

# If everyone was Attractive

March 1, 2023 | 14 upvotes | by [100ks-p1lled](#)

---

Casual sex would be relatively easy to get because everyone would be sexually desirable. The average happiness and well being will increase a lot. Misogyny, Misandry and Racism would be at their lowest level and people in general would be more friendly. Most relationship would be open and Personality will actually be important (not as much as money and status tho)

Do you agree with this view?

---

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

---

## Comments

---

Antisocial\_Nihilist • 6 points • 2 March, 2023 01:25 AM

I'm a pretty avid supporters of making cosmetic surgery more readily available.

crypto\_druid • 1 point • 7 March, 2023 06:01 AM

So everyone would look like Madonna.

sounds like a great world to live in

no\_bling\_just\_ding • 11 points • 1 March, 2023 10:05 PM

it wouldn't be easy to get because then women would just filter out men based on the next thing after looks

100ks-p1lled[S] • -1 points • 1 March, 2023 10:36 PM

I think you're wrong, the filters you're talking about would apply only if she wants to find a husband. I bet that if all men would be hot then most women would be cock carouseling without any particular filter just for the fun of it until, eventually, maternal instinct kicks in. Besides, personality and common interests would be filters too, which is good imo

no\_bling\_just\_ding • 3 points • 2 March, 2023 08:19 AM\*

i think you're mostly right but the casual sex scene is by natural design meant to filter the majority of men out. there's a reason why hot/young lesbians hook up with ugly/old lesbians like it's no big deal, any gay male will hook up with most gays, but straight women are by comparison extremely picky about men. my point is: **we are not meant to receive the chad treatment**, and women would immediately adjust their supply and demand curve as circumstances change to accommodate that. while their standards for who they settle with might drop, their standards for actual bang-like-a-pornstar attraction never do, they only get more stringent. you always need to be better than every other man she's been exposed to in order to get that, and it's not realistic nor practical to chase that even in the best of circumstances.

100ks-p1lled[S] • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 01:04 PM

I don't agree. There is a lot of objectivity in beauty, meaning that if men and women had ceratin features they would be percieved as attractive no matter the circumstances. In particular, if all men were tall and with a softer warrior skull, light almond eyes and visible cheekbones they would be percieved as attractive because it's in the human nature to find this features attractive.

The problem is that Nature is statistically designed to give this features to a few % of men and it's utopian to think everyone could have them. But imagine if somehow we could cheat nature and give this features to everyone, beauty standards won't change because they are the result of million years of evolution

But yeah, the chad treatment would only be for a few because there are other factors, but still I believe that even the bottom 10% would be treated at least like a HTN which is HUGE improvement

caption291 • 1 point • 3 March, 2023 08:16 PM

if all men were tall

Then no men would be tall. Tall is a relative concept. Most things we use to describe beauty are

RELATIVE concepts rather than absolute concepts because finding things attractive is an evolutionary adaptation and evolution is mostly concerned with RELATIVE things rather than absolute things.

100ks-p1lled[S] • 2 points • 4 March, 2023 05:39 PM

most things about beauty are more absolute (or pseudo-absolute) than relative imo, the reason is that the environment around us is the frame of reference for everything. If all men were tall then women would still perceive them as tall because we would be "big" compared to them and compared to the environment around us.

Besides, considering how the human skeleton is structured our bodies cannot "evolve" to be ever bigger or taller because too much is counterproductive, I say this to prove that there is definitely *absoluteness* about how we are perceived on this planet

BitsAndBobs304[ ] • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 06:53 AM

I bet that if all men would be hot

today's most men are significantly taller than centuries ago. so do women swoon over someone who's 175cm ?

rogueamazondrone • 9 points • 1 March, 2023 10:52 PM

the idea of ugly would just evolve.

100ks-p1lled[S] • 6 points • 1 March, 2023 11:36 PM

that's impossible imo, good looks are practically objective, especially for men. I like this food analogy: conventional good looks are like a good steak, it will always be tasty in every historical period because humans are meant to find it tasty

blebbyroo • 2 points • 1 March, 2023 11:45 PM

That's not true, in the past people valued and found fat bodies attractive because it meant wealth.

100ks-p1lled[S] • 1 point • 1 March, 2023 11:52 PM

I'd argue that it happened because society back then was less vain and the looks threshold was lower and I believe that if we brought back in time people we judge conventionally attractive now, they would be considered attractive even in the past

blebbyroo • 2 points • 2 March, 2023 01:11 AM

You've moved goalposts now. Beauty is not objective. It's subjective. There are places in Africa where fat bodies are still proffered to skinny fit bodies.

fatsackguy47 • 3 points • 2 March, 2023 06:48 AM

beauty is subjective

I'm actually going to lose my mind if people keep on pretending like the west does not have a set standard for what is objectively attractive.

This is why these pill subs go nowhere because we still have people claiming chad and his soft harems don't exist and that the 80/20 and AF/BB are fake and that it isn't true that the vast majority of women find the vast majority of men unattractive.

Like don't you realize your essentially a flat earther at this point. Your legit denying basic facts.

blebbyroo • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 06:58 AM

The west beauty standards are applicable in the west. That doesn't mean that beauty isn't subjective. The example I was African. Which is not the west. The whole world isn't the west, and people in the west have their beauty standards influenced based on them living in the west.

fatsackguy47 • 2 points • 2 March, 2023 07:05 AM

Beauty is objective because I can point out who will do well on dating apps and who won't and I will be right every time because I am not a science denying virtue signaler.

Yes I understand not everyone lives in the west but these pill debates generally are centered in the west. I understand that in places where the people look completely different their beauty standards are going to vary a little bit because they look different.

That doesn't mean that each part of the world doesn't more or less have it's own standard for objective beauty. Not to mention the similarities between the cultures when we are not pointing out exceptions like underdeveloped nations/area which are screening for wealth as opposed to actual beauty.

blebbyroo • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 07:11 AM

Ok so by saying societies have different standards that means beauty is subjective, including to which society you are a part of.

This post wasn't necessarily about pill theories either.

fatsackguy47 • 3 points • 2 March, 2023 07:15 AM

When you say beauty is subjective the implication is that it's on a individual level. Like some people in the US like this some like that.

When you say whole ass parts of the world prefer this and another whole ass part of the world prefers that, is that not objective enough? Especially considering the great many overlaps these cultures have, height being an example?

If everyone in my country of hundreds of millions of people prefer 1 type of man, that doesn't sound very subjective to me.

fatsackguy47 • 2 points • 2 March, 2023 07:35 AM

And remember, when you filter out countries which are super undeveloped because they are biased towards indicators of wealth, and when you filter for intrinsic differences in races, beauty is actually quite universal for the most part

This shit really ain't subjective, not even by your crazy definition.

We\_Are\_All\_One • 1 point • 7 March, 2023 05:39 PM

We see too far for it to be globular.

fatsackguy47 • 1 point • 7 March, 2023 07:21 PM

these nuts are globular lmao

rogueamazondrone • 2 points • 2 March, 2023 12:41 AM

nah, they really aren't, even if we focus on men's visuals. kbeauty standards are the perfect example of this. the men get glutathione injections to be super light, while Western women prefer darker skin in men (*tall, dark, and handsome*). you thought a strong jawline was objectively attractive in men? well men in kpop literally shave their jaws to get a slim v-shape to meet male beauty standards there. they also prefer staying thin.

humans of both sexes simply aren't wired to find the same exact things attractive, and you'd be shocked at how beauty standards can drastically change.

fatsackguy47 • 2 points • 2 March, 2023 06:55 AM

Yeah they really are objective. In the west it's tall, dark FEATURES not skin, and handsome.

Yes other parts of the planet where the majority of people look different of course have different standards, naturally, but even they have an objective beauty standard of their own. Not to mention, while it may seem different, it's more similar than you would think. Many facial ratios/features are maintained between the most attractive western and far east people.

Thinks like IPD, forward growth, eye width and length, FWHR, ES ratio and features such as good hair, strong brows and a straight nose are seen as attractive in both cultures.

rogueamazondrone • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 12:56 PM

dark skin *is* a dark feature. even in white men, tan is a trend. there are also women in the West who fetishize dark brown skin due to porn/stereotypes.

i'm not even gonna pretend i know what all that stuff means. but even if there are mathematical calculations about what the best face is, humans still don't assess the attractiveness of other humans objectively so it's not relevant in the real world. they go based off of personal experiences, cultural and racial bias, and what the media tells them is attractive. if humans were really that objective, people wouldn't consider entire races or ethnicities ugly.

when people discuss what their type is anywhere in the world, they don't bring up facial proportions.

seeyouagan • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 02:01 PM

tbh tan preference is somewhat new, they used to prefer whiter skin, but honestly this is proof beauty standards can change.

i think kpop boys fit into western beauty standards, just prettyboys instead of hypermasc chads.

apparently in japanese porn there's now "blackened" genre too so even some dark skinned men can find luck in asia.

rogueamazondrone • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 02:05 PM

if the standards can change, then it's not objective.

fatsackguy47 • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 03:24 PM

I'm pretty sure a moderate skin tone has always been preferred, but regardless it's just

likely from immigration causing the US to become more mixed.

Skin tone is hardly something I consider important, the underlying bone structure is much more important for attractiveness and that remains unchanged in the west.

Also, if there is one thing people consider attractive at one point in time, it's not really that subjective is it?

Basically if everyone in the world lived in one country, which was developed and not a developing nation, there would be an objective most attractive look. Looks are not subjective.

seeyouagan • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 05:04 PM

Europeans used to prefer super pale skin like Asians before the tanning craze, it used to be staying inside showed you were richer and those were paler, but in modern era, tanning showed you were rich enough to afford vacations instead, so it switched, Asians never had this switch.

I guess the BBC/Black propaganda caused some of the dark=masculine light=feminine bias too but that's more niche than what I'm saying.

fatsackguy47 • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 05:44 PM

In the past indicators of wealth determined "beauty" as opposed to actual aesthetics.

Tanning is attractive because it's a moderate skin tone, not too pale and not too dark.

seeyouagan • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 05:07 PM

I don't think it was ever objective to begin with, however, beauty standards are getting more and more globalized, which means a lot of ethnicities like the same shit now.

fatsackguy47 • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 03:12 PM

Dark skin is not preferred in men. And tan is wayyyyy different than dark skin lmao. And the fetish thing is an exception, fetishes are supposed to be different and niche. Still the only thing that separates one attractive man from one race to another is minimal, and based mostly in intrinsic differences. It's why many Black men, who tend to have broad noses, are considered to be better looking with skinnier "white" looking noses.

That's the thing people don't consider entire ethnicities ugly. If you take an Indian guy, give him sorta light skin and all the facial proportions and features required to be attractive in the west he would be considered attractive. Same with Asian guys. The only difference is these guys have features native to their race that separates them slightly from white people, but literally everything else is the same. The only reason it seems like people consider entire ethnicities and races ugly is because certain races and ethnicities are prone to have features considered unattractive in the west. For example, many Asians have tend to have a naturally low ES ratio which is considered unattractive in the west.

There is some culture bias though. The beauty standard in the west isn't the same as in the far East. There are some minor differences, mostly playing off of the natural differences in races. For example Asians prefer slightly chubbier faces, but again they tend to be born with slightly chubbier faces. Still, most things like height and many facial ratios remain the same among

the far east and west. But if a whole part of the world basically has one definition more or less for what's considered attractive, like in the west, doesn't that mean that beauty is not objective?

And attractiveness doesn't really vary from person to person, in the west there is obviously a objective definition for what's attractive. Again, it's based on height, build, facial ratios and features. These can bend a little bit based on features that are intrinsic in races, for example of course an Asian persons eyes doesn't look like a white guys eyes, but aside from small variation it's all the same in terms of what's considered attractive.

And yes I know people don't talk about IPD and bizygo measurements when talking about their type, but these are all measurements that determine your attractiveness. IPD is a measurement of how close together your eyes are. If your IPD is too low, people aren't going to say that, but they are going to notice your eyes are too close together and will find it ugly.

rogueamazondrone • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 05:28 PM

Dark skin is not preferred in men. And tan is wayyyyy different than dark skin lmao. And the fetish thing is a exception, fetishes are supposed to be different and niche.

The point is dark skin in black men is seen as hypermasculine because of media brainwashing. This means that attractiveness is not objective because of how malleable it is. And most black women do prefer deep brown complexions in the US.

Still the only thing that separates one attractive man from one race to another is minimal, and based mostly in intrinsic differences. It's why many black men, who tend to have broad noses, are considered to be better looking with skinnier "white" looking noses.

This is how I know it's subjective. So broad noses are bad on black men, but asian women who have those same broad noses are somehow stereotyped as more feminine.

And there's a reason why black people have broad, short noses. It's an adaptation to climate. It's the same reason they evolved darker skin and kinkier hair. Their ancestors needed it to survive. White noses are not objectively more attractive or healthier. They're not superior. They're just suited to colder climates. That's it.

>That's the thing people don't consider entire ethnicities ugly. If you take a Indian guy, give him sorta light skin and all the facial proportions and features required to be attractive in the west he would be considered attractive. Same with Asian guys. The only difference is these guys have features native to their race that separates them slightly from white people, but literally everything else is the same.

yes they do. someone published a "scientific" article about why black people are ugly. the "sorta light skin." Dark skin is preferential in some climates for a reason. There is nothing defective or undesirable about dark skin.

The only reason it seems like people consider entire ethnicities and races ugly is because certain races and ethnicities are prone to have features considered unattractive in the west. For example, many Asians have tend to have a naturally low ES ratio which is considered unattractive in the west.

so you think white people are just objectively more attractive than every other race? they



have superior genes that make them prettier? the reasons white people are considered attractive are their eye, skin, and hair color, not what you brought up. so this shows that people can't objectively assess beauty.

if you make a white worshipper choose between an East African whose face meets all western beauty standards and a meh white person with blonde hair and blue eyes, they will choose the white.

>There is some culture bias though. The beauty standard in the west isn't the same as in the far East. There are some minor differences, mostly playing off of the natural differences in races. For example Asians prefer slightly chubbier faces, but again they tend to be born with slightly chubbier faces. Still, most things like height and many facial ratios remain the same among the far east and west. But if a whole part of the world basically has one definition more or less for what's considered attractive, like in the west, doesn't that mean that beauty is not objective?

it can be objectively determine by comparing a person's face to the culture's beauty standards. but there is no one "right" universal way to look, if that's what you're suggesting.

>And attractiveness doesn't really vary from person to person, in the west there is obviously a objective definition for what's attractive. Again, it's based on height, build, facial ratios and features. These can bend a little bit based on features that are intrinsic in races, for example of course an Asian persons eyes doesn't look like a white guys eyes, but aside from small variation it's all the same in terms of what's considered attractive.

what about people who live in remote parts of the world with even more bizarre beauty standards? like adding rings to the neck or men who have extreme body modifications as a sign of status.

>And yes I know people don't talk about IPD and bizygo measurements when talking about their type, but these are all measurements that determine your attractiveness. IPD is a measurement of how close together your eyes are. If your IPD is too low, people aren't going to say that, but they are going to notice your eyes are too close together and will find it ugly.

humans aren't objective. this will take a backseat to personal preferences. if a woman is obsessed with blue or green eyes, she won't care about a black or asian guy having a proportionate face. if a woman from korea sees dark skin as gross, she won't objectively assess the face of a person with dark skin. she'll automatically see them as ugly.

fatsackguy47 • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 06:07 PM

Black women are an exception, and even then they can admit white guys who are objectively attractive are attractive. Plus the most attractive black guys still have many of the same "Caucasian" features and the same facial ratios mostly.

Asian women with broad noses are more feminine.

Never heard this, like ever. Everyone knows small buttons noses are super feminine and the preferred for women. This is true even in Asia lmao. It's certainly not true in the west anyway.

And white noses literally are more attractive. Look at handsome black men, many of them have white noses. Straight, non-crooked, not wide noses are objectively the most



attractive in the west.

| yes they do. Someone posted a scientific

So few people are like this, the majority of people would concede that attractive people can be found in all races. Sure maybe they don't have the most optimal skin color but a brown guy can still be super attractive if all his other features and facial measurements are good and his skin isn't too brown.

| so you think white people are objectively more attractive

I don't know, but it seems in the west white people tend to have the most desired features most often. I don't think anyone is superior based on looks alone chill out I'm not some nazi lmao.

| the reasons white people are attractive are for eye color, hair color

See this shows you really know nothing about how looks work. You know nothing of facial ratios which far outweighs the important of small features like "hair color".

And yeah I'm sure a white worshipper would choose the white guy but most people would concede the other person is more attractive lmao.

| it can be compared to the cultures beauty standard

Here is my point, if everyone in the world lived in one country, there would be one universal most attractive face. There would be small variance allowed for differences in races, because obviously white people have different looking eyes than Asians for examples, but for the most part it would literally be the same face. That is why looks are not subjective. The only reason this varies from culture to culture, and it doesn't even change that much for the most part, is because of the natural difference in races.

| what about people in remote parts of the world

LMAO, exactly what about people in remote parts of the world? Your scraping the bottom of the barrel with these small exceptions in underdeveloped countries lol.

| humans aren't objective

They are though. If a woman is obsessed with a certain feature, that's fine, she will still filter for the most objectively attractive for that feature. For example we can clearly say tall height is one of the most important things a guy can have. A women might choose a uglier tall guy over a handsome short guy, but it doesn't mean she won't chase the most objectively handsome tall guy she can. And it doesn't mean she can't recognize that the short guy is objectively more attractive. I can look at male models and see they are super hot, do I wanna fuck them? No.

And I like how you concede there is no "universal" standard but can acknowledge that whole entire cultures can find have a set beauty standard. Doesn't sound very subjective to me. Actually it sounds like people from different places look a bit different, and these beauty standards ever so slightly accommodate these differences in these different cultures. For example, Asians having chubbier cheeks and so there standards for beauty have a slightly less defined jaw than western standards. Hmm it's almost like chad is basically the same everywhere but only slightly adapts to changes

between races. Very subjective.

rogueamazondrone • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 06:25 PM

black women aren't an exception because their spending power can influence what other women in the west like to some extent. for example, in the 80s, wesley snipes was considered really hot in the mainstream and he's as black as it gets in terms of both features and skintone.

Here is my point, if everyone in the world lived in one country, there would be one universal most attractive face. There would be small variance allowed for differences in races, because obviously white people have different looking eyes than Asians for examples, but for the most part it would literally be the same face. That is why looks are not subjective. The only reason this varies from culture to culture, and it doesn't even change that much for the most part, is because of the natural difference in races.

of course they would agree because one country would share the same culture. beauty standards are based more on culture than genetics.

the remote parts of undeveloped nations are actually good examples to use because they illustrate how diverse beauty standards would be without any globalization or western influence.

fatsackguy47 • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 06:35 PM

provides example of famous actor who has fame halo

Okay? Lmao. There are also people who CLAIM Michael cera is attractive.

beauty standards are based on culture

What you say is culture is really just the differences between the majority race within a certain part of the world. Again, so many facial ratios and sometimes even features are maintained from one beauty standard to the next. But if you insist the beauty standards are so subjective that hundreds of millions or even billions can agree on them then idk what to say to you lmao.

And underdeveloped nations are not great because they often look towards indicators of wealth/power as opposed to actual physical aesthetics. Once a nation reaches a certain point it can focus on what actually makes a human good looking, and not what makes them appear to be of a high socioeconomic class.

crypto\_druid • 1 point • 7 March, 2023 06:02 AM

Rappers would disagree

fatsackguy47 • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 07:32 AM

Also the strong jaw thing isn't really truthful either, Asians naturally tend to have chubbier looking faces. Kpop models actually have pretty well defined jaws for their race. They just lack hollow cheeks really.

seeyouagan • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 11:17 AM\*

what she means is that they have widejawbones, but get surgery to make it narrow even if sharper, asians have more bodyfat and chubbier cheeks but also wider jaws too.albeit the v-jaw thing for males is going out of style a bit

hollow cheeks wouldn't be liked in asia, they like soft and neotenous/youthful faces

but tbh i think kpop guys can fit into western beau standards, just the prettyboy type instead of hypermasc gym chad type.

fatsackguy47 • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 02:49 PM

Either way when I look at pictures of Kpop guys they have pretty nice jaws. I know hollow cheeks wouldn't be liked their, I'm just saying it's like the small thing their missing separating them from western standards

seeyouagan • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 04:22 PM

i think they fit into western standards even with their current selves, just the more "prettyboy" type instead of "hypermasc" type, prettyboy is a bit more mainstream in east asia than in the west but its quickly chaning.

fatsackguy47 • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 04:28 PM

I think hypermasc and pretty boys will always be relevant in the west.

Honestly they are mostly the same, the main difference is probably like a bigonial:bizygo that is smaller than usual compared to more "masc" guys.

seeyouagan • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 04:30 PM

the main difference is the neoteny, prettyboys require cuteness and some kind of "teenage" look to work, whereas "masc" is more rough or rugged.

east asia has the sme logic with liking "cute" girls over more mature ones in their women too, which is spreading to the west again.

fatsackguy47 • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 04:46 PM

Neotony is based on those facial ratios and features.

I mean yeah some of it is superficial like wrinkles or something but a lot of it is bone structure.

seeyouagan • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 11:18 AM\*

tbh dark refers to darker hair instead of skin, euros liking tan skin is frily new.

the v-jaw thing is kind of going out of style in korea for males, but i get what you mean, its a good point.

tbh i do think kpop stars can fit in western beauty standards, just the more pretty or cute type instead of "hypermaculine chad" type, pre-wall leo dicaprio in particular resembles a lot of kpop stars down to the smaller eyes, i think harry styles, jesse mccartney and justin bieber are of the same logic and genre too, obviously roided gymcels with blockjaws aren't the only type of "western male beauty" and never were in the first place

SDW137 • 3 points • 1 March, 2023 11:37 PM

If everyone was "Attractive", then women's standards would just increase. Unless you mean that everyone was at the same level of attractiveness. Or they would place more emphasis on other things besides looks.

100ks-p1lled[S] • 2 points • 1 March, 2023 11:47 PM

I believe that beyond a certain level differences are not that much significant because beauty is kinda objective. In particular, I think that if everyone was *at least* Chadlite level the social gap between the top 10% and the bottom 10% would be small. Chadlites do not magically become average/unattractive juts because Chads exists because they are already well beyond the "threshold"

insertcredit2 • 2 points • 2 March, 2023 10:09 AM

No. The issue at the moment is the number of very attractive men is much lower than the number of women interested in casual sex. The vast majority of women are not interested in casual sex (this can be shown where there're more men than women in an environment there's much less casual sex as women have more control of the market and in gay vs lesbian numbers of casual sex).

If the stats stay as they are shown to in gay and lesbian sex studies that around 80% of men and around 20% of women are highly sociosexual (like casual sex) then there's still a massive miss match of the numbers.

orbstnedifnocdesab • 2 points • 2 March, 2023 06:14 PM

they need to have a class in school where they teach proper tongue posture/chewing hard food to yoy as a young child will prevent us being recessed ugly guys

Last-Post2085 • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 02:54 PM

If everyone is attractive then no one is attractive.

100ks-p1lled[S] • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 04:40 PM

False as fuck, if all food was tasty would it cease to feel tasty?? (no, it wouldn't)

kanzakistudent • 1 point • 2 March, 2023 06:25 PM

I think the goalpost would just move higher. Jus tthink about it: Western men are now wealthier and more privileged than most kings of the past. Are you being treated like a king? lol No you're not.

100ks-p1lled[S] • 1 point • 4 March, 2023 05:42 PM

richness is relative, beauty is more absolute than relative. The comparison doesn't work in this scenario

crypto\_druid • 1 point • 7 March, 2023 06:00 AM

looking good requires effort, a six pack is attractive because it's rare...people know it took time, effort and pain to achieve, if it was easy then everyone would have a six pack and no one would see any value in it.

attractiveness, whether its physical or internal requires pain and discomfort to attain.

100ks-p1lled[S] • 1 point • 7 March, 2023 05:25 PM

Looks require luck more than anything because it's mostly about Face and Height.

Things like building a six pack, mewing and having a healthy lifestyle are good but in most cases are not enough (everyone should still do them imo). If self improvement alone would be sufficient to become desired by the opposite sex men already would know, but in reality it's just a baseline that doesn't guarantee anything special. If anything we know something that actually works to get laid: becoming rich, but it still

doesn't guarantee genuine attraction

crypto\_druid • 1 point • 8 March, 2023 12:52 AM

I take it you are at the peak of physical health and are talking from experience ?

zastale • -1 points • 1 March, 2023 11:45 PM

Height would still be a problem.

100ks-p1lled[S] • 2 points • 1 March, 2023 11:57 PM

Yeah it could, in my utopian vision I imagine that every man is around the same height with no more than a 3cm gap between the tallest and the shortest (everyone is above 6ft obviously)

no\_bling\_just\_ding • 2 points • 2 March, 2023 08:18 AM

that 3cm gap would become extremely important