

do you think the current state of mating is due to technology, cultural conditioning or nature?

August 21, 2022 | 3 upvotes | by [no_bling_just_ding](#)

/r/AllPillDebate/comments/wtzx1t/do_you_think_the_current_state_of_mating_is_due/

Archived from [theredarchive.com](https://www.theredarchive.com)

Comments

BoogersAndSugar • 11 points • 21 August, 2022 01:52 PM

Basically women make their own money and don't have to prostitute themselves for survival anymore, so they can afford to only get with guys they're physically attracted to, and they can afford to stay single if they can't get one of those guys. Generation Z is the first generation of women to fully embrace the new sexual marketplace. Only problem is, the vast majority of women are only physically attracted to the same small pool of men, which leaves an ever-growing number of leftover males who don't get picked, and society can only have so many of those guys before it becomes destabilized.

Eyesofmalice • 4 points • 21 August, 2022 03:37 PM

I agree. only to build upon what you said, we have also observed that usually women also are attracted to the canonical standard of masculinity propagated by the patriarchy.

I also think that while women have earned the ability to access resources and education, the system still sees them as social tokens, therefore even if they still earn their own money, they feed the traditionally patriarchal figure of the guy that has a ton of money, part of the petit bourgeoisie and usually European or white in general terms.

I think this is the product of our current society's trend to further impoverish the middle and lower classes, making it so that for a woman right now to have a shot at a luxurious life, even if she works hard, even if she's talented, she still has to prostitute herself in some capacity.

I think that's why onlyFans is such a relevant phenomenon. For many middle and lower class women, the only asset that they can make a good living with is their bodies. And is not on them necessarily but rather the cultural architecture of the spaces they inhabit.

no_bling_just_ding[S] • 4 points • 21 August, 2022 04:14 PM*

propagated by the patriarchy.

Call me a Debbie Downer but I don't think toppling the patriarchy isn't going to make women get wet for 5'5" chin-recessed broke surentras who work in call centers as I think the patriarchy is just a boogeyman for feminists. Men don't have much power if any at all just by being male.

Really, calling them "social tokens" is just another way of saying that even as we treat them as autonomous worker units, they continue to enjoy the privilege of being desired just *for being there*.

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 August, 2022 01:35 AM

You're not wrong women being desired for just being there is a privilege.

But do you really think in a world where most people weren't living paycheck to paycheck, women wouldn't choose different mates?

For a lot of women, choosing the guy with resources is survival, not fun.

I read a study ages back that found women with their own resources focused less on money/socioeconomic status and more on looks, youth, & compatibility...much the way men with resources do.

SaltyGeekyLifter • 2 points • 22 August, 2022 11:50 AM

With regards social structure, men date across and down.

Women date across and up.

While there are exceptions, that appears to be hardwired across cultures.

So, a woman who is a rich successful lawyer may well fuck the pool guy who is her age if he's buff. But there's no way she wants him as a husband.

Women find men with less resources than them unattractive as a long term mate.

It is what it is.

no_bling_just_ding[S] • 1 point • 22 August, 2022 09:59 AM

For a lot of women, choosing the guy with resources is survival, not fun. I read a study ages back that found women with their own resources focused less on money/socioeconomic status and more on looks, youth, & compatibility...much the way men with resources do.

yep im aware of this, you described betabuxxers coping that their woman actually wanted to be with them because they're good at bribing her

Eyesofmalice • 1 point • 22 August, 2022 02:13 AM

Well I don't meant to be antagonistic. I do think that a different social structure can shape wildly our dating reality.

<https://mondediplo.com/2021/07/07women-socialism>

We have evidence that suggests that dating culture in communist countries were vastly different to that of our own capitalistic west. I don't mean to say that in our current system women can just find the people you described attractive, but the very idea that for such a huge part of the population, working at a call center is their only resort, and where artistic and artisanal pursuits are mocked, is part of the reason why they're not seen as desirable.

besides I also think that globalization also changed the way in which we see mates. for example in the early chronicles of people who came to america, part of the job colonizers did was to kill the men that were important for a tribe, that doesn't only impact the amount of warriors available for the colonized, it also changes the entire set of values which are desired in the community. I mention it simply because I like to see the problem of dating as a societal problem instead of an instinctual one. Its kinda hard for us to imagine what dating would be in different system because our own ideas of justice and desired are shaped by a colonizer mindset.

You might be right that it might be too late now to undo the damage that was done, i mean hell is uproot the blackpill, im not optimistic about the possibility myself. White people kind of got lucky and had a few very important victories at the time when global expansion was made available and the east had been hit hard, and they have established a hegemonical power for the last three centuries that is also reflected in our western ideals of beauty. Now, I'm not a blue piller nor a liberal, I don't believe that in a more fair society everyone will find love and we can all be loved, I don't think that to be the case. I do however think that the focus on love being the determiner of your social value is a western ideal imposed by europe. You can see it in all artistic works from classical antiquity until the enlightenment. While in contrast, in the east solitude and autonomy were the mark of a truly exceptional individual.

People's attitudes towards femininity were drastically different as well, as well as masculinity. For an example see how "the diary of lady murasaki" being such a profoundly influential work of art in the east while in the west we were burning women.

Lastly I wholeheartedly agree that beautiful women were desired for existing, and their character or desires were pretty much irrelevant in art. But that was in relation to men, and not only any man. Men were seen as tokens too, tokens to be spent in order to prove masculinity. When you mention the 5'5 call center worker you display the same carelessness towards their lives as Odysseus shows to Penelope's suitors. You see them as men who only exist to be destroyed in order to legitimize the life of the truly exceptional men. Which is a very colonial and european mindset. In the west, the idea of the lower members of society as the guardians of wisdom and virtue came about seven hundred years earlier than it did in europe. You could argue shakespeare was the first one to even pay any mind (in art history) to the lives of nobodys, while in the east there is a notorious tradition of "nobodys" being the keepers of enlightenmnet.

Just to conclude, Maybe people like me who are hopeless in the dating scene won't ever see our chances improve due to our genetic markings. if that's the case however, we ought to fight for higher wages and more free time instead of blaming women who are far from being the group of people who take the most impactful decisions in our society.

SaltyGeekyLifter • 1 point • 22 August, 2022 12:00 PM

You're hopeless on the dating scene because - I assume from your comments - you consider yourself a male feminist.

This makes you far more likely to be a simp. And women tend to have contempt for simps.

Read some Dawkins. Understand why women *around the world* tend to find male strength and male dominance attractive, (despite what they say), and why men *around the world* tend to find female fertility markers attractive.

Once you understand the Why, things will become clear.

That, or bury your head in political horseshit and stay single, Tovarisch. □

Eyesofmalice • 2 points • 22 August, 2022 12:23 PM

Dawkins?

Not having that idiot on my bookshelf thank you.

SaltyGeekyLifter • 0 points • 22 August, 2022 12:23 PM

Then your head stays buried.

Eyesofmalice • 3 points • 22 August, 2022 12:27 PM

Right. I rather be in the company if Kierkegaard and Heidegger than that of Dawkins.

Besides thinking your personality matters in the dating scene is a major cope from red pillers who'll just get women who don't desire them and have to gym max and cope with not being truly exceptional.

This is why I can't take red pillers seriously. They're as deluded as blue pillers, they think that by reading people like Dawkins and drinking whisky they'll overcome bad genes.

SaltyGeekyLifter • 1 point • 22 August, 2022 04:37 PM

And once again, your head stays buried.

Cool. More pussy for the rest of us. □

jqs1337 • 1 point • 18 September, 2022 10:39 AM

Bruh, last time you felt a pussy was your mothers.

[deleted] • 3 points • 22 August, 2022 01:34 AM

This is such a kind & empathetic response to women on OnlyFans that I officially stan for AllPillDebate. Thank you for being reasonable & seeing people as the tokens trapped in the system they're in, not dehumanizing them for the choices they're forced to make.

The big question to me is are women actually attracted to rich men or are they forced to choose them because they're broke otherwise? No one ever seems to mention that when they claim women are gold diggers. Plenty of women choose a guy they don't really want because they would be destitute otherwise, and it hurts to know that.

Eyesofmalice • 1 point • 22 August, 2022 02:31 AM

Well, I think psychology has proven that people tend to love desperately the things that hurt them.

I don't think it's unlikely that women deep down "Don't love the things they seem to love". I think it'd be disingenous to claim I don't think that's most likely the case.

THing is I don't think love is relevant though. People will love whatever they can love. I mean we Live in an era where people marry animals, household objects, pieces of plastic etc. ANd I'm not condemning that, I think that's fine; in fact, not only that, I think it's perfectly consistent with how love is.

I hate to bring personal anecdotes to this but I do belive this is very common for how people fall in love. You're single, you have ideas for what you like in women, but then a stupid day a girl speaks to you and you realize that you're starting to love this person simply because they came into contact with you and seem to desire you. You're most likely lying to yourself, and like that's ok. that's love, a stupid accidental and perverse thing. People always lie to themselves and to the people they love more intensely than to anyone else. Sex too is about manipulation, lying, play acting, power struggle etc etc etc . it's like this contract between two people that allows them to live out their perveted desires in communion.

And I don't meant to sound as if I'm condemning sex and advocating for celibacy, I hope the next example illustrates what i mean. You have a couple, and the guy wants to be loved for who he is, However, when he's having sex, he'd get turned off if he was told "I don't care how you look because I love your personality". that'd be a huge turn off. I can't speak in behalf of women but I would imagine is the same for them. in sex sometimes you want your partner to pretend that you're an object thats desired because well being desired for your personality is something that causes a ton of suffering. Most people carry on their shoulders a huge impostor syndrome, insecurities, resentment towards how life made them be a certain way or another. So in sex the people who seem to be the best at it are those who can truly treat you as an abject, granting you the freedom to momentarily pretend that you're not a flawed and insecure person deep down. It's as if when you loved someone you told them "I know you know me, but stop for a second while we fuck and pretend like you don't know me"

Now finally, to stop beating around the bush and answer your question more directly. I just think that people will love whatever they have nearby. If you live in a society where many men can't afford to date, and this guy that's rich comes along and talks to you, and makes you feel desired, you'll probably love him. If a lonely guy is this Andrew Tate or jordan Peterson kind of idiot, and they

suddenly find a woman that spoke to them, they'll deceive themselves telling themselves that this woman is different from the rest when in reality she's probably a normal person. I feel like that's the case for most people, they lie to themselves believing their partners to be special while in reality they just fell in love because they had the opportunity to get to know another person that by chance said the right stuff at the right time, and that was it.

If we're to resolve the crisis that we're facing as a society of increasingly isolated lower classes, we can't focus on love. People will love and hate one another regardless. But we have to ensure most people have a place to live, food, access to entertainment, and that they feel they aren't being ostracized for being alone. Might also help to legalize suicide, so that people feel like they have a way out and aren't just living because they have to contribute to a society that doesn't work for them.

[deleted] • 3 points • 22 August, 2022 02:44 AM

I quite agree on the object of desire thing. But I don't think men quite get women on this point: I have found myself not at all physically attracted to a guy I've known for ages, but one day he does one thing that turns me on massively.

He is a genuinely a sex object to me at this point. It's just I'm not a visual creature, so he wasn't a sex object until he stimulated my mind.

He's still a sex object at that point. I want nasty shit with him. And often - this sounds weird but it's female desire - I want to please him desperately because he's such a good person. He's such a good guy. He does so much right by me that he's going to live out the best of porn dreams because he fucking deserves it.

For men the equation seems simpler - she's attractive, I want to fuck her.

Men often feel rejected because female desire isn't male desire. So men assume if a woman doesn't want him IMMEDIATELY, she doesn't want him.

That's not how women work. Nothing could be further from the truth. It's such a weird moment as a woman when you're lusting after a guy because he's proven himself to you. We get pregnant; it makes sense we work like this. We want the guy who has proven he values us beyond a ONS.

I enjoy porn where the woman is pleasing the man. So why on earth would I want just any guy? That doesn't match my fantasy of giving a man what he deserves. And he doesn't deserve sexual pleasure unless he's taken care of me in other ways. Doesn't have to be financial, it can be giving in so many other ways.

Eyesofmalice • 1 point • 22 August, 2022 03:49 AM

This is a genuine question, and If It comes across as insulting I'm sorry.

Don't you think that kind of follows patriarchal rule? Isn't a major historical issue that women matter for what they look like and men for who they are?

And like i don't know if this can be changed, since I'm a pessimist. Like for example I'm a man of color, and I don't believe it'll be passive for someone of my generation to leave behind the historical scars left by exploitation.

I'll give you an example. In black communities around the world, the idea of heritage is more mythical while from what I've seen, for white people it tends to be more historical. And some liberals will say "oh yeah you see, black people have this more genuine and mystical connection to their roots and we have to preserve that" when in reality, the fact of the matter is that my great grandma was a slave who didn't speak the language, was born in slavery and had no idea who her parents really were or where they came from.

And I don't mention this in order to elicit pity or anything, but rather to show how a consequence of our oppression was integrated into our identity and sometimes it is seen as a natural thing when in reality it is an imposed thing.

Do you think women experience desire radically differently from how men do due to historical reasons or due to biological reasons? (It's an honest question because well there aren't many places where you can discuss these type of topics with anyone)

WOPR-19831 points 21 August, 2022 08:15 PM [recovered]

Only problem is, the vast majority of women are only physically attracted to the same small pool of men, which leaves an ever-growing number of leftover males who don't get picked, and society can only have so many of those guys before it becomes destabilised.

Well, as these men "check out" of the economic systems that are largely about amassing relatively useless status items, yes this will have downward pressure on economies.

It starts with boutique products but it has a trickle down effect throughout the entire supply chain, down to iron ore and steel.

Every time a man opts out and throws his "shit I gotta buy to meet the ladies" list in the garbage, it makes a small impact, which is growing.

Socialist economies are basing their existence on capitalist momentum that is not sustainable, and the men rejected sexually have no incentive to get resources only to be used as a host to a parasite who finds him otherwise reprehensible.

Women find giving sex for stuff to be reprehensible.

Yet, they can't see why a man would feel the same way about giving stuff for sex.

Transactional relationships, through the historical lens of romance and love, are gross.

BoogersAndSugar • 2 points • 21 August, 2022 10:10 PM

opts out and throws his "shit I gotta buy to meet the ladies" list in the garbage,

.....
the men rejected sexually have no incentive to get resources only to be used as a host to a parasite who finds him otherwise reprehensible.

THESE PARTS, RIGHT HERE are the real danger society faces with the new sexual marketplace. Too many leftover males, even just 20% of the male population checking out of the game like this, will utterly devastate not only the economy, but civilization itself.

alienamongnormies • 1 point • 21 August, 2022 04:55 PM

Basically women make their own money and don't have to prostitute themselves for survival anymore

There are lots of women out there who are still looking for a beta bux. I got ghosted because I wouldn't be a transwoman's free taxi. Now imagine the entitlement of ciswomen in 2022. Lots of the thots you see on Tinder are wannabe sugar babies wanting to live the Instagram life.

[deleted] • 7 points • 21 August, 2022 01:47 PM

All three would be my answer

TriggurWarning • 3 points • 21 August, 2022 02:25 PM*

I think the current state of mating has taken us back to the stone ages (our natural state) in terms of the gender disparities in sexual success during adolescence and early adulthood (18-27). The only fundamental difference is people now possess many effective birth control methods. It has been shown through genetic studies that most of the men who ever lived during the evolution of our species never reproduced. This is a sobering fact, which reminds us of the extreme selectivity that exists in the female human population. Without female selectivity though we'd still be eating bananas and swinging from trees.

It is however social curbs on selectivity and taboos on promiscuity that enabled the formation of civilizations. Once it became clear this was necessary, it was easy to invent religious dogmas meant to curb our more selfish impulses. And what we are witnessing may be the beginning stages of a complete degeneration of that formational basis to maintain a civilization in the long run (we know it's hard already based on history for many other reasons without additional fuel for the fire). Young men are not only getting less sex than before, but they're also much less educated too relative to women, which implies rising social instability may be unavoidable without a police state to contain it.

Eyesofmalice • 1 point • 21 August, 2022 03:48 PM

I don't think birth control is a factor of little importance though. It's birth control what allows us to see sex as a purely recreational activity nowadays.

Also I think there is already a police state that heavily contains it. Is no surprise that onle a few months ago, or years idk. We found that in hollywood there was still quite prevalent the practice of fucking your way to the top for young actresses.

Also about education, I partially agree. universities are encouraging more and more inclusion of women into their faculties and also have programs to include more women into academia. And we as men are becoming less educated yes but is also a result of how inflation has overtaken wages, making it very difficult for most young men to have access to education.

TriggurWarning1 points 21 August, 2022 04:02 PM* [recovered]

The median lifespan of a human being in the stone age was 20-25 years old. I don't think people were too worried about the consequences of reproducing via sex, only survival and extracting what little pleasure you can out of a brutal world. Many children died in the first 4 years of age. Constant fucking was a necessity to survive. Genetic data also shows the human population may have been reduced to just a few thousand at one point. Try to comprehend the situation these people were in. We have never possessed a capacity to control our own reproduction. Let us not minimize the amazing potential consequences of such an incredible achievement, but not forget the potential downsides as well.

Eyesofmalice • 1 point • 21 August, 2022 04:13 PM

I can't say I understood what you said here tbh.

TriggurWarning • 1 point • 21 August, 2022 04:15 PM

Never mind, I thought you said birth control was a factor of little importance.

HinduProphet • 1 point • 21 August, 2022 04:56 PM

You are ignoring the significance of group selection and in group out group competition which was also heavily responsible for ensuring that homo sapiens outcompete their other hominid cousins.

Sexual selectivity of females is only one way through evolution happened, the other way was through Tribalism, war and stone age genocides.

TriggurWarning • 1 point • 21 August, 2022 04:59 PM

I'm sure I'm ignoring quite a few things, but the genetic history of our race shows we may have been almost wiped out in the distant past. I read an article years ago that argued there's some reason to believe we were down to just a few thousand people at one point. Relative to other animals we are incredibly weak when we are young and require an enormous amount of maturation.

BumblingBeta • 2 points • 21 August, 2022 04:12 PM

All three of them, but technology has really ruined things in recent years for the average man and put massive amounts of power in female hands. Now we have a situation where women are monetizing male thirst like never before, by getting income for clicks on their social media pages from desperate lonely guys and many of them getting into sex work.

Even if lots of women don't make much money from this, the fact the option is there and so many try to get into it, just shows how women view men in modern day society. They view men for some easy cheap \$\$\$ and someone they can exploit for their higher sex drive.

Glad-Discount-4761 • 2 points • 21 August, 2022 04:22 PM

No it is because of feminism and some stupid women forcing women to follow their footsteps

Incellius_Maximus • 1 point • 21 August, 2022 02:13 PM

"mating" lol

Eyesofmalice • 1 point • 21 August, 2022 03:30 PM

People have this idea of natural laws as if they were societal laws.

Technology is part of nature, culture is part of nature. you can't go faster than light because some intergallactic policeman will give you a ticket, you can't simply because you can't. the laws of nature are absolute and can't be subverted, therefore anything that exists IS part of nature.

secondly, we as humans have discovered that the cultural context in which we live massively shape our own biology even. we saw how going from hunting to farming changed our anatomy. having external memory banks "writing" has changed our brain and our capacity to perceive time. It has to be a product of our culture, because that technology didn't arise out of the ground one day. We developed it to fit our idea of progress and mating.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 August, 2022 01:30 AM

Women telling men to leave women alone irl, grow up, and join a dating app destroys my soul as a millennial. Meeting people for dating used to be something you did irl - through friends, at social events, and yes, even in public. At the gym. At a bookstore. I met my boyfriend at an art gallery and people are always like "omg meet cutes still happen?!" and I'm like YES, get offline and go out!

That was a better world.

Online dating often sucks for women but it destroys men. Women aren't typically attracted just based on looks, but that's all online dating shows. I'm 100% sure some of the guys I've swiped left on via dating apps would have charmed me had we met irl. I like humor, personality, intelligence, kindness, etc. - can't really see that via online dating, which is why I hate it.

Marzipan-Happy • 1 point • 22 August, 2022 04:55 AM

I think that technology has made things more difficult, and (don't hate me) easier access to birth control. Women are more selective and careful when there is the possibility that they might get trapped with a baby. Men are as

well, and this can reduce the chad effect.

Point in case? I have four kids. If I didn't love my husband as much as I do, I'd be trapped anyways. Kids make it a lot harder to separate yourself from someone.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 August, 2022 09:20 PM

We just need to take a look at the recent Johnny Depp vs Amber Heard.

If we sum everything up and I won't do it by detail here, Johnny Depp essentially paid 5 million Dollars for being married to a woman (here Amber Heard).

Now, Elon Musk was also together with Amber Heard and he paid nothing. He wasn't married to her, he basically could just use her for his pleasure and drop her like a hot potato.

Ontop of that, take into consideration that every little detail about Johnny Depp and Amber Heard was brought into daylight. Marriage, which actually is something very private and intimate, was presented as a zoo for millions of people to watch and gossip about.

Now, who in his right mind would want to marry after witnessing something as banal and comical as Johnny Depp vs Amber Heard?

The "winner" are obviously men like Elon Musk.

no_bling_just_ding[S] • 2 points • 22 August, 2022 09:24 PM

or the divorce attorneys

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 August, 2022 11:12 PM

True!

kvakerok • 1 point • 27 August, 2022 09:55 PM*

All of the above. Thanks to technology today is a very dynamic world, so the things that used to take time and people could adapt to, don't work anymore. Consequently, technology allowed our culture to take various hard turns without giving us time to see if they were actually good turns. Combine that with biological imperatives both sexes have and you get a black powder keg doused in rocket fuel of a situation.

We have rapidly compounding issues that we don't know how to resolve, or the solutions we come up with have unintended consequences that become their own problems. The whole thing is spiraling out of control.

I don't think the outcome is going to be grim though. Humans have yet another behavioral strategy programmed into them, that we are already employing, and it will solve ~80% of problems very soon.

no_bling_just_ding[S] • 1 point • 27 August, 2022 10:02 PM

Humans have yet another behavioral strategy programmed into them, that we are already employing, and it will solve ~80% of problems very soon.

not reproducing? suicide?

kvakerok • 1 point • 27 August, 2022 11:35 PM

Swarming.