

Boundaries : Self-Control vs Drawing the Line

Posted on [2024-12-19](#) by [Jack](#)

The tricky dance of courtship.

Readership: All

Targeted Readership: Single Men and Women; Mentors of Singles;

Theme: Boundaries; Virtue; Virtue in Relationships;

Author's Note: This essay was submitted on 2023/10/2 by a long-time happily married female reader who wishes to remain anonymous. Reorganized and expanded for clarity and emphasis by Jack.

Length: 1,000 words

Reading Time: 5 minutes

Foreword

I was just about to write a long spiel about sex before marriage. Fortunately, Jack beat me to it when he posted, [Is Sex a Necessary part of Vetting?](#) (2023/10/2) on the same weekend. Jack said EXACTLY what I was going to say. So this will be a follow-up post (four actually) that fits nicely into the themes of [Boundaries](#) [and Virtues in Relationships].

The Necessity of Pushing the Boundaries

One of the axioms of the Manosphere is, *"She must be willing to break the rules but just for you."*

Why is this important?

For a man, this is a confirmation that a woman trusts him, submits to him, and is under his domain of authority.

But truth be told, this approach does not work for women. A single woman cannot break the rules for a man, even only one man, and expect that to play out well.



A woman who breaks the rules because she is sexually attracted to a man is a woman who believes sexual attraction HAS to be ACTED upon. But for women, Chastity does not work that way. Sexual Purity does not work that way.

We all want a spouse to remain faithful, so it doesn't work for a man to teach or tempt a woman to relax her boundaries "just for him". Besides, Men have no way of knowing whether it's "just for him" or "just for the man she's with at the time".

A girl who kisses a man simply because he bought her a coffee or who does not mind if he grabs her breast may be very sexually attracted to him and therefore submissive to him in their relationship. But she is NOT a chaste woman. She does NOT have boundaries.

These days, a lot of women are demanding much more than a coffee date before they put out, but it's still the same ritual only with a higher admission fee.

OTOH, if a woman does NOT care to kiss or have her breast grabbed on the first date, it does not necessarily indicate a lack of attraction. She may be a modest and chaste woman who is wisely drawing a boundary, biding her time, and doing her own vetting for a husband. Just because this type of woman is rare does NOT mean they don't exist.

But as Sir Red Pill Apostle said, a man has to press those boundaries in order to know her reaction.

This is where it gets touchy in this day and age (pun). Such actions place a man in a very vulnerable position.

- If a man does NOT press her, then a boundary cannot manifest and the relationship may not develop properly along those lines.
- If a man presses her and she gives in, then he's opened the door to promiscuity.
- Even if he presses her and she rebuffs him, there remains the problem of determining whether that means she is NOT a 304 or she is NOT attracted to HIM *enough* to be a 304.
- Another problem is the risk of him being accused of h@r@ssment.



Effective Communication of Intent

Proper boundaries can only be established by first communicating intent. It is a 2-way street, and there is not an inch of wiggle room for miscommunication — it is disastrous!

While I do not think it is right for a woman to expect a man to be a eunuch and NOT push for some kind of physical intimacy, OTOH, I do think if the girl refuses, a man needs to at least check whether it is because she is NOT attracted to him or because she is NOT someone who takes physical intimacy lightly. The latter does NOT signify disqualification.

The problem with this is that women may very well lie about this in order to exact what they want out of a man. But that also depends on her level of Self-Control — how much of a sophisticated liar a woman is capable of being, and how much energy she's willing to invest in maintaining this façade. Some women are quite skilled at this — scarily so, while others are total airheads. The former is a m!s0gyn!st generator while the latter type tends to get knocked up pregg0 rather early in life and then either becomes a single mother or else is wifed up and taken out of the SMP. A man would probably be much better off having chosen a blithering buffoon over a Machiavellian Maneater, but neither is ideal.

This is why I think communication is key, and I don't mean just verbal conversation. I mean specifically about expressing expectations and meta-cognitions, verbally and non-verbally — *especially non-verbally*. A lot of women won't 'hear' a man unless he communicates *non-verbally*, i.e. action and behavior. They already instinctively know that you have

to watch what a man DOES, NOT what he SAYS, just as the Manosphere says to men about women. The problem with *verbal* communication is that once you start talking about expectations, intentions, and motives, it kills the ‘magic’ of romantic attraction, and women HATE this. But OTOH, that might be a good thing if the ‘magic’ is built on [delusions](#). Delving into a meta-discussion would filter out those girls who just want to be lied to and repel them with self-revealing truths — like garlic is to a vampire.

These difficulties in communicating intent and reading women *accurately* is precisely why identifying [IOIs](#) and [Slut Tells](#) have become so important in recent years. In a word, *discernment*.

More on this point in the next post.

Related

- Donal Graeme: [Moral Agency in Women Revisited](#) (2013/3/11)
- Donal Graeme: [Knowing When to Escape](#) (2013/12/15)
- Σ Frame (NovaSeeker): [Ethical Issues Surrounding the Christian Conundrum](#) (2021/4/5)
- Σ Frame (Jack): [Jack on Female Agency](#) (2022/11/23)
- Σ Frame (Oscar): [The Importance of Family and Community — Part I](#) (2023/10/29)
- Σ Frame: [Setting Boundaries Changes Reality](#) (2024/1/26)



About Jack

Jack is a world traveling artist, skilled in trading ideas and information, none of which are considered too holy, too nerdy, nor too profane to hijack and twist into useful fashion. Sigma Frame Mindsets and methods for building and maintaining a masculine Frame

[View all posts by Jack →](#)

This entry was posted in [Agency](#), [Attraction](#), [Authentic Authority](#), [Authority](#), [Boundaries](#), [Calculated Risk Taking](#), [Communications](#), [Courtship and Marriage](#), [Decision Making](#), [Determination](#), [Discerning Lies and Deception](#), [Discernment](#), [Wisdom](#), [Fundamental Frame](#), [Game](#), [Game Theory](#), [Headship and Patriarchy](#), [Headship Authority](#), [Holding Frame](#), [Indicators of Contempt](#), [Inner Game](#), [Intersexual Dynamics](#), [Male Power](#), [Masculine Disciplines](#), [Models of Success](#), [Moral Agency](#), [Personal Domain](#), [Personal Presentation](#), [Power](#), [Psychology](#), [Relationships](#), [Sex](#), [Sexual Authority](#), [Sphere of Influence](#), [Vetting Women](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#).

11 Responses to *Boundaries : Self-Control vs Drawing the Line*

Pingback: [Sigma Frame Abandons the Patriarchy - Derek L. Ramsey](#)



Info says:

2024-12-20 at 3:59 am

“Sigma Frame abandons the Patriarchy”

???

Liked by [1 person](#)

[Reply](#)



Oscar says:

2024-12-20 at 1:30 pm

It's Derek.



Like

[Reply](#).



Info says:

2024-12-21 at 3:24 am

Skewed understanding as revealed below.

Like



Oscar says:

2024-12-21 at 4:19 am

Kudos to Jack for having the patience and grace to read that (twice!), try to make sense of it, and offer constructive criticism, because I certainly don't.

Or, maybe he's a masochist! 😊

Liked by [1 person](#)



Info says:

2024-12-21 at 8:57 am

I like to thank the host. But also that may prove useful as a sort of training against similarly erroneous ideas.

Liked by [2 people](#)



Jack says:

2024-12-20 at 7:38 pm

I read Derek's post. It appears that he thinks the [Mating Dance](#), or drawing and/or testing boundaries is somehow unChristian, or unpatriarchal, or something. It doesn't make any sense at all.

Like

[Reply](#)



Jack says:

2024-12-21 at 3:08 am

I read Derek's post again. It appears as though he's updated it to be more clear because it makes more sense now.

Derek is making the following errors and omissions in his reasoning.

1. He fails to address the core idea covered in the above post, which is how a man is supposed to accurately read a woman he is interested in to know her level of attraction and how virtuous she is.
2. Quoted text is taken out of context and is misleading.
3. He fails to recognize the contrasting contextual nuances between modern society and a patriarchal community (which is largely theoretical to most readers).
4. He is assuming that the larger society is or should be Christian or patriarchal. (The larger secular society is NOT Christian or patriarchal. Christian communities *should* be patriarchal, but few are.)
5. He's assuming that single women live under the authority of their fathers when most do not.
6. He's assuming that these same women who do not submit to the authority of their fathers are above scrutiny, and that their moral rectitude is not to be questioned or tested, and that it is shameful for men to do so. He doesn't offer an alternate method.
7. He's expecting men to act like they're living in a patriarchal society when they're not, and calls these men hypocrites if they do not.
8. He is assuming that the secular SMP/MMP will magically transform into a Christian or patriarchal one if only men would step up and stop being lazy hypocrites. It's the old "*blame it on men*" card. (I agree that this *could* happen if there was a critical mass of men who did this, but we're not there yet. If Derek is referring to a specific community that operates differently and in the way he describes, then he would be much more self-aware and considerate to his readers by mentioning this. He might even attract a following of men who desire to build such a community.)

He's also trolling Dalrock, Deti, Jack, Sharkly, and others, as he's done many times before.

Like

[Reply](#)



Jack says:

2024-12-21 at 3:15 am

A note to Derek for improving his writings

Both the church and society are more fractured than ever before, and we can no longer make blanket / generalized statements as we might have done a decade ago. We cannot make any meaningful arguments without first establishing the specific context we are referring to in our discussion. Adding references to the context makes posts much longer and more tedious to read, but this also makes the knowledge therein more easily understandable, relevant, and transferrable for those to whom it applies. I've mentioned this idea many times before, and I've had to change my writing style to account for this source of confusion. But it appears that you never read this memo. You're still writing half-baked tomes without any context.

You might also benefit from going back to read the theme on *Problems with The Red Pill* [[Summary](#) / [Outline of Posts](#)] to see how your writings contribute to further fractiousness rather than the unity you like to preach (hypocritically?), and thus pose more of a problem than a solution. (I'm generously assuming that isn't your express purpose, but your past interactions here would have me believe that it is.)

However, I expect that you'll say you are not Red Pill (even though Red Pill is essentially patriarchy, which you claim to espouse) and are therefore exonerated from any responsibilities thereof (even while you hypocritically call others who are doing the dirty work hypocrites), that everyone who doesn't fully agree with you is wrong by definition, and that I shouldn't give you advice about how to improve your writings. But I'm stupidly hoping that you'll prove me wrong here.

Finally, check your purpose for writing. Try to come up with something original that aims to help readers, instead of lambasting those who are already [doing so](#).

Like

[Reply](#)

Pingback: [Summary of Virtue](#) | [Σ Frame](#)



Red Pill Apostle says:

2024-12-21 at 11:28 pm

“If a man does NOT press her, then a boundary cannot [manifest](#) and the relationship may not develop properly along those lines.

If a man presses her and she gives in, then he's opened the door to promiscuity.

Even if he presses her and she rebuffs him, there remains the problem of determining whether that means she is NOT a 304 or she is NOT attracted to HIM enough to be a 304.”

Men, don't fall into the assumption of our female author which is that you are ruled by your libido. You can press a woman's boundaries while still having your own. In dating, a man pressing a woman should be the male version of a \$h!t test to see what she does. The bible tells us to be sober minded and self-controlled, the area of pressing a woman's sexual boundaries when dating is a big one.

The section of this post on communication gave me mental whiplash. Being clear with verbal communication kills her fantasy because *“once you start talking about expectations, intentions, and motives, it kills the ‘magic’ of romantic attraction, and women HATE this.”* OTOH, *“Proper boundaries can only be established by first communicating intent.”*

What we see here, is a crystal clear example of why Peter calls women the “weaker sex” in 1 Peter. Being weaker has nothing to do with physical strength or intelligence and everything to do with giving emotion priority in guiding decisions.

Men are to do what they think is best when it comes to communication based on who the woman is as a person, what the man will need from a spouse, and the current situation. Clear verbal communication that is congruent with his actions is essential. It does not matter that this verbal communication might pop her D!\$ney fantasy, in fact, a man running roughshod over her fantasy prior to offering his precious commitment is necessary. If she can't take it and leaves, then he's dodged the bullet that would've made his life much harder than it should be.

The varying issues brought up in the post, with all the unknowns a man must deal with, emphasize the need for a man to both learn women by dating a significant number of them from his teen years on and then be patient with a woman before offering commitment. Make her wait for the ring. She will struggle to keep up the act if she's not genuine over the long term. Be an astute observer of her behavior and study who she is. If she's the genuine article, then the time and study will help your marriage. But if she is not, then you know what you need to do.

Liked by [1 person](#)

[Reply](#)