

"Women Choose" is why undesirable men are born

August 1, 2022 | 14 upvotes | by [WOPR-1983](#)

This is going to be controversial.

Let's start with some basic truths.

1. Women are the "choosers" - men compete to get chosen.
2. Women are more likely to reproduce than men are, historically.
3. Women are hypergamous, and when it comes to genetics want a man who is taller, more fit, etc.

Here is my theory:

Less genetically blessed women will have the ability to choose from among men genetically superior to herself. But, she will never exceed her own genetic limitations by very much. It could well be a law of averages situation, or simply her attempting to compensate for her own genetic shortcomings. We've heard it before because it's very common with short women, as an example:

"Being 5-0" tall, I only date guys 6-4" and taller because I don't want short kids."

And what are her ODDS of transcending her 'short gene' and having kids taller than herself? 50% perhaps? Short daughters who will have no trouble finding partners because they are short, and short sons who will have quite a big challenge ahead of them especially if they are closer to 5-0" than 6-0" tall.

And here is the big difference between men and women when it comes to genetics:

If a man is rejected, they say "Good, we don't want his genes in the gene pool."

But what about hers? Why is that it is perfectly okay for the male sex drive to allow genetically inferior women to get a chance reproduce?

Is it not ironic that women sneer at men they find sexually unqualified while in many cases they themselves would be sexually unqualified if held to the same standards? (Height, facial symmetry, weight, fitness, fat distribution etc.)

Here is the system today.

1. Men want sex more than women.
2. More women than men will reproduce.
3. Her efforts to "mate up" genetically have limitations.

Why is the system this way? It must work, else nature would have not have made it this way. Is the "men want sex more" imbalance necessary? Do women need to struggle to get high value partners, and men need to struggle to get any partner at all for this to work?

And since 6-4" tall Basketball Joe is dating 5-0" tall girl, why doesn't he ask himself if he's going to be okay with a much shorter son? Wouldn't he want to try and get with a woman of average or above average height for better odds of passing on the tall gene? Or is he thinking, on a primal level, that so long as he is chosen by *some woman*, his genetic work is done?

Question #2:

Can such a discussion happen without going down the rabbit hole into eugenics?

Question #3:

Or, is asking such a question really speaking about eugenics outright?

Comments

Antisocial_Nihilist • 17 points • 1 August, 2022 06:23 PM*

There really is no talking about this topic in depth without it going down the eugenics rabbit hole, that may be too controversial even for this sub so let's not go too far down there.

But you are correct in that "female choice" isn't exactly the grand end-all-be-all of mate selection some people think it is. Are you familiar with the term "Fisherian Runaway"? It's when female choice for specific traits in males in their species leads to either a detrimental effect or downright extinction because the traits females sought were actually disadvantageous for survival.

The Irish Elk is a textbook example of this. Females preferred to only mate with the Elk which had the largest antlers. Over time smaller antler Elk were eliminated from the gene pool. But the remaining males in the gene pool had antlers that were so large that males could no longer escape predators, which led to the Irish Elk's extinction. <https://youtu.be/eCtRSGcHOEE>

WOPR-19831 points 2 August, 2022 05:33 AM* [recovered]

There really is no talking about this topic in depth without it going down the eugenics rabbit hole, that may be too controversial even for this sub so let's not go too far down there.

Agreed and done.

But you are correct in that "female choice" isn't exactly the grand end-all-be-all of mate selection some people think it is. Are you familiar with the term "Fisherian Runaway"? It's when female choice for specific traits in males in their species leads to either a detrimental effect or downright extinction because the traits females sought were actually disadvantageous for survival.

Mind blown. Kind of reminds me of women who get wet panties for violent thugs who beat them to death.

Antisocial_Nihilist • 6 points • 3 August, 2022 11:00 AM

I'm just trying to keep this sub from getting nuked, and out of the quarantine zone. Too much discussion of eugenics here might do that, so thanks for understanding.

WOPR-19831 points 3 August, 2022 04:42 PM [recovered]

By definition: *Eugenics is the scientifically erroneous and immoral theory of “racial improvement” and “planned breeding,” which gained popularity during the early 20th century. Eugenicists worldwide believed that they could perfect human beings and eliminate so-called social ills through genetics and heredity.*

There it is. It's clear why THAT is problematic. We have not discussed that, and will not, so I think what I've posted in this thread is okay.

I'm talking about *mating preferences* and observable outcomes on offspring.

catniagara • 2 points • 4 August, 2022 05:46 PM*

It was disproven in its infancy by scientists who concluded that a significant number of illnesses and disorders aren't genetic, are unable to be seen until later life, and more importantly that a number of less-than-desirable traits (like having 3 toes, webbed feet or for some reason brown

eyes) are dominant traits that can and often will be passed on even 10 generations out.

Of course there's also the fact that a number of genetic diseases actually make people more physically attractive, like pretty leprosy or my autoimmune condition.

Breeding people to be "beautiful like me", based on the modern standard of tall skinny and symmetrical, would result in a horde of gorgeous, young for their age looking people with severe bronchial asthma whose skin boils like a vampire in Florida every time they go out in the snow.

Likewise your traditional "ugly" people are usually quite strong. Look at wrestlers. Many of them are what you might describe as "obese neckbeards". But can you lift a 200 lb man over your head?

And then you run afoul of what even IS attractive. RP guys go wonk-wonk-wonk about EVERY GUY being obsessed with underweight barely legal teenagers....

So how does that explain the hundreds of thousands of fans who want to call Xena warrior princess mommy?

Garth1234567890 • 1 point • 6 August, 2022 05:57 PM

Eh you spend enough time in the gym you get accustomed to women who are stronger than average womenproof and fitter

Paliant • 2 points • 9 August, 2022 02:42 PM

I think Epigenetics is more pragmatic and less ignorant minded than eugenics.

It can also account for genetic differences amongst races based on biological factors, not some biased racist perception.

RatDontPanic • 2 points • 7 August, 2022 12:13 AM

Fuck me, I knew Fisherian Runaway was a bad thing, but I never imagined it could lead to the extinction of a species.

Antisocial_Nihilist • 8 points • 1 August, 2022 06:41 PM

Another facet of this issue is that there are too many men. Perhaps eventually we'll reach a point where we will implement a sort of ethical population/birth control to ensure that at any given time, there is at least 25% more women than there are men in the world.

Take deer populations for example. Naturally, deers usually have a population ratio of 2:1 female/male. And in hunted populations anywhere between a 3:1 or 4:1 gender ratio.

When this ratio of 2:1 female/male becomes disturbed (as in, too many males), it causes huge problems for the population as a whole. Even in predatory species like wolves, females usually comprise a majority of about 60%-70% of the pack population. And again, if that ratio becomes too distributed, it causes lots of issues like high sexual competition and in-fighting amongst the males, breaking down social cohesion in the pack and effecting their ability to hunt and survive.

Who is to say we are really so different? Having a relatively 1:1 ratio of women/men world wide may be seriously detrimental for us.

In fact, worldwide there are currently more men than women:

[https://www.ined.fr/en/everything_about_population/demographic-facts-sheets/faq/more-men-or-women-in-the-world/#:~:text=The%20number%20of%20men%20and,496%20are%20women%20\(49.6%25\).](https://www.ined.fr/en/everything_about_population/demographic-facts-sheets/faq/more-men-or-women-in-the-world/#:~:text=The%20number%20of%20men%20and,496%20are%20women%20(49.6%25).)

catniagara • 2 points • 4 August, 2022 05:52 PM*

There are too many men because of female infanticide, genocide, and hyper masculine socialization that devalues women. If the trend continues (and I predict it will) we'll face an extinction level event.

North America already has to actively replace our population through immigration due to a low birth rate. Which also replaces our values. This can become detrimental because they have more ties to their country of origin than the one they live in. It results in income transfer overseas, housing crises and business closures in too high amounts.

Paliant • 1 point • 10 August, 2022 09:19 AM

This is false.

Nature has always birthed extra men. Around 105 men for every 100 women. This constitutes about an extra 10 million baby boys born per year.

This is well documented in demographics / sociology.

Female infanticide at scale was only in Eastern countries.

catniagara • 1 point • 10 August, 2022 12:33 PM*

“Well documented” like female infanticide

and the unprecedented over-abundance of males due to deliberate subjugation and murder of women...

Or documented in your own mind?

In a society that hates girls and women, more boys are born. “Accidentally”. Sure.

I...it's not like you can choose to destroy a fetus based on gender if you have enough money or anything.

Still, thank you for telling me I'm special. I already knew ;)

Paliant • 1 point • 10 August, 2022 02:51 PM

I never said it didn't happen? You should really read more carefully. I specifically said eastern countries like Iraq or Asia, that's what eastern means. Female infanticide does exacerbate the already existing issue but it is not the reason there are more men than women in the world.

Its not an accident that extra men are born, there's no accident about it. Nature has always birthed more baby boys every year besides famines.

Here's some sources for you since you so smart and know it all:

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3367790/>

<https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2015/03/30/396384911/why-are-more-baby-boys-born-than-girls>

<https://www.thebump.com/a/more-baby-boys-than-girls>

gaslick • 1 point • 3 August, 2022 01:07 AM

How is there too many men? Especially when men have a higher death rate than that of women do. More so no population control is really needed when least in western countries the population is declining. But it seems you just want less competition to have with other men. We are no longer cavemen, and men shouldn't live their life for the sole purpose to get with a woman let alone have a relationship. Men need to learn to be happy without women. Women are doing this and men need to as well.

Glad-Discount-4761 • 5 points • 2 August, 2022 07:15 AM

But what about hers? Why is that it is perfectly okay for the male sex drive to allow genetically inferior women to get a chance reproduce?

Because population,we need more people for survival.

Who has power to give birth?Women.So,..

Women are valued for giving human life to world. Man is not valued for it,even if he didn't have kids,he wouldn't face judgement like women do.

WOPR-19831 points 2 August, 2022 04:03 PM [recovered]

Because population,we need more people for survival.

But what about better people? "Just people" is all that is needed?

What about people that unknowingly reproduce with severe incompatibilities such as likelihood of birth defects or genetic disease? And worse, what about those who know and still have child after child WITH these disease?

Glad-Discount-4761 • 1 point • 2 August, 2022 04:07 PM

I don't know man.Ask them why still reproduce. Pro life people are there in planet.

But what about better people?

This only happen if parents raised them right.

Cobra_x30 • 4 points • 1 August, 2022 11:23 PM

I think you are entirely incorrect. The system as we have it today is entirely new and is entirely supported by a rather fragile cultural elite group.

In the past, women did not marry for height or looks, or any other such bullshit... Otherwise we would all be big ass gorillas. In the past women generally didn't choose their own mates... their family did. Even then had you given these women the opportunity they would have consistently chosen stable, intelligent, hard working men who can feed any potential children. We have been breeding for these traits for thousands and thousands of years.

However, just as men have an innate desire to create a family... yet still shag a few women on the side. Women also have this desire to marry the boring, smart, hardworking man, yet shag the big tall dipshit gorilla type man on the side. We put stiff controls on such behavior because knowing paternity was difficult. So women did this quite less frequently than they do today.

Now we have created a system where Big Daddy government taxes the fuck out of all the polite intelligent, hard working men, and child support allows women to pillage the fruits of this man's labor while still chasing stupid violent men who are tall and handsome. This bullshit will last only until the economic wheels fall off.

catniagara • 2 points • 4 August, 2022 06:05 PM*

None of this "history" is true.

In the 1950's everyone wanted to marry Elvis Presley who looks extremely similar to modern stars like Chris Evans and Zak Efron.

My Grandpa looked like Elvis and my Nana looked like Grace Kelly.

Most defining actors of the 1920's (Boris Karloff, Lon Chaney) were extremely attractive by the day's

standard and over 6 feet tall (Lon Chaney was 6'1", Karloff was 6'5" or so)

Prior to the 1920's we get an even wider view of what was considered attractive from books.

In *Pride and Prejudice* (pub. Jan 28, 1813), Mr Darcy is described as "England's upper crust; a lord of pemberley, an expensive estate" (so he's rich and owns an excessive house) "fairly tall and handsome" but even that doesn't sway the female protagonist who also describes him as a royal douche "unfriendly, aloof, arrogant, and unapproachable" Until Mr Darcy acts right, he ain't getting none.

The Greeks aren't immune. Go back to the *Iliad* and Achilles is "the most handsome young man in the Greek army; and he has reddish blond hair" definitely a tall white dude, and back then you couldn't even get away with being a pale, weak, but intelligent and well studied young man as you could in Shakespeare; Achilles was made larger by much dust and sweat, and yet for all his weapons and hastened labours still pleasant to the sight; a radiant glow shimmers on his snow-white countenance, and his locks shine more comely than tawny gold."

Women have definitely always married for height, looks, and status.

The farther back you go, the more screwed you are trying to get laid as a lazy entitled modern pillsbury dough boy. This is truly the best timeline for that type, where no army will force you and no law will punish you. And women are socialized to feel sorry for and help you, instead of calling you unworthy and throwing rocks at you.

Most of today's men would have been long dead by most historical standards.

Cobra_x30 • 1 point • 16 August, 2022 11:39 PM

Women have definitely always married for height, looks, and status.

When they COULD. This is the key point I was making.

For most of human history we put constraints on female sexuality... because women don't become intelligent at picking mates until the very end of their ability to produce children. To be fair men are basically the exact same... give an 18 year old boy a choice and he is going to pick big tits over brains almost every time.

Also... quoting the writing of gay greek men from ancient times doesn't prove your point.

Edit: Your point about modern men being useless douchebags is true. Most of us wouldn't last a month living in the past... but that said... neither would virtually any of the women.

WOPR-19831 points 3 August, 2022 05:24 AM* [recovered]

Women also have this desire to marry the boring, smart, hardworking man, yet shag the big tall dipshit gorilla type man on the side.

This is the dual mating strategy or dual mating conundrum I like to call it. It's a real thing, and it forms the basis for the Red Pill "Alpha Fux / Beta Bux" philosophy.

Women have been shown to prefer different types of men depending on where they were in their menstrual cycles.

beeyootiful1 points 3 August, 2022 06:09 PM [recovered]

Anecdotally, I have seen that straight men do the same thing. They will sleep with anyone, even women they consider to be evil and crazy, and at the same time have a ton of standards for "wife material". Men also cheat on and leave their wife for a younger woman, often having children with them too.

no_bling_just_ding • 1 point • 3 August, 2022 09:58 AM

i think that last part about menstrual cycles is subject to a replication crisis

[deleted] • 2 points • 2 August, 2022 12:49 PM

Women are the "choosers" - men compete to get chosen.

I would rephrase this. It's the people with options that are the choosers. We all know this to be true. Even outside of the dating market.

It may seem like women have a lot of options when compare to men, but there are a few things we all know to be true.

Young women have options. Old women don't.

High quality men have options. Low quality men don't.

Your theory ignores a lot. Height is only 1 of the dozens of genetic markers that people look at. Let's take your example:

And since 6-4" tall Basketball Joe is dating 5-0" tall girl, why doesn't he ask himself if he's going to be okay with a much shorter son?

Is the girl only 5' tall? No. You can't represent her with 1 attribute. She's most-likely very curvy, has a smoking body and face, and is young.

But besides all of that, I agree, men date down while women date up. All things considered, the man is typically higher value overall.

Now let's examine your proposition from the title:

"Women Choose" is why undesirable men are born

Yes and no.

Let's just examine the "height gene", since that's the gene you're using as an example in your post.

Just because being short is a disadvantage for men, it doesn't mean it has no advantage for women. Women who are shorter are seen as most child-like and elicit the emotional response of protection from men. Men also desire shorter women sexually.

It's not just women choice that is the lone contributor to the propagation of the short gene. It's also men's choice.

why doesn't he ask himself if he's going to be okay with a much shorter son

Probably because he's okay with a shorter daughter. It's a 50/50 if it's a boy or a girl. So either way, his genes which constitute 50% in his children, would have a 50/50 chance of being disadvantaged vs advantage. Unless he has absolute control whether it will be a boy or a girl, then there's no real distinction in procreating with a tall woman or a short woman.

WOPR-19831 points 3 August, 2022 05:25 AM* **[recovered]**

Just because being short is a disadvantage for men, it doesn't mean it has no advantage for women.

Women who are shorter are seen as most child-like and elicit the emotional response of protection from men. Men also desire shorter women sexually.

But women like taller men. The title of my thesis was "Women have choice and that's why lesser men are born." Her giving birth to short girls is not a problem, and she reproducing herself and being short proves you correct. It's not a liability for females. But, it's a serious liability for her sons.

[deleted] • 1 point • 3 August, 2022 10:40 AM

That's why I said it's yes and no.

It's half true.

Men like shorter Women.

Women like taller men.

Your theory puts all the power of choice on Women. Which is half true. Men choose too.

WOPR-19831 points 3 August, 2022 04:47 PM* [recovered]

Men like shorter Women.

Or do men know what women like and adjust their preferences accordingly?

Example: many men avoid women who earn more than they do. Feminists quickly jump up and say "Misogyny! He's threatened by her independence!"

Or, is he de-selecting high-income women because he is away, consciously or unconsciously, of hypergamy?

It's a fair point you make though.

[deleted] • 3 points • 3 August, 2022 04:58 PM

It can be a mix of both reasons. Not to make a cop-out argument.

Personally, I like smaller women, because I can dominate them sexually. Also I like small cute things, even as a man. A smaller women has that child like quality (without sounding pedo lol). I like to be a protector too. Gives me a good feeling.

Feminist have a point. But it's also only half true. I don't like feminist, so that's coming from a person who dispise feminism overall.

I think men do want to dominate a relationship. Aka lead. I think women also want men to dominate them. Which most feminist would never admit.

I know a few relationships where the women is dominant and she loath her own husband for being submissive.

WOPR-19831 points 3 August, 2022 05:31 PM [recovered]

I think men do want to dominate a relationship. Aka lead. I think women also want men to dominate them. Which most feminist would never admit.

Men seem to go with what they women want. I see so many women today who think they need to manage their relationship like they manage their careers - and they try to "wear the pants".

I know a few relationships where the women is dominant and she loath her own husband for being submissive.

My brother and I both had domineering and controlling wives, very similar to our own mother. We're both now divorced.

Now, I think women trying to control things is just a massive shit test that men fail. They act like they want to control things, but when the man lets them, they actually resent it and lose

respect for him.

[deleted] • 1 point • 3 August, 2022 05:44 PM

I agree.

Condolence for the divorce. I hope you didn't get rake by the courts.

I'm actually a very agreeable and soft man. Raised like that. But I know the only way my relationship will work with my wife is if I'm more dominant and take the leadership role. So I did just that.

It's not comfortable, but I've learn to do it over time.

WOPR-19831 points 3 August, 2022 06:10 PM* **[recovered]**

Condolence for the divorce. I hope you didn't get rake by the courts.

Meh, my mistake. I own that now. We didn't have a court battle but a lawyer-assisted separation agreement. Over-all in the last ten years, it's actually been pretty good, but with here, there is always some catastrophe or drama.

I'm actually a very agreeable and soft man. Raised like that. But I know the only way my relationship will work with my wife is if I'm more dominant and take the leadership role. So I did just that.

I was raised by an agreeable man who thought it was best to acquiesce to a mentally unwell, controlling, neurotic woman. I mean, I love her. But she's unwell controlling and neurotic. And that somehow works for them. They fight a lot, and my dad seems like he's constantly exasperated and literally micromanaged, but they've been married over 50 years.

I made the mistake of following in his footsteps. It stands to reason we chose the "less unwell" parent to model ourselves after, but ended up with a recipe for codependence.

It's really fucked up. You try to "save" someone and then they end up resenting you. *"You enabled me, you bastard!"*

My advice to men now is (a) don't stick your dick in crazy (b) don't be captain save-a-ho and (c) don't trade on saving someone who is broken for affection - it will blow up in your face every time.

[deleted] • 1 point • 3 August, 2022 06:27 PM

We think much alike.

My father figure was absent because he worked 2-3 jobs during my childhood. My mother beat me with a stick.

I didn't go through a physical "trial by fire" to become the man I am today. I was fortunate enough to have the internet and stumble upon very good content from red-pill, black-pill and white-pill ideologies. I did go though a psychological "trial by fire". I admit, I broke down crying when I had to dismantle **EVERY** belief structure I once had. Which is insane. But my thirst for knowledge drove me to keep seeking more and more truths about the world.

I'm actually beyond the ideas of relationships (meaning, I think I know enough that

I'm not interested in it). I'm looking at the ideas of spirituality now.

Paliant • 2 points • 9 August, 2022 02:40 PM

I think the tall basketball player is kind of selfish to just be concerned with passing his genes on at any costs. Passing your genes on is not just about you having your next generation, it's about perpetuating your genes for generations to come.

WOPR-19831 points 9 August, 2022 08:36 PM* [recovered]

Passing your genes on is not just about you having your next generation, it's about perpetuating your genes for generations to come.

WAT?

You can only pass your genes on to one generation at a time.

Paliant • 1 point • 9 August, 2022 09:05 PM

Yes but if you just birth a 5 ft 1 full height male who has no success, does it actually matter if you passed on your genes? Not really.

It's why we see short women be absolutist in terms of dating taller guys. They inherently understand.

beeyootiful1 points 3 August, 2022 06:14 PM [recovered]

This is definitely a eugenics conversation. I think you're also using a faulty premise, that these physical qualities are actually undesirable (vs simply not idealized). I think the vast majority of undesirable men are the result of nurture not nature. The vast majority of men have the basic building blocks to be desirable to a woman if they just get their shit together.

WOPR-19831 points 3 August, 2022 06:56 PM* [recovered]

This is definitely a eugenics conversation.

I disagree.

Eugenics (by definition) is along the lines of "human breeding" and mating for "racial purity". It's abhorrent and only psychopaths like Hitler thought it was a good idea.

Mating preferences is not eugenics.

That's like saying a woman selecting only men who are over 6-2" is eugenics. It is not.

It's just an interesting concept that if a short woman doesn't want short sons, she'll still take that risk because she is short herself.

If I've written something that qualifies as eugenics in this entire think, I'll happily look at it quote by quote. But do show me where I said anything about trying to "build" a better human by sorting people by race and having them stick within "racial boundaries" to achieve some sort of - not superior human - but *superior race*.

*** I do not believe in "racial purity" and have mixed children of my own so... yeah.***

kokorwqac • 1 point • 5 August, 2022 09:14 AM

Doesn't blackpill ideology put importance on race though?

Play_Muted • 1 point • 5 August, 2022 09:18 AM

yeah? are you saying race doesnt matter? Race greatly effects appereance

kokorwqac • 1 point • 5 August, 2022 09:27 AM

It does to some extent (i think beauty standards are often decided by media) but if that guy is a blackpill then why is he not aganist race mixing?

Incellius_Maximus • 1 point • 2 August, 2022 07:45 AM

Historically men were much more likely to die, so this system worked in that world, but in modern society where we have medicine and all sorts of safety measures it is going to cause some issues. Women don't need to choose the most 'fit' mate anymore, but they still do because it's in their nature. I personally don't have a problem with it; I mean it is what it is.

no_bling_just_ding • 1 point • 2 August, 2022 07:20 PM*

it is that way unfortunately as you said. sure, women are the natural selectors, but **who selects the selectors?** our species has put immense power (and you might laugh at this notion, but it is tremendous power to be able to decide whose genes will create the future of the human race) in the hands of many women who are not the least qualified to use it, and who do not meet the standards they hold for others.

female selection is not wired for the good of you, me, some other redditor or even the good of the species as a whole. it's simply wired for the good of the female herself, as an individual, in the moment. it does not select for higher intelligence unless said intelligence brings visible resources along with it to show off, or social status which ultimately has to be bestowed upon an individual by dumber people. it does not select for morals, unless said morals net a man resources & good looks in the form of an undamaged body.

and i think that the way modern society puts (all but moreso female) sexuality on a pedestal as something absolutely and inherently good by itself, not something that ever needs to be adjusted the way you'd want to adjust other personality traits is holding us back. i don't really care for "correcting homosexuality" or other things like that, gay people seem to be doing pretty damn well for themselves in the west. but i'm really more concerned about *evidently harmful* forms of sexuality like pedophilia[thankfully that one is not accepted in the mainstream], hybristophilia and the like. be it among women simping for murderers or guys fawning over fucking sadistic anime girls.

catniagara • 1 point • 4 August, 2022 05:38 PM*

Let's start with some basic truths.

1. women are the choosers
2. Men are historically more likely to reproduce offspring in greater numbers than women. Women are more likely to care for children, which explains why women are so choosy. We face a greater risk from reproducing than men, physically emotionally and financially.

80% or more of single parent families are female led

1. Both women and men sleep with roughly the same number of people but it is women who are more likely to have less partners in older age groups.

Since 2/3 of your premises are wrong, the rest of the argument based on these is wrong in its infancy, even without reading forward.

Regarding the height thing, relationships regress toward the mean. Excessively tall men date excessively short women (and vice versa) so they will have average sized children. "Basketball Joe" doesn't want his 6'2" daughter to have limited dating options, and "Tiny Tina" doesn't want her midget son to have limited dating options

In my experience (and surely yours in these subs) people don't want to pass their perceived negative traits on to their offspring. That's why short guys chase my 5'10" ass like I'm selling luxury cars at half price, and the tall guys I'd rather date are terrified of reproducing into the stratosphere with me ☐

WOPR-19831 points 5 August, 2022 06:10 AM [recovered]

More women than men will have progeny. This is scientific fact.

Please use better sources than "Psychology Today" or the first google result.

catniagara • 1 point • 5 August, 2022 11:44 AM

Go ahead. Post your "scientific fact". Not the words. The actual studies. Since it's demonstrably untrue and you know you're completely insane but hey, let's play pretend. That's what the internet is for, right?

☐

WOPR-19831 points 6 August, 2022 12:10 AM [recovered]

<https://www.theguardian.com/science/2014/sep/24/women-men-dna-human-gene-pool>

As modern humans moved into Europe more than 45,000 years ago, the number of mothers may have outnumbered fathers by around 100 to 30, according to Stoneking. His study appears in the journal, Investigative Genetics.

Eyeroll all you want. There's your study.

This is commonly accepted as fact by the way.

catniagara • 1 point • 6 August, 2022 02:11 PM

I live in North America, not a polygamist Sub-Saharan African tribe. Honestly the manosphere bitches about feminism and also whines about what happens in an unequal, male-controlled society where the strongest men obviously get all the women because equality isn't a thing.

"Have had" and "will have" are two different things there, Chachi.

You live in the best possible timeline for weak, ugly, unintelligent pot-bellied annoying men and some of you still complain that you aren't getting top-tier women.

We go back to the past it's going to be me thriving not you, so bring it on ☐

WikiMobileLinkBot • 1 point • 4 August, 2022 05:38 PM

Desktop version of /u/catniagara's link: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Single_parents_in_the_United_States

[opt out] Beep Boop. Downvote to delete