# **De Facto Monogamy**

Caleb Jones | 25 February, 2016 | by Blackdragon

Very often, and I really do mean often, I receive a question from guys that goes a little something like this:

Lately my MLTR (or OLTR) has been stirring up the drama. Everything was fine for a few months but now sheâ $\Box$  s constantly complaining about <this or that>. Like the other day, she was bitching about <some minor issue> and a few days ago she screamed at me about <some other minor issue>. Iâ $\Box$  ve been following all the relationship rules you talk about, like seeing her once a week, not texting too much, etc, and they were working great, but lately they donâ $\Box$  t seem to be working any more. A few months ago, I stopped having sex with other girls because I got lazy <or complacent, or busy with work, or some other excuse>. What's going on? What should I do?

Eagle-eyed readers already know exactly what the problem is before I even point it out. Isn $\hat{a} \Box t$  it odd that he has no idea what he $\hat{a} \Box s$  done wrong? Or that all this drama is his fault? Because it $\hat{a} \Box s$  related to the one thing that causes most girl-drama in the first place? Even if you do everything else right?

Seriously, I really do get this question all the time. I $\hat{a} \square \square$  ve seen it on forums many times as well. Let  $\hat{a} \square \square$  s define exactly what the problem is and how he has caused it.

### The Three **â** $\square$ Assumed **â** $\square$ Categories of Relationships

When most people hear the word  $\hat{a} \square monogamy \hat{a} \square$  they usually assume, as I assume, that we $\hat{a} \square$  re talking about a couple who have verbally promised in some way to not be sexual with other people. Don $\hat{a} \square$  t fuck other people and I promise I won $\hat{a} \square$  t either. That $\hat{a} \square$  s monogamy. In many cases these promises are lies, particularly if the man is an Alpha or if the woman is under the age of 23, but that $\hat{a} \square$  s a topic for another time.

Nonmonogamy is usually the opposite, particularly polyamory which is one type of nonmonogamy. This is where a couple has verbally defined that they are allowed get sexual with other people under whatever ground rules they both establish. Under the system I discuss, this is  $\hat{a} \square$  The Talk $\hat{a} \square$  that I describe $\hat{A}$  in <u>one of my books</u>, plus a second "OLTR Talk" talk that only <u>OLTR</u>s receive. It $\hat{a} \square$ s when the nonmonogamous aspect of the relationship is clearly verbalized and agreed to by both parties.

The more serious the nonmonogamous relationship is, the more rules there are. In an <u>FB</u> relationship, there are no rules at all. In an <u>MLTR</u>, there are few if any. In an OLTR, there are several. In a live-in OLTR, or <u>OLTR marriage</u>, there are several more, but even then, the number of rules is far fewer than the typical monogamous relationship, even if the two arenâ  $\Box$  t living together. One of the reasons nonmonogamy is so attractive is that there less rules to follow and limitations on your freedom and long-term happiness.

If you $\hat{a} \square$  re dating and having sex with someone relatively new, but haven $\hat{a} \square$  t had any talk about the relationship yet, most normal people assume (correctly) that the relationship is not monogamous (yet) and that they are allowed to get funky with other people. Even normal, everyday monogamous people generally assume this.

Iâ  $\Box$  ve talked at length about how men screw this up and *act* like mono-boyfriends even if they aren't, giving women the assumption that the relationship is monogamous even when it is not (and causing all kinds of needless problems). (Hit <u>the archive of this blog</u> to do more reading on that).

There are also needy people, religious people, and/or many women over age 33 who automatically

assume that the instant you have sex the first time you are in effect  $\hat{a} \square \square \text{promising} \hat{a} \square \square \square \square \square \square \square$  monogamy even if you've said nothing about it, but these ridiculous idiots are thankfully the exceptions to the rule. As I always say, it's not 1952 any more, and pretending it is will simply cause you pain and frustration.

Those are the three categories people generally assume relationships fall into. Promised monogamous, nonmonogamous, or  $\hat{a} \square dating \hat{a} \square \square$  and not yet monogamous.

However, there  $\hat{a} \square \square s$  a fourth category most people know nothing about.

## De Facto Monogamy

Sexual monogamy is defined as two people having sex with each other but neither are getting sexual with anyone else. This is why if you are cheating on someone, or they are cheating on you, youâ  $\Box$  re not monogamous, regardless of what was promised or what the two of you present to the outside world. It might *feelÂ* like monogamy, but it isnâ  $\Box$  t. One of you is having sex with multiple people, therefore you are not in a monogamous relationship. This is why I always describe these cheating relationships as â  $\Box$  monogamousâ  $\Box$  with quotes, instead of monogamous.

If youâ re cheating, or have recently cheated, on your girlfriend or wife, you may argue that you are monogamous, but youâ re not. Youâ re certainly pair-bonded, but youâ re not monogamous. Youâ re fucking multiple people, so youâ re nonmonogamous, just like me. Youâ re just doing it under a different (and far inferior) model than the one Iâ musing. The same goes for if youâ re a cuckold, and your wife or girlfriend is fucking someone else when you arenâ t. *You* are monogamous, but youâ re not in a monogamous relationship. It just sort of feels like you are.

This concept also works in reverse, and here $\hat{a} \square s$  how it happens. If you have two MLTRs and one FB, you $\hat{a} \square$  re nonmonogamous. Assuming you $\hat{a} \square$  re managing these relationships correctly, you $\hat{a} \square$  re reaping all the benefits of a nonmonogamous lifestyle.

Letâ  $\Box$  s say your FB does what all FBs eventually do; she gets a temporary monogamous boyfriend or husband, <u>LSNFTE</u>s you, and she's gone. You shrug and donâ  $\Box$  t care. You really like your favorite MLTR and somewhat like your other MLTR, so you let it slide and you let her go. Itâ  $\Box$  s the Alpha Male 2.0 thing to do. Good job.

Letâ  $\square$  s say a few months later your second MLTR starts floating away. You start seeing her less and less. Itâ  $\square$  s not anything conscious for either of you. Itâ  $\square$  s just one of those things. Plus, you really like your main MLTR and sheâ  $\square$  s satisfying all of your emotional and sexual needs even though youâ  $\square$  re still following all the usual nonmonogamous relationship rules. So the fact that your second MLTR is floating away doesnâ  $\square$  t really bother you.

One day, you realize you haven $\hat{a} \square t$  seen your second MLTR for six weeks. All you $\hat{a} \square$  ve got now is your main MLTR. You know you probably should get back out there and get some new women, but you don $\hat{a} \square t$  feel like it. Your main girl is plenty, you $\hat{a} \square$  ve been really busy with work lately, and blah blah blah excuse blah blah pussy blah blah beta blah blah lazy blah blah.

### Congratulations, you are now monogamous.

Guess what? That girl you $\hat{a} \square$  re calling your  $\hat{a} \square MLTR\hat{a} \square$  or  $\hat{a} \square OLTR\hat{a} \square$  isn $\hat{a} \square$  t either. She $\hat{a} \square$ s now your **monogamous girlfriend.** That $\hat{a} \square$ s right, pal. She $\hat{a} \square$ s your GF.

 $\hat{a} \square \square No \ she \hat{a} \square \square s \ not!$  She  $\hat{a} \square \square s \ my \ MLTR!$  I don  $\hat{a} \square \square t$  take her out on fancy dates and I only see her once a week and I follow all the other rules.  $\hat{a} \square \square$ 

Yeah, but you $\hat{a} \square$  re not having sex with anyone else other than her. That means you $\hat{a} \square$  re monogamous. You can *say* you $\hat{a} \square$  re nonmonogamous or open or poly or any other words that make you feel comfortable. Doesn $\hat{a} \square$  t matter what you say. What matters is what you are. Just like I $\hat{a} \square$  ve had married-but-cheating men on this very blog scream at me that they $\hat{a} \square$  re monogamous. They can

scream all they want, but they  $\hat{a} \square$  re still not monogamous. Pair-bonded, but not monogamous.

So you can *say* youâ $\square$   $\square$  re in an MLTR and I can *say* Iâ $\square$   $\square$  m a turnip. Does it really matter what we *say*? Nope. All that matters is who we really are and what weâ $\square$   $\square$  re actually doing.

By the way, not only are you monogamous, but *she knows it*. Even if you haven $\hat{a} \square t$  told her this, she still knows it, because women $\hat{a} \square s$  intuition is very good in this area. She can *feel* the betaness emanating from you, even if you can $\hat{a} \square t$ . This creates a monogamous frame to match the monogamous relationship and then, voil $\tilde{A}$  ! Say hello to all the usual drama and betaization all other monogamous men have to deal with on a regular basis.

## $\hat{a} \square \square No! I\hat{a} \square \square m$ not monogamous! I never promised her that! We never discussed it! $\hat{a} \square \square$

Still doesn $\hat{a} \square t$  matter. De facto monogamy is when you are truly monogamous (you $\hat{a} \square$  re not fucking anyone else except her) without actually saying it or making any promises. De facto monogamy is just as bad as promised monogamy, except that you have delayed the usual monogamy drama by a few months. Other than that, it $\hat{a} \square s$  monogamy baby!

This is why these de facto monogamous guys who *say* they have a MLTR or OLTR are confused as to why they $\hat{a}$  are getting all this monogamy drama. It $\hat{a}$  is because they $\hat{a}$  are monogamous. She $\hat{a}$  is not a MLTR or OTLR, she $\hat{a}$  is a girlfriend. Girlfriends are drama. That $\hat{a}$  is how monogamy works.

If it makes you feel any better, many years ago I made this mistake myself. When I was first mastering these concepts, I was dating three different women, all of whom I liked. My least favorite floated away, then my second favorite floated away, leaving me with my favorite. I didn $\hat{a} \Box t$  go get any new women because I didn $\hat{a} \Box t$  feel like it, and I figured it would be fine. I could always go get some more later if I needed them, right? (Oh BD, you *dumbass.)* 

After about three months of my de facto monogamy, guess what started to happen? Drama. She started getting snippy in ways no other woman had been before (when I wasn $\hat{a} \Box t$  monogamous). Fortunately, I understood what was going on, so I nexted her ass (which was painful, because I really liked her) and quickly got three more women. That was early 2008 and I $\hat{a} \Box$  ve never had that problem since, because I $\hat{a} \Box$  ve never been monogamous since, de facto or otherwise. I learn from my mistakes and I don $\hat{a} \Box$  t repeat them. The last time I $\hat{a} \Box$  ve had to soft next a woman, for any reason, was almost two years ago.

(By the way, that woman came back to me, many times, including just last year. As usual, nothing was truly lost by nexting. This is why nexting is so much better than breakups.)

Always remember that if you ever get down to just one woman, and keep it at one woman because  $you\hat{a} \square$  re being a lazy little bitch, **you are monogamous**. You are going to start getting monogamy drama and problems even if  $you\hat{a} \square$  re doing everything else correctly, because  $you\hat{a} \square$  re not following the most important rule of them all: never get sexually monogamous.

Archived from theredarchive.com