

# Meta survey on cuckoldry points out it is rare in humans (few %)

April 6, 2016 | 4 upvotes | by [IASGame](#)

---

I thought the readers here might be interested. The study refers to cuckoldry as Extra Pair Paternity (EPP).

I became aware of it through the Rational Male comments section, poster Culum Struan posted a link to the Ars Technica article:

<http://arstechnica.com/science/2016/04/cuckoldry-is-incredibly-rare-among-humans/>

Following shortly, poster Scribblerg linked to the journal article:

<http://www.cell.com/pb-assets/journals/trends/ecology-evolution/tree2086.pdf>

I collected a few links to abstracts of some of the references in the new survey, of the studies it refers which are not historical, so affected by modern culture and modern birth control:

2006 study shows large difference of EPP between fathers with high confidence of paternity (around 2%) and fathers with low confidence (around 30%) <http://www.psc.isr.umich.edu/pubs/abs/4910>

2012 estimate of Germany EPP, under 1%, statistics 971 fathers (states similar rate in Switzerland)

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22688803>

2008 meta survey of decline of EPP with birth control, suggests a small decline of EPP with birth control, supports that EPP is and was below 10% <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19320216>

EDIT: Another reference of the meta survey is on the Dogon population, which does not use contraceptives. Still low %, lowest for those with the indigenous religion (and then Islam), higher for Christian religions

The paper is titled

Religion as a means to assure paternity

<http://www.pnas.org/content/109/25/9781.full>

“We show that paternity certainty was higher in the indigenous religion than in Christianity, which we attribute to the abandonment of menstrual taboos by the Christians.”

(the indigenous religion is at 1.3% vs 2.9% for Christians).

---

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

---

## Comments

---

[deleted] • 3 points • 6 April, 2016 04:10 PM

cuckoldry!= having a kid.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 04:14 PM

The new math.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 04:15 PM

its like common core math

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 04:22 PM

I don't believe shit that comes out of the U of Michigan.

Plus, the phrase "discrepent genetic and social fatherhood" isn't as fun to say as cuck.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 04:24 PM

What's wrong with U of M? Serious question... whats wrong with it that isn't wrong with most other institutions?

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 04:25 PM

I'm kidding.

Not every school can be Villanova! Lol.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 04:26 PM

Oh... Oh well. I went to publik skoolz.

It helped.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 04:31 PM

Clearly it did. Only one of us is a doctor and it ain't me.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 04:43 PM

This is the brain version of gay sex I take it?

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 04:45 PM

Yeah I put the tide box out for him.

But only after I learned you had a tatoo.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 05:54 PM

How do you take it again, sailor?

BluepillProfessor • 1 point • 7 April, 2016 09:43 PM

U of m is a filthy bastion of feminism. It it is rotten to the core. Source: I interviewed at um. They hired a 22 year feminist with no teaching experience and no phd. fuck the victors.

See also Catherine McKinnon.

[deleted] • 1 point • 7 April, 2016 09:45 PM

en to the core. Source: I interviewed at um. They hired a 22 year feminist with no teaching experience and no phd. fuck the victors.

soo... how is that different from anywhere else , except that at U of M, you were the one that got fucked over?

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 05:02 PM

Yeah. But the studies are referring to the original meaning of cuckoldry - woman cheats on husband, affair partner knocks her up, passes off child as husband's without husband's knowledge.

[deleted] • 2 points • 6 April, 2016 05:34 PM

Nothing new. Here's the Wikipedia article summarizing the older research.

If you think the kid is yours, 98-99% chance it's yours.

If you think the kid might not be yours, ~70% chance the kid is still yours, and 30% chance that it's Chad's.

IASGame[S] • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 06:30 PM

It seems somewhat strange to me that the historical % was around 1-3% level and the modern % is still around 1-3% level, yet so much changed.

The big ones - which are related of course - are technological advances in birth control, prophylactics and medicine (which controls the risk) and societal norms (which used to control hypergamy and now encourage it).

Perhaps they just canceled out each other to give around the same rate of "strict cuckoldry" (actual EPP as defined in the study).

The only point against the historic studies that I've seen so far and mostly agree with is that they are covering small communities, rather than big cities where women might actually have access to "alphas" to cuckold their husbands with.

Rollo also points out that even though it is not by strict definition cuckoldry, there are many single moms that "retroactively cuckold" their (new) husbands by marrying them already with some other man's progeny.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 06:38 PM\*

yet so much changed

If you ever find yourself in Italy, visit Pompeii. The culture of how people interact was unchanged for thousands of years. It's only the increased travel and electronic communication that is changing things. Even then, many parts of love and attraction are hard-wired. Most women don't physically cheat, some do, and many guys don't vet well enough to know which is which.

You're right that many guys find themselves raising other men's kids. I'm glad they're out there. Spending any amount of time in the manosphere should make it obvious that having an absent father can cause problems for both boys and girls.

Too much Rollo can make you paranoid.

Edit: a word

BluepillProfessor • 1 point • 7 April, 2016 09:45 PM

Retroactively cuckold should be in the dictionary.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 04:19 PM

?

MRPCowboy • 5 points • 6 April, 2016 04:25 PM **[recovered]**

TL;DR is hard science disagrees with TRP's soft evopsych "science" about the extent of BB abuse in LTR/marriage.

[deleted] • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 04:42 PM

Lol. I heard almost no bears kill people. I guess it's time to start hugging me some bears.

MRPCowboy • 1 points • 6 April, 2016 06:14 PM **[recovered]**

Well, prevalence of chumming it up with bears is quite low in my estimation so... maybe ask a STEM to chug it through Bayes' Law for you before you go Into the Wild. ;)

gelded\_no\_more • 2 points • 6 April, 2016 09:14 PM

Not much to chug through using Bayes' Law, a known producer of false inferences based on disparate population sampling.

I'm pondering what you mean.

MRPCowboy • 2 points • 6 April, 2016 09:25 PM **[recovered]**

K. Keep me informed if your pondering yields anything. I'm literally on the edge of my seat (don't get the wrong idea though... I'm nursing a hemorrhoid).

gelded\_no\_more • 3 points • 6 April, 2016 09:55 PM

Flippant is my go-to. I need to self edit.

Guy's likely worried about the woman cheating will likely marry a woman that will cheat.

ta\_prop • 1 point • 6 April, 2016 10:41 PM

No, this is wrong. I used to work in a lab that did genetic research. The rate is about 10%.

These are poor quality studies - and most of them include 10% in their confidence interval.

IASGame[S] • 1 point • 8 April, 2016 07:50 AM

Could you please elaborate (genuine question)? Why / how are they poor?

I'm not an expert in this kind of research.

BluepillProfessor • 1 point • 11 April, 2016 04:39 PM

It is 10% of the TESTED samples at your particular lab not 10% of a RANDOM sample representative of the population.

Sepean • 1 point • 7 April, 2016 07:59 AM

It seems to me that modern contraceptives would really put a dent in the cuckoldry rates.

I don't think many women consciously and rationally want to cuckold their husband. It's just something that happens; she's ovulating and she crosses paths with a bigger alpha, gets the tingles and it just happens.

When that happens, these days she don't get pregnant from it. When women do get pregnant today, they make a conscious decision to have a child with the man they're with. It's generally at a time when their relationship is good, they want the guy's baby, they plan to have sex during her ovulation, and yadda yadda.

That doesn't mean that AF/BB isn't a thing, that doesn't mean the dual sexual strategy isn't how females operate in modern times. It just means that even though that ancient evolutionary strategy is still hardwired in her brains, modern contraceptives have fucked with it so she doesn't get pregnant with alphas anymore.

In many ways it is parallel to how the financial security and contraceptives that women have in modern times allow them to ride the cock carousel, something that would have been an absolute disaster in the times when a woman could get pregnant anytime and needed a man to support her and her children.

It would be great to have some historical data on cuckoldry rates. I would also like to know the cuckoldry rates as a function of the number of children; maybe the 2 first children were 98% the husband's but then the cuckoldry rates increased for the later children. That also makes sense from an evolutionary perspective; the cuckolded guy would still want to care for the first children which were his own, so he couldn't just throw out his women if she cheated or denied him sex completely.

IASGame[S] • 1 point • 7 April, 2016 08:18 AM

The point is the meta survey I linked does have historical data on cuckoldry rates and it is low. It is however for recent history (if I recall past few hundred years), and in a few small communities.

What it doesn't have is historic cuckoldry rates for societies from many hundreds of years ago.

Sepean • 1 point • 7 April, 2016 09:08 AM

Condoms have been in use for hundreds of years, and simply pulling out has an effect too.

And the betaification of men is a somewhat recent thing.

IASGame[S] • 1 point • 10 April, 2016 01:51 PM

Updated original post with another interesting paper, the Dogon population doesn't use contraceptives.

BluepillProfessor • 1 point • 7 April, 2016 09:47 PM

Wilful blindness is no excuse. It didn't just happen. She took off her clothes and let another man cum inside her.

Sepean • 1 point • 8 April, 2016 07:13 AM

I didn't intend to imply that she wasn't responsible for cheating.

We all have all sorts of urges for doing stupid, irresponsible, cruel shit. We also have self control that allow us to keep those urges in check, and ultimately we are judged by our actions.

