you need to do. But, no, people who don't know you can't figure out the specifics.

So if you don't kids, or you want a career, or you're not so into powerful, dominant men... does that mean none of this applies to you? No. Because none of these are the real principles we're really talking about.

What are some of these basic principles we're really talking about?

- **Relationships, not achievements, are what makes women happy.** That's why redpillian advice says things like "have children when you're young", and "prioritize marriage over your career", and "don't slut around", and "be sweet and nice, not sassy and competitive".

You see, all of these things are intended to build you satisfying and long-lasting *relationships*. With your man, with your children, with your friends. And to persuade you not to sacrifice those relationships for a career that will not fulfill you. This is why women get paid less than men... because they make less sacrifices for their career. And that's *good* for them.

- **Masculine, not feminine, qualities are what women find attractive and fulfilling in a mate.**
- **Feminine, not masculine, qualities are what men find attractive and fulfilling in a mate.**
- **Feminine attractiveness becomes harder to achieve or maintain with age. Male attractiveness does not.**

Do you get the point? Stop looking for a precise set of instructions on how to live your life. I know you're somewhat submissive by nature, and precise instructions would be comfortable, but people who don't know you cannot give them to you.

Instead, keep the principles in mind, when making decisions. Should you move to another city with your boyfriend when he gets that better job? Should you be receptive to that 40 year old guy hitting on your 22 year old self? Should you have the children you want at 23, or wait until 35?

So let's not hear anymore of this "Look, I have an engineering degree, none of this stuff must be about me at all!", "Oh, noes, I love a man who refuses to even consider marriage 2.0! I must be doomed!", "I don't

want children at all, all your theories must be wrong, wrong, wrong!"

Okay?

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

AlwaysLateToThreads • 9 points • 29 July, 2013 01:20 PM

There seems to be this view that redpill women are a bunch of Ann Romneys.

But to be fair, it's kind of the subs fault. We need to side-bar this post so there aren't any misconceptions and instruct people to read the side-bar before posting.

[deleted] • 6 points • 29 July, 2013 04:41 PM

There seems to be this view that redpill women are a bunch of Ann Romneys.

The more active posters here have a similar set of circumstances. This allows them to band together and take comfort in that. This is where the misconception is born.

Overall, though I think the sub would greatly benefit from a FAQ dealing with the common questions.

TempestTcup • 4 points • 29 July, 2013 05:40 PM

Yes, we do need that, but the problem is that, being red pill women, our priorities are our husbands, families & households, so that leaves little time for other things. I will try to make it a priority.

red_tux • 2 points • 30 July, 2013 02:41 AM

Good leaders delegate. :-)

TempestTcup • 3 points • 30 July, 2013 01:10 PM

Cool - write us out one then :)

margerym • 2 points • 30 July, 2013 06:56 PM

The more active posters here have a similar set of circumstances.

Only if you're not paying attention. Tempest, for example, is a career woman. So is Dana. Even those of us that aren't, like me, are far from Ann Romneys. The misconception is born because people come here to cherry pick what they see. They think natural gender roles = 1950s June Cleavers and they take that assumption and run with it.

Whisper • 8 points • 31 July, 2013 01:26 AM*

Only if you're not paying attention. Tempest, for example, is a career woman. So is Dana. Even those of us that aren't, like me, are far from Ann Romneys.

Indeed.

To select the most blatant example for illustrative purposes, FleetingWish, one of the most ardent swallows and pushers of the red pill, is a woman who has no intention of having children, isn't married, doesn't plan on getting married, and has a degree in mathematics and a career as an actuary.

Does this make her a big fat hypocrite?

No. Because the truth she is embracing isn't "you must get married, because... uh, that's how we always used to do it". That's not the red pill. That's just traditionalism reinvented, following along with others with no understanding of *why*.

The red pill begins with, and is composed of, *understanding*. The truth and understanding she embraces is that *it is relationships, not achievements, that fulfill her*. So she prioritizes relationships over her career.

Why does she refuse to marry? Because the man she loves refuses to accept Marriage 2.0. (Is there any woman here who blames him?) If she were to leave him and seek out another man who *would* marry her, then she would be treating marriage as an *achievement* to check off her list, rather than a *relationship* with someone she loves.

She has given up resume-building in favour of connection-building.

So why does she work? ~~Why does Dana work?~~ {Apparently, she doesn't, much. Because she doesn't have to. Which just supports the point I am about to make} Why does Tempest work? And why is Ann Romney emphatically NOT a career woman in any paid sense of the word?

Well, money, that's why. Women need money to live, so they work if they have to. Ann Romney is not working for money because she doesn't have to. She is independently wealthy. (Independently is the sense that she doesn't need a job.)

But notice how women who are independently stop working when they become so. Men who are independently wealthy keep working, and try to amass huge financial empires as a way of keeping score. Only when they have succeeded so thoroughly that their prestige could in no way be advanced by more wealth, do they switch tactics and try to gain yet further prestige by giving most of it to charity (Bill Gates, Warren Buffet, etc.).

Women work to survive and live in comfort. Men work to survive and have something to be proud of.

Once upon a time, women didn't have to work to survive. Their husbands would take care of that. A single professional-class income was all that was required to support a family of a husband, wife, and a few children, in a professional-class lifestyle. This changed when feminists demanded entry into the labour pool for all women, whether they wanted it or not. There were, after all, no real barriers to entry. No laws. No exclusions. All that was required was to shame women into going to universities and getting jobs.

With the supply of the professional labour increasing, but with no new source of demand for goods and services (because no new consumers entered the demand market), the real price of professional labour dropped sharply. Now it is possible for a single person to live a professional lifestyle on a single professional income, or for a family to live a professional lifestyle on *two* professional incomes, but the housewife is a dying breed... because even among those men willing to enter Marriage 2.0, who can afford one? Even those families wherein the husband's income is high enough to support everyone himself, the standard of living would still take a considerable hit from doing so. Only among the rich, not the merely well-off, can the absence of the wife's income be absorbed without pain.

Thus it is that feminists took an option which once belonged to all women not of the meanest fortunes, and reserved it for the richest of women, all in the name of making it slightly less awkward for white middle class women with liberal arts degrees to push papers in an office all day if they chose.

Ann Romney is Ann Romney because she can be. The rest of womankind isn't so lucky.

On some level she may even understand this:

"Look, I don't even consider myself wealthy, which is an interesting thing, it can be here today and gone tomorrow. And how I measure riches is by the friends I have and the loved

ones that I have and the people that I care about in my life."

This sounds a lot like what I just said: women are fulfilled by relationships, not achievements. To have a wealthy husband is not as much to score big "got the best guy" points, as it is to free a woman from having to do the unfulfilling and necessary, replacing it with the rewarding and natural.

[deleted] • 3 points • 31 July, 2013 03:02 AM

to be clear, i work extremely part time as a realtor because its fun, i barely sell 8-10 houses a year--we own rental properties and live on the income and hang out together almost all day leading a contemplative lifestyle, yay (my husband ACTUALLY has more to say than me, if you can imagine it). work is not something i particularly value in anyone, male or female, the whole protestant work ethic and work-as-self-actualization thing isnt my bag. i prefer the victorian aristocrats life of amateur intellectual pursuits and hobbies for working my power process.

being a housewife (what i call a "helpmeet" wife, vs what i call an "odalisque" wife of the harem or aristocracy, chosen only for breeding stock and family alliance)was always lower/middle class, not wealthy or aristocratic. any woman of means had servants, maids, cooks, and nannies and governesses raised her children while she spent her life socializing with other women and doing needlecrafts. this isnt a judgment, its just a fact, that its now become the hallmark of the upper class is fascinating. there's no such thing as traditional, things are always in flux. among my people, the Juden, the ideal match would be the daughter of a businessman who quite often worked and a rabbinical student who studied all day and was quite often supported by her work.

TempestTcup • 3 points • 31 July, 2013 01:14 PM

I just barely work full time, only a few days a week. We are almost retired, debt free, with retirement pretty much in the bag. I work because they pay me a ton of money to do so. Money is fun! I like my job and the people there, so I have no problems working.

[deleted] • 2 points • 30 July, 2013 07:16 PM

i never read the red pill subreddit, is that where they are getting the idea its about being june cleaver?

FleetingWish • 6 points • 30 July, 2013 07:32 PM*

They are getting it from the implication and related brain association with the words "traditional gender roles".

We see nothing inherently wrong with the 1950s housewife approach, as it fits in with the red pill quite nicely. People see things like that and think that it is the only red pill household model.

People see us say "you should make your man happy", and picture us waiting on our man hand and foot.

People see us say "your career is unimportant and not attractive to men" or "your career will never be as important as your husband", and think that we mean that "you shouldn't have a career".

The red pill doesn't actually directly advocate any sort of relationship. The only thing the red pill is knowledge, it's the knowledge that the genders are inherently different. They have inherently different wants, needs, ambitions, and goals. They have different dating strategies, and purposes for those strategies. Red Pill Women is the attempt to understand what those differences are, and how to adjust our lifestyles for maximum happiness knowing those things. What that adjustment comes to can have many variations. That adjustment is where our individual personalities and preferences come into play, but it's still under the larger red-pill-umbrella of "allowing men and

women to be different".

TempestTcup • 2 points • 30 July, 2013 07:33 PM

Well said!

margerym • 3 points • 30 July, 2013 07:19 PM

I meant TRP in general. I honestly don't know where they are getting it besides that they assume that's what natural gender roles means. It's a common assumption to make.

[deleted] • 2 points • 30 July, 2013 09:27 PM

nothing says ann romney like an ex punk/skinhead jew lol

[deleted] • 2 points • 31 July, 2013 12:20 AM

You can have similar circumstances without them being exactly the same.