

Women Are Living All Seven: final script, research pack and sources

7 Deadly Sins: packaging read, verification, and script

Prepared 24 Aug 2026. Live YouTube pull the same day.

1. The one thing I would change before anything else

The concept is strong and nobody in your set has run it. The packaging route in the research is the risk.

Live numbers, pulled today: your long-form median across 42 uploads is **112,229 views**. Recompute everything against that, because the research PDF is carrying stale multiples. Schopenhauer is now at **879,560 views, which is 7.8x**, not 9.2x.

Two of your last five long-forms were numbered lists, and both landed under half your median:

Video	Published	Views	vs median
Schopenhauer Was Right About Women All Along	Jul 29	879,560	7.8x
Women's Standards Have Become Delusional	Aug 15	130,685	1.16x
14 Relationship Patterns That Quietly Destroy Men	Jul 01	56,857	0.51x
The Double Standards Men Are Told To Accept	Aug 21	52,773	0.47x (still young)
50 Brutal Truths About Modern Women	Aug 10	51,995	0.46x

And title construction across all 42, from the August 23 pull: titles that start with "The" median **72,433**. Titles with a number median **113,097**. Titles that open "Women Are" median **300,228**.

"The 7 Deadly Sins of Modern Women" starts with "The" and contains a number. It is your two weakest constructions stacked on top of each other, sold as a countdown, in the format that just underperformed twice in six weeks.

The sins should absolutely be the spine of the video. I would not sell it as a countdown in the title. Three options:

- **A. Women Are Committing All Seven** (30 characters). Your strongest construction, doer plus action, and the number stays implied so the sidebar reads as an accusation instead of a listicle.
- **B. Why Women Can't See the Seventh** (31). Question-shaped, opens the loop, and it sells the actual structure of the video, which is that the seventh sin hides the other six.
- **C. The 7 Deadly Sins of Modern Women** (33). The safe version. Highest keyword familiarity, lowest construction ceiling on your channel.

My pick is A, with B as the swap if the first 48 hours are soft. Route B in the research, the "7 Levels of Modern Female Delusion" framing, I would drop entirely. The levels format is proven on gaming and dream channels where escalation is a spectacle. On your channel it reads as the countdown format your audience has already told you it is tired of, and "delusion" repeats your Aug 15 title.

Thumbnail: the seven sigils with one glowing crimson is beautiful and it violates your own verified thumbnail law, which is two to three huge words, direct eye contact, and a second figure carrying tension. Seven small icons is a design, not a thumbnail, and at sidebar size it is seven grey smudges. Use it as the in-video chapter card. For the thumbnail: you centered, hard eye contact, **ALL SEVEN** in huge type with SEVEN in the red box, and the seventh sigil behind you, redacted.

2. What survived verification, and what did not

I checked every number in the sin map against primary sources.

Holds.

- **Contempt and divorce (Wrath).** Gottman's own theory paper reports contempt among the behaviours predictive of dissolution, with the wife's contempt at $r = 0.34$ and her facial disgust correlating 0.51 with months to separation. The Gottman Institute's own language is that contempt is the greatest predictor of divorce. Safe to say. Do not attach the 93 percent accuracy figure, which is contested and already on your retired list.
- **Choice overload (Gluttony).** D'Angelo and Toma 2017, *Media Psychology*, doi 10.1080/15213269.2015.1121827. Daters who chose from 24 profiles were less satisfied with their choice a week later than daters who chose from 6, and more likely to switch. Supporting: Wu and Chiou 2009, doi 10.1089/cpb.2008.0182, more options produced more searching and worse choices.
- **Envy from passive feed use (Envy).** Verduyn et al. 2015, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, doi 10.1037/xge0000057. Passive scrolling lowered wellbeing, and the mechanism they isolated was envy. For the relationship-specific version, Sharabi and Hopkins 2021 in *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* found that attention to alternatives on Instagram tracked with both the perceived quality and the actual pursuit of alternative partners.
- **The 80 percent rating (Lust).** Real, and it is Christian Rudder's OkTrends post from November 2009, later in *Dataclysm*. Women rated 80 percent of men as worse looking than medium. Two caveats you should say out loud, because the top comment on Mikhaila Peterson's video about this exact stat is a man raising the first one: these were profile photos, not people, and it is 2009 data.

Does not hold, cut it.

- **"The same 10 percent of men."** There is no source for 10 percent. It is a number that floats around the niche unattached. If you say it, the comment section will ask for it and you will not have it. Replace it with SwipeStats 2026, which is a real dataset of 7,000-plus profiles and 294 million swipes: men's average match rate 5.26 percent, women's 44.4 percent. Cite it as app data, not as a study.
- Standing reminder, since it lives next door to this territory: the "bottom 80 percent of men compete for the bottom 22 percent of women" line is fake, an anonymous 2015 Medium post built on 27 invented profiles. It is not in the script and it should not get added.

3. Structure notes

The confession beat is the thing that makes this land as diagnosis instead of attack, and it is the one thing I cannot write for you. Act three has a marked slot for it. Put your real story in it, whichever sin you actually recognise, and it should cost you something to say.

Hardest material sits at 68 percent of runtime, in the wrath act. Every comment quoted is a real API-pulled comment with its like count, listed in the appendix. No composite quotes.

Draft 4 changes [2026-08-24]

- Title locked to *Women Are Living All Seven*, with *Women Are Living All Seven And Calling It Healing* held for a 48-hour CTR swap. Framework rationale in the titles doc.
- All seven sins retained per Kait. Her reason, that living in them does not create a full life, is now the closing argument.
- Act three carries her own disclosures: values hierarchy over feelings, the counter-virtue position, radical acceptance. Two slots remain open and are marked in the script (the sin she is least fair about, and what the comment section corrected in her).
- Close rewritten to end on Gregory's virtue column instead of restating the charges. Male mirror retained in wrath, pride and the close.
- New verified data: Rosenfeld on divorce initiation (act one), Pew on the over-40 dating market (act two). Both with their limits spoken out loud.
- Removed the fabricated personal beat in the old close. Nothing in this script claims a history Kait has not described.
- Lint clean against `skills/no_ai_writing/scripts/lint_ai_tells.py`.

Final [2026-08-24]

Slot 2 closed at Kait's call: she does not have a sin she runs ahead of her evidence on, so the beat is cut rather than manufactured. Act three now runs check, position, then what the comment section changed, which is a cleaner build anyway because it ends on the audience rather than on her.

Draft 5 [2026-08-24]

Slot 4 filled with Kait's own words: the comment section changed what she understands about men, the sadness about the group she belongs to, and the men told they are bad or toxic for being men. Only slot 2 (the sin she is least fair about) remains open, and it gets cut if she does not fill it.

Flag: the line "it makes me sad to be part of that group" is the most clippable sentence in the video. It is hers and it stays unless she says otherwise, but expect it out of context.

SCRIPT: Women Are Living All Seven

Final. All slots filled or closed. Nothing left to write.

Final draft. Target 23 to 25 minutes. Pacing target 175 to 185 wpm through evidence, 145 to 155 at every marked slowdown.

COLD OPEN

A man wrote this under one of my videos three weeks ago. Four hundred and eighteen people liked it.

"I pray there's a 'why it's even remotely worth the effort' follow-up video."

[beat]

He is not angry. Read it again. He is not calling anyone a name, he is not blaming a gender, he is asking whether the thing he was raised to want is still worth what it costs, and he is asking a woman on the internet because there is nobody else in his life he can ask.

Underneath him, another man, five hundred and fourteen likes: "I don't have the energy, patience or masochistic tendency to suffer this."

I have been reading a comment section like that for two years now, and I kept trying to describe what those men are describing, and every framework I reached for was too small. Attachment styles, too small. Dating apps, too small. Hypergamy, too small and also mostly wrong.

So I went back to a list somebody finished writing about fifteen hundred years ago.

Pope Gregory the First, sixth century, took an older list from a desert monk named Evagrius and cut it down to seven, and the whole point of that list was never to catalogue crimes. It was a list of the seven things that a person does while sincerely believing they are doing something else. That is the entire design. Every one of the seven feels good from the inside. Every one has a flattering name.

Today I am going to walk through all seven, in order, with a number inside each one, and I am going to end on the seventh, because the seventh is the reason the other six are still running. The seventh is the one that renames the other six as growth.

This is not about judging anybody. It is about naming a pattern that a lot of people are living inside and cannot see from where they are standing. Halfway through I am going to stop and tell you exactly what I run my own behaviour against, because if I am going to hand you a list like this, you should know what I hold myself to.

ACT ONE: SLOTH AND ENVY (the ledger and the feed)

Sloth. The empty ledger.

Sloth is the one everybody gets wrong, because the modern word means lazy and the original one did not. In the framework the word was acedia, and it meant a refusal to do the work of caring for what you already have, spiritual indifference dressed as tiredness.

Here is what it looks like now. Go and read any modern requirements list, the standards video, the checklist post, and count the lines. Six foot, six figures, emotionally intelligent, secure, therapy-literate, adventurous, no baggage, and it runs and runs. Now go and find the other column. The one that says what she brings.

There is no other column. [beat]

That is the sin. Not the standards. The missing second column.

A man under my standards video put it in eleven words and a thousand and twenty nine people liked it: "100% focused on what they want, 0% focused on what they have to do to get it."

And here is what that does to a man over time. Same comment section, forty seven year old electrician: "have not had sex in over 10 years, been laughed at, called a creep, ew, ick, completely and totally done."

And there is a number underneath this one that almost nobody puts next to it.

Michael Rosenfeld at Stanford, using the How Couples Meet and Stay Together survey, 2,262 adults tracked from 2009 to 2015. Of the couples who split, women initiated 69 percent of the divorces. Men, 31. Now here is the part that makes it worth saying out loud. In non-marital breakups, cohabiting or not, the split was statistically even. Gender neutral.

So the asymmetry does not show up in relationships generally. It shows up specifically inside the arrangement that requires ongoing maintenance from both people. Rosenfeld's own reading is that it says something about the institution of marriage rather than about women being more sensitive to problems, and I am giving you his interpretation as well as mine, because he did the work and I did not.

That man is not owed a partner. Nobody is owed anything. But a market where one side publishes requirements and never publishes an offer is not a market that clears, and a man reading that list correctly identifies that he is being evaluated by someone who is not offering to be evaluated back.

Slow down here. 145.

The reason this stays invisible is that the requirements list feels like self-respect from the inside. It feels like knowing your worth. That is what sloth always feels like. It never feels like indifference. It feels like rest that you have earned.

Envy. The feed.

The second one is the machinery that keeps the first one topped up.

Envy in the original list goes further than wanting what someone else has. It is resenting that they have it. That distinction matters, because envy does not send you out to get more, it sends you home to be dissatisfied with what is already yours.

The research here is not soft. Verduyn and colleagues, 2015, in the *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, ran this two ways, in a lab and then in the field with experience sampling, and found that passive scrolling drove down affective wellbeing over time, and the mechanism they isolated was envy. Not screen time. Envy specifically.

Then take it into relationships. Sharabi and Hopkins, 2021, surveyed one hundred and seventy eight couples and analysed three thousand two hundred and seventy of their

actual Instagram posts, and attention to alternatives on Instagram tracked with both the perceived quality of those alternatives and the real pursuit of them.

So a woman sits in a bed next to a man who has been at work for eleven hours, and she scrolls past a stranger's proposal video, and a stranger's kitchen, and a stranger's husband writing a caption a copywriter wrote for him, and the feeling she gets is not "that is nice for them." The feeling is that she has been shortchanged.

She is comparing a whole man, including his bad Tuesday, against a highlight reel of two hundred men's best forty seconds. And she loses that comparison every single night, for free, forever.

A man under my chasing video, one thousand five hundred and twenty one likes, wrote this. He is fifty, he has a terminal illness. "I am circled by post 40 women, like vultures, looking for resource extraction in my last and most vulnerable years. I am dying alone, by choice."

[beat]

I am not going to soften that one.

What this means, plainly: the feed does not make anyone leave. It makes staying feel like settling. And a woman who feels she is settling will start to treat a good man as a downgrade she has to explain to her friends.

ACT TWO: GLUTTONY AND LUST (the menu)

Gluttony. Consumption with no ceiling.

Gluttony is the sin of consumption past the point where consumption does anything for you. And this one has a clean experiment behind it.

D'Angelo and Toma, published 2017 in *Media Psychology*. They gave online daters a set of profiles to choose from. One group got six. One group got twenty four. A week after choosing, the group who chose from twenty four were less satisfied with the person they picked, and more likely to want to swap them out. Same people, same profiles, more options, less happy.

Wu and Chiou got there earlier, 2009, with a hundred and twenty eight participants, and found that more search options produced more searching and worse choices, because the extra options ate the attention that selectivity requires.

So a woman opens an app that has been engineered to never run out of profiles, and her satisfaction with any individual man goes down as a mathematical function of how many men she has seen. She has not become pickier as a personality trait. She has been placed in a condition that manufactures pickiness, and the condition is profitable.

I want to be careful here, because this is where the niche usually gets lazy. The apps do this to men too. A man swiping four hundred profiles a night is running the same machine on himself, and it is making him worse at seeing an actual woman in front of him.

The difference is the volume, and the volume is where the fourth sin lives.

Lust. Pointed at a market that cannot clear.

Lust in this framework was never about wanting sex, because wanting is not a sin in any version of this worth using. What the word covers is desire that has come loose from the person it is supposedly about.

Here is the number, and I want to give it to you with its caveats attached because the caveats are the interesting part.

November 2009, Christian Rudder, one of the founders of OkCupid, published the internal ratings data. Men rated women on a zero to five scale and the curve came out symmetrical, roughly a normal distribution, roughly charitable. Women rated men and the curve collapsed. Women rated eighty percent of men as worse looking than medium.

Now, two things. This is 2009 data and it was profile photographs, not human beings. The single most liked comment under the most popular video about this stat is a man saying exactly that: "keeping in mind these women were rating men's online profiles, not men from real life. We all know most men can't take a good photo to save their lives." He is right. That is a real limitation and I am not going to pretend it away.

But watch what Rudder found next, because this is the part that gets cut when this stat travels. Women rated eighty percent of men below average and then went and messaged them anyway, close to the normal curve. The rating was harsher than the behaviour.

Which tells you the ratings are not really a measurement of men. They are a measurement of a standard being held in public.

The modern version of the number, and I am labelling this as app data and not as a study: SwipeStats, 2026, seven thousand profiles and two hundred and ninety four million swipes. Men's average match rate, 5.26 percent. Women's, 44.4 percent.

And the market thins from the other end at the same time. Pew Research, 2020, nationally representative: 71 percent of single women aged 40 and over say they are not looking for a relationship or dates at all, against 42 percent of single men that age. Among single people under 40 the gap almost disappears, 39 percent of women and 33 percent of men.

I want to be honest about what that number is and is not. It is not proof of a sin. Plenty of those women have done their time in bad marriages and have chosen peace, and that is a legitimate choice that I am not going to sneer at. What it does mean is that a man over 40 looking for a partner is reading a market where most of the women his age have already left the building, and when he says that out loud he gets told he is imagining it.

Two people are on the same app having entirely different experiences of what a human being is worth. A commenter on a data channel about this described it better than the literature does, twenty two thousand six hundred likes: dating apps are "filled with women who get attention they don't want and men who want attention they don't get."

Nobody designed that outcome. It emerged from a menu with no bottom.

ACT THREE: THE GAP

Your answers cut in. Slot 1 and slot 3 are now written, in your words, tightened for spoken rhythm only. Two slots are still open and I have left them marked rather than filling them myself, see the note at the end.

I want to stop halfway, because if I run all seven at you back to back this turns into a charge sheet, and a charge sheet is useless. Nobody has ever changed after being handed one.

So here is the actual question. If these six things are as visible as I am making them sound, why does almost nobody catch themselves doing one?

The answer is the gap.

There is a distance between doing a thing and being able to see the thing, and for most people, on most of these, that distance is measured in years. People are not stupid. The delay comes from how the seventh sin works, and I will get there properly at the end, but the short version is that every one of the six arrives pre-named, and the name is flattering, and you cannot examine something while you are wearing it as an identity.

Which means the useful skill is not honesty. Plenty of people in these patterns are completely honest. They will tell you exactly what they are doing. They will just tell you using the good name for it.

The useful skill is having something to check yourself against that is not your own feelings.

So here is what I actually run things through. My values, and the hierarchy of those values. Not how I feel. Not what feels right or just in the moment, because that changes hour to hour and it always argues in my favour.

The question I am asking is: how do I conduct myself so that no matter how this turns out, I am okay with how I showed up.

If you do not have standards for yourself, you do not have any awareness of how you want to show up, and that shows up worst when it is hard to stay composed. You end up reacting to whatever is happening around you and blaming the person standing in front of you for it.

And here is why I trust that check more than I trust my own sense of being fair. A person's sense of being fair is generated by the same machinery that named the sin in the first place. It is the defence attorney and the judge being the same guy.

[Optional beat, 10 seconds, only if you want the tool to be stealable: the sex-flip test. "The version of this I use on claims about men and women is simple. Swap the sexes and see if I still believe it. If it only works in one direction, it was never an argument, it was a preference wearing one." Cut freely, slot 1 stands without it.]

I want to be straight about my own position here, because people ask.

Every one of these seven has a counter virtue sitting opposite it, and I know exactly what those virtues are. I lose nothing by living inside them. Rational restraint. Control over my

own behaviour. Not letting emotion flood my brain so that I am just reacting to whatever circumstance I am standing in. Letting the virtue guide the decision, and being deliberate about it specifically when it is hard, is how I choose to show up. Not perfectly. Consistently.

And doing that over and over is what builds an identity. Every obstacle, every struggle, every moment of emotional flooding is a place where I get to reinforce it. I do not have to feed the thing. I can rise above it. They say you do not defeat your demons, you rise above them, and I think about that regularly, because it sets the standard for how I show up in a way that represents my husband, my family, and the things I actually care about.

I am not entitled to anything. And the things I cannot control, I let go of, with radical acceptance, instead of fixating on them and feeding an emotion that is not doing anything for me.

That is the whole answer to the gap, and it is available to anyone watching this. The six sins run on feeling. The check runs on a standard you set before the moment arrived.

And I should tell you where I am standing when I say all of this, because I did not always see it.

The comment section is what opened my eyes to the reality men are living in. I did not understand it before. My own lived experience never put me on the receiving end of it, so I had no reason to look.

I had a lot of sympathy for women, and I still have the nurturing part of that, because it is a real part of femininity and I am not interested in giving it up. But watching what women are becoming, how they are conducting themselves, the attitudes and the entitlement, it makes me sad to be part of that group.

And it makes me sad for the men. Men who are just trying to be acknowledged, while being told at the same time that they are bad, toxic, wrong, unjust, for being men.

[beat]

So when I say I read every comment, I mean it changed what I think. That is the only reason I have anything to say about the seven at all.

So that is the frame for the back half. Six behaviours, and one gap that keeps all six of them invisible to the person doing them.

The next one is the hardest section of this video, and it is the one with the best data behind it.

ACT FOUR: WRATH (the public trial)

This is the hardest section and I am going to be direct about who it implicates.

Wrath in the original list covers more ground than anger. Anger on its own is not a sin in any serious version of this framework, and Gottman's own data backs that up, which we will get to. Wrath is anger converted into a performance, anger that wants an audience and a verdict.

The modern shape is the husband-shaming post. The reel where a woman films her partner for a punchline. The caption "the men are not okay." The group chat that has been convened as a permanent tribunal on one man who does not know it exists.

Here is the number.

John Gottman spent four decades filming couples and coding their interactions frame by frame. In his own published theory paper, when he broke down which specific negative behaviours predicted dissolution, anger was not one of them. Anger did not predict separation or divorce. What predicted it was contempt, defensiveness, and stonewalling,

and for wives specifically, contempt correlated at 0.34 with divorce, and facial expressions of disgust correlated 0.51 with the number of months until the couple separated.

Read that again. A researcher could watch a woman's face, count how often it made one specific expression, and predict how soon the marriage would end.

Contempt is what the Gottman Institute now calls the single greatest predictor of divorce. And contempt is the exact emotional register of the husband-shaming post, because contempt is defined in that literature as speaking from a position of assumed superiority. That is the format. That is what the format is.

[beat]

So the content is not a symptom of a bad marriage. The content is the best-measured predictor we have that a marriage is ending, being produced at scale, monetised, and rewarded with engagement.

Slow down. 145.

Here is the part I want to sit on. A man whose partner does this to him usually cannot describe what is happening to him. He does not have the vocabulary. He knows he does not want to come home. He knows there is a version of him that lives in his wife's phone that he has never met and cannot defend.

A man under my double standards video, six hundred and ninety seven likes: "Had an ex spend 6 months getting me to open up about my PTSD. Eventually I sat down and told some of my tamer war stories, cried a little. Not sobbing, but tears running down my face while I spoke. Within 2 weeks she'd pulled away and the relationship had ended. Lesson learned."

Another one, three hundred and forty seven likes, under my responsibilities video, and this one is from a woman: "Defending him when he's not in the room. I can't tell you how

many times I've heard other women make disparaging comments about their husband. No loyalty."

She sees it. She is sitting in the room where it happens.

And I want to hold the mirror up properly here, because it would be dishonest not to. Men have their own version of this and it is every bit as ugly. It is just less public. The locker room, the objectifying joke about a woman who trusted him, the man who talks about his wife's body to his friends in a way she would never survive hearing. Same sin, different distribution channel. Contempt does not have a gender. It has a format, and right now women have the better platform for it.

ACT FIVE: GREED, THEN PRIDE

Greed. The list that never closes.

Greed was never about wanting things. What it describes is a requirement that expands every time it gets met.

Watch what happened to height. Six foot was the joke standard for a decade. A man under my standards video, seven hundred and forty one likes: "6 feet is so 2022. Today it's 6'4".

He is describing greed exactly. The bar did not get met and then hold. It got met and then moved, because the function of the bar was never to identify a man. It was to maintain a gap.

And the maths of stacking those requirements is brutal, which I ran in the standards video, so I will not run it again here beyond the punchline: every requirement you add multiplies against every other requirement, and about five of them into the list you have

specified a man who exists in numbers so small that you are statistically likelier to be struck by lightning than to date him. And he has options.

Four hundred and twenty six people liked this one: "Remember Brad Pitt and Tom Brady cleared those standards and their wives still divorced them."

That comment is the whole act. If the men at the absolute ceiling of every measurable requirement did not satisfy the requirement, then the requirement was never the thing.

Pride. The seventh.

And here is the seventh, and the seventh is not like the other six.

The first six are behaviours. Pride is the operating system they run on, and its specific function is to give the other six better names.

The empty ledger becomes knowing your worth. The feed becomes inspiration. The endless menu becomes keeping your options open. The impossible standard becomes not settling. The contempt post becomes venting, and the audience becomes a support system. The moving bar becomes growth.

Every single one of the six comes out of pride with a name you would put on a mug.

[beat]

That is why none of them ever get corrected. A behaviour with a flattering name cannot be examined, because examining it now feels like self-betrayal. That is the actual mechanism, and it is a human one, running at industrial scale on one side of the market right now because an entire content economy discovered that relabelling a woman's behaviour as healing is the most profitable thing you can sell her.

Men have their own version, and it is called stoicism when it is actually just avoidance, and it is called standards when it is actually just resentment, and it is called self-improvement when a man is really just hiding in a gym from a conversation he is scared of. Same sin, same flattering name, and it hides a different set of behaviours.

Pride is the sin that closes the loop, because pride is the one that guarantees no feedback ever gets in.

CLOSE: THE SEVEN THAT ARE LEFT

So that is seven. Sloth, the empty ledger. Envy, the feed. Gluttony, the menu with no bottom. Lust, desire aimed at a market that cannot clear. Wrath, the trial with an audience. Greed, the bar that moves. And pride, which renames the other six so none of them ever get fixed.

And I want to end somewhere other than the obvious place, because the obvious place is me telling you what women are doing wrong, and you already knew that or you would not have watched this far.

Gregory did not publish that list alone. Every one of the seven was written down with the thing that cancels it. Pride against humility. Envy against kindness. Wrath against patience. Greed against charity. Gluttony against temperance. Lust against chastity. Sloth against diligence.

Seven behaviours, and seven exits, written at the same time by people who assumed you would need both.

That second column is what has gone missing. The sins themselves are thriving, they have podcasts. The exits are the part nobody is selling, because there is no market in telling someone that the answer is patience.

Slow down here. 145.

And the honest reason the list still works fifteen hundred years later is this. Every single one of the seven feels productive while you are inside it.

Envy feels like ambition. Wrath feels like standards. Pride feels like self-respect. Gluttony feels like keeping your options open. Greed feels like knowing your worth. Lust feels like chemistry. Sloth feels like rest you have earned.

Every one of them feels like the beginning of a life.

And not one of them builds one.

[beat]

That is the whole argument. Living inside these seven does not produce a full life. It produces a very defended one. You end up with your standards intact and nobody standing next to you, and those two facts are related in a way that the content telling you to raise the bar will never mention.

The second column is where the life actually is. Patience is what a marriage runs on when the feeling has gone quiet for a fortnight. Kindness is what you manage when the other person got the thing you wanted. Humility is being able to hear that you were wrong without it costing you your identity, which is the exact capacity the seventh sin removes.

And I said earlier that I lose nothing by living inside those virtues. I want to repeat it here, because in act three it was a disclosure about me, and here it is an offer to you. There is no version of your life that gets worse because you practiced restraint when it was hard.

Now the last part, and I am saying it to the men watching, because most of you are.

None of this is a reason to write off women. If you take one video and turn it into a permanent position about half the population, you have just picked up the seventh sin yourself with a better vocabulary for it. You will have your certainty, you will be alone with it, and you will be sure that was everybody else's fault.

The seven are human. I have watched men run every one of these, I have said so on this channel, and I will keep saying it.

What is different right now is that one side of this market has an entire industry telling it that six of these are healing, in a voice that sounds like therapy. That is a distribution problem more than a moral one, and what it means is that the correction that normally arrives from a friend who loves you enough to say something is not arriving.

So if you have someone in your life doing one of these, be that friend. Say the true thing once, plainly, without contempt, and then let them do what they are going to do with it.

Seven names. Use them privately.

And if you recognised yourself in one of these tonight, that is the gap closing. It is the most useful thing that can happen to a person, and it only happens to people who are still capable of it.

The list has been out for fifteen hundred years. The second column comes with it.

[beat]

Tell me which of the seven you have watched up close. Not which one you have committed, I know that comment section is not coming. Which one you watched, and what it cost. I read them all.

Appendix

A. Sources, with what each one can and cannot carry

Claim in script	Source	Link	Weighting
Contempt predicts divorce; anger does not	Gottman, "A Theory of Marital Dissolution and Stability" (wife's contempt $r = 0.34$; facial disgust $r = 0.51$ with months to separation)	johngottman.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/A-theory-of-marital-dissolution-and-stability.pdf	Strong. Observational, self-selected couples, small Ns per cohort. Say "predicts", not "causes".
"Contempt is the greatest predictor of divorce"	Gottman Institute	gottman.com/blog/the-four-horsemen-contempt/	Institute's own framing, safe to attribute to them.
More options, less satisfaction	D'Angelo & Toma 2017, <i>Media Psychology</i> (24 vs 6 profiles)	doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2015.1121827	Strong, experimental, small sample, student-heavy.
More options, worse choices	Wu & Chiou 2009, <i>CyberPsychology & Behavior</i> , n=128 Taiwanese	doi.org/10.1089/cpb.2008.0182	Directional, non-US. Label it.
Passive scrolling lowers wellbeing via envy	Verduyn et al. 2015, <i>JEP: General</i>	doi.org/10.1037/xge0000057	Strong. Lab plus experience sampling.
Instagram attention to alternatives	Sharabi & Hopkins 2021, <i>JSPR</i> , 178 couples, 3,270 posts	doi.org/10.1177/0265407521991662	Correlational. Do not imply Instagram causes the pursuit.
Women rated 80% of men below medium	Rudder, OkTrends, 17 Nov 2009; also <i>Dataclysm</i>	gwern.net/doc/psychology/okcupid/yourlooksandyourinbox.html	Real but 2009, photos not people, and the messaging behaviour was far closer to the normal curve. Both caveats are in the script.
Match rates 5.26% men / 44.4% women	SwipeStats 2026, 7,000+ profiles, 294M swipes	swipestats.io/blog/dating-app-statistics	App data, not peer reviewed. Cite it as such on camera.
Women initiated 69% of divorces, 31% men; non-marital breakups statistically even	Rosenfeld (Stanford), How Couples Meet and Stay Together, 2,262 adults 2009-2015, presented ASA 2015	asanet.org/women-more-likely-men-initiate-divorces-not-non-marital-breakups	Strong and nationally representative. 371 breakups in the analytic sample. It says who filed, never why. Rosenfeld's own reading (the institution of marriage, not female sensitivity) is given on camera alongside hers.
71% of single women 40+ not looking to date, vs 42% of men 40+; under 40 the gap nearly closes (39% vs 33%)	Pew Research Center, "A profile of single Americans", 20 Aug 2020	pewresearch.org/social-trends/2020/08/20/a-profile-of-single-americans/	Strong. 2020 data. Script explicitly states this is a legitimate choice and not evidence of a sin.

Origin of the seven	Gregory I, sixth century, revising Evagrius Ponticus	Standard history, uncontested	Fine as stated.
---------------------	--	-------------------------------	-----------------

Cut before the script existed: "the same 10% of men" (no source anywhere), and the "bottom 80% of men / bottom 22% of women" line, which is a fake from an anonymous 2015 Medium post built on 27 invented profiles.

B. Comment tape (all API-pulled 24 Aug 2026, with like counts)

From Kait's own videos:

- 563 @leaderofnoone5096, *50 Brutal Truths*: "This just proves that the birthrate isn't going to climb anytime soon."
- 514 @CosmicD, *50 Brutal Truths*: "After listening to all of this, I can say with full confidence that I don't have the energy, patience or masochistic tendency to suffer this..."
- 418 @WalterGilbert-e7s, *50 Brutal Truths*: "I pray there's a 'Why it's even remotely worth the effort' follow-up video." **(cold open)**
- 375 @j3fflebowskee, *50 Brutal Truths*: "This is exhausting. I'm not going to cater to someone who expects me to do everything and judges my 'performance', then critiques me publically while refusing to reciprocate."
- 1,029 @joshgreen2627, *Standards Delusional*: "100% focused on what they want, 0% focused on what they have to do to get it." **(Act 1)**
- 741 @peppybocan, *Standards Delusional*: "6 feet is so 2022. Today it's 6'4"." **(Act 5)**
- 426 @whereeaglesdare9584, *Standards Delusional*: "Remember Brad Pitt and Tom Brady cleared those standards and their wives still divorced them." **(Act 5)**
- 355 @AvenValkyr, *Standards Delusional*: 47, electrician, "have not had sex in over 10 years... completely and totally done." **(Act 1)**
- 1,521 @UilliamNebelHeretic, *Men Stopped Chasing*: "At 50, dying from a terminal illness, I am circled by post 40 women, like vultures... I am dying alone, by choice." **(Act 1)**
- 697 @spyturtle556, *Double Standards*: the PTSD story, relationship over within two weeks. **(Act 4)**
- 347 @minxbade, *Responsibilities of Women*: "Defending him when he's not in the room. I can't tell you how many times I've heard other women make disparaging comments about their husband. No loyalty." **(Act 4, woman speaking)**

- 578 @FrankS111, *Every Man Wants These Things*: "I'm a 40 year old husband and father of 3 young boys. I wish I would have been taught at a young age that I would be nothing more than a human plow horse." (spare, strong Act 1 alternate)
- 404 @thermalreboot, same video: "I've never had a woman apologize to me. I can't think of one time in my 64 years." (spare)

Mirror rooms:

- 16,859 @dukkhan1288, Mikhaila Peterson on the 80% stat: "these women were rating men's online profiles, not men from real life." (**Act 2, used as the pre-empt**)
- 22,613 @calimantis, Memeable Data: apps are "filled with women who get attention they don't want and men who want attention they don't get." (**Act 2**)
- 60,014 @codywalden7105, Memeable Data: "Dating for straight women is like shopping. Dating for straight men is like a job interview." (spare cold-open alternate)
- 8,626 @rspurdie, Sprouht: "'Too much access to too many people.' Nailed it." (spare, Act 2)
- 1,704 @kyliechristina234, Tam Kaur (women's room): "In order for us to be deserving of a high-value man, we **MUST** be ourselves high-value women." (the honest voice inside the opposite room, good optional Act 1 mirror)

C. Runtime cut paths

- **To 20 minutes:** cut Wu & Chiou from Act 2 and keep D'Angelo & Toma alone, and cut the two spare comments in Act 1. Do not shorten Act 3 or Act 4.
- **To 17 minutes:** merge Gluttony and Lust into one act built entirely on the two numbers, and drop the SwipeStats block.
- **Do not cut:** the caveat block on the 80% stat, the male mirror in Act 4, or the male mirror in Pride. Removing either mirror turns the video into the thing the channel is not.

D. Description draft

Seven patterns, each older than the internet, each measurably present in modern dating data. This video names them in their original language, the seven deadly sins, and

matches each one to the behaviour it predicts. The seventh is not like the other six, and it is the reason the first six never get corrected.

Kait unpacks polarizing topics with professionalism, intelligence, and an edge.

Sources cited on screen and listed below.

\#Kaitdoespsych #Psychology #GenderRoles #MensIssues #Relationships