

Male Attractiveness to Women as Explained by Evolutionary Psychology

857 upvotes | 12 July, 2017 | by the_christian_grey

Over the last few weeks I've been watching a series of lectures by the psychologist Jordan Petersen, in which he explains the function of the male dominance hierarchy and its relationship to sexual selection. These evolutionary psychology concepts have clear implications for those of us who would like to improve our own success with women, but can be a bit opaque to the lay reader. I'm going to make it more accessible.

Genetic testing of modern humans has led scientists to estimate that historically about 80% of women and only about 40% of men have been able to reproduce successfully. If you're wondering how the sexes could be so mismatched, it means that every reproductively successful man impregnated two women on average.

A woman can only be impregnated by one man every nine months, at maximum. Whereas one man could theoretically impregnate a thousand women during that same timespan. Since the number of men and women is about equal, this makes female reproductive capacity far more scarce—and thus far more economically valuable—than male reproductive capacity. This means that women are the primary agents of sexual selection.

What that means, in English, is that women are in general a lot more picky about choosing men than men are about choosing women. It also means that as a man, the deck is stacked against you. This means that you are more likely than not to FAIL at having sex with women. That is, unless you can get into that top 40%. Average won't cut it.

The Dominance Hierarchy

So how do women choose which men are worthy of their scarce vaginas? The answer, curiously, is that men choose themselves. They do this by way of a dominance hierarchy. A dominance hierarchy is a natural, spontaneous ordering of males from most dominant to least dominant. You can envision a dominance hierarchy as similar to a corporate org chart. It is pyramid shaped, with the CEO at the top, the other executives under him, the middle management under them, etc., until you get to the grunt workers at the bottom.

All species of social animals have some form of dominance hierarchy. For some animals, this hierarchy is ordered according to a single factor, such as physical size. This is the case for the elephant seal, for example. A male elephant seal can determine his place on the hierarchy very easily. If he is the largest male, he is the alpha, and he is entitled to all the females. If he is not the largest, then he is a beta male, and is not entitled to mate with the females. If a beta tries to mate with a female, the female will loudly protest, and the beta male risks being physically harmed by the more powerful alpha male. Therefore the beta male elephant seal has an instinctual fear of trying to mate with females, since doing so would put his life in jeopardy.

The human dominance hierarchy is far more complicated than that of the elephant seal, but shares the same basic functioning. Every human male instinctively knows his place in the dominance hierarchy, and our subconscious minds guide our behavior and feelings accordingly in various situations. Approach anxiety, for example, is our instinctive reaction to the prospect of hitting on a girl to whom we are not entitled, given our place in the dominance hierarchy. It is the same as the aversion felt by the beta male elephant seal that keeps him from mating with the females.

Also like the elephant seal, a woman's interest in mating with a man is determined by his place on the dominance hierarchy. A man who mates with a woman by force is similarly punished by higher ranking men. And in more primitive cultures, even hitting on a woman to whom a man is not entitled is grounds for physical punishment. In modern society, such men get by with the rather minor punishment of being called "creepy" by onlookers and other such displays of social disapproval.

But unlike the elephant seal, the human male dominance hierarchy is quite complex. And one man is likely to be a part of multiple dominance hierarchies at the same time. Some hierarchies are clearly delineated. A CEO is the alpha male in his company's dominance hierarchy. The Head of State of a country is the alpha male in his country's political structure.

Other hierarchies are less obvious. A rock star or a movie star may be high in a dominance hierarchy, despite perhaps not having anyone formally working for him. Dominance is determined by a number of factors beyond formal authority. Physical size, strength, wealth, fame, intelligence, attractiveness, creativity, personality, and a variety of other characteristics can factor into a man's place in a dominance hierarchy.

So how does anybody figure out who is where on such a complicated hierarchy? The answer is that we place ourselves by comparing ourselves to others. We each have a deeply ingrained perception of our own status, and we size up other males and compare ourselves to them. We do most of this on a subconscious level.

If you are a typical guy, and you find yourself face to face with a famous rock star, you are instinctively going to judge his place on the dominance hierarchy as higher than yours, and you will act in a way that is deferential to his higher status. Similarly, if you are face to face with a beggar on the street, you will naturally expect him, being of lower status, to defer to you. We defer to those whom we deem higher status than ourselves, because deferring is easier than getting into a fight we are likely to lose, or risking alienation by society as a whole.

Your subconscious mind will make this comparison with just about every other man with whom you interact. Most of the time the comparison will be less obvious to your conscious mind. But your subconscious is extremely observant. It will pick up the tiniest cues from another man's posture, vocal tone, movement, word choice, body language, etc. to make this determination.

Sometimes it is not immediately clear which man holds the higher position. Let's say you and

another guy both judge yourselves to be higher status than the other. In this case it largely comes down to conviction. If you are more convinced of your higher status, he will pick up on that from your body language, and will reassess your status as higher than his own.

The subconscious minds of women are also very adept at determining men's place on the male dominance hierarchy. Women are attracted to men who have a high position in the hierarchy. You've probably heard a million times that the most attractive characteristic in a man is confidence. This is basically true, but I'm going to be more specific. The most attractive characteristic in a man is his own conception of his high position on the dominance hierarchy. This looks a lot like confidence.

And it shows. Men have been trying to fake confidence (i.e. a high position in the dominance hierarchy) in the presence of women for millennia. This is very difficult to do, because women are very adept at deciphering tiny signals and can instinctively spot fakers. There is a feedback loop between confident body language and actual confidence, however, so consciously learning alpha male body language can still be useful (perhaps I'll go into this in more detail in a subsequent post).

The importance of our place in the dominance hierarchy leads us to the obvious question: where does our conception of our own position on the dominance hierarchy come from? This is where it gets tricky. Our subconscious mind has built our self conception on the accumulation of our entire lifetime's worth of experiences, including during childhood. A kid who was bullied in school, abused by his parents, or rejected by other kids may well grow up to have a rather negative conception of himself. Even if he becomes rich and good looking, he may still carry this negative self-conception as a relic of his formative experiences.

If you've ever seen a tall, handsome, well-dressed guy timidly try to start a conversation with a girl and get coldly rejected (happens all the time), something like this is the issue. And it only compounds itself. Every time he gets rejected, it reinforces his assessment of himself as low on the dominance hierarchy. It's a very difficult cycle to break.

So is it possible to improve your subconscious conception of your own place in the dominance hierarchy? The answer, thankfully, is yes. Your subconscious generalizes from examples. You need to give it new examples that show that your position has changed and you've managed to move up to a higher position on the dominance hierarchy. As luck would have it, I'm going to tell you exactly how you can do this.

Step One: Realize that hitting on girls is not actually dangerous

Before you can start focusing on success with women, you have to get rid of your fear of trying. If you are naturally a beta male, as most men are, you are going to have some anxiety when hitting on girls. You need to accept your fear (which is totally normal), and face it.

Do exactly what you are afraid to do. Go talk to women. The more uncomfortable it makes you, the better. The less alcohol involved, the better. I have a great program to gradually ease you into it, which you can find here.

You will almost certainly get rejected a lot at first. That's ok. Your purpose in this step is simply to show your subconscious mind that nothing truly bad happens when you hit on girls. If you live in a modern Western society, nobody is going to come chop your head off because you talked to a girl to whom you were not entitled. The more your subconscious sees that there is no real danger, the less anxiety you will have around attractive women.

Step Two: Convince yourself that you are attractive to women

Rest of the article here:

<http://www.christiangreypua.com/dominance-hierarchy-male-attractiveness/>

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

[deleted] • 147 points • 12 July, 2017 05:21 PM

Genetic testing of modern humans has led scientists to estimate that historically about 80% of women and only about 40% of men have been able to reproduce successfully.

I just want to point out real quick here that this mightn't be as cut and dry as you think it is regarding "women are more picky" - even though they definitely are in general.

Men had more dangerous jobs historically and some of them will have just been *killed* by either other men, infections, food poisoning whilst out gathering or have fallen victim to the elements if they got lost whilst out doing the do, before they had chance to stick one up her.

If you think "Yeah but they could have had sex first." then let me counter with, "It's not guaranteed a woman gets pregnant after having unprotected sex."

indivisibleremainder • 58 points • 12 July, 2017 08:58 PM

This guy got the reasoning wrong. The 80%/40% stat is true, but unrelated to women being picky. Chimpanzee females are not picky. They will literally have sex with any chimp that initiates it. The reason dominant male Chimpanzees monopolize sex is because they chase away the betas. Human females on the other hand are picky. They won't have sex with just anyone. But the reproduction stat is not proof or evidence of this.

Auvergnat • 7 points • 12 July, 2017 11:15 PM

Any other great ape has picky females?

indivisibleremainder • 50 points • 12 July, 2017 11:53 PM

Kind of.

Gorilla females exhibit mate preference by soliciting sex from their choice of male and most copulations are initiated by the female. But they do not resist copulation as far as i know. Pregnant gorillas initiate sex even more often than fertile non-pregnant ones.

Orangutan females actively seek the alpha males and they do so while they are ovulating (most fertile). They end up being "coerced" (forced) into sex by a lot by non-alphas, but they have evolved to be more available for sex with betas when they are not ovulating (least fertile).

Both Gorillas and Orangutans are using the "anti-infanticide strategy of paternity confusion" as far as I know. Meaning they prevent infanticide by making it unclear who the father is. But the female maximizes the odds of getting choice genes by actively soliciting sex from the alpha or responding to his mating calls when she is fertile, then allowing sex with betas when she is either already pregnant or less fertile.

The Orangutan strategy is reminiscent of AF/BB, it's similar to the studies on humans that have shown women to be more attracted to AF features while ovulating, and BB features while not ovulating. A key difference is that in Orangutans, the father is not involved in child rearing at all, so there's no BB involved. However both the human AF/BB and Orangutan female strategies are types of "paternity confusion" strategies.

[deleted] • 3 points • 13 July, 2017 12:48 PM

This is extremely interesting. I would prompt you to make a full post on this matter, it would benefit the community. Btw, got any sources on what you're saying? I want to read more on this subject.

redditreaderrabbit • 3 points • 13 July, 2017 03:03 PM

Read Sperm Wars by Robin Baker.

the_christian_grey[S] • 3 points • 13 July, 2017 02:17 PM

Interesting. I like the orangutan comparison better than the chimp comparison. Clearly more similar to humans. I wonder if human females actually want to have sex with their beta bucks when they're less fertile, or they just do it out of necessity to get his resources.

RedPillFreedom • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 05:06 PM

From personal experience, most have told me it's because they couldn't lock down that alpha they wanted. They just have to settle for the best they can get to preserve their futures.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 July, 2017 09:01 PM

This guy got the reasoning wrong.

Sorry, but do you mean me or OP?

indivisibleremainder • 9 points • 12 July, 2017 09:28 PM

BTW death (war, disease, etc.) is also not the reason.

If you're interested in this topic here is a good article about it:

<https://psmag.com/environment/17-to-1-reproductive-success>

tl;dr: 8,000 years ago agriculture changed human societies from small groups of nomadic egalitarian tribes into small city-states. These city-states were dominated by a ruling elite that owned all the land, livestock, farms & *women*. Later on, the invention of marriage rituals would help provide beta men more equitable access to reproduction, although it never would become completely equal.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

RedPillFreedom • 5 points • 13 July, 2017 05:27 PM

Great comment!

Please, make a post on this topic.

It's nice to see something new being added to the conversation.

Everyone is subconsciously aware of this but acts like it's not real.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

j_arbuckle2012 • 4 points • 13 July, 2017 06:19 PM

That was a fucking brilliant read.

I have always believed that alpha as described here was hollow. You sir, are proving my point. Let's dig deeper, what actions could one take to offset our weakened upbringing?

I already train martial arts, lift weights (heavy compounds focused on strength and durability), do calisthenics, run, ruck, swim, hike, shoot precision rifle and tactical pistol/carbine, and study bushcraft. Is it more about resistance to disease/injury or is it about being more skilled than the risks you take? I have been seriously injured doing some of the things I mentioned (multiple broken bones, dislocations, etc.), so should I focus more on injury prevention and durability or is it a skillset and mindfulness thing? I am very interested in hearing your answer.

the_christian_grey[S] • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 08:49 PM

Excellent post. I made the point in another thread that our modern conception of status has become largely divorced from the more primal, intrinsic status that drives the sexual marketplace. Mark Zuckerberg is my exhibit of choice when explaining that.

[deleted] • 2 points • 15 July, 2017 12:06 AM

yes, join me. we must be very vigilant and active for time is running short. there is still hope, somehow but it is not all about resurrecting the old social norms either.

we have lived in bonds of slavery for thousands of years, this new iteration is different radically from what our still enslaved ancestors knew.

but that is not to say the old ways we know are correct either.

nothing we know is true, the only thing we can really know is that most things, for centuries, have been lies; sometimes mixed with the faintest hint of truth somewhere entangled within

the goal should be to provide the fairest competition for the best results possible for all, with as little unnecessary suffering as possible, and assurance that everyone gets a fair chance by removing the loopholes and anyone who exploited them previously to gain said unfair advantage in competition, or false social value

sadomasochrist • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 10:01 PM

I'm only going to address one point. HB10 has better genes, that's why she's HB10.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

sadomasochrist • 1 point • 14 July, 2017 07:12 PM

You're being autistic about basically all of this. It's overly reductionist and needlessly pedantic.

I'm not to engage you on the level you'd require to understand the counterargument, but its simply put as this.

In a world where resources approach infinite, and risks are minor and close to absent. Power arises from areas that were previously not important.

HB10 has value because looks are more important in our society than being resistant to a strain of flu. In some ancient time period, that same flu resistant person would be heralded as a demigod.

Your arguments are honestly just thinly veiled "naturalistic fallacies."

The only thing that determines what good genes are or who holds a position of

alpha is group selection. That group selection, subconsciously selects a leader.

Because HB10 can't do things you believe to make her have "good genes" is irrelevant. Because Brad Pitt's ability as an actor has little bearing on how many buffalo he could kill and extract food from doesn't matter.

What does matter is both HB10 and Brad Pitt were put into positions of alpha vs beta, by subconscious, group choice. Those features were selected for by the group.

And honestly, your HB5 child would be greatly disadvantaged to the HB10 child. So long as manual labor is not the most likely outcome for her in the future. A beautiful woman is and has always been, the most valuable commodity on earth outside of water.

You might want to argue for silicon or some other rare commodity, but you'd again be missing the point by being pedantic. Beauty for a woman is the most valuable trait she can have, which is mostly facial asymmetry and other body dimensions. For men, it's physical dimorphism and social status.

Your arguments are blue pill. They are "this is what it *should be*. Sorry, but that's not how it is.

The most attractive drug dealer on the planet is still subordinate to Brad Pitt in the SMV. And there's lots of reasons for that. There is some minority of women who might be more compelled to be with the drug dealer than figurative Brad Pitt, but for most socialized women, the choice is easy.

You are one of those people that things need to be binary for, otherwise it all falls apart. And you spend needless amounts of time trying to conceptualize things as *right* or *wrong*.

It's much more productive to understand why things are the way they are.

HB10 is valuable for a reason. So is the CEO for a company. And I'm sorry it's not comforting for you that being a gym rat won't elevate you to that level of social standing and access to women.

That's why the framework is $BB < AF < AB$

Provider

Protector

Protector and Provider

[deleted] 14 July, 2017 07:27 PM*

[deleted]

Hjalmbere • 1 point • 14 July, 2017 07:02 AM

So Jobs was a sociopath, big surprise. So was Gaddafi and Saddam, they picked people from their own clan that they trusted, not "true alphas".

[deleted] 14 July, 2017 06:05 PM*

[deleted]

Hjalmbere • 1 point • 14 July, 2017 07:26 PM

You don't seem to understand Arab culture. The reason why they keep losing their wars is because the alpha dog selects army officers based on blind loyalty, not competence. Pretty much like Stalin.

Different times and cultures call for different personalities and leadership styles. I would find it completely unlikely that either Faceberg and Trump would rise to be leaders of the Huns had they been magically transported to that time and age. A guy like Chuck Zito could probably stand a chance, on the other hand, can you seriously imagine Chuck Zito or Sonny Barger running Apple?

[deleted] 13 July, 2017 10:39 PM

[deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 14 July, 2017 11:58 PM*

YES YES YES.

it is artificial selection and the system must be overthrown. they have gained power through an artificial system. some of us at the bottom are far superior, genetically, and Intellectually, than they are. the difference is ONLY inequality and unequal distribution of wealth and educational opportunities. they try to claim its valid evolution and social Darwinism but it is nothing of the sort. its in fact, the exact opposite in a guise that hides its true nature from the uninitiated

we have raw natural talents, at times, that quadrillions of dollars and all the lifetimes in the world cannot buy for someone.

and they will not hold us down forever.

we will invalidate them and their system, and finally render them the obsolescence they have long feared and avoided.

[deleted] • 3 points • 13 July, 2017 05:40 AM

BTW death (war, disease, etc.) is also not the reason.

No one factor will be the sole reason for this, of course not, you rarely get simple answers to complex questions.

Sounds like you've interested in history, can I recommend a book by Douglas Carswell called "Rebel: How to overthrow the emerging Oligarchy"? It's revelatory.

indivisibleremainder • 3 points • 13 July, 2017 05:52 AM

That book looks really interesting, thanks. Right up my alley.

Based off your book recommendation-- makes me think you drew the same conclusion as I did even though I hadn't mentioned it in the previous comment.

With the collapse of marriage and rise of inequality (oligarchs), the sexual marketplace appears to be returning to the same conditions of 8,000 years ago. Maybe in the future it will be possible to trace another genetic bottleneck, this time from the 21st century when the betas failed to pass their genes on.

[deleted] • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 06:02 AM

That book looks really interesting, thanks. Right up my alley.

Did you look it up? Honestly, I can't recommend it enough. Douglas is an Ugandan-born English politician formerly of the Conservative Party and latterly UKIP - though he's not sitting in Parliament at the moment - and his historical knowledge, insights and love for capitalism are...I don't care if I sound Gay when saying this...*breath-taking*, and this book *will* change how you argue politics online (if you ever do).

We're living in a paradoxically troublesome time, on the one hand there has never been *less* inequality between either the sexes, the classes or the races and yet simultaneously we get nothing from the MSM, Academia and Politicians but ludicrous Apex Fallacies and mistruths (You know that if you're rich it doesn't mean I can't be right? We're not on the Gold Standard anymore, I can create wealth and the gov can print more money. Right? RIIIGHT?) and yes, we're going backwards pretty damn quick.

the_christian_grey[S] • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 02:22 PM

That sounds cool. I might have to check that out too.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 04:05 PM

I hope you do.

Sorry for hi-jacking your post mate, Rule 0 is a little difficult to stick to sometimes.

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 July, 2017 11:50 PM*

this. join me comrade in the fight for the new age, and the replacement of the elite with ourselves.

it may not be perfect, but if we know each other are out there, somewhere, and are always at the ready to take action and carpe diem when/if the moment comes, if you are willing to make compromises with other groups you may not agree with (socialists, communists, anarchists, independents) and perhaps even fight further with down the line.

but if you believe *anything* is better for us, then stand together and some day a new age will dawn, dominated by us, with the heels of our boots on the throats of those who once pinned ours down and declared themselves god amongst men

I only hope whichever of us succeeds, it is not another bloody Bolshevik tragedy; the vanguard must give up power, must share it and not entirely hold on to the archaic ways of domineering power entirely for oneself and one's own social caste. and while direct revenge is in some cases justified and expected, the guillotine has to stop falling. getting the peasants to agree without massacring them might be a problem. some people are so indoctrinated by the system they will fight attempts to be freed from their chains

we must accept that the wider distribution of happiness, and the relative stability the new system causes, in addition to the greater diversity, will ultimately cause greater luxury and wealth through innovation than ever would be possible in the old ways of doing things for the benefit of a single class as a society

it won't happen overnight, but if people have faith and give the new system time, it will advance far beyond its opposition at near light speed

indivisibleremainder • 1 point • 12 July, 2017 09:18 PM

OP got the reasoning wrong for why human females are picky maters.

The statistics show that far fewer males reproduced, but it is not proof of picky mating behavior.

Women do happen to be picky maters, but it's not because of the reasons OP stated.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 July, 2017 09:20 PM

Thanks for clarifying, I got that you were coming down more on the negative side to OP but I only asked because, if you'd been trying to say **I'd** got it wrong instead, you'd have wanted to reply to my comment so people could see yours underneath it and "This Guy" could have meant me.

Anyway, Yes, Correlation does not equal Causation.

grandaddychimp • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 12:54 PM

Op was right that they're more picky because sperm is far more abundant than eggs

the_christian_grey[S] • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 02:13 PM*

Humans are not chimps, and human females clearly do select based on the dominance hierarchy. In humans, the male dominance hierarchy (and alphas chasing off competitors) and female selection exist in harmony. That's why I used the elephant seal comparison; the alphas chase away the betas, and the females cry for the alpha's help when threatened with the possibility of being impregnated with inferior beta sperm. Suggesting that female selection plays an insignificant part in the matter strikes me as kind of silly given what we constantly observe of female humans' mate selection behavior.

the_christian_grey[S] • 12 points • 12 July, 2017 05:31 PM

That's a fair point. I'm sure that does influence the numbers. Though I would say there are a few factors that push the numbers in the other direction as well. For example, men (who don't get killed) have much more time to have children, whereas women have a relatively short fertility window. Also civilization and most major religions limit the number of women that top alphas are allowed to have, thus giving betas more opportunity. I think an unconstrained sexual marketplace (which we seem to be quickly approaching) would result in an even lower figure than 40%.

PillTheRed • 43 points • 12 July, 2017 08:29 PM

Biologist here. The studies I have personally seen on this topic, doesn't seem to match up what is being hypothesized here. We can rule that out, simply by checking historic mortality rates. In order for the, men died a lot vs women, we would need an enormous mortality rate, much, much higher than what we think it was.

I've seen some studies that put the numbers even further apart, to more like 1 to 5. For every man who successfully reproduced, five women did. This deduces itself that women are hypergamous by nature. We can track specific DNA lines, and it still appears that only certain men bred. There is a ton of royalty genetics in the normal population. Meaning, there were tons of cucked bastards, who went on to reproduce as well.

I don't think we really even need to look at that stuff to make the argument that women are hypergamous. All we need to look at is all of the primate species around us. I don't believe there is a single one that doesn't have an alpha male, and females breeding only with them. It makes sense from an evolutionary standpoint. Women must be this way, we don't want them not to be hypergamous. If they weren't, we would probably go extinct as a species because all of the genetics would be garbage. Women have to

select based on hypergamy or the best genes don't get passed on. If they selected on beta male traits to breed, our species would be a bunch of wimps who couldn't handle surviving their environment.

So, don't get mad that women are like this. It's actually incredibly important to the species survival as a whole. Again, if women didn't do this, they wouldn't have a male to protect them, and it goes without saying the beta male wouldn't have enough access to resources to raise the kid. A neighboring tribe would just come steal all the shit simply through brute force.

sharp7 • 4 points • 13 July, 2017 09:02 AM

I think what pisses people off with AF/BB are the hierarchies used and the failings of women selection.

Girls would probably rather fuck dumbass chad who had a fortunate and overly easy childhood than someone who later in life actually becomes great and rich. The beta bucks are often in the "money" hierarchy, whoever makes the most money is the best. As OP mentioned someone who got bullied as a kid may hormonally still feel beta even if as an adult they are at the top. But women seem to often just operate on the hormonal hierarchy where dumb chad who works at a gas station gets the chicks. That's what makes the beta bucks mad. This random borderline retard, who is possibly even too stupid and drugged up to realize how lame he is, has girls wanting to fuck him. Beta genius guy may come home to find his wife fucking the stupid pool boy for example.

It's not ideal for women to use how awesome a guy FEELS as basis for attraction. You can be at the top but feel like shit because of childhood stuff. Or you could feel awesome cause you're drunk when really you work at a dead end job.

Also OP's suggestion that approaching girls is the way to cure your low self esteem is fucking retarded. As a guy who did that a bunch it just doesn't work that well. It helps at first because conquering your fear is inherently fulfilling, but after awhile you realize how good you are at entertaining chicks is a shitty self esteem metric. I mean who can really lay down at night and go "I tricked a chick into fucking me once I must be awesome. More awesome than bill gates!" It can also hurt if the guy just gets rejected a lot (although it's much rarer than you would think).

Some decent advice I heard recently is to write down your accomplishments in a big list. Then view that list periodically over and over. If you don't have any accomplishments GET SOME. If you tried your very best and still managed to do nothing in life, then just go MGTOW cause your genes, circumstances, or both are shit. The feeling of knowing you really tried your best failed over and over and still suck, is honestly a great relief. It's the pretending that's the worst. Imagine you were actually mentally retarded, finding out you are would be a great relief and would make you realize it's not your fault just bad luck. But I've found most of the time if you try your best you end up succeeding eventually at something.

the_christian_grey[S] • 3 points • 13 July, 2017 02:27 PM

I didn't suggest that approaching girls will help your self esteem. In fact I precisely said that it wouldn't. The point of that (step one) is simply to face your fear and get over it. My suggestion to build up your self conception was to use visualization exercises, which in concept is actually quite similar to your idea of writing down and reviewing your accomplishments.

beachbbqlover • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 03:21 PM

I found the simple act of scratching out items on my todo list instead of deleting them made a difference.

While I can't serially go through my list because there's always hold-outs (credit union only works

from Tuesday to Friday? One more day...) I can usually scratch out enough stuff in a given day that I find most days to have been pretty productive.

sharp7 • 1 point • 16 July, 2017 04:41 AM

Ya at the day to day level being productive makes a huge difference for me too! I've been using my phone to keep track of todo lists, I'll have to try out your scratching method maybe it makes a big difference.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 July, 2017 08:50 PM

It was the *links* on this post that caused me to question the veracity of the claims - http://lesswrong.com/lw/h4e/differential_reproduction_for_men_and_women/

Interested to know your interpretation.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 July, 2017 08:43 PM

Biologist here. The studies I have personally seen on this topic, doesn't seem to match up what is being hypothesized here. We can rule that out, simply by checking historic mortality rates. In order for the, men died a lot vs women, we would need an enormous mortality rate, much, much higher than what we think it was.

I appreciate your insight, and you're probably more knowledgeable in this field than I am, but it was never my deduction from the original done in the first place that I was relaying, it was one of the academics that had done it.

I believe as well that a great deal of women died in child-birth? So they would have "reproduced but not survived" and so equalled out the tally somewhat.

For these figures to be right, *without* it being a "high value males for mating only" scenario, it is only really necessary for a large number of those men to be unable or unsuitable for mating - this could include debilitating injuries, disfigurement or other disqualifiers - not necessarily death alone.

I'm not even sure how this would shake out but, do men and women have parity of fertility and/or has this changed throughout the ages? Could be that loads of dudes were firing blanks. Doesn't nearly answer the distance in % of course but it's a possible factor in how they stack up overall.

Lateralanouncer • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 10:07 AM

Such an Interesting topic. that could mean from an evolutionary stand point, the unconstrained sexual market place is good for human evolution. Due to woman not passing the test of time it also hits the female gene pool. A 40 year old Alpha/beta male choosing a 30 year old woman gets the pick of the litter.

[deleted] • 0 points • 12 July, 2017 05:51 PM

That's a fair point.

I can't claim it as my own unfortunately. It was featured prominently on a non-RP Game website, exactly as you had typed it, and I was discussing it in comments here with someone else and they asked for the source. I wanted to find the *original* piece and not someone just talking about it, but when I found the relevant link it became apparent that the PUA/Game guys had more or less bastardised the results of that study in their favour but the reality (adjusting for error) was more or less what I initially responded to you with. We're certainly not going to disagree that being a man historically was more hazardous than a

woman (sans childbirth) so it does make a lot of sense.

Also civilization and most major religions limit the number of women that top alphas are allowed to have

I guess I see what you mean, but we're talking about a woman *choosing mates* still aren't we? Not a slave being assigned to a harem or similar.

The thing with JBP is that he's a brilliant psychologist and a fantastic in-depth analyst of people's actions and of how their art can tell us about the world we live in and how our consciousness functions, but he makes gaffes all the time when talking about things he hasn't studied intensively.

One video I watched of his (I've watched loads BTW) had him saying plainly that "Greeks just stopped paying taxes." and the comments section was full of Greeks typing reams of text correcting him, and I in turn corrected them with "Yeah, your right, they never *stopped* paying taxes. They never actually *started*."

BrosepeVerdi • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 05:34 AM

Women also have a window of maybe 30 years wherein they are able to reproduce whereas men are, by and large, fertile for virtually their entire lives.

Also, while war has historically beget an inequity between male and female lifespans, battle deaths prior to the industrial age didn't have nearly the body counts as those in the last century.

[deleted] • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 05:46 AM

Also, while war has historically beget an inequity between male and female lifespans, battle deaths prior to the industrial age didn't have nearly the body counts as those in the last century.

Aha, that's probably true - I vaguely remember reading something similar and it would seem to make sense - so I'll take your word for it. But don't forget that there were *less* people around then and also *more* battles, I mean for a huge period of history you've got to factor in *slavery* as a probable means of death for men too.

As for big battles with high body counts pre-industrial age? Charles Martel rallied the armies of Europe against the invading Muslim's in the 700's, and the Crusades (the most misunderstood events in history, seemingly) had a high body-count too.

Plus, as I stated to OP below, it wasn't necessarily that men had to be *killed* it's just that they had to be incapable or otherwise disqualified from being adequate mates as a result of battle wounds or illnesses - disfigurement, lameness etc

fitalt47 • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 11:44 AM

Why do you keep trying to say battle disqualified people from mating to such an extent that it was responsible for the reproduction ratios? There's no evidence that actually supports that.

beachbbqlover • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 03:24 PM

He's suggesting it's partially responsible, and he's right that far.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 04:09 PM

That is only a small part of what I am saying - specifically though, fighting in armour or with blunt instruments and high-force was very dangerous and if bones broke they wouldn't heal right, so you could end up in poor shape physically.

There are no 'simple' answers to complex historical questions, OP and others have acknowledged that it's perhaps not as cut and dry as first outlined - I'm just making suggestions regarding things that could have contributed.

fitalt47 • 1 point • 14 July, 2017 02:19 AM

I don't think you understand. The amount of men killed/injured in battles is statistically insignificant.

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 July, 2017 05:57 AM

I don't think you understand.

I don't think you understand I'm talking about *factors* that would *contribute* to the statistics used and not catch-all, 100% conclusive explanations for how they are as they are.

Please read comments before responding.

fitalt47 • 1 point • 14 July, 2017 03:09 PM

Did you read my comment? I said that was statistically insignificant. Meaning it is not even worth mentioning as it adds nothing to the understanding and actually serves to be a bit misleading.

If you want to include deaths/injuries in war let's also include the amount of times men had heart attacks shoveling snow in 2012. They are both accounting for far less than 5% of deaths in human history and both are statistically insignificant but since you are determined to make pointless contentions we mine as well include this too.

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 July, 2017 03:16 PM

There is a Logical Fallacy concerning 'Latching onto a person's weakest argument' rather than counter with something of substance, I cannot remember the name of it.

Perhaps it is statistically insignificant, perhaps it is not, at this point I only have your word for it and you have provided no source.

If you want to swallow OP's line as it is, go right ahead, no one is stopping you.

fitalt47 • 2 points • 14 July, 2017 03:32 PM

NO IT IS STATISTICALLY INSIGNIFICANT.

108 billion people to ever live. $108/2 = 54$

150m - 1b killed in war lets give you the benefit of the doubt and assume it was 1b and they were all men.

This means given THE MOST GENEROUS estimates, war/fights accounts for 1/54 of male deaths in history. Now to be super generous lets say for every 1 male that died 3 received an injury that stopped them from reproducing. That would push war/fighting to be responsible for 4/54 of deaths.

With probably the most generous estimates to help your case you will ever see... it is still clear that deaths/injuries to war would not be a significant factor to the 40% - 80% reproduction ratio being discussed. WAR ACCOUNTED FOR LESS THAN 1% OF MALE DEATHS EVER.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/07/06/books/chapters/what-every-person-should>

-know-about-war.html

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_wars_by_death_toll

I'm not swallowing OP's line nor did I ever say I was. It is ironic that you dismiss me as mindlessly following the OP when you are getting butt hurt about me questioning what you said about war. I won't even begin to get into the fact that you said slavery was partially responsible for lower reproduction rates although I would encourage you to learn more about what slavery was actually like for those enslaved.

[deleted] 13 July, 2017 12:56 AM

[deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 05:38 AM

OP needs to be wary of drawing incorrect conclusions and calling it "science" humans have a long history of doing this to justify all kinds of discrimination

He's not the only one that's done this, when that research first came out it was all over the Game seen as "proof" of...something or other...any port in a storm right?

Byxitcomment score below threshold • -8 points • 13 July, 2017 03:26 AM

Women have access to contraception today, so the scarce vagina theory is a myth. I lost interest at the walrus. Men must realize that women will appreciate any man who is caring, trustworthy, has a sense of humor and is financially independent. I want to emphasize, that it largely does not matter what you look like, if you make it up some other way. 60% of men not impregnating a woman is the biggest hogwash I have heard in a long time. It simply has no relation to reality. (Assuming "men" means heterosexual men).

red-arctic-tern • 5 points • 13 July, 2017 07:36 AM

Are you getting a ton of women by being caring? Or, do you have a magnificent girlfriend, if that is what you want?

Let me guess. No.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 05:52 AM

I want to emphasize, that it largely does not matter what you look like

In my experience, it is only ever attractive people that say this and there's a horde of Incels behind me waiting to back me up over that.

Looks don't matter *much* as long as you meet a minimum *bench-mark* of genetic quality.

Now you might say to me "Well yeah obviously, I didn't mean you can get pussy if you're disfigured!" but I'd ask back "Well what do *you* personally class as disfigurement? Could a big nose not be considered such? Could a pock-marked face or acne ridden skin not be considered such? Irredeemably bad teeth? A lumpy skull? Being bald?"

Any deviations from "normal" can be classed as 'ugly' and you've just got to hope and pray that the sum of parts is greater than any individual flaw.

And that particular statement of yours is demonstrably incorrect as, if you have *asymmetry in the face*,

you will desperately struggle to find a mate.

Byxit • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 02:07 PM

My FIL was a very ugly man, half bald with crinkly hair, long pinched face with leery eyes and weak chin. He married a beautiful woman from a rich family. His assets were charm, humor, intense incessant romance and a in his career, a professional leader.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 04:06 PM

His assets were charm, humor, intense incessant romance and a in his career, a professional leader.

Can't say that the guy didn't know how to compensate then.

no_face • 52 points • 12 July, 2017 09:49 PM

There's some good stuff here, but also vast simplifications that may mislead the reader.

1. Elephant seal is a terrible standard. Primate societies are far better precursors of human social behavior. Chimps for example, are members of smaller subgroups that change fluidly while belonging to a larger group.
2. Secondly, the idea that females reject betas is wrong. Most females of primate species will cheat on the alpha with a beta. This is necessary because sometimes the alpha could be sterile (but physically strong). Without cheating, the troop is at a risk of extermination
3. *"So how do women choose which men are worthy of their scarce vaginas? The answer, curiously, is that men choose themselves."* I get this is your big hypothesis and don't mean to shit on it, but we know from primate studies and our own pre-history that human beings were promiscuous and each female mated with many males in an orgy. This is why the penis is shaped to scoop out the semen of the prior male and the ejaculate forms as gluey to stick to the opening of the cervix and prevent new sperm from getting in. Also sperm competition where sperm arrange themselves into swimmers and blockers to increase chances of fertilizing to deal with multiple simultaneous male partners
4. *"The most attractive characteristic in a man is his own conception of his high position on the dominance hierarchy. This looks a lot like confidence."* This is an attempt to conflate status with confidence. They are absolutely orthogonal. While many confident people eventually rise to high status, they are not the same.
5. *"This is very difficult to do, because women are very adept at deciphering tiny signals and can instinctively spot fakers."* This is very correct.
6. *"You will almost certainly get rejected a lot at first."* Until you improve your SMV, this will continue to happen, not just *at first*
7. *"Ok, for step one let's say you've talked to 100 women and been rejected by all of them. You've also managed to subdue (to a large extent) your fear of talking to women."* This is standard PUA BS with no basis in reality. Your body will create more and more anxiety every time you get rejected. I challenge the readers here to go to a place where all women are out of your league and see how many you can even approach. After the first 10 or so rejections, you will be so distraught that you won't be able to approach any more.
8. *"What you need is a large supply of experiences during which you were successful with women."* On the

other hand, this is exactly what builds confidence. *Repeated success, not repeated failure*

9. "NO! This part of your brain can be hacked. You can trick your brain by implanting experiences that you never actually had in real life, as well as by repeating the good experiences you have had in the past. As it turns out, this part of your brain is incapable of distinguishing reality from fantasy." So why the fuck would I want to get rejected 100 times first? Why don't I just add 100 fake successful experiences by visualization first? Businessmen and sportsmen visualize what they've trained to do for years with proven technique and experience. Visualizing how to swing that golf club is about pre-playing technique, not about *creating positive experience*. You can actually anticipate what you will do, unlike a social interaction where you can't plan anything.
10. *infield videos of guys successfully picking up girls. * We know this is selected, edited video. They don't show the 99 times they have failed. They don't show the hours until the girl is piss drunk. Most importantly, you can never copy the techniques of other players since you are not them. You will always feel like an imposter when you try and your body will create anxiety.

Overall, there is a slight smell of "Law of attraction" stuff here. Believe/visualize and it will happen.

the_christian_grey[S] • 4 points • 13 July, 2017 03:08 PM

I appreciate the substantive critique. Here's my response:

- 1) See Hitleresque's response.
- 2) Humans are not winner-take-all (like elephant seals). The status hierarchy is a continuum, and women are hypergamous. They go for the highest status they can get. I don't think this is controversial.
- 3) I'd be curious to see your sources on this one. I've heard the penis scoop theory, but it strikes me as idle speculation without much evidence. In my personal observation women who are getting fucked by an alpha male don't seem to have any desire to get fucked by a lesser male. And why should they? They can only be impregnated by one man at a time, so it is in their interest to not dilute the quality sperm with lesser sperm.
- 4) Fair point. Confidence and status are not the same in modern times. My contention is that confidence is a manifestation of status as it exists on a more primal level. In modern times, an awkward nerd (think Mark Zuckerberg) can build a website and become a billionaire CEO. The awkward nerd then has high status in a way, but still may well be low on the dominance hierarchy because his subconscious still considers him as such.
- 6) Agreed. My assumption is that the reader will work on his SMV as well as working on subduing his fear.
- 7) Completely disagree. And from experience. I used to be deathly afraid of approaching women. Then I made myself do it a bunch, and the fear gradually subsided. Sure you get tired after a while during a single outing, but the second 10 approaches are considerably easier than the first 10 approaches. It is "standard PUA BS" for good reason; we've all done it, and it works. Not the most pleasant thing in the world, but I don't think there's any way around it.
- 8) Thus step 2.
- 9) You're correct about pre-playing technique (and this works amazingly well). But that's not the only reason athletes use it. It boosts confidence as well, which for athletes, just like pickup artists, results in improved performance. Athletes that really believe that they will win push themselves harder than athletes who don't. You MIGHT be correct that you could skip the approaching step. It's an interesting contention, and I don't know the answer to that. I included that step because the best way to overcome an irrational fear is to face it repeatedly and observe that no harm comes to you. I think this is a tough nut to crack, since our psychology is naturally far more focused on the possibility of negative rather than positive outcomes. But perhaps

visualization could overcome that as well.

10) The fact that infields show the successes and not the failures is exactly the point. We're trying to identify with success, not failure. And I think you're being way too cynical. The idea is to identify with PUAs whom our minds let us identify with. I'm not talking about copying their techniques (though I would encourage that as well), I'm talking about using someone else's positive reference experience as your own.

11) I don't have anything against the law of attraction stuff, but that's not at all what I'm trying to communicate. Being confident doesn't make you rich. It probably helps, but it doesn't get you rich in and of itself. But you DO attract women by being confident, because the confidence itself is what women are attracted to most of all.

Hitleresque • 8 points • 13 July, 2017 02:24 AM

I don't think his elephant seal analogy was poor in the context he used it. OP wasn't outlining it as a "precursor for human social behaviour", he was using it as an extreme example of sexual selection in action, specifically female mate choice and a male hierarchy.

[deleted] 13 July, 2017 02:23 AM

[deleted]

no_face • 5 points • 13 July, 2017 03:04 AM

The only way to earn status is to gain the respect of fellow men. You could be born a prince but if everyone talks shit behind your back you are unattractive.

You earn the respect of fellow men by adding value to your group.

You should never be afraid of speaking the truth. Do not lie to spare other's feelings.

You retain respect by staying cool -- not easily getting emotionally pushed around by actions and words of others.

You amplify respect (and attraction) by commanding attention. This means that when you speak, others stop what they are doing and pay attention.

These are more important than much of the BS that's discussed here.

[deleted] • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 03:34 PM*

Interesting analysis. I'm bouncing off point seven.

One girl right after the other, yes... You will become exhausted from continuous rejection. However, approaching with periods of relaxation and reframing between approaches allows you to better handle rejection, or success. An example of this is approaching once per day, or three times per week.

I have been cold approaching once per three days on average, and find that both my anxiety stabilizes, and my confidence strengthens after each experience. This happens even if the approach is successful, or unsuccessful. Having that self-reflection period of a few hours, or few days, after an approach allows your body, and mind to rest. This reflection period allows you to better calibrate your next approach, reflecting on what you did wrong, or right, for more success in the future.

greatslyfer • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 05:29 PM*

infield videos of guys successfully picking up girls. We know this is selected, edited video. They don't show the 99 times they have failed.

Haha why do I get the feeling that you're shit at pickup?

The fact that you have to resort to that type of number means you're salty af when it comes to that area, so you rationalize it by saying a) They needed to try 100 times, Jesus Christ you really don't trust them huh? and b) That they're piss drunk, which in most videos you can see that THEY'RE CLEARLY NOT and are in control of their mental faculties.

P.S. Put up a video of you trying to pick up girls so we can see if you're doing something that is destroying your interactions but you're not willing to address it or haven't even detected it yet. Cause chances are you're not coming off as a guy who girls just wanna be with.

Snazzy_Serval • 2 points • 14 July, 2017 02:38 AM

Very well thought out analysis of the authors original post. Just a couple of points I wanted to bring up.

Starting off I think you are extremely wrong on this point

Secondly, the idea that females reject betas is wrong.

Of course women reject beta males. How could you even think otherwise? The whole reason the seduction community exists is because of the multitude of beta men that are getting rejected.

"This is very difficult to do, because women are very adept at deciphering tiny signals and can instinctively spot fakers."

This is very correct.

I absolutely agree, and it's why I hate the "Fake it till you make it advice" that's often given. Starting off, how do you even fake having confidence? And even then, you somehow have to convince women who seem to be psychic level on detecting this aspect in men that you aren't full of shit.

"You will almost certainly get rejected a lot at first."

Until you improve your SMV, this will continue to happen, not just at first

Correct. Nothing actually changes with constant rejection.

"Ok, for step one let's say you've talked to 100 women and been rejected by all of them. You've also managed to subdue (to a large extent) your fear of talking to women."

This is standard PUA BS with no basis in reality. Your body will create more and more anxiety every time you get rejected. I challenge the readers here to go to a place where all women are out of your league and see how many you can even approach. After the first 10 or so rejections, you will be so distraught that you won't be able to approach any more.

Absolutely fucking correct. Using myself as an example. I'm a low status male who is also introverted and has low confidence. I have gone out multiple times to try and hit on women and after getting rejected repeatedly, guess how great I feel about myself? Do I feel great that I accomplished something? Fuck no! I feel like shit. Alcohol helps somewhat, but each rejection still stings. I probably didn't have enough to drink.

I've also taken a couple of day game boot camps and again, even the soft rejections started to wear me down. This ties into point 8

"What you need is a large supply of experiences during which you were successful with women."

On the other hand, this is exactly what builds confidence. Repeated success, not repeated failure

Confidence is based on success. A man who is always rejected by women will not have any confidence. Likewise a man who has a decent ratio of succeeding with women will have more confidence.

I actually think I just came up with a great bootcamp. Instead of sending guys out to approach a ton of

women they think are hot and get rejected over and over again hoping they are numb. The guys should actually be sent out to hit on fat women. There is a greater chance that the fat women will respond positively which in turn will build up a mans confidence. As confidence grows so can then the attractiveness of the women he's hitting on.

I may actually go out tomorrow and grind on some fatties. If I end up bringing one home, then at least I broke my dry spell.

no_face • 1 point • 14 July, 2017 02:53 AM

Females prefer alphas, they dont necessarily reject betas. Otherwise, 90% of the marriages would never occur. Also, you can get cheated on regardless if you are alpha or beta. This is an evolutionary defense against mate sterility and selection for higher genetic variance of offspring

Snazzy_Serval • 1 point • 14 July, 2017 03:57 AM

Yet many many beta men aren't getting laid.

Something isn't adding up.

The-Peter-Principle • 3 points • 13 July, 2017 03:22 AM

Great critique, surprised this is not higher up.

[deleted] • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 01:10 PM

Probably because it has the smell of self-promotion a little too strong. "I have a great program", complete with website link. Also because he tries to simplify/boil everything down to confidence and male dominance. Which do in fact have a large part. But saying you need to be more dominant isn't really helpful. You have to explain what dominance is, how those traits are expressed and so on. The same goes with confidence. You need to be more confident, but without explaining how. Instead you get come to my website, which really means come pay me money.

The-Peter-Principle • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 02:07 PM

Errr I meant no-face's critique not the OP. Your assessment of OP is dead on tho.

the_christian_grey[S] • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 02:31 PM

Oh come on, everything I posted and linked is free, including the AA program.

[deleted] 13 July, 2017 04:06 AM

[deleted]

Desadarius • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 07:22 AM

Because they want security, and use the beta for his cash money

[deleted] 13 July, 2017 05:52 AM

[deleted]

no_face • 3 points • 13 July, 2017 06:16 AM

ooh! Touched a raw nerve, did we?

NeoreactionSafe • 52 points • 12 July, 2017 05:29 PM

It's important to remember that through most of human history the men went off to war and most didn't come back.

So the more "normal" scenario has 2 women for each guy and very limited natural resources so the women used to have to compete against each other to get a man so she could reproduce.

It's the modern era of abundant food and lack of war that creates a situation where too many men are alive.

The whole transgender push is to get more men to "check out" and effectively kill themselves as men.

Transgender gives a totally different meaning to "Kill the Beta".

(kill the beta to allow the transgender to grow in it's place... like beta squared... beyond beta)

When we say "Kill the Beta" we mean to shake off the myths and realize that you must approach women and be a credible Alpha to get in.

mallardcove • 22 points • 12 July, 2017 06:28 PM

The whole transgender push is to get more men to "check out" and effectively kill themselves as men.

Pretty much. It's mainly pushed on straight white males. Straight white males are the enemy of the globalist and the establishment, so they push transgender garbage onto them in order to convert them from an enemy to an ally while sterilizing them at the same time.

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 12 points • 12 July, 2017 06:13 PM

Well and to make women infertile.

It's just another population council kinda thing to reduce population (of certain groups).

[deleted] 12 July, 2017 06:40 PM

[deleted]

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 7 points • 12 July, 2017 07:04 PM

Reading too much into what? I'm not saying anything about any individual trans person (although I did have a friend who wanted transition surgery, eventually did not end up doing it and when I pressed him because we are pretty good friends and I wanted to understand his motivation at a deep level, the fact that it would be helpful to other trans people because he'd be a good ambassador was no small part of his motivation).

I am talking about one of the richest families in the world, the rockefellers, who have been funding things like the population council to reduce fertility of population groups.

That's why it's an idea that's being pushed. I know the claim is that it's for trans acceptance, but I assert that it's about promotion of transgenderism as well, just as they promoted contraceptives and longer work decades ago to get women to have fewer children.

It's not about the people who buy the propaganda, it's about the people who create it. And that typically works by getting young activist people to buy into it and push it for their life through whatever profession they get into, whether it's education, media or otherwise.

It's not even a guess about the population council. It was in their own meeting notes, which included plans to make women depressed so they wouldn't have children. Look at it. Verify it. You'll see that it

checks out.

I agree that the hassle & burden thing is real, but it's another way that it is being pushed, not the only way, just like they had about 16 points of attack to reduce fertility per woman in the image I just shared.

rfu12 • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 07:02 AM

Your link above and this post are extremely interesting. Do you have a good book or website to recommend to learn more about this in general?

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 10:13 AM

It's a good question as it's one of the things I'm investigating further.

You can see their role in sterilizing peruvian women, as well as exacerbating the HIV problem in Uganda: <https://www.hli.org/resources/exposing-the-global-population-control/>

(The writer seems to think the reason is closeminded adherence to their own methods for the latter, I think making HIV prevention program fail is in line with the reason and motivation they were founded in the first place.)

I'm also asking around so I might come up with more/better sources.

Let me get back to you.

vengefully_yours • 4 points • 12 July, 2017 07:05 PM

I've had a similar experience with trans people. They're not on a crusade to force you to cut off your balls, they want to live their life. The bullshit and negative crap they have to deal with is overwhelming, nobody would ever do it on a whim. Most hide it their entire lives.

I know lots of girls who are child free, meaning they never want kids. ever. The reasons vary why they don't want kids, but they simply don't. I never wanted kids, but ended up getting trapped by a girl claiming to be on the pill back in 1993. I've simply never wanted to have them, but since I do now, they're fun to have around.

They aren't like most people, so what? They're not a threat, they don't want to be beaten for who they are is all

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 July, 2017 02:03 AM

LGBT is not truly Marxist. these people use the words of marx to entice the uneducated peasantry into following them into fascism.

the fascists tricked the whole wide world. they established the west, the Nazis AND the USSR. they did it through financing and the world economy, not obvious direct action.

its been a study on how to produce the best slave system and develop technology while maintaining the peasantry until they could be eliminated in the future.

instead of acts of direct hostility, they hide it with weapons of attrition, attacking our economic/social opportunity, our health, things like this, etc.

instead of seeking to heal, mental health institutions manipulate from a place of power.

this is the worst form of fascism the world has ever seen. people believe it is capitalism and

democracy when it is neither. if marx were alive today, he would say if religion is the opiate of the masses, then consumerism and media is the 100% pure coca and heroin extract straight to the vein.

its not Marxism, it was never Marxism. that was just the words they used to entice the poor and downtrodden to be their slaves; all propaganda in all nations is the same -- meaningless words pandering to people who will never get what they want.

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 5 points • 13 July, 2017 02:12 AM*

I don't mean this as a joke, but no, only about half of trans people want to live their life, as 40% try to commit suicide.

I know that the typical line is that this is due to discrimination, but there's no strong evidence to back that up.

The people that did transition that I know did not generally become happier people. The guy I know that considered it, but then decided not to, seemed a lot happier afterwards (much like when he left a turkish religious cult, being intense and unhappy during and happy and lighthearted after).

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 July, 2017 02:05 AM

no, its because of the obvious reasons. its the same thing as if you lost your dick in a railroad spike accident and killed yourself. Its just in this case its even worse, since it wasn't an accident, just an amazingly retarded decision you made. or even worse, your parents.

if my parents did that to me when I was too young, Id have killed them while they slept as a teenager and felt no guilt

[deleted] 12 July, 2017 09:46 PM

[deleted]

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 13 points • 13 July, 2017 02:04 AM*

"Queer means different, and being different is so much fun"

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SmpV_gFqOW4

Aimed at 4-8 year olds.

-
1. What caused your heterosexuality?
 2. How and when did you first decide you were a heterosexual?
 3. Is it possible your heterosexuality is just a phase you may grow out of?
 4. Does your heterosexuality stem from a neurotic fear of others of your own sex?
 7. Isn't it possible that all you need is a good gay lover?

From a question list they ask 12-13 year old kids.

<https://www.pcc.edu/resources/illumination/documents/heterosexual-quiz-glbtc-oppression-exercise.pdf>

Look at how bad someone treats someone else, until they find out they're trans, and then treat them almost with a royal deference:

<https://youtu.be/x7vHvclMgYI?t=112>

Or watch people trip over themselves to defend a threat of violence because it comes from a trans person:

https://youtu.be/-DE_WOCHITk?t=328

You may not have seen it, but others have. You can look at these and see the kind of thing I'm talking about, though most of course happens subtly at schools.

Besides, I've shown a historical accurate document that literally shows one of the richest families in the world wanting to push similar things, so to deny that some people try to push it and proselytize it shouldn't be a point of discussion. There people that do.

I don't have a problem with people that are trans, want to be trans, etcetera, but I do have a problem that want to push people to be trans for bad motives.

SmallCockSissy • 2 points • 12 July, 2017 10:51 PM

I am really curious to hear more about this view of the transgendered. One if my reasons for reading into TRP is to gain an understanding of LGBT's role in the larger picture. Also is there anything of note about the dominant bi men who fuck TG and gay men?

I don't necessarily consider myself transgendered, but I don't feel like a real man (despite genetically being one) and that sometimes leads to me being more feminine and definitely taking the submission feminine role sexually and in relationships.

NeoreactionSafe • 18 points • 12 July, 2017 10:58 PM

Remember that the Blue Pill is emotional programming.

Basically it's "Monkey see, Monkey do."

They achieve it by what we call "Game" but others call "Magic" and that is to distract your mind (example television) then while you are in a trance state they introduce some idea into your subconscious mind.

This is called "normalization".

So they feed you crap and over time you embrace the crap.

They feed gay... pretty soon gay is accepted.

They feed transgender... pretty soon transgender is accepted.

The scary thing is *how effective* this is... it's highly efficient.

The victim ultimately is unaware his "programmed self" is fake.

SmallCockSissy • 2 points • 12 July, 2017 11:05 PM

I have always felt like it is a biological driver that makes me the way I am and felt that way from quite a young age. I have seen that there are studies that the brains of gay men when scanned are closer to that of female brains than male brains, however I am in no way an expert in how to read or analyse such a thing.

So you appear to be saying that LGBT is nurture over nature? Can you expand on how such a mechanism might work? And do you consider LGBT as Blue Pill?

NeoreactionSafe • 5 points • 13 July, 2017 12:02 AM

Male - XY

Female - XX

...everything else is imaginary.

The only exceptions are the **authentic** hermaphrodites.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hermaphrodite>

Red Pill - "Reals before Feelz"

Blue Pill - "Feelz before Reals"

Wide is the gate to myth. (Blue Pill)

Narrow is the gate to Truth. (Red Pill)

SmallCockSissy • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 12:05 AM

Male - XY Female - XX

I am fairly sure that there is a lot more concrete in an individual's nature than just 1 set of chromosomes.

NeoreactionSafe • 10 points • 13 July, 2017 12:50 AM*

DNA actually turns out to be like "Object Oriented Programming".

What that means is all living creatures share much of the same "toolbox" of code chunks.

An example is the GMO.

What they do is pull the "chunk" that performs an action in animals and replace that with an equivalent "chunk" removed from a plant.

You end up with a plant that behaves in ways like an animal.

If you get the XX it will create a female.

If you get the XY it will create a male.

Only in the imagination does someone violate the Truth and think other than their biology.

The Blue Pill is myth... emotional programming... an illusion... a figment of the imagination.

There are no stoic transgenders. (to go down that road is to follow your subjective feelings)

The Blue Pill mythology is a **highjacking** of your natural biology.

It's brainwashing.

<https://youtu.be/mYyg17Jc23c>

SmallCockSissy • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 01:03 AM

I understand that, and am not suggesting it isn't true.

To use your analogy (which to nit pick sounds more like the composite pattern than pure OOP polymorphism) there are many other categories of chunks beyond XX/XY that define how a person will behave.

I get that some will be nature (i.e genetics) others will be nurture, but most will be a combination of both, i.e. your genetics provide the predisposition and the environment provides the conditions for it to flourish. A perfect storm if you will.

You seem fairly certain that LGBT is a purely nurture thing, which I am willing to accept, but to do so I would need to show some evidence and potentially an explanation as to how it occurs and why it only effects some people.

NeoreactionSafe • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 01:12 AM

An unenlightened person cannot know his own motivations.

If you live "in the dark" and are emotionally programmed then you have no idea that what you think is "you" was actually programmed into you.

You lack memory *because the abuse occurred young*.

<http://educate-yourself.org/mc/IlluminatiFormulaindex.shtml>

...just to get some ideas.

[deleted] • 4 points • 13 July, 2017 02:44 AM*

I like to fuck women. I like to fuck men. I have zero desire to be fucked by a man. My motivation is that I enjoy sticking my cock into tight holes.

Roman society stated that the man who penetrated was not less of a man

regardless of which hole he was fucking. The fuckees were observed to be feminine regardless of their actual sex therefore less valuable to society. This was all well before feminism/bp ruined modern society. How do you reconcile my statement of male primate sexuality with the statement you have made.

Obviously I know that fucking a man results in zero reproductive possibility. Where is the evolutionary psych in my desires? I'll add that I greatly enjoy Peterson's profound work.

TRP does not explicitly address male bisexuality. I've found that trp principles apply directly to feminine males as well as they do to females.

Edit: trp must actualize masculine heterosexuality before considering male bisexuality.

SmallCockSissy • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 01:41 AM

It is entirely possible. The site suggests reading could be dangerous. Would you be able to give a high level explanation of what it contains?

UnKnownSurviving • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 02:55 AM

Yeah. Pretty much brainwashing. All of it is.

NeoreactionSafe • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 12:04 PM

I'm afraid this guy has accepted his programming without question.

He comes here hoping that the Red Pill can somehow enable his gender confusion, but all we can offer is a painful waking up experience.

By getting sidetracked into gender confusion you are so distracted by that you can't focus on understanding authentic women and their confused Hamster Wheel rationalizations. It makes you blind.

UnKnownSurviving • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 12:17 PM

Pretty much. I was giving information to guys here, when they are serious. This one is strange. And kind of ticks me off.

He wants to serve men in the same as women, in which he is asking. I explained the differences with men in men's roles, with women's roles, and lastly, feminine men who are less value to society, but has the same value of women.

Once he asked, and even admitted the roles of these specific individuals, I realized I can't help him anymore. I just can't. There's no way to even help him. So, I leave it there.

the_christian_grey[S] • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 03:45 PM

I appreciate your openness to find the truth rather than blindly accepting whatever sounds the nicest. I'm no expert on the matter, so take it with a grain of salt, but here's my theory:

Submissive male homosexuality (or transgenderism, which isn't much different) is about eroticizing feelings of sexual inferiority. A protective mechanism, perhaps, since learning to enjoy being fucked by men is more pleasant than being a self-hating incel. I've read studies showing that daily meditation can change brain structure; so I wouldn't automatically write off differences in brain structure to nature rather than nurture.

Modern society exacerbates these feelings of sexual inferiority like crazy. Everybody watches porn with buff dudes with bigger dicks than 99% of the population. Women are getting more promiscuous, so if you fuck a girl and weren't as good in bed as her last 20 lovers, she'll treat you with disdain.

And I think feminists/liberals do push homosexuality and transgenderism, because they have long seen the nuclear family as a threat to their utopian visions. This is stated explicitly in the Communist Manifesto iirc. They also seem to go out of their way to try to make men feel inferior. Feminists blather on constantly about "male fragility" while at the same time trying to convince us that masculinity is "toxic" and turn us all into emasculated housecats, while pushing masculinized female characters from every direction in TV and movies. If you ever argue with a feminist, she'll almost always tell you that you're insecure in your masculinity and/or that you have a small dick (often immediately after shrieking about how terrible it is to "body shame").

It would probably be helpful to stop watching porn, start lifting weights, engage in other masculine activities (shoot guns, play football, etc.), avoid unsupportive people, and do visualization exercises and affirmations and hypnosis to beat into your subconscious that you in fact are a real, strong, masculine man regardless of what you may have thought before.

SmallCockSissy • 3 points • 13 July, 2017 10:42 PM

Thank you for taking the time to share that. There is definitely truth in how I react to feelings of sexual weakness (is maybe a little closer to how I experience it than "inferiority"). There is definitely a correlation with the gap in perceived masculinity and my attraction and levels of arousal.

That being said, despite my psychology, I don't think many would know I am gay simply by looking at me or even talking with me. I'm not particularly feminine in my manner and I am not slight, both of which probably count against me in my SMV in my particular market. I already don't watch much porn, I lift 3 times a week and am a big follower of sport and socially with men participate as an equal. I don't hide that I am gay, but I also don't feel the need to actively broadcast that either.

I couldn't agree more about feminism though. I am fine with what I call pure feminism (i.e. simple equality of opportunity, no gender is actively discriminated against by law) as that essentially allows the natural order to take place. That is far from how most approach feminism, which is a full of hypocrisy. I believe a dominant male lead society is the best society.

The idea of mental exercises and hypnosis is an interesting one. I definitely want to understand and challenge perceptions but I am not sure if I want to try and change (if I could). It is how I always remember feeling and I am happy. It may just be me being willfully ignorant as some have suggested, and to be honest I don't know the other side of the coin so it may be a far happier/satisfying/rewarding existence.

the_christian_grey[S] • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 11:59 PM

Maybe a holdover from childhood experience then. I'm very skeptical of the claim that

being gay is genetic simply because gays tend not to pass on their genes. Regardless, it would seem natural to me that any man would be happiest when he feels strong and masculine, though of course I can only speak for myself. Anyway you're clearly very intelligent and open to new ideas, so I'm sure you'll figure out what's best for you.

SmallCockSissy • 2 points • 14 July, 2017 12:24 AM

I am very skeptical of that claim as well. Being gay seems unlikely to be a genetic trait or, at the very least, a solely genetic trait. There has to be some level of environmental component, whether that be developmentally in the womb, social or specific individual trauma. I certainly can't remember a trauma, but there is much evidence to suggest that developmental traumas are often blocked out.

Thanks again for your time and thoughts.

WerewolfFW • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 06:18 AM

I'm not really getting the hate on "game" - no one is arguing that looks don't factor in but it is key to be able to GAME/FLIRT with the opposite sex in order to make it anywhere a lot of that is playing to their bullshit emotions about fairy tales. Elliott Rodgers was considered moderately attractive by most but still had 0 social skills.

sadomasochrist • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 10:09 PM

To be honest, I think the biggest dispute to the idea that TV is such an effective indoctrination tool was Trump's victory. He was treated as a joke till the 11th hour.

It has influence, but there is ebb and sway in the world. And that power is seemingly much more powerful than what they can pump through TV and the internet.

MrAnderzon • 2 points • 12 July, 2017 07:12 PM

So war and transgender movement is to have less men? Very interesting

s_leben • 18 points • 12 July, 2017 09:37 PM

This is really well explained. Sidebar material IMO.

[deleted] • 8 points • 13 July, 2017 06:11 AM

It's generic nonsense you can find anywhere. And it's just luring you to click his website.

[deleted] • 5 points • 12 July, 2017 11:36 PM

Link to the lecture sequence? This guy is fucking gold but holy shit he's got a lot of content

Hitleresque • 4 points • 13 July, 2017 02:27 AM

Well, he's an active tenured professor at a pretty renowned institution. Even though academia has been infiltrated by anti-intellectuals you still find a lot exceptional minds. Having attended UofT I'm proud of what he's done, he's red-pilling younger men in the thousands.

the_christian_grey[S] • 3 points • 12 July, 2017 11:44 PM

Very true. Link is in the first paragraph of the original article (at the bottom of the post).

[deleted] • 9 points • 13 July, 2017 05:50 AM

"you find yourself face to face with a famous rock star, you are instinctively going to judge his place on the dominance hierarchy as higher than yours"

Not if it's that guy from Nickelback

NietzscheExplosion • 3 points • 12 July, 2017 09:42 PM

40% is too high it. Most of history it was 20%.

More importantly, have you been LAID Lately?

dr_warlock • 3 points • 12 July, 2017 09:48 PM*

Finally, a quality post.

However, the third paragraph, though it may be true, is off-putting. It's regurgitated by pseudo scientists with no infield experience which then conjures a feeling of reluctance to read on. It has been ruined by overuse.

bossplayaintraining • 3 points • 13 July, 2017 03:45 AM

You can argue that nowadays trying to fuck a girl is life threatening... what with the girl hanging the threat of accusing you of rape & destroying your life & future prospects at will, not to mention the countless white knights she can send after you (both civilians & police) who have the weapons & mentality to kill you if they think you're mistreating her.

We're all betas in this system, no way around it.

the_christian_grey[S] • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 03:50 PM

You're right, there is always that risk. But any real risk from just talking to a girl is very remote. That said, I never approach girls in front of police or security.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 12 July, 2017 08:23 PM

[deleted]

the_christian_grey[S] • 10 points • 12 July, 2017 08:37 PM

Exactly. I'm only analyzing the "alpha fucks" side of the mating strategy (because who wants to be on the "beta bucks" side?). And I don't think "relationship attraction" actually exists. Women are wired to seek provision in addition to sex from men, and if they can't get it from an alpha male (which would be ideal), they'll settle for a beta.

fitalt47 • 1 point • 12 July, 2017 09:04 PM

It may be worthwhile to edit that into your main post a source many people have been confused by it and it seems to be the main issue in the post.

fitalt47 • 1 point • 12 July, 2017 09:04 PM

It may be worthwhile to edit that into your main post a source many people have been confused by it and it seems to be the main issue in the post.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

whatsthisgarg • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 04:07 AM

Women are perfectly happy to get provision to the exclusion of sex, hence the phenomenon of beta orbiters and cuckolded husbands.

This is true NOW, now that conditions are such as they are, that women can indulge their basic and fundamental LAZINESS and SELFISHNESS.

Women (and people in general in the West) are just entirely too comfortable. So women aren't motivated to be interested in sex unless 1. they are ovulating or 2. they are being agitated by proximity to a hawt dood.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 12 July, 2017 09:39 PM

[deleted]

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 12 July, 2017 09:59 PM

[deleted]

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 12 July, 2017 10:31 PM

[deleted]

yomo86 • 1 point • 12 July, 2017 10:24 PM

Just my popular science knowledge talking but this dichotomy does not bear the ultimate theory.

The human is a species, much like the chimp who is exposed to an enviroment that can only be conquered by intellect, strength and social cohesion.

Being the caviest caveman does not yield the best results per se. Kings who were genetically disadvantaged, just look at the czar bloodline, and physically weak mated on a regular basis. Same goes for almost all historical seducers. Being fit and to some degree intimidating is just one of the major corner stones.

sadomasochrist • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 10:14 PM

AF\BB is actually scientifically validated. It's one of the few areas where bluepill has had to admit it's real, but then they roll out a whole bunch of bullshit trying to sugar coat it.

They've come up with a variety of different reasons to make it sound as soft and non-threatening as possible, but none of the experiments come up with opposing results.

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 4 points • 12 July, 2017 06:12 PM

I do wonder what effect the high mortality rate due to combat and building aquaducts has on this.

Not that I question that there might have been a lot of foreveralones, but it might be half early death/half foreveralones.

the_christian_grey[S] • 1 point • 12 July, 2017 06:21 PM

Does anyone have a numerical estimate of that mortality rate?

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 5 points • 12 July, 2017 06:27 PM

To look at just Rome, which probably is a bad representative, but at least we have stats about it, it seems that mortality rates between men and women weren't too dissimilar:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Demography_of_the_Roman_Empire#Mortality

So I think we can safely put my previous musing aside.

Hitleresque • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 02:19 AM

It's a pretty poor analogue sadly. We'd need data as far back as 200 000 years, approximately the time when early humans begin to appear in the fossil record. Female mate choice is still a really good hypothesis, and it's easily observable in everyday life, so it likely plays at least some role.

fukuall69 • 2 points • 12 July, 2017 09:51 PM

So with this logic, do you think your smv will be higher and you'll have more success if you're in a group of guys who are lower smv than you compared to being in a group who has higher smv than you?

the_christian_grey[S] • 4 points • 12 July, 2017 11:07 PM

Yes, absolutely. But you have to be a little careful about defining your group. Going to the bar with a bunch of nerds isn't going to help your cause, because the relevant group is every guy in the bar, not just your group of friends. But if you're the only cool guy on an island full of girls and nerds, you're going to be the top dog.

sadomasochrist • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 10:15 PM

Yes, this is the fundamental point of SMV that is lost on a lot of guys. SMV is not static, it is dynamic.

jetpuffedpanda • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 03:57 AM

I love stuff like this. Thanks for the cool post!

NMF_ • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 12:32 PM

In order to impregnate a thousand women in 9 months you're looking at like 5 nuts a day. Aggressive LOL but can you imagine

[deleted] • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 02:33 PM

in one of Peterson's talks, he mentions that prior to homosapien and advanced primates, females tend to be completely indiscriminate of who they mate with. chimps/apes/monkeys indiscriminately mate. that's why it comes down to males marking territory and mate guarding. hypergamy is what changed the game for homosapien. the mutation that caused women to stop indiscriminately mating, and instead only mate with the top 10-20% of available mates massively increased the quality of subsequent generations.

monogamy was a bolt-on by organized societies because it encourages betas to work and support a larger tax base. it promised betas that if they commit their resources to a woman and offspring, that they too could procreate. yes, paternity fraud was always a thing, but replacing monogamy with divorce rape is exactly why

men are going their own way. people say these men are failing to launch and need to man up, but betas don't just lose the benefits of monogamy... they get punished for chasing it.

the_christian_grey[S] • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 03:58 PM

Yes, exactly. Thanks for the addition.

sadomasochrist • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 10:18 PM

Have you seen any references of what they believe that mutation is? I think I have a hypothesis of what that is and how it functions. I'd be interested to here if anyone has done research on the underlying mechanics of hypergamy.

DoesNotMatterAnymore • 2 points • 14 July, 2017 09:54 AM

I don't want to over hype Jordan Peterson, but if you are fed up with TRP after a while (and neutrally you SHOULD), start shifting to proper science like JBP.

GeauxTigers1933 • 2 points • 14 July, 2017 04:54 PM

Excellent article with very relevant information. Thanks for sharing.

Shaman6624 • 2 points • 15 July, 2017 11:04 AM

To add my own view on this: The real characteristic of high dominance men is that they have learned that they are appreciated if they show their real intentions unapologetically. I like this article because it gives you some things to do to get on that positive spiral.

One thing I've been thinking about is that you should take it step by step and apply it throughout all your life. What you've got to do is:

1. Be Conscious of your reaction to things and why you react this way.
2. Accept them and fully be aware of them.
3. challenge them (think of alternative thoughts way to see it.)
4. Ingrain the new paradigm by acting on it. (Even if it's scary)

6d65746164656c7461 • 2 points • 21 July, 2017 09:53 PM

This translates well why lifting or learning a martial art does wonders to your confidence. Or learning any skill, for that matter. You see yourself going through the ranks of the practitioners of the activity you are learning. You see yourself climbing the hierarchy ladder. And that extrapolates to the rest of your life.

Great insight.

[deleted] 5 August, 2017 03:18 PM

[deleted]

the_christian_grey[S] • 2 points • 5 August, 2017 08:48 PM

Yeah I think you're on the right track. Certainly one alpha male does not get every female. He can only handle so many at a time. I think a better way of thinking about it is that the alpha can get every female he wants. So basically after the alpha gets his fill, the betas get whatever is left over.

I don't think it's possible to have two men who are equal in the same situation. This is just my understanding, so don't take it as gospel, but it seems to me alpha/beta status is context specific. So the shaman is the alpha in the temple, the hunting pack leader is the alpha in the hunting pack, etc. But as soon as both men are in the

same room, they will subconsciously evaluate each other to figure out who is the alpha in the mixed scenario.

This is related to the old pickup artist AMOG (alpha male of group) concept. A mixed set will have an established alpha male. When the PUA comes into the group, his status is not set within the context of the group, so if he wants access to the group's women, he has to get the AMOG to subconsciously step down and recognize him as the new alpha male.

[deleted] 6 August, 2017 09:10 AM

[deleted]

the_christian_grey[S] • 1 point • 9 August, 2017 03:23 AM

I've never read that one. I've read the Evolution of Desire, which is probably the same material. I wouldn't get too caught up in who our supposed evolutionary ancestors are. I used the elephant seal example just to illustrate a really simple example of a dominance hierarchy. But it doesn't really matter how chimps and bonobos act, because we can watch how actual humans act. Human sexual selection clearly occurs by way of dominance hierarchies.

PlanB_pedofile • 4 points • 13 July, 2017 01:56 AM

wanna throw a small tldr in here.

there are many hierarchies in which someone can dominate. be it wealth, fame, body, looks.

find your societal hierarchy. dominate in it.

if you are a leader in your club, you will gain the attraction of women whom are in that same club.

Mudpielol • 2 points • 12 July, 2017 07:45 PM

At least get the man's name right ^^ it's Peterson, not Petersen.

dark_dragoon10 • 2 points • 13 July, 2017 03:06 AM

Step One: Realize that hitting on girls is not actually dangerous

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2017/07/11/american-tourist-killed-in-greece-was-fatally-beaten-over-a-selfie-police-say/>

the_christian_grey[S] • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 03:55 PM

I should have said "much less dangerous than your subconscious thinks it is". That primal drive to physically harm "unworthy" men hitting on women still exists, to be sure, and comes out occasionally. But thanks to modern legal systems, it is a rare occurrence.

livinlavidal0ca • 1 point • 12 July, 2017 07:07 PM

Yore not saying only 40% of men today have sex are you? That's just historical?

the_christian_grey[S] • 2 points • 12 July, 2017 08:29 PM

Correct. Though it would be interesting to know what that number looks like today. Of course now we can't treat reproduction as a proxy for sex, since birth control is so common.

FormlessAllness • 1 point • 12 July, 2017 10:19 PM

Please note a lot of woman died giving birth resulting in the men whom could marry to remarry. In addition,

rape and sex slaves should also be accounted for. So while this history data is useful, it does not give use a clear view of modern mating dynamics in the western world.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 01:16 PM*

I disagree with the idea that faking confidence is bad. On the contrary faking confidence is a great way to learn to be confident. Practicing how confident men behave, speaking slowly and clearly vs rushing out your words, taking your time to do things vs hurrying, actually help you become more confident. That's how confident men act, it's an air that is projected. It can be learned by practicing.

Saying that "faking confidence" is bad for some reason sounds to me almost like "just be yourself"...

Agree on the dominance part being very important and huge even, but it isn't everything. The CEO who comes home to find his wife taking it in the ass from the pool boy who makes minimum wage isn't getting cucked from not being dominant enough with other men.

MattyAnon • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 01:17 PM

Other hierarchies are less obvious. A rock star or a movie star may be high in a dominance hierarchy, despite perhaps not having anyone formally working for him

That's because in humans, *status* is more important than dominance.

In fact dominance without status is actively discouraged. We allow men to dominate us only if they have the status to go with it.

nd it only compounds itself. Every time he gets rejected, it reinforces his assessment of himself as low on the dominance hierarchy. It's a very difficult cycle to break.

I find it weird that we haven't evolved to fake the signals better, given how important they are. I suggest that showing these signals has a large cost - ie other men attacking us for it. And therefore behaving in a high status way without other men accepting that status is costly.

[deleted] 13 July, 2017 03:40 PM

[deleted]

MattyAnon • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 05:51 PM

Would these guys still be "alpha" in your book?

We use alpha to mean lots of things.

"You dominate in the ghetto but you don't earn shit" vs "You earn fuckloads but you can't handle a fight". is either of these alpha? Who the fuck even cares?

I'll clarify further, "Appointed Pseudo Alphas", are winning in America because the "unspoken rules" and "legal system" have been designed to prevent "aggressive retaliation" by disgruntled underlings

Yeah... brute force is more or less illegal because people band together and outlaw it for the sake of productivity.

Is this a beta or an alpha move?

It just doesn't quite make any sense to call things "alpha" or not in this context.

Back then, they HAD TO CONSIDER the PHYSICAL consequences of being a "Robber Barron" or swindling their employees. Today they do not have to consider these potential consequences AT ALL

Without the protection of the government, most of the most brutal alphas you know would be dead because they'd lose to someone else.

I don't buy the argument that a police force is a bad thing.

NegativeSinX • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 03:39 PM

And how does a man go about Step Two?

the_christian_grey[S] • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 03:56 PM

Step Two: Convince yourself that you are attractive to women

Ok, for step one let's say you've talked to 100 women and been rejected by all of them. You've also managed to subdue (to a large extent) your fear of talking to women. Your subconscious still believes that you are low on the dominance hierarchy and unworthy of attractive women, and those 100 rejections didn't help. Now you have to start working to remove that self-image.

What you need is a large supply of experiences during which you were successful with women. If you have a negative self image, chances are you have many more negative experiences than positive. This reinforces your negative self image. If you hit on a girl, your negative self image is going to turn her off, and she's going to reject you. It's a catch 22. You're out of luck...right?

NO! This part of your brain can be hacked. You can trick your brain by implanting experiences that you never actually had in real life, as well as by repeating the good experiences you have had in the past. As it turns out, this part of your brain is incapable of distinguishing reality from fantasy. All you have to do is visualize. Play in your mind scenarios, which can be real OR imagined, in which you're interacting with people and they are reacting positively to you. I recommend imagining interactions with both men and women, since both are related to your place on the dominance hierarchy.

This is called a visualization exercise, and the more you repeat it, the better. Many professional athletes and powerful businessmen use visualization exercises to enhance their performance. It works. I've had great success using them to help me in my interactions with women as well. The more often you do it, the better it will work. The new positive experiences will eventually overwhelm the old negative experiences, and your subconscious will gradually move you up the dominance hierarchy.

Another exercise that I've found helpful is watching infield videos of guys successfully picking up girls. But—this is important—you have to be able to identify with the guys in the videos. If you watch the video and think “He’s much better looking than me. I could never do that”, you’re not helping. But if you think “hey, I could do that!” and actually imagine yourself doing it, you’re giving your subconscious a positive experience, with the added benefit of getting a better idea of how women respond in the real world.

You can assess your progress by gauging your own instinctual reactions to real or imagined interactions with other people. For example, let's say you pass a pretty girl on the street. Visualize what her response would be if you went up to introduce yourself to her. Don't try to push it one way or the other, just let your subconscious create the image.

If the first image you get is of the girl being attracted to you and happy that you introduced yourself, your self-imposed position on the dominance hierarchy has risen. If, on the other hand, the first thing you imagine is her responding with “Ew, get away from me, creep!”, then you clearly have more work to do. You can reassess every once in a while during your visualization practice, and be sure to appreciate the progression through the many shades of grey between believing you're an ugly repulsive worm and believing you're James Bond.

Bohemiann • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 08:51 PM

What if you have this "high social dominance" and you are still anxious? Like you subconsciously ignore it because your not fitting the shoes yet?

MonsterinNL1986 • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 10:54 PM

If approach anxiety is related to feeling that a girl is higher value than you as a man, then why I have witnessed many good-looking guys, for instance in the Netherlands (my country) and Germany feel the pressure and fear that they could get rejected by the girls even lower SMV than them?

Mritunjaya239 • 1 point • 31 October, 2017 01:24 PM

So well written. Wonderful. Please accept tip of my hat buddy.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 July, 2017 10:36 PM

100 % bullshit. Grade a bullshit. My brother has a stutter, can't talk to chick's, and is broke. What he does have is extremely good looks. He gets approached by girls every single damn day. He is nothing you described and get all the ass he wants. I have low self esteem and have he'll talking to girls, no trouble getting ass. Looks make all the difference, I'm the talk dark and handsome dude you described and very rarely get rejected.

masomenos123456789 • 1 point • 14 July, 2017 11:00 PM

Do you and him get approached by average looking girls (5s or 6s) or do you also get approached regularly by hot ones (8s or 9s)?

Desadarius • 1 point • 13 July, 2017 07:43 AM*

Pretty sure the "alpha" doesn't compare himself to others. People view him as superior not because he views himself as such, but because he doesn't give a shit about others in the first place.

Don't justify an inferiority complex by saying everyone naturally compares themselves to others.

Never in my life have I seen someone I would label as a "natural alpha" bend to anyone else, even if it's someone they would no doubt (if they struggled with an inferiority complex) view as superior.

And this mindset of not giving a shit is achievable by anyone. It happens when you start giving a shit about and chasing what's important to you, a.k.a. not dedicating your life to chasing pussy.

TyrannicalWill • -1 points • 13 July, 2017 12:43 AM

This sub is all about catering to women because vagina, it's primitive and desperate

El_Duquee • 0 points • 13 July, 2017 12:30 AM*

I like to see that all the red pill members are anthropological and prehistorical experts and they go as far as to say if primitive people were one way or another, a thing that true scholars don't really know and they just hypothesise.

Paleolithic was this way, neolithic changed this and that. Prehistoric men were ruthless savages and only the alpha male, like animals, would be able to pass on his genes... Do you guys have a degree on that? Really I have studied a few modules about prehistory and asked my professor about this fact, that only 40% of men reproduced, and he said that it is impossible to know for sure. And he is an renowned expert in Europe.

livinlavidal0ca • -2 points • 12 July, 2017 10:08 PM

Very unscientific here but I'm gonna throw out a number like 96% of men have HAD sex but maybe around

70% get it on any sort of consistent basis. Wonder what others think?

psychyness • 4 points • 12 July, 2017 11:48 PM

Way less than 96% of men have HAD sex. 75% at best.

Conceited-Monkey • 0 points • 14 July, 2017 08:10 PM

So, you first state that sexual access is determined by your place in the hierarchy, and it is really hard to fake women on what your place is. Then you offer advice on how to fake it.