

Deregulation of the sexual marketplace is showing why feminism doesn't work.

RedPillDad | 14 October, 2019 | by RP McMurphy

This is basically a response to [RedQuest's post on why women hate the demystification of romance](#), but long enough I thought I'd post it here instead of replying with a comment.

The TL;DR (it's excellent and well worth the read) of RQ's piece is that women don't like the idea of game because it takes away some of their power in the sexual marketplace and "men become less interested in commitment."

He's 100% correct, and points out that in essence, game commoditizes sex with women—in some ways what I was trying to get at from a different angle in my post on how [modern women view most men as disposable](#).

But it also got me thinking about how the basic arguments in favor of feminism are being exposed for what they are: wrong.

To begin, one of the concerns people had about feminism and women entering the workplace in large numbers was/is: who will take care of the children, keep the house, cook and clean?

Feminist response: well, the woman will be bringing in more income in addition to her husband, so they can either pay for these things to be done or share the burden together. Further, it's possible that if the wife makes a lot more money than her husband, he could quit his job and assume those responsibilities.

OK. Cool. Hypothetically speaking that makes sense.

Problem is, in practice it doesn't work. Why?

Because in general [women won't marry men who make less money than they do](#), and even if they do, they often grow to resent and despise their husband for not being the breadwinner. This is not conjecture on my part—multiple studies now show this, on top of the media's recent panic that there aren't enough economically attractive men for women to marry (I should also note it's framed as the fault of men for not making more money, as opposed to women being too picky—which they obviously are—but that's nothing new to those of us who've swallowed the pill).

The other side of the coin was one of value: if a woman can't cook and clean, care for children, or keep a house, why would any man want to marry her?

Feminist response: the woman is replacing this value by earning a salary. Money can pay for other people to do these things. Plus, men want sex and women can give them sex. That is enough.

Again, a fair hypothetical argument, and yet again not one that pans out in the real world for exactly the same reason: women do not find men who earn less than themselves attractive, and men don't care how much women make—what we value is her beauty, feminine charm, compassion, and maybe just maybe, a willingness to bear and raise children and keep the house.

Which brings me back to the point RQ made: pussy, especially for a successful player/economically attractive guy, is a commodity. It's widely available and can be had with reasonable regularity given some study and effort. Sure, there are still those blue pill guys for whom pussy is enough to warrant commitment, but women don't find them attractive—either physically or in terms of game.

So a woman's beauty and sex is not enough to lock a hot guy/economically attractive guy down—she's got to be bringing something more to the table. If not, what's the point? Again, what I was trying to get at with my post on why players should play and not get locked down by chicks.

Anyway, I bring this up not to bitch about women, but simply to point out that the arguments made in favor of feminism with regard to relationships don't work, and yet, a huge portion of our society is blind to that reality.

For how long? Who knows. But it does seem to be getting more attention.

And, as I'm fond of saying, it's just another reason there's never been a better time to be a player.

Archived from theredarchive.com