

Gendernomics: I'm Not Like Other Girls

Black Label Logic | 27 March, 2017 | by Black Label Logic



This is post two that was inspired from the same thread regarding Emilia Clarke on the red pill reddit [1], the other being dedicated to [means of communication](#). I've written much on the concept of differentiation in my posts on [female sexual strategy](#), and I also cover it in the [Gendernomics book](#). Differentiation as a concept can be summarized as "*setting yourself apart from the competition*" and good differentiation should rely on unique and hard to replicate attributes, thus also contributing to competitive advantage. The two generic strategies often being cited as low-cost, which attempts to compete based on producing a good or service cheaper than the competition, and differentiation, which is based in attempting to set oneself apart from the competition through other means than price.

One thing most men will find themselves hearing at least once from every woman they ever find themselves dating is "*I'm not like other girls*", this statement is representative is interesting when seen in light of "*Not all women are like that*" (NAWALT), in that women themselves appear to be cognizant of how "*women are*" and seek to actively differentiate themselves from it. Likewise, a blue pill man having found his "*soul-mate*" is hardly at a loss when asked to explain how she is "*not like other girls*".

In the case of the woman, encouraging a perception that she is different from all other women, positions herself as an extremely scarce product. The Beta male through "*She is not like other girls*" justifies his [oneitis](#) through a perception of her as extremely scarce, thus justifying his [over-valuation](#) of her. Both of these rely on an unstated axiom about "*how women are*", after all how can one be an exception if there is no general rule or principle?

Not Like Other Girls

This is simply a differentiation technique where the woman is attempting to set herself up as a scarce product. This is no different than men who adopt the female perspective and spend their time attempting to demonstrate how they are not like other men, for instance through adopting the feminine perspectives. A common strategy by some men at present is the "*white knight*" role, that seeks to differentiate the man as a "*defender of women*" as a means to the end of sexual success. In the same manner, the "*cool chick*" strategy is a means by which women seek to set themselves apart as requiring little sacrifice on the part of

the man for the relationship, and thus offering him a better deal.

One could therefore argue that in both cases one party is attempting to negotiate attraction with another party, with whom they cannot secure mating and/or a relationship using conventional means. For instance a female 5 may attempt to lock down a long-term relationship with a male 9 or 10, through for instance being lower maintenance.

When I first heard about the “*Dad Bod*” trend, I wasn’t very surprised, after all it is common knowledge that female attraction is a compensatory model of sorts [2] in addition to the variances that occur depending on a woman’s stage in the sexual life cycle. Thus, some women may find security and reduce their anxiety in certain stages of their life by reducing the disparity between her sexual market value and the sexual market value of the men she dates. A female 6 who aimed for male 8s and 9s during her party years, may start aiming for male 6s and 7s in her epiphany phase. Due to both her recognition of her own faltering value relative to the new models, but also in that the lower value males are likely to have less stringent demands for the women they enter relationships with.

This is sold men as less of a performance burden for them to fill, in a sense of “*just be yourself and drink your pitchers of beer*“, in the same manner that “choreplay” is sold to men as “*if you do more chores, she will do the chore of banging you more often*“. The carrot and the stick, in a new fashion and adapted to the perceived desires of the feminine imperative.

For instance, when a woman says “*Just be yourself*“, this is connected to their view that men “Should just get it”, which again is connected to hypergamy and solipsism. In this case, “*Just be yourself*” can be translated as “*Just show you get it*“, if the man does not show that he gets it, it makes it easy for her to differentiate him from others. An extension of this is the “Dad Bod” phenomena, which means externalizing “*Just be yourself*“, rather than having to invest time speaking to a man to determine if he gets it, his adoption of the “*dad bod*” demonstrates that he does not.

The Positive, Negative and Neutral

One of the concepts that I frequently use when creating premises or attempting to break things down is the positive, the neutral and the negative. In the case of [AWALT](#), this would break down into 3 mutually exclusive statements.

- A) *All women are like that*
- B) *Some women are like that*
- C) *No women are like that*

Obviously, these statements cannot all be true. In fact, If A is true, then B and C are false, if B is true, then A and C are false, if C is true, then A and B are false. These statements make it very clear which position one can adopt, and thus makes it easily to evaluate and form conclusions regarding which position is sensible. For instance, if one adopts the position of the blue pill, that all women are unique, special snowflakes thus, there is a soul-mate, then all women are psychologically and behaviorally speaking not part of a shared set “*Women*“. If one adopts the purple pill view in B, then it follows that one has two sub-sets of “*Women*“, “*Women who are like that*” and “*Women who are not like that*“. In this position, parent set has all the characteristics of the two sub-sets. If one adopts the red pill perspective in A, then it follows that there are no sub-sets, only the main set “*women*”.

With the statement “*I’m not like other girls*” it takes this form:

- A) I am like other girls

B) I am like some other girls

C) I am like no other girls

This is no challenge to deal with in and of itself, however what is interesting is what is contained implicitly her statement. In position A, she is stating that women are all part of the same set with shared characteristics. In position B, she is stating that the set “*Women*” has multiple subsets with varying characteristics shared by the parent set “*women*“. In Position C, she is creating her own set distinct from the parent set “*women*“.

Thus, when a woman says “*I’m not like other girls*” then she is differentiating herself, however she also states that all other girls are a certain way. In essence, she is saying “*all women are like that, but I am like this*“. This is clearly a case of differentiation where she seeks to increase her value, and interfering with the male’s ability to [value her correctly by playing up her rarity](#). It is a human tendency to view that which is rare as highly valuable and that which is available as less valuable. This clearly proves that women do understand the value of leveraging AWALT in order to differentiate themselves from other women in a positive regard. However, more than that, she relies on AWALT in order to differentiate herself.

Furthermore, the beta male who has found his oneitis, would in order for the “*soul mate myth*” to be true, have to adopt a version of C in order for his conclusion to be true. After all, if his “*soul mate*” is like all the other girls, then it follows that he has over 3 billion other potential soul-mates out there. If she is like “*some*” other girls, then it follows that there are other “*soul-mates*” out there for him, and thus she is not truly scarce. Therefore, in order to have a soul-mate, the Beta male also adopts “*All women are like that*”.

The Feminine Definitions

“The Manosphere” as the collection of blogs, forums and various other sites are defined uses “AWALT” as a central concept in order to explain and define a collection of behaviors commonly observed in the human female. AWALT outlines the various actions that stem from among others hypergamy and solipsism, such as female cheating, female initiated divorces and lack of accountability. Thus, it can be argued as a collection of negative traits that a man must be aware of and build his strategies around. For instance, much of the manosphere and especially the PUA community is focused around triggering the female’s “*Alpha male detection system*“, while avoiding her “*Beta male detection system*“, which is based in hypergamy.

A core concept of Rollo Tomassi is the feminine imperative, which is his construct that represents the female-centric perception of the world. Above, one has the male-centric view of the world, concisely exemplified as “*problem – analysis – solution*“. The problem is the female action, the analysis of the problem results in the AWALT construct, the solution is the strategy that solves the problem.

From the [feminine frame](#) however, the definition of AWALT from the male-centric perspective is unacceptable as it serves to undermine not only undermine the perception of each woman that she is special, but also to undermine the general view of the soul-mate. The soul-mate being a central theme used by the feminine in order to further their sexual differentiation strategy, and thus realizing their sexual strategy.

The feminine definition of “AWALT” thus, takes the form that is the title of this article “*I’m not like other girls*“. This is a general trait of women, in that they will always spin negative traits, qualities or behaviors as positive much in the same manner real-estate agents and used car salesmen cite obvious flaws in their products as good qualities. “*Sure, the car doesn’t have an engine, but that’s great for the environment*“, “*Sure, the entire house needs to be bulldozed and rebuilt, but that’s a great opportunity to*

make it your own” and “*Sure, I slept around a lot, that just means I know what I want now*“.

Summary and Conclusions

When I sat down to write this essay, the contrast between “I’m not like other girls” and “All women are like that” was one that puzzled me somewhat. After all, as I outlined before, both require the same core premise in order to be true. In order for “I’m not like other girls” to be true, then “other girls” have to all have something in common. In order for AWALT to be true, then “all women” have to have shared characteristics. Thus, both AWALT and “I’m not like other girls” require the set “women” to all have shared traits. The soul-mate myth (the beta male definition of AWALT), “I’m not like other girls” (the female definition of AWALT) and AWALT (the manosphere definition) all share this simple requirement.

When I started this blog, I often broke down arguments in terms of their premises and the conclusion that follows from those premises. In the case of AWALT the common argument goes as follows:

Major Premise: All women are like that

Minor Premise: X is a woman

Conclusion: Therefore, X is like that

Both the Beta male and female versions of AWALT utilize this exact same argument, however they argue a case of special pleading. Special pleading being a fallacious argument in which someone attempts to cite something as an exception to a generally accepted rule or principle without justifying the exception. In the case of the Beta Male he cites his “soul-mate” is an exception, in the case of the woman, she cites herself as the exception.

A note:

I recently launched a [Patreon page](#) where I will be posting additional content every month for those who support me and I will do a Google Hangout for the highest tier Patrons (limited to 10 people).

I’ve also had some requests for consults, which I’ve declined up until now, but due to demand I’ve chosen to open up for doing some consults on request. For details please check out my [Consulting and Patreon Page](#)

[As always you can buy my book Gendernomics at Amazon.com as both paperback and Kindle](#)

Sources:

[1] [Red pill Reddit – Emilia Clarke](#)

[2] [A Billion Wicked Thoughts by Oni Ogas](#)

Archived from theredarchive.com