

Dominance is everything: Study shows bullies highest self esteem, social status, lowest rates of depression

181 upvotes | 28 July, 2015 | by Cyralea

Tell me if this one sounds familiar: "Bullies lash out because they're really insecure deep down inside". No doubt that bit of nonsense was cooked up by progressives to vilify masculinity as they so often do, but now there's a study showing that it's a load of horseshit:

[Link to article](#)

Look at that. Socially and physically dominant men have the lowest rate of depression, highest self esteem. And further, it's rooted in our biology; their findings show that the men who are natural alphas are that way due to their genetics, and not adaptive behaviour as is the normally touted belief.

The researchers themselves, citizens of the secondary Canadian feminazi capital Vancouver, had this to say regarding the way we should treat bullying:

Wong recommends that, instead of trying to change how bullies think, schools expand the range of competitive, supervised activities they can participate in — giving them a less harmful channel for their dominating tendencies.

Huh, go figure. Giving men a way to channel their masculinity is healthier than forcing them to be girls. Only in modernity where masculinity is a pathology is this idea considered taboo.

There's a load of good TRP truths in there too:

Humans tend to try to establish a rank hierarchy," says Jennifer Wong, the criminology professor who led the study. "When you're in high school, it's a very limited arena in which you can establish your rank, and climbing the social ladder to be on top is one of the main ways ... Bullying is a tool you can use to get there

Men use hierarchy to establish social class. Almost like there are Alphas and Betas out there, and definitive ways to achieve either one.

Being #1 means that everyone else has to be lower on the totem pole. Don't be ashamed of asserting dominance. Fuck whoever uses shaming language to dissuade you. Women and beta faggots will always try to demonize you for it.

Of course this doesn't mean you have to destroy others to get ahead, but make it clear where you stand in relation to them, and don't hesitate to lock your hold as the social leader.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

whatsherbucket • 119 points • 28 July, 2015 06:47 PM

But is the ego in this instance real or false? Bullying is the need for validation from your peers which seems, in this context, more of a beta behavior. Alphas don't need to seek out validation because the action or the work speaks for itself; the validation comes to you, in other words. You don't seek conflict to prove your strength because you know when the time comes it will speak for itself. Bullying someone is more about intimidation than respect which would create a false sense of ego (completely unsurprising coming from teenagers.)

DannyDemotta • 50 points • 28 July, 2015 08:56 PM

Michael Jordan is one of the biggest bullies in the history of the NBA, a legendary shit-talker who played his entire GOAT career with a chip on his shoulder. On the court he was the furthest thing from a beta there's ever been. It wasn't about validation, it was about destroying his competition then shitting on their remains. "For the love of the game" is rarely enough motivation at the very top of any given industry.

"Bullying" happens for many different reasons, and on many different scales. A bully might be insecure about one or two things (star WR, in shape, great hair, tons of friends but their parents are divorced); their target is likely insecure about DOZENS of things (fat, short, acne, poor, squeaky voice, etc etc).

So to say "all bullies are insecure".....you aint really saying shit. At all. The more effective question is "Are all bullies ultimately more insecure about more things than their targets?" - and the answer to that is a resounding FUCK NO.

So much wishful thinking going on in this thread.

Myrpl • 18 points • 28 July, 2015 10:57 PM

Piggybacking your comment because I found something that proves your point and is fairly interesting to read, [here](#).

My model is that bullies are superior to their victim in some category (wealth, popularity, athleticism, capacity for violence, etc), and then use that category for their bullying. Basically, they pick a contest they can win and then rub in their superiority. In that model, one option for the bullied is to change the frame. Someone being mocked for not having money can get revenge by displaying athletic prowess, or vice versa. Bullying is presumably worse when person A is superior to person B in every (socially valued) regard, because there's no way to flip who's dominant.

The full comment and the whole thread that I linked is very interesting. I can see similarities with the concept of contextual alpha, because for someone to bully you he must be superior to you in some sense, the popular context in middle/high schools is of course violence.

Red_August • 11 points • 29 July, 2015 12:22 AM

Contextual Alpha, yes. Even on a more tactical level, it boils down to frame: establishing your frame, and holding your frame.

Strangely enough, I was at a cocktail thing tonight, and as I was doing my little round of chit-chatting with various people, I was presented to an author who was a professor of something or another. I was grinning because of how hard he tried to steer the conversation to a subject matter in which he was an expert. We had a few girls listening. He wanted me in his frame, on his territory where he was the master. I humoured him for the shortest polite amount of time, and using a third person as a foil, I

interjected a joke which threw the conversation in a completely different direction. Others chimed in, and with this momentum I took control. I'm happy to share the platform, but he wanted to AMOG, and he needed to be put on a leash. Own the frame - be as magnanimous with air time as you wish - but own the damn frame always.

[deleted] • 5 points • 28 July, 2015 11:27 PM

Sidney Crosby same thing. He is chippy dirty players which also happens to be skilled.

whatsherbucket • 2 points • 29 July, 2015 01:31 PM

I would argue that being a dick doesn't by default make you a bully. I wouldn't classify Jordan's behavior as bullying. He didn't waste his time messing with the little guys, he walked right up to the biggest guy in the room and took him down, so to speak. There's a social hierarchy and within that hierarchy the people above you are stronger, more capable, more dominate, etc. And the idea of hypergamy teaches us people, particularly women, are constantly climbing to improve status because you can't go down and improve status. Now that we've established that, bullying is the equivalent of trying to launch yourself into higher social status by going down the ladder and simply reasserting your dominance over those there. This is a waste of your energy because 1) it's redundant and 2) you cannot gain improved social status from those below, only above. And if there's no one above you anymore, fuck it, have a beer.

BlackHeart89 • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 05:12 PM

Michael Jordan is one of the biggest bullies in the history of the NBA, a legendary shit-talker who played his entire GOAT career with a chip on his shoulder.

Maybe my definition of bully is a bit messed up. To me, I just saw him as being aggressive. The other guys are in the same league as him. Alpha vs Alpha.

CZ-75 • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 01:20 AM

I wouldn't call that bullying, it's more like intimidation. When you're playing a game, you're trying to physically and mentally defeat your opponent.

NO_LAH_WHERE_GOT • 2 points • 29 July, 2015 09:09 AM

That's exactly what bullies do. We're all playing a game called "the social game", or "the human game". Bullies physically and mentally defeat their opponents.

Grompher • 6 points • 29 July, 2015 01:39 PM

Until they get punched in the face and are unable to cope with defeat. They thought they were billy badass until they meet billy badass. Now they are in shambles identity crisis. Bullies are betas. Wannabe/temporary Alphas, but ultimately betas.

DannyDemotta • -2 points • 30 July, 2015 05:36 AM

Your revenge scenarios are so fucking stupid, and the fact so many other people are having them is just pathetic. It makes me want to slam my head into a fucking brick wall, seeing how sad and weak so many of you guys are.

"There's no unicorns! AWALT, right guys!??!" - and you believe it.

But you're stupid enough....*so fucking stupid* that you truly believe that 100% of bullies - every single one, without exception - eventually get punched back in the face, and back down, and have some identity crisis. Such a beta bitch thought to have.

Russell Wilson has admitted that he was a bully back in High School. How's that working out for him? Wait, don't answer, because you're weak as shit. And I can't learn from people who are weak as a bitch.

BlackHeart89 • 2 points • 29 July, 2015 05:15 PM

Bullies only bully the weak. They are bullying people who they aren't even competing with. It would be like MMA fighter picking a fight with a spectator and claiming, "I'm the best fighter in here". But then sucking up and being friendly to the other fighters.

mickeysf • -3 points • 29 July, 2015 12:50 AM

But Michael Jordan is a piece of shit person on and off the court. Why would I want to emulate him? You can be dominant without feeling the compulsion to push down non-threatening people in the pecking order. For example, was it a good idea for Jordan to invite his HS basketball coach to the hall of fame induction only to give him an 'I told you so' story? Balance. Humility. Empathy. And strength! That's the real path. Jordan will die a bitter man.

RedPharaohRising • 13 points • 29 July, 2015 04:00 AM

Balance. Humility. Empathy. And strength! That's the real path.

Careful, you're projecting your morality here. There's no 'real' path.

NO_LAH_WHERE_GOT • 8 points • 29 July, 2015 09:11 AM

Yup. And "Jordan will die a bitter man" is classic sour grapes. This is the sort of projecting people do to feel better about themselves. See also: poor people saying, "I may not be rich, but at least I'm happy."

DannyDemotta • 2 points • 30 July, 2015 05:38 AM

"Look at how thin she is! She must be so unhappy. Sure, she's smiling and happy and gets so much attention from other guys, but I bet what she REALLY wants is more cake." - the fatlogic version

Just straight idiotic. I have no doubts in my mind that we are being brigaded by this point. Either that, or we're being overrun by absolute fucking MORONS that haven't even touched the sidebar material - just jumped right in and started spouting stupid shit.

joeyjoesharknado • 12 points • 28 July, 2015 11:19 PM

I agree. The best leaders I've encountered have had no need to throw their weight around or bully subordinates. They typically exude quiet confidence and strength. This is true Alpha to me.

In addition, I've found women (esp. in office environments) to be the biggest bullies of all. Typically to other women. And this behaviour is purely ego. It has no rational basis or logically thought out endpoint.

[deleted] • 2 points • 29 July, 2015 02:50 AM

They might not bully you because you aren't their competition

Cyralea[S] • 15 points • 28 July, 2015 07:06 PM

Bullying is the need for validation from your peers which seems

Not necessarily. Achieving social dominance isn't validation-seeking behaviour in the pejorative sense that is normally ascribed to non-confrontational men. It's a means of self-actualization, the same way that competing in a sport to be the best is.

Alphas aren't validation-seeking, but they are definitely socially dominant. Many times this manifests as putting competitors in their place. You'll find that the more you climb the social ladder the more people try to knock you down a peg.

When kids bully each other in school, they typically pick on the weak simply because it's easy. Attacking other strong individuals carries with it risk, with little added benefit. Picking on the weak establishes yourself as higher up in the pecking order. People see that you're above others because of the way you dominate others.

This isn't an endorsement for bullying, mind you, merely a descriptive analysis for the behaviour.

Trillidelphia • 26 points • 28 July, 2015 08:03 PM

I remember looking at a study awhile back that was done on high schoolers which described the young males, those who wanted to move up in social stature (aspiring alphas), to be highly aggressive and confrontational, especially when a girl was around.

The ultra popular (true alphas), on the other hand, were often considered the most friendly and accommodating. Just some food for thought.

rporion • 13 points • 28 July, 2015 11:51 PM

Its the same with chimpanzees, the up and coming next-gen alphas are full of cortisol, a stress hormone, the established ones are cool as fuck.

yestheman1 • 7 points • 29 July, 2015 01:25 AM

This is the same study I read. People at the top don't bully because they have no need to. It is only low men on the totem poll who have to bully.

mickeysf • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 01:08 AM

It's probably because the true alphas had a better starting hand. If you are a great looking guy and you can play football reasonably well and if you are a smart kid with a future, you don't need to contrive a ton of strategies to get girls to like you. They will flock to you. These true alphas will dismiss easily the rest that are trying to emulate what they have with some PUA playbook. It will never work because they dont have the goods.

averageredditor123 • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 04:56 AM

The ultra popular (true alphas), on the other hand, were often considered the most friendly and accommodating.

Most likely, their status can't be threatened because they're already a star athlete, extremely good-looking, etc. Why put anyone down if there's no competition?

scrantonic1ty • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 05:13 PM

Not necessarily. The most popular people in my highschool were the funny guys, life of the party types. They'd occasionally use their powers for evil but usually they were just cool as fuck and knew how to get people to genuinely like them and want to be around them.

averageredditor123 • 0 points • 30 July, 2015 10:45 PM

The most popular people in my highschool were the funny guys, life of the party types.

Yeah, there were some people like that in my school who were in the popular crowd, but they were short and scrawny so they never got any action. Meanwhile, the more chill tall and athletic popular guys had no trouble.

AlphaJesus • 7 points • 28 July, 2015 08:53 PM

I don't know why you are getting down voted because you're actually being objective about the RP truths you're supporting in your case.

Remember fellas. Forget everything you learned growing up. Forget your "bad" school years that weren't "good" as defined by westernized entertainment (The Ministry of Social Conditioning) and UBSFS (Unique Beautiful Snowflake Syndrome) and your BP brainwashing fantasy.

WE COME FROM THE JUNGLE AND "BULLYING" IS AN OLD MASCULINE VALUE THAT AT ONE TIME WAS A NECESSITY IN A NOW FOREIGN ENVIRONMENT. IT'S NOT IMMORAL. ITS AMORAL AS ARE ALL THINGS WE DISCUSS HERE.

But in an environment of LIFE and DEATH (Pre-Civilization) it is an necessary "evil" to bring about your survival, which is a "good."

Understand it for what it is as it is and not how 12 year old Chad Thundercock used to push you around on the playground.

Sooner or later he wised up and harnessed that masculine energy into being captain of the football team, cultivating his dark triad traits, and fucking the girls you orbited.

Social Dominance in the jungle used to be life and death when social interactions involved some dude from another tribe coming to your tribe to take your women, resources, and/or children.

Stabbing him in the face with a sword was a necessary masculine value.

Granted today it is misplaced and evolved into "bullying" in a society that we all know completely disregards and shames masculine imperatives.

Don't be a bitch about it because that masculine trait is hardwired into your DNA and is essentially why any of us are alive and breathing here today learning RP theory to take control of our lives. We are all winners somewhere down the line. Don't take for granted how your ancestral fathers got you here today.

Take that God given testosterone and channel it not into "bullying" but lifting, self-improvement, and achieving your goals.

This is even doubly more important on a MRA scale for the younger generation of males coming up in our place.

Guys like us are gonna be few and far in between in the next few decades and our lives will most likely be standards of living that others BP males close to breaking out of the matrix will want to live up to and that others in the matrix who will never break out of will shame us.

We already see this today. So be amoral. Be Black Knight. Hold your fucking ground amongst the times and amongst the sheep.

You're either a black wolf or a black sheep if you're a man in westernized feminized society. Either way you're gonna be an outcast.

Predator or prey choose.

Wolfs, foxes, lions, bears, hyenas, jaguars, and etc are all predators but with different strategies.

Pick a side, adopt a strategy, or roll over and die.

It's the circle of life.

Sdom1 • 2 points • 29 July, 2015 05:07 PM

"BULLYING" IS AN OLD MASCULINE VALUE

Wait, so women aren't bullies? They're probably worse than men when it comes to bullying.

Social Dominance in the jungle used to be life and death when social interactions involved some dude from another tribe coming to your tribe to take your women, resources, and/or children.

Stabbing him in the face with a sword was a necessary masculine value.

In what way is being able to engage in violence in self-defense related to a group of third grade girls tormenting another little girl via social media? Or a bigger, stronger boy beating up on a weaker boy to impress a girl, for that matter?

If you wanted to actually make a real argument in support of your cause, you could claim that bullying was a way to punish unproductive or dangerous behaviors in prehistoric tribal times. But I could counter that there's a difference in that it has a defined goal, and if the behavior changes, the bullying stops.

AlphaJesus • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 06:43 PM

What in really trying to get at is the drive behind bullying and not nessecarily the act of bullying itsslf. My writing skills aren't that great so I may have not have gotten that point across as much as I wanted too.

Yes women are capable of bullying too but it's a different side of the same coin.

It's mental violence. Women are as machiavellian as water is wet.

A man's instinct is to hit but a women's instinct is to hit you in the mind. I.e. Shit tests.

Sdom1 • 2 points • 30 July, 2015 02:52 PM

Again, this depends on the environment more than genetics. A white, upper class man is more likely to psychologically bully as fighting is too harshly punished in that society to be worth it.

Black and Hispanic girls, on the other hand, often physically bully. There was a video online of a black girl beating up a white girl she didn't like. Snatched her off a bench by the hair and the 3 year old on her lap went flying. Then she kicked the shit out of the girl. It was more aggressive than most fights I see men engage in, and I've seen many and participated in my share.

Black and hispanic girls don't have more testosterone than a man of any race, so there's something else that is causing that behavior. Further, when you look at black or hispanic girls from middle to upper middle class intact families, that tendency disappears.

Again, this is more environmentally driven.

needsomehelp3211 • 7 points • 28 July, 2015 08:58 PM

I have no idea why you're downvoted. I think you've hurt people's feel-feels... nobody wants to be told

that bullying is an observed effective sexual strategy.

Folks would rather live in a fantasy world, where the nice guy gets the girl and the bullies get their due comeuppance once day.

collidoscope • 8 points • 29 July, 2015 08:52 AM

Facebook has shown me that all of the people that bullied me or treated me like shit growing up never "got what was coming to them" which teachers, parents, etc assured me would happen. In fact, those people seem to have turned out just fine. Meanwhile, I'm still sorting my shit out because of a long past with shitty self-esteem.

I've started reading *No More Mr. Nice Guy*, which has been an eye-opener so far. After hearing about it on TRP, the reason I bought it was because of this 1-star review on Amazon:

This book changed my son into a jerk.

This book changed my only son into a jerk. He is only 23, and was always a kind, sensitive, and respectful. He told me he was reading it after a girl broke his heart. Now he is having one night stands, yelling at me for being too kind and generous to other people, insulting minorities, and acting pompous. The one thing that I remember him telling me about the book is that boys have too many women in their lives, like teachers and mothers, who make them soft. I hate you Robert Glover.

somewhereadogbarks • 0 points • 29 July, 2015 10:02 AM

Sounds like a great marketing strategy, especially the "Now he's having one night stands" bit. Sounds like you lapped it up to. Just saying.

collidoscope • 3 points • 29 July, 2015 04:41 PM

There are hundreds of reviews for the book. Your accusations are groundless.

Cyralea[S] • 7 points • 28 July, 2015 10:39 PM

You should have seen the initial fallout from the thread I made about rape. We're all prone to emotional investment to our deeply held ideas. Takes a while for the TRP mentality to set in.

BlackHeart89 • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 05:23 PM

We all know better than that.

I think the point is, bullying and asserting dominance to exude alpha status are similar, but different.

Bullies bully the weak and only the weak. This implies that bullies are also weak.

dapowa • 2 points • 28 July, 2015 09:04 PM

The downvotes are uncalled for, here. This is objective analysis, a fundamental for logical thought.

On a related note, when I was younger I found myself shoved around and bullied a lot, jumped by cliques of older black guys. (I'm white, was quite literally the only 'white house' on the street.)

There's a difference I'm trying to touch on here that I'm struggling to put into words - The dominance plays in the school were bullying, sure - but I was the definition of an easy target. The jumpings, however.. well, crazy's gonna be crazy + mob/gang related mentality shows through there more than the concept of bullying. I may have gone a bit off topic, but I do think the distinction I'm trying to verbalize (poorly accomplishing it, mind you) is significant.

juliusstreicher • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 12:03 AM

Exactly. Also, when the bully pushes the dork around, he does it for his own amusement, not for validation. The first few times that they do it, it raises their social level among their peers—who wouldn't take the free social points, simply by amusing one's self?

yeahweewe • 1 point • 30 July, 2015 04:18 AM

Bully is only validation when later in life you realize your downfalls (dumb jocks without enough athletic skill) for anyone else they never have an actual downfall so it's very real alpha behavior, and if it is fake beta behavior does it matter if it's an illusion if it never breaks?

Di-onysos • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 04:27 AM

I would put this as: bullying is a tool of increasing your social status at the expense of someone else's and establishing & maintaining dominance. The higher one's social status is, the less he needs to use bullying to maintain it (though ones with aggressive dispositions are likely to use it all the time for their own enjoyment).

It also functions as a fitness/shit test. The ones who submit will be relegated to lower rungs of the ladder. Group hierarchy sorting tool.

Corndog_Enthusiast • -1 points • 28 July, 2015 08:53 PM

Ah see, here's some common sense. The most 'alpha' individuals will be at the top of the chain, but even though they're more 'alpha', they won't be the archetypal example. Barely anybody is, so I suppose bullying could possibly be a manifestation of those flaws. Or maybe kids are just jackasses.

[deleted] • 41 points • 28 July, 2015 07:20 PM

Since this has been reposted again, I'll paste in some of my comment from another thread, along with some extra info.

Here is a link to the whole study, for anyone interested.

What the study found was that of all of those who admitted to bullying behaviors, about 58% of them were not bullied themselves, whereas 42% of them were bullied and then turned around and bullied others. That's a statistically significant difference, but it's not as significant as the articles imply, especially considering that the sample was all taken from the same school, just the one time.

So, what they've found is that the majority of bullying comes from the top down, rather than from the bottom up. Well, no kidding. How does someone with no advantage over you bully you? Bullies are either physically tougher or backed by status and peers.

They also found that bullies were less depressed than kids who were bullied. Again, no kidding.

Researcher: "What did you do today?"

Kid 1: "I pushed a kid around at school and made my friends laugh."

Researcher: "How do you feel?"

Kid 1: "Fine."

Researcher: ""What did you do today?"

Kid 2: "I got pushed down the stairs and everyone laughed at me."

Researcher: "How do you feel?"

Kid 1: "Pretty depressed."

The idea that this is genetic is entirely a hypothesis and goes against some existing evolutionary theory. Even if there were a genetic factor—which there certainly could be—epigenetics shows us that genes are not destiny.

Let's also talk about the myth so prevalent here that there is a historical evolutionary basis for being a dick to other men in order to claw your way up the social circle to leadership. The whole "nasty, brutish, short" idea of life in ancient societies has been debunked over and over again. Studies of hunter-gatherer groups, which are the closest link we have with our ancestors, show that they are almost entirely egalitarian societies. I.e., they share everything and exist in extremely cooperative societies.

The research of Peter Gray and E. Fuller Torrey, in particular, shows that hunter-gatherer tribes operate like one big family and interpersonal violence and threats are almost unheard of. Not only that, but men who try to set themselves up as above the others or more important get shunned and laughed at by the tribe until they learn some humility.

The best leaders are the ones who lead from the front and don't put themselves up as being better than their men. See Earnest Shackleton as one of the best examples in history.

The idea that being selfish and violent is somehow a superior male behavior has no scientific support.

confuseacatlmt • 8 points • 28 July, 2015 07:57 PM **[recovered]**

I too disagree with the premise that it is ALL genetic, but the point of the article was that it dispelled the myth that bullies feel bad about themselves. They feel great because they've "won" at something (and gotten the testosterone spike from it) and raised their social status.

As for the tribal thing, this article actually suggests more activities to channel aggression. That is how the tribes establish social rank, so they don't need bullying much. The guy they choose to have the first shot at their prey, that guy is the alpha. The guy who is best at tracking? Well he's pretty fucking useful too! Mutual respect plus hierarchy.

DannyDemotta • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 09:02 PM

Exactly. Big difference between hunter-gatherer, and just gatherer.

Beta/weak males wouldnt be trusted to hunt, and would have to gather with the women; top males would be the most trusted hunters and have the most say-so; and so on. Even then, no hunters would respect the leadership of even a genius-level gatherer beta bitch male.

Sdom1 • 2 points • 30 July, 2015 04:30 PM

NO, stop it with all of your logic and reason. And especially stop it with all of those research-backed assertions. Don't you know that dark triad is the way to go?

Cyralea[S] • -2 points • 28 July, 2015 07:26 PM

They also found that bullies were less depressed than kids who were bullied. Again, no kidding.

Actually, this is what's not so obvious. Conventional wisdom is that bullies are low in self-esteem, and bully others as a means of channelling their insecurity. What this study shows is that this simply isn't true. We can speculate about the rest, but this much is strongly evidenced by the study.

Also, your study is behind a paywall. Got an alternate link?

DuncanMonroe • 3 points • 29 July, 2015 12:19 AM

Why do you think conventional wisdom is that bullies are low self esteem? This much I've never understood. It's counterintuitive, if you ask me.

RedPharaohRising • 2 points • 29 July, 2015 04:04 AM

Conventional wisdom believes in rainbows, unicorns, and fairytale weddings. It's malarkey. They

can't(or rather, won't) attribute this to the idea that someone could actually be born with a cruel streak. It's much less of a cognitive dissonance to the idea of the-world-is-good.

Hence, the plebs endorse the idea of " The only way someone would hurt you is if they were hurt in turn".

False premise. Some people are born assholes. They get a kick out of making others suffer.

Cyralea[S] • 0 points • 29 July, 2015 01:29 AM

I never gave it much thought, the same way that I never gave much thought to the nature of female primacy growing up. It's amazing what you can be indoctrinated with passively during adolescence.

[deleted] • 2 points • 29 July, 2015 02:12 PM

Actually, this is what's not so obvious. Conventional wisdom is that bullies are low in self-esteem, and bully others as a means of channelling their insecurity.

The funny thing is that studies have shown that this is not necessarily true for quite some time. Here is a link to an abstract from 1985 that shows much the same thing. This study shows a fairly even split between high-status bullies and those who both bully and are bullied. Interestingly, although it was conducted in low socioeconomic areas the rate of bullying is half that of the more recent study (13% total bullies). Anyway, the study says that despite the fact that the high-status bullies had problems "getting along with classmates" they were "psychologically strongest and enjoyed high social standing among their classmates". Go figure.

However, as someone else here pointed out, school is an environment that produces antisocial behaviors, in and of itself. It's an artificial construct and over-crowded. Many studies, along with the famous "Rat Park" from the 1970s, demonstrate that overcrowding, lack of free play, and other factors found in schools all can cause antisocial behavior just by themselves (there are studies on humans, too, of course). When all put together, it becomes a place where studies of people in school really just reflect how people act in that sort of environment and shouldn't be broadly extrapolated as reflecting human nature outside of that sort of environment.

A tribal situation is much less of a me-versus-them situation for men. As I posted elsewhere, testosterone levels do not rise in men who win against friends, only when they compete against outsiders. In school, boys are thrown together with relative outsiders all the time, hence the more competitive social environment. See also Dunbar's Number.

Also, your study is behind a paywall. Got an alternate link?

I don't, sorry. Only to the abstract.

[deleted] • 20 points • 28 July, 2015 08:18 PM

What's muddling this is that "bullying" has been defined to mean lots of things that aren't really bullying.

Shade_Raven • 6 points • 29 July, 2015 01:01 AM

When I was a kid , my friends used to come to the lunch table armed with jokes and insults but at the end of the day we were bros.

Now that shit is a lawsuit

BlackHeart89 • 2 points • 29 July, 2015 05:44 PM

Same here. In elementary, I remember sitting at a table with a bunch of guys in class everyday that would

make jokes and talk shit about me for the entire class period. It took me weeks to realize that they considered me a friend. Anyone else they completely ignored. After realizing this, I started cracking jokes on them. We all laughed together and began sitting with each other at lunch and so forth.

Even before realizing they didn't have an issue with me, I never went home crying about it. I would just be like, "Goddamn. Lets gets this 1 hour of talking shit over with".

Nowadays, that would be called bullying. I always just considered them to be stupid fuckers that joke around a lot.

GoldPisseR • 23 points • 28 July, 2015 06:50 PM

I hate bullies from the core of my soul.

A close friend attempted suicide because of that.

He's now on a money making spree and will hire some muscle to fuck his bullies up.Its not possible to forget and forgive the person who degraded you to tethers.

Cyralea[S] • 21 points • 28 July, 2015 06:56 PM

I hear you. I was bullied too during my teen years, and I can see how it's a sensitive spot for some of the men in this sub. It doesn't change the truth; when you come to TRP, a lot of the ideas simply won't be palatable, but that doesn't change the truth.

CumForJesus • 7 points • 28 July, 2015 08:16 PM*

This comment has been overwritten by an open source script to protect this user's privacy.

If you would like to do the same, add the browser extension GreaseMonkey to Firefox and add this open source script.

Then simply click on your username on Reddit, go to the comments tab, and hit the new OVERWRITE button at the top.

foldpak111 • -1 points • 28 July, 2015 09:38 PM

He needs to take the business ownership route, like I did. I've done well for myself financially and plan on hiring two bodyguards by the end of this year.

DuncanMonroe • 3 points • 29 July, 2015 12:24 AM

How much fucking money do you make to justify hiring a bodyguard? Most (low level) millionaires I've encountered never hired a bodyguard. Either you're making 7 figured or you're living a deluded fantasy.

RedPharaohRising • 3 points • 29 July, 2015 04:06 AM

What do you do that warrants having a personal bodyguard? Sounds like you're actually worried about occupational hazards.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 11:57 PM

Just out of curiosity, do you mind sharing how much you make/how high profile what you do is that you think two bodyguards is a useful way to spend your money?

needsomehelp3211 • 16 points • 28 July, 2015 08:57 PM

Interesting how nobody has mentioned the sex appeal aspect. The article mentions that bullies were also the ones slaying the most pussy in high school.

More evidence for the fact that girls get horny for aggressive and intimidating men. If you put others down, you will become more attractive in the eyes of most women.

Note: this is **not** an explicit endorsement of bullying, just an impartial observation of what works. The meanest guys are also the ones with the biggest harems.

BlackHeart89 • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 05:41 PM

The article mentions that bullies were also the ones slaying the most pussy in high school.

I've never witnessed this before. In my experience, it was the popular kids who got the most pussy. The funny guy with the good looks and a car. Or the guy with all the money that was also in a gang, but was cool with everyone, though occasionally cracking jokes on everybody.

Then again, my school didn't have many bullies. Or at least not that I was aware of.

[deleted] • 16 points • 28 July, 2015 06:21 PM

[permanently deleted]

Cyralea[S] • 0 points • 28 July, 2015 06:23 PM

They made the argument that it's due to genetics, hence causation. Granted, it's a single study with a limited sample size.

UncharminglyWitty • 6 points • 28 July, 2015 06:51 PM

You can make any argument you choose. Correlation can never be asserted as causation. End of story.

larrythetomato • 3 points • 29 July, 2015 02:56 AM

Correlation can never be asserted as causation.

It's correlation does not imply causation.

Not correlation is **never** causation. Correlation is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for causation. To repeat, **every variable that is causal is correlated.**

UncharminglyWitty • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 02:59 AM

You're right. But I picked the word "asserted" on purpose.

Cyralea[S] • 2 points • 28 July, 2015 06:54 PM

That doesn't make sense. There are ways of demonstrating causation. Dose-dependency is one such way, for example.

Get rid of touting the crap you're used to hearing within the rest of reddit.

thegayestfaggot • 11 points • 28 July, 2015 07:07 PM

Other issue: lowest *reported* rates of depression

where someone less dominant may not see depression as a weakness, someone more dominant may not report it (i'm a psych grad student, this little fact is used to skew a lot of survey studies)

Cyralea[S] • 5 points • 28 July, 2015 07:08 PM

Yep, further studies are definitely needed.

DannyDemotta • 0 points • 28 July, 2015 08:44 PM

Yet when people "report" being depressed or "report" being anxious, absent any objective tests/measurements, doctors have no problem loading them up on happy pills to make their problems go away - which more often than not just compounds the issue.

Thx psychology for all the wonderful work you do!

thegayestfaggot • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 09:48 PM

Psychology doesn't prescribe, that's psychiatry.

Also I don't support anti depressants unless for severe, severe depression, and are proven not to work for mild or moderate depression (SSRIs anyway, SNRIs might be different but for some reason they're prescribed less.)

Psychology is helpful for a lot of people.

UncharminglyWitty • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 07:48 PM

It's not reddit. It's the entire world. You cannot draw causes from correlations. Period. There's nothing else to debate about it, otherwise we'd have banned ice cream long ago as a leading causes of drowning deaths. There is 1 single instance in which correlation has been allowed to draw a causal effect in the scientific communities and that is with smoking and cancer. And that took a 50 year legal battle to legitimize with studies spanning at least that long to back up an unbelievably high R2 term.

Just because you're ignorant of basic statistics doesn't mean the rest of us are.

Cyralea[S] • 0 points • 28 July, 2015 07:53 PM

I don't think you read my previous statement. There are ways of demonstrating causation. Showing that a correlation (smoking) is causative (lung cancer deaths). This isn't the only such instance where this is true, it's rather asinine to suggest it.

UncharminglyWitty • 0 points • 28 July, 2015 08:00 PM

It is the only time it has been accepted as a causal relationship by a scientific community. To suggest otherwise is asinine. If you can't control for other variables then all you have is correlation.

WAFComment score below threshold • -5 points • 28 July, 2015 07:06 PM

Throughout this thread you sound like a bully who found a study that he thinks exonerates him for being shitty to people. You seem really frustrated that you can't intimidate people into agreeing with you.

DannyDemotta • 4 points • 28 July, 2015 08:46 PM

Tone policing, are we? Shaming tactics? I could have sworn i read a thread (or 50) about how we dont do that around here.

Not going to stop people like you though. You're here on your own agenda, not because you believe in the TRP cause.

WAFComment score below threshold • -2 points • 28 July, 2015 10:45 PM

....that's not tone policing, nor shaming. I bluntly called him out for stamping his feet whenever anyone disagreed with his frankly myopic reading of the study.

Cyralea[S] • 6 points • 28 July, 2015 07:09 PM

Quite the opposite, I was bullied in my teens. Recognizing the truth means sometimes putting your ego aside and accepting the way things are, even if they make you feel uncomfortable.

yestheman1 • 4 points • 28 July, 2015 07:23 PM

Bullying is a strategy for social dominance, but a bad one. It works, short term, I think. However, in the end, either the group, or an alpha with more emotional control will win, because people get sick of bullies.

My observation, backed by some high school bullying research, is that bullying is a beta problem. Contrary to popular belief, bullying usually happens between guys with lower social status. It's an easy way for a beta to score a few dominance points by picking on someone even weaker.

Cyralea[S] • 2 points • 28 July, 2015 07:36 PM

Bullying happens in the higher strata as well, but it manifests differently. You'll see Alphas AMOG'ing each other, and using playful but invective jokes or commentary. It's the same premise, played more skillfully.

yestheman1 • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 08:07 PM

That's true, but that's not really bullying, since both parties understand it much differently.

Cyralea[S] • 0 points • 28 July, 2015 08:13 PM

It's not the same manifestation as with middle schoolers, but the functional principle, social hierarchy dominance, is the same.

DannyDemotta • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 08:49 PM

Precisely.

That's why the media/SJWs get so overprotective and bitchy any time an athlete like Michael Sam comes out as a gay.

They already know what will happen - the teasing and joking will be RELENTLESS.

But counter to the daft OP up above's view it won't be because all those 250lb athletes with 7% BF have "lower than average testosterone", but for the reasons you just enunciated.

garlicextract • 0 points • 28 July, 2015 07:52 PM

It found correlation (IN MIDDLE SCHOOLERS!)

mordanus • 7 points • 28 July, 2015 07:26 PM

I think that the problem in the comments relates back to what each person's definition of a bully is. Most arguments can be resolved like this actually. I think that most people here are hearing you say "be the guy that picks on everyone smaller than you" and you are saying "compete and be better than other people and fuck how they feel about it"

'Bullying' is as natural for men to do as finding women attractive. It's part of our programming to find out who we are. We test ourselves to see if we are better than other men and if we aren't we get knocked down a few pegs. This lets us know our place in the tribe and also demonstrates to the women who is most attractive.

The bad side of this is that not everyone is going to be a winner. Our society has this concept of equality that we have all bought into for some reason that everyone should be an equal. In concept it's nice but in reality it doesn't work. It teaches you to not compete to your fullest or to grow because everyone gets a medal for participating. When you put this to reality though you just get left frustrated because you believe you should be good enough as is but you never are. In order to be good enough as a man means that we must be better than we are. That means we can never stop and must always be improving.

DannyDemotta • 8 points • 28 July, 2015 10:53 PM

The funny (or cruel) addendum to that is, when someone is clearly the physical inferior to another, they'll convince themselves they're the intellectual superior (the dumb jock/smart nerd dichotomy)

This also is routinely false; there's a shitton of stupid nerds out there who are good for nothing. Then there's former jocks who go on to succeed in the business world, academia, medicine, law, etc etc.

It's sad, but it's reality. Karma doesn't real.

BlackHeart89 • 3 points • 29 July, 2015 04:58 PM

Being #1 means that everyone else has to be lower on the totem pole. Don't be ashamed of asserting dominance.

The thing about bullies is, they only bully those who are already openly known as being on the bottom of the totem pole. They never go after someone on their level or even slightly below their level.

It implies that they are actually weak. It's okay to assert dominance. But a lion asserting dominance over a baby gazelle means nothing. In fact, it implies the opposite of what you're trying to convey.

Cyralea[S] • 2 points • 29 July, 2015 05:03 PM

The thing about bullies is, they only bully those who are already openly known as being on the bottom of the totem pole. They never go after someone on their level or even slightly below their level.

Only because there's little added benefit to doing so. They achieve the position of social dominance in other's eyes by bullying, irrespective of the status of the bullied individual. There's no need for them to take on the added risk of bullying another high status individual.

You only need to *position* yourself as a socially dominant person. You don't have to beat up everyone along the way to achieve this.

BlackHeart89 • 2 points • 29 July, 2015 08:04 PM

There's no need for them to take on the added risk of bullying another high status individual.

But if the goal is to assert dominance, what's the point of bullying someone who is already known to be below you? Anyone on the same level as the bully or who thinks he is, will merely think, "Ha. I wish a motherfucker would try me like that".

But stepping on the weak and timid, isn't doing anything but implying that he is stronger than the weak and timid. It accomplishes nothing.

How many times have you seen a kid get picked on and thought to yourself, "wow. I better not mess with that guy. He's beating up that nerd"?

Cyralea[S] • 2 points • 29 July, 2015 08:06 PM

But if the goal is to assert dominance, what's the point of bullying someone who is already known to be below you?

You're not just asserting dominance to the person you're beating up, you're *signalling* dominance to those around you. You're sending out the message that you're socially superior in your peer groups. Outsiders only see aggressor and victim; the latter is the social loser, so by definition the former is the winner.

Of course, this dynamic plays out differently as we age, throwing fists no longer works as well for establishing dominance in a social group. There are verbal methods to achieving the same thing.

BlackHeart89 • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 08:35 PM

You're not just asserting dominance to the person you're beating up, you're signalling dominance to those around you.

I've addressed this.

You're sending out the message that you're socially superior in your peer groups.

I've never even heard of a bully bullying someone in his peer group. It's always someone outside of his peer group. Weaker than his peer group.

Outsiders only see aggressor and victim; the latter is the social loser, so by definition the former is the winner.

Maybe my experience is different. Maybe the outlier. But from what I've witnessed, the bullied is perceived as weak and the bully is perceived as being a punk for picking on the weak. This would explain why I rarely saw any bullying.

The dominant ones at my school were the most popular. They showed it by controlling conversation, intimidating anyone who challenged them, etc. Never bullying.

Cyralea[S] • 2 points • 29 July, 2015 08:42 PM

Anyone on the same level as the bully or who thinks he is, will merely think Not necessarily. Many will simply gravitate towards you. It's often other, low-status individuals who operate the way you suggest, because they see themselves as potential prey.

I've never even heard of a bully bullying someone in his peer group. It's always someone outside of his peer group. Weaker than his peer group.

I never meant to suggest differently. Bullying someone outside of your peer group signals to your own peer group that you are on the winning side of the equation when it comes to dominance (it helps, think of bullying in this context not to mean physical aggression, but social bullying via male shit-testing or invective attacks).

But from what I've witnessed, the bullied is perceived as weak and the bully is perceived as being a punk for picking on the weak

You can use punk/aggressor interchangeably here. The undisputed thing is that he is socially dominant, even if he's an asshole. Recall that an Alpha does not have to be a nice person. Think of the drug dealer and other assorted bad boy types. These men are at the top of their

social groups.

The dominate ones at my school were the most popular. They showed it by controlling conversation, intimidating anyone who challenged them, etc. Never bullying.

You say controlling and intimidating, which is precisely how bullying works as we get older and more socially sophisticated. Bullying doesn't manifest as flying fists beyond a certain age, it's a primitive form of adolescent dominant control.

BlackHeart89 • 2 points • 29 July, 2015 11:43 PM

Think of the drug dealer and other assorted bad boy types. These men are at the top of their social groups.

Maybe I'm misunderstanding what you mean when you mention their social groups. Being a bad boy or drug dealer doesn't place you at the top of your social group. You have to outperformed those in said social group to be at the top of it.

A bully demonstrates to his group that he too can beat up the weakly, doesn't assert dominance amongst anyone in his group. It just means that...

Ha. I see (I think). You're saying that it keeps the others in his group from basically turning on him?

Cyralea[S] • 1 point • 30 July, 2015 03:14 AM

Pretty much. "This is a guy who isn't to be fucked with".

BlackHeart89 • 2 points • 30 July, 2015 02:13 PM

Gotcha. Though I see it more as a, "He's one of us".

I've been a bully before, but it was out of pure ignorance.

I still see bullying as a weak thing to do if you're doing it to appear dominate. But I can also see how someone would use it in order to get acceptance within a certain group. So yeah. Being a bully can be a successful social strategy. But unlike OP, I would never recommend it. There are much less damaging and much more effective ways to become socially accepted.

Gunnilingus • 3 points • 29 July, 2015 08:33 PM

ITT: People who have imbibed the SJW definition of a bully and believe that a bully is inherently insecure and only preys on the weak to assuage their own broken self-esteem. Well, here's some Webster's for ya:

"Bully: to act the bully toward; intimidate; domineer."

OP is correct. Bullying is about dominance; it doesn't have anything to do with the bully's self-esteem. I'd occasionally bully kids in middle school, not because I felt bad about myself, but because I was witty, and I noticed that when I'd deal out scathing, funny insults to *anyone*, weak or strong, everyone else admired me for my wit and I was thus elevated socially. And if the bully IS inferior by some measures when compared to the general population; well, he's doing the best that he can to make sure that everyone knows that there's still people lower than him on the totem pole. Alpha is a spectrum; if you can't be apex, then it's still preferable to be considered alpha in lower circles.

SexyDevil • 33 points • 28 July, 2015 06:07 PM*

I'm all for condoning dominance but the reality is that the bullies have lower than average testosterone rates. This is why their hormonal balance and nervous system state is beta - too hectic.

Bullies are quick on flinching, yelling, assuming dominant posture (that is faked), and trying to increase their intimidation factor through faking because they are in essence not confident enough to feel calm and assertive in the face of confrontation, which is why they choose to substitute it by screaming and acting angry. Why? Because anger suppresses anxiety. And they feel it all the time.

Do you think its a coincidence that research found that most of the bullies have severe psychological disorders due to various forms of trauma, including domestic abuse, sexual trauma, death in the family, and lack of powerful male role models? They are scared, and acting on fear trying to overcome it through rage - and it doesn't work like that unfortunately, it'd be too easy.

Yes, sure that they do have more testosterone than the class's most famous nerds and scared kids of single moms. But **truly high** testosterone levels, science says (I don't have the time to search google and scientific experiments for exact results, you can take or leave this fact at your discretion) are characterized by constant, unshakeable calm state of mind and emotion with expressions of brutal aggression **in the face of perceived injustice**.

Think Fedor Emelianenko.

Regarding the post I do agree on the rates of depression and other displayed facts, except for the statement that being #1 and being dominant equals being bully - it's just wrong. I never in my life knew any bullies who were #1.

CreateTheFuture • 31 points • 28 July, 2015 06:59 PM

No True Scotsman

the reality is that the bullies have lower than average testosterone rates

How the fuck would you know that?

THCanadian17 • 9 points • 28 July, 2015 07:50 PM

No doubt haha Such a ridiculous claim.

Cyralea[S] • 9 points • 28 July, 2015 06:12 PM

I'm all for condoning dominance but the reality is that the bullies have lower than average testosterone rates

Disagree completely. I'd argue the opposite. High testosterone correlates with increased aggression, physicality, hierarchy dominance and shorter temper. These are hallmark behaviours in bullies.

Going to need a citation for your claim. That's a pretty bold claim that flies in the face of most of our tenets here, chiefly that it's limp-wristed SJW's that are concerned with attacking perceived injustices.

colucci • 18 points • 28 July, 2015 06:31 PM

High testosterone correlates with increased aggression, physicality, hierarchy dominance and shorter temper.

So much testosterone!

I mean, yes testosterone makes you more aggressive and dominant. Being stupid allows that to express itself through bullying. If you're smart enough, you'd funnel your aggression and competitiveness towards shit that matters instead of bullying people.

Cyralea[S] • -1 points • 28 July, 2015 06:32 PM

Establishing yourself as the social hierarchy leader *is* shit that matters. And you achieve that through aggression and displays of dominance.

brianjamesxx • 3 points • 28 July, 2015 09:57 PM

That little cocksucker is nowhere near the top of social hierarchy.

tomysotomayorfluxboys • 9 points • 28 July, 2015 06:15 PM

A lot of limp-wristed SJW's are bullies.

Cyralea[S] • 8 points • 28 July, 2015 06:16 PM

Only on the internet and behind the guns of the government.

DannyDemotta • 3 points • 28 July, 2015 08:01 PM

Intellectual ones, not physical.

Stop frauding

whitepoison • 8 points • 28 July, 2015 06:57 PM

The fucking vote brigading in TRP is getting fucking out of hand. You are fucking contributing to discussion and being down voted.

Cyralea[S] • 10 points • 28 July, 2015 06:58 PM

It happens. Usually when the bulk of TRP has had a chance to review a post the effect of brigading is offset, but that'll be a few hours still.

Rathadin • 0 points • 29 July, 2015 02:47 AM

The problem is a lot of the guys in TRP, browsing around for the first time, were (are?) the outcasts.

Still learning how to be the alpha... so they still cling to this shit because they aren't there yet.

They still have the beta bitch worldview, and like anything you've known your whole life, it takes time to break away from it completely.

CumForJesus • 5 points • 28 July, 2015 08:15 PM*

This comment has been overwritten by an open source script to protect this user's privacy.

If you would like to do the same, add the browser extension GreaseMonkey to Firefox and add this open source script.

Then simply click on your username on Reddit, go to the comments tab, and hit the new OVERWRITE button at the top.

SexyDevil • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 06:26 PM*

Disagree completely. I'd argue the opposite. High testosterone correlates with increased aggression, physicality, hierarchy dominance and shorter temper. These are hallmark behaviours in bullies.

Except for the "shorter temper". Higher testosterone builds emotional control, i.e. a state of complete mindfulness. You'll never see the highest testosterone people having a short temper and losing their shit

over some insignificant element.

Think "Why are you looking like me at that, ha?!" "You've got a problem?" in most cases directed toward betas that are perceived as easy prey. You'll **never** and I mean **without exception, never** hear it from extremely high testosterone males.

Their high status leaves no room for "short temper". They are calm, mindful, unreactive, but once you manage to take it so far to really insult them - there is no "short temper", no arguing, no "what did you say?!", there's just a silent, no hassle beatdown and the challenger laying on the floor knocked out.

Think of elite club security guards that are a real professionals of their business. Are they "short tempered", displaying aggression? Hell no - they don't need too. They are sitting there, chilling, drinking orange juice with a straw while some "high testosterone bully" is getting too drunk (hectic vibe of nervous system, too erratic because of suppressed anxiety) and starts displaying "hierarchy dominance", "physicality" and "short temper". Next thing you know he ain't so dominant laying all bloody on the floor.

I've lived it and seen it hundreds, if not thousands of times.

Trust me, bullies testosterone > nerd fatty testosterone. High testosterone standard > bullies testosterone.

You don't need Canadian SJW's and Tom Blackwell's stamp of approval of it to demonstrate its simply not true.

Cyralea[S] • 9 points • 28 July, 2015 06:31 PM

Think "Why are you looking like me at that, ha?!" "You've got a problem?" in most cases directed toward betas that are perceived as easy prey. You'll never and I mean without exception, never hear it from extremely high testosterone males.

I think you're falsely conflating stoicism with high testosterone. I don't think there's necessarily a causative overlap there.

Here's some sources stating the opposite of what you just said:

Testosterone makes it harder to control ones anger.

Anger is the only emotion tied to testosterone.

103342 • 6 points • 28 July, 2015 07:22 PM

/u/Cyralea, people ITT are completely in denial. This shit really touched a nerve apparently.

I was bullied in high school and my bully was a textbook alpha. These days he is a bodybuilder and married his high school girlfriend. Dude seems really happy.

Cyralea[S] • 5 points • 28 July, 2015 07:29 PM

It is what it is. I've got a history of posting controversial topics. The downvote system in reddit doesn't really lend itself to these kinds of conversations.

JP_Whoregan • 5 points • 28 July, 2015 09:48 PM

It just goes to show how many male fee fees are still festering in the walls of our house, like a termite infestation. You don't realize they are there until you start chipping away at the flakes of the wall.

confuseacatlmd • 4 points • 28 July, 2015 07:43 PM [recovered]

Yeah this is frightening. I understand that a lot of people in this sub (apparently) got bullied,

but this place is about excepting reality for what it is. I got bullied too, because I am short. I fought back and won. Guess what? No more bullying and higher social status. Had a girl hit on me IMMEDIATELY after one time. If the people here didn't fight back, that's their failure as a man. Hopefully they can move past it and learn alpha behavior now.

Sdom1 • 2 points • 29 July, 2015 05:18 PM

Just remember that this depends on who you are dealing with, and the context of the situation. The one poster talked about being the only white kid at an all black high school - how well do you think this would have worked out for him? I attended a mixed high school, and I can tell you that your advice would have been a good way to get himself seriously hurt, like spending some time in the hospital hurt.

I got bullied when I was younger, and took the whole "beat up your bullies" advice to heart, and started kicking ass. It eventually ended with me getting ambushed by 7 kids. I'm big, strong, and really quick for my size (my sin was being fat), but you don't beat those odds.

Again, depends on the situation.

SexyDevil • 2 points • 28 July, 2015 09:53 PM

Anger is the only emotion tied to testosterone.

I disagree, and would be inclined to believe that its a SJW study that has an agenda of tying testosterone to aggression and anger and labeling it as a hazardous chemical unit that needs to be reduced as much as possible.

The other studies show that the average testosterone levels have declined by over 17% overall when compared to 1987. If we go even further the average testosterone levels are even higher. Since anger is directly tied to testosterone, it would mean that me that the masculine males of 50s were more angry than today's betas?

<http://www.ourstolenfuture.org/newscience/reproduction/2006/2006-1210travisonetal.html>

I don't believe that to be the case.

DuncanMonroe • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 12:30 AM

Club security guards are a terrible example. In my experience, they can be as insecure as they come and will often bully and abuse power. We had a club shut down in Baltimore because the bouncers at said club were beating the piss out of skinny college kids who showed up with a lot of girls, and then making unwanted advances on said girls.

Sdom1 • -1 points • 29 July, 2015 07:37 PM

Club security guards aren't insecure - if anything, they are quite secure in their position of authority. When they fuck with you by keeping you in line, they are generally trying to get you to bribe your way in, as every minute you spend in line makes you look beta as fuck. Club owners don't really care about this, as it gets the people willing to spend money in while keeping the more, ahem, budget-oriented out in line. It's a widespread hustle.

I know this because I worked security at a club for a bit. I don't know what it's like in Baltimore, but as your demographic changes and the level of money in your club changes, YMMV.

yestheman1 • 5 points • 28 July, 2015 07:13 PM*

I too read about testosterone making guys more relaxed. I believe it was mentioned in the men's health guide to sex.

I have also read other research suggesting, like you mention, that bullying is a beta male thing, low status guys jockeying for power with other betas. Guys at the top have no need to pick on lower status guys. That is way too much effort when you are busy being successful.

The biggest blowhards and bullies I've known were losers... They hated their jobs, had ugly girls, and only found status by picking on weak guys.

Case in point: my buddy overheard this meathead prison guard at the gym picking on a kid with Downs syndrome. My friend, a high up at a local business, calmly told him he better lay off or they'll be consequences. The guy backed off.

Who was the real alpha there? I think it's obvious.

THCanadian17 • 0 points • 28 July, 2015 07:49 PM*

This post is non sense tbh. Bullies have lower than average testosterone levels? BS. Truly high levels of testosterone equals a calm state of mind and emotion? BS! Fedor Emelianenko is a MMA legend who has been training under various disciplines that teach you how to stay calm and relaxed under pressure.

tallwheel • 0 points • 29 July, 2015 01:59 AM

My manager at work is a bully like you describe. Quick to anger, and yells people's heads off until he gets what he wants. I find it extremely immature, but at the same time, I think that's how he got to be a manager. He gets shit done because he won't settle for anything less than what he wants.

I agree that it is better for a man to remain calm and fair, but I can't argue with results. What is perceived as alpha, is alpha whether we like it or not. There are quite a few articles indicating a high rate of personality disorders among CEO's.

<http://www.dailyfinance.com/2011/07/21/youve-gotta-be-crazy-to-be-a-ceo-literally/>

TurbowolfLover • -4 points • 28 July, 2015 10:02 PM

This comment screams "I was bullied."

DuncanMonroe • -1 points • 29 July, 2015 12:27 AM

This is just a load of conjecture and unsupported claims.

favours_of_the_moon • 5 points • 28 July, 2015 09:19 PM

Bullying in itself is often a compensatory mechanism. These are people who seek out weaker individuals rather than competing fairly with other individuals who are on their own level.

Big difference.

DreamBoatGuy25 • 2 points • 29 July, 2015 07:43 PM

We're all just damn dirty apes.

NightwingTRP • 2 points • 30 July, 2015 02:22 AM*

I feel the Alpha Game blog post on this was much more useful and interesting (for anyone who hasn't already read it.)

I can confirm that this "No doubt that bit of nonsense was cooked up by progressives to vilify masculinity as they so often do, but now there's a study showing that it's a load of horseshit:" is total nonsense. Putting others down and trying to negatively impact the competition is how women compete. Men improve. Bullying is not masculine. If anything it's obviously feminine given the gender differences in competitive behaviour. As usual, life is more complex than we wish it was. If it wasn't... I'd have found it much easier than I have. Shrugs and boredom continues.

[deleted] • 3 points • 28 July, 2015 07:55 PM*

Finally, some vindication for the redpill archetypal father who proudly raises his sons not to be pussies or show weakness. This is also an excellent primer on why weak, beta men are so intrinsically nauseating to an authentic alpha. Their behavior runs contrary to everything that stokes our sense of worth and motivation. It's fun to keep your minions in line. Well meted social humiliation keeps a well oiled social hierarchy running smoothly. No ones talking about abject torture, but a bit of reinforcement of who runs the show affords a sense of calm to the group that their scene is in good hands. Somebody has to be selected for the role of targeted dipshit - it's why all royal courts for centuries enlisted a jester to tapdance and hurl shit at.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 08:00 PM*

Tell me if this one sounds familiar: "Bullies lash out because they're really insecure deep down inside". No doubt that bit of nonsense was cooked up by progressives to vilify masculinity as they so often do

I do agree that there are certain kinds of healthy masculinity that are unfairly demonized by progressives.

I don't agree that bullying is a healthy expression of masculinity, not for yourself or for the victim. Having to put others down to feel good about yourself is a sign of lack of inner confidence in my eyes.

I certainly don't agree that progressives only vilify bullies to vilify men and promote a feminist agenda. At least in part, progressives dislike bullies for the exact same reason why many conservatives dislike bullies: they're bullies.

edit: OP, you might want to make an edit to your post and define what you mean with the word "bully." I think there might be some confusion there. I don't think that pushing a random cripple down the stairs just because you can is empowering or will help you in life. I can accept that some forms of domineering behavior will help you in appropriate situations.

edit: A part of the reason for the hostile response might be that many people like to believe that following TRP both benefits them and everyone around them. Clearly, bullying others doesn't benefit everyone around you, so this advice shatters that illusion. Many people are apparently not ready to say "I'm going to do what benefits me, even if I'm hurting other people, even if it would be a disaster if everyone were as selfish as I am."

[deleted] • 5 points • 28 July, 2015 07:04 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

[deleted] • 2 points • 28 July, 2015 06:02 PM

Doubtful. Most of the men I know with the highest self-esteem are skinny as hell. Physical dominance is overrated, women don't really care all that much about being with a bear of a man. What they want is a tall, pretty boy. Back in college the guys who were swimming in hot women were the tall, lanky dudes and I could break those dudes in half without breaking a sweat.

i really don't advise anyone to try and pull an "Alpha male" on other men in real life. On the internet is fine I

guess because you aren't near them, but if you try to act Alpha near men you are going to get your teeth knocked off. No thanks, pussy ain't worth it.

Cyralea[S] • 8 points • 28 July, 2015 06:06 PM

Being dominant is more than just about getting pussy. It's about winning at life. Further, you don't need to be a huge guy to be dominant. Not every dominance display results in fisticuffs.

Like it or not, the guy that can socially destroy other men is the one that most people end up respecting. Bullying tends to manifest in physical ways during adolescence, but transitions to more verbal avenues as we get older. The principle remains the same.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

Cyralea[S] • 12 points • 28 July, 2015 07:50 PM

I'm a little surprised to be honest. Lower in this thread chain I'm having to explain the AMOG concept.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 07:39 PM

I am not interesting in risking my life over women. And competing with men is what happens, you are risking your life over women. In college I had guys get mad at me and trying to escalate things to violence because they either saw a woman look at me, or because for some reason they perceived me as being more Alpha.

What did I do in these situations? I laughed it off, turned my back to the guy and never spoke to him again. Its dumb to get competitive with an average guy, and that's what the guy was doing. How about trying to win over the chad?

Cyralea[S] • 0 points • 28 July, 2015 07:42 PM

You're misinterpreting what it means to bully someone, especially at higher levels of social class. It doesn't come down to overt insults and flying fists.

Being the AMOG means knocking down your challengers, often with playful but invective language. The guy who can humourously play down his peers is the guy that women gravitate to. You'll see this at parties, but also in corporate circles. The level of tact and plausible deniability is the only thing that varies.

[deleted] • 0 points • 28 July, 2015 08:44 PM

Back in college I had 40 female classmates and only 4 male classmates. The girls were all dating someone but this guy always kept trying to beat me down on anything, either asking me how much I got on an exam, or trying to beat me on table tennis.

i just found it retarded, for a guy to try to come out across as an Alpha to women who were nothing special to look at(only two were hot) and who already were dating, and the funny thing is that this guy was bigger than me, so no reason to feel intimidated by men.

I don't know, I just find the whole mentality of men competing with other men for the attention of women to be retarded because chad always wins and he doesn't even bother to learn the girl's name.

[deleted] • 1 points • 29 July, 2015 07:23 AM

[permanently deleted]

RedSovereign[M] • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 01:05 PM

No concern trolling.

MaxManus • -1 points • 29 July, 2015 03:50 PM

Excuse me, I am no native speaker myself. What exactly are you trying to tell me?

Dr_HoaxArthurWilmoth • 1 point • 30 July, 2015 08:55 AM

I can only imagine what life is like without recess in Grade School and Middle School and gym class in High School at less than 3 days a week.

Add on an additional 2 hours of homework after school and I don't envy these boys.

Without sports, exercise and lifting, I have no doubt I would be dead or in jail.

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 July, 2015 12:05 PM

Tell me if this one sounds familiar: "Bullies lash out because they're really insecure deep down inside". No doubt that bit of nonsense was cooked up by progressives to vilify masculinity as they so often do.

Ah, yes. Nothing says "masculine" like attacking people too weak to resist you.

By your logic the fastest route to alphaville is to start randomly punching women in the face. Maybe rape them too, to really show everyone who the big cheese is.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 10:07 PM

It's funny how TRP changes you. A year ago this would have pissed the hell out of me. I would have related to the victims. One year after taking the pill, and not only am I not surprised, but I relate to the top dogs.

JakofClubs • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 07:23 PM

I asked my endocrinologist about outward signs of testosterone and he said that you can't just guess someone's T levels by outward appearance. People that you'd think would have high T might have low T and vice-versa. People tend to associate testosterone levels with many physical characteristics and behaviors, but it's not that simple.

Primemale • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 07:26 PM*

The men with the highest testosterone levels, generally don't have to bully, it's the insecure guys that do, sure they can be brash or "rude" by comparison to the overly polite average nice guy, but I have never met a high testosterone man (me included) who felt the need to bully. I am so sure of myself that I will bring other people up with me, and feel the need to guide others. Bullies are worried about their position in the hierarchy and therefore lack true confidence. The caveat is of course when a man's position is threatened then he may have to "bully" to assert himself, but it is not a matter of course.

I still agree with your premise, that dominance is everything, one feels GREAT when leading others and dominating social groups. I also agree with the depression part, it's extremely hard to be depressed when you in a position of power or dominance, especially as a man.

KobeHardensMyDirk • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 08:15 PM

People who are angry are just expressing internal sadness.

juliusstreicher • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 12:00 AM

It was discovered that bullying wasn't a self-esteem issue many years ago, and, quite to the contrary, that the bully had a better opinion of himself than others had of themselves.

[deleted] • 1 points • 28 July, 2015 08:20 PM

[permanently deleted]

brianjamesxx • 2 points • 28 July, 2015 10:05 PM

The bumbling idiot that goes out of his way to be a dick to people will always fail. The man that stands like a rock and laughs off the bully is the one that wins every time. This post is putting bullies and beta fagots into a box but we forget about the man that isn't a bully nor a beta faggot. He's the real winner because he doesn't have to be a dick to exert dominance.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 08:28 PM

The problem with the term, "bully" is it is so subjective.

When I think of a bully it is someone hassling or physically harming someone blatantly much lower than them physically and in terms of social status.

I have always had the tendency to defend the weak from bullying.

However I have always jockeyed for position with other males on my level or slightly above it.

If you saw transcripts of some of my younger interactions they would sound like bullying, but the difference was that I was combating other males who thought they were hot shit or were attempting to up jump.

So if a male of lets say an 7/10 status level degrades/harms a male of 2/10 status, thats bullying and thats beta behavior.

I on the other hand hassled/harmed other males in the 6-9 levels, or males who were engaging in the above example.

TL:DR punching down is bullying beta behavior and true bullying. "Bullying" is being used currently to describe any sort of dominance/jockeying for social status, but thats not what bullying is.

SuperStalin • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 10:11 PM

among primates, the alpha is the guy who gets the respect of all the other apes, and gets all the primate pussy he wants... and usually it's not the largest or the most violent male, but the one who knows exactly when and how to assert his dominance, be it by threatening, or gathering the group against a problematic individual, or by putting a female primate in its place if she misbehaves.

FishFoxFerret • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 11:03 PM

In high school a couple guys tried bullying me. Each did it once and never did it again. I made it clear not to fuck with me - typically through non-violent means (embarrassment can be effective but it depends on the person).

Be sure to take action to correct negative behavior as quickly as possible. The longer you wait the less effective the punishment. Also, responding in front of other people makes it more effective and helps you gain respect. I am **not** talking about fighting. You're correcting their action as a father would, and a father would not fight their child for bad behavior.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 11:09 PM

This article again proves that behavior that would have been characterized in previous generations as normal behavior exhibited by aggressive, competitive, high-spirited teenage boys will now get a kid labeled a bully in today's feminized culture.

For example, busting balls was something young guys commonly did back in the day. So what if you got your feelings hurt? It toughened you up and was great preparation for female shit tests.

Back in the day, if you acted like a pussy you got called out for it and maybe smacked around a little. If it went too far, you were expected to defend yourself. It toughened kids up and helped them to develop frame. Now, a kid who does this is considered a bully.

All of this was part of male rites of passage. Ever observe male pups playing? To the female eye, it looks like violence, bullying if you will. In reality, rough play by young men is a critical part of their development.

Hell, the helicopter mom coalition is now trying to ban youth tackle football because it's too rough for their little baby boys.

My takeaway from this: boys who are allowed to be themselves are happier than feminized boys.

ferengiprophet • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 11:45 PM

It's ironic but those who make other people's lives miserable usually live pretty good lives themselves.

Cyralea[S] • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 01:31 AM

Better to be the lion than the gazelle. Life isn't fair.

ferengiprophet • 0 points • 29 July, 2015 02:32 AM*

Everything on this planet, from the smallest microbes to lions, eagles, hyaenas, and apes have evolved to exploit their environment for their own gain. Humans have always had to strike the proper balance. If we choose our own interests 100% of the time, society falls apart; if we forget our own needs and cater to everyone else's we lose out; if we choose our own interests 80% of the time and spare the remaining 20% for society, we get a good place to live in.

Cyralea[S] • -1 points • 29 July, 2015 03:03 AM

You are presuming a scenario where you have two options, one in which you can choose between working mutually to society's greater benefit and working selfishly to your own benefit, at the expense of others.

The reality is that you *only* have the latter option. The former option does not exist in Western society, not in recent times. The current state of society is that adopting a collectivistic attitude is a sure way to end up losing in life, you will be taken advantage of by all those who choose to act selfishly, as is the expected outcome of a Prisoner's Dilemma. There's no saving this society, so take care of yourself instead.

ferengiprophet • 0 points • 29 July, 2015 06:45 AM

I agree but I can't just turn it off. I'm a builder by nature and so I intend to give 20% of my resources to community service; the other 80% I'm keeping for myself.

jwquiroz • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 01:26 AM

Lowest rate of depression..lol

It has been known since ancient times that happiness comes from other people getting the axe. Show yourself as weak and there will be always someone there to knock you down.

Cyralea[S] • -2 points • 29 July, 2015 01:28 AM

Couldn't be more true. Better to be the lion than the gazelle.

Upvote_To_The_Left • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 01:41 AM

Bullies are fucking scum. If i could go back to grade school knowing what i know now i would put those fucks in the hospital

[deleted] • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 03:00 AM

it doesnt matter how hard they try and suppress our toxic masculinity they are fighting against nature

OneRedYear • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 04:34 AM

I never had a bully. I had nemesis. We fought each other our entire childhoods. He even had his homies gang up on me and I fought them too. We never went to principals or school officials. I never backed down even when he had back up. Later as adults he apologized and said how he always was jealous of my middle class life and admired how I never gave in to his attempts at bullying me. Never give in to a bully, never stop fighting your nemesis.

Oma266 • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 06:26 AM

I think people confuse Alphas & Bullies. They are NOT the same thing. Being an Alpha is walking around believing you are the best. Being a Bully is constantly destroying those you KNOW are below you because you need to trick yourself & your peers to thinking you are an Alpha. A Bully is just a fake, wannabe Alpha. A man that is willing to take on people bigger & stronger than him because he believes in himself is an Alpha. A dude destroying someone half his size is just a little bitch. Please don't get it confused.

[deleted] • 0 points • 29 July, 2015 07:10 AM

We're talking about kids here

Oma266 • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 07:24 AM

Considering children do not have social status I don't think its talking about them. Even if so, the sentiment is the same. Being the confident kid that doesn't need to be verified by his peers is an Alpha, and probably will be as an adult. Being the kid that only beats up kids smaller than you because you're scared of kids your own size, makes you a bitch, and builds the foundation for the bitch you'll be as an adult.

throwawaylifespan • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 08:31 AM

Take out the psychopaths from the study,I mean that in the non-colloquial sense, and what are the results. I wouldn't count psychopaths as bullies because to bully is an active thing in my mind, psychopaths don't know anything else.

TheDialecticParadox • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 09:06 AM

I'm living with a bully.

One of my housemates is dating a guy who managed to blow all their savings at a casino and get arrested for harrassment and assault *twice*.

He has no money, no job (due to criminal history), and he lives off his girlfriends wages in a crappy little share house lounge room that's been 'modified' into a bedroom in his mid 30's.

The best part is he's extremely insecure, paranoid and violent. Also over 6ft tall and weights more than 120kgs.

This guy has hit the genetic gold mine and he's thrown it all away because he can't control his temper. It's like living with a teenager on tren.

[deleted] • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 09:43 AM

This is why I say that the universe itself is an immoral object and ought to be destroyed. There is no reason for this other than to cause pain; none. The entire thing should have never been allowed to come about to begin with. Existence on the whole, is filth and always a **Bad Idea**.

If you cannot create a closed and perfect system; do not create anything at all. There is no need for useless parts (non-alphas) to be allowed to live. The communist in me sees that that should be applied unilaterally to remove any potential problems before they come up.

TL;DR: The universe is a shit because of this shit right here. The only Good thing, is Nothing; the only sweet sound, Silence.

EDIT 1: Bring on the downboats and calls of being beta/omega/mangina etc. I don't care; I hate the world and those in it for so many reasons you wouldn't even begin to fathom. Check my history; the entire sordid and vile affair. I *still* stand by what I said; Everything is shit and you know it. The entire thing is immoral and should not be borne. We should be actively trying to destroy everything and scatter the remains so that nothing else could take root after it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 03:12 PM

I did read about this and while I do agree I think that it varies by bullying. People bully others because they have no friends and have a shit home life. Or it could be because of the sense of superiority they have. Either way, I will take the study with some skepticism although I do agree that having schools put more sports and competitive activities not to mention things like wood shop will help combat bullying and it will give these bullies actual applicable skills that will help them in the real world.

I mean that seems more effective than all those bullshit bullying awareness campaigns and the like which do more harm than good.

Lt_Muffintoes • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 03:12 PM

Bullying is not a masculine trait. If anything, I'd describe it as feminine.

This should not be surprising. Win-lose confrontations are R-type behaviours. Highschool is an R-type environment. You would expect R-types to be the happiest in R-type environments, where their psychopathic behaviour is not only not punished, but actively rewarded.

Prison, politics, schools and similar environments allow these R-types to flourish.

In the real world, I would imagine this behaviour gets more suppressed, because of the harsh social penalties.

It would be interesting for a study to follow what happens to bullies over the next 2-3 decades after highschool.

Cyralea[S] • 0 points • 29 July, 2015 03:19 PM

Bullying is not a masculine trait. If anything, I'd describe it as feminine.

You'd be wrong. Competing for social dominance, shit-testing other males, generally AMOG'ing, these are all bullying behaviours done by adults to establish hierarchy.

Bullying manifests differently in middle school. It's more physical, and typically more lop-sided. Bullies pick on easier targets because it accomplishes the same effect with minimal risk.

You're right in that the same sort of physicality would be frowned upon in adult behaviour, but bullying definitely exists in higher social circles. It's simply more verbal.

Lt_Muffintoes • 1 point • 30 July, 2015 12:03 AM

I think we have different definitions of bullying.

Quick and dirty, I'd define bullying as behaviour designed to cause anguish in others for the purpose of activating pleasure centres in the bully's brain. This is not an action open to normal people.

Competition, shit testing and AMOGing are not bullying, since they have a purpose which is not inducing pain in others, even if those other's [relative] status is lowered as a result.

Cyralea[S] • 1 point • 30 July, 2015 03:13 AM

You can't really argue that lowering someone's status isn't causing anguish. It's precisely the same as a punch to the face, albeit on a different order of magnitude.

Lt_Muffintoes • 1 point • 30 July, 2015 08:40 AM

The *objective* is not the anguish. With bullying it is.

Let's say there's two stores competing for business. Is the one which is run better and so has lower prices *bullying* the other? Yet it still has caused the other shop's owner anguish.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 0 points • 28 July, 2015 09:34 PM

We exist, in 2015, in a world where the weak outnumber the strong, where weak men and women are such a dominating force that they're inexorably trying to shun all forms of reality that show their inferiority in the biological and social hierarchy.

Bullying exists and always will for a reason. It is social policing, a tool those at the top use to remind outcasts that they're acting outside of the socially accepted norms and putting a strain on the social hierarchy, making it harder to live in harmony.

Sound familiar? America currently exists in this state of social turmoil because people don't know their place or where they stand, something that's very important for social animals, most of whom are natural followers.

This is not to say people can not transcend their social hierarchy while maintaining individuality, it's saying it takes a strong majority of compliance for a society to thrive. To many individuals stepping out of place creates discord and chaos.

Bullying is something that exists in all of us from a young age and it's never going away, even as they ironically try and bully it out of people.

Discomposure • -1 points • 29 July, 2015 01:51 AM

Hilarious, most of you are hamstering away on a blue pill lie society told. No, not all bullies bully people because they have low self-esteem or have some other problem in their life causing them to bully kids. That is not a fact, it's a theory. I grew up with a kid named John. John was your everyday normal kid, except John loved getting people angry. He was a real life troll. Me and John were walking home from middle school and we saw a porta potty. We saw a guy walk into it as we were walking home and the second we got near it, John pushed the porta potty with the man inside and we both ran home. I would always go to John's house because our parents were really good friends and John was like a brother to me. John just loved doing bad things. He would create a Myspace account of a random kid at school and draw pictures of the kid getting cummed on lol. Then he would add everyone from school lmao. He would just love to fuck with people. It was his thing. John is now in a different university than I am and is still doing dumb shit. He just loves to make people angry.

[deleted] • -4 points • 28 July, 2015 08:00 PM

Is this a serious post? Are we advocating being a childish, violent, and instinct led animal now? Being a bully is without a doubt, a way to seek validation from fellow classmates. Contrary to popular belief, bullies outside of the U.S. get the shit kicked out of them by the educational system. No matter how you spin it, being expelled, and spending yet another year at fucking high school looks bad, **always**.

Boys should fight, argue and compete, it's part of our biology. But to say that some fat ass who's brother beats him up is the most RP, Alpha, Fuck bitches get money, son-of-a-bitch out there is downright retarded. Hell, I knew a so called bully who jumped in front of a train a few years after HS.

TRP folks need to learn to take "news" articles with a grain of salt. Asking fives dudes who used to bully if they're happy is by no means a "study". You know who the dominant one is? The one who does what he loves, trains rigorously for competitions, doesn't give a flying fuck what others think, and has no interest in high school politics.

CumForJesus • 2 points • 28 July, 2015 08:20 PM*

This comment has been overwritten by an open source script to protect this user's privacy.

If you would like to do the same, add the browser extension GreaseMonkey to Firefox and add this open source script.

Then simply click on your username on Reddit, go to the comments tab, and hit the new OVERWRITE button at the top.

[deleted] • -1 points • 28 July, 2015 08:29 PM

I read through the post and the article. Just have a look at the second paragraph of this post with all these fantastic claims. Posts such as these can't attempt to harmoniously combine "extreme" ideas with a mellow, logical conclusion.

["**Bullies are fucking alphas man!** and that's why we need to create a competitive yet safe environment for our sweet and youthful children"] It's just ridiculous.

Discomposure • 1 point • 28 July, 2015 08:57 PM

It's true, as much as you don't want to admit it. If these were the old times before we formed a structured society, the bullies would be the ones fucking all the hot girls and being the leaders, while the weaker males who didn't stand up to the bullies would never spread their seed.

brianjamesxx • -1 points • 28 July, 2015 10:08 PM

What about the man that laughs off the bullies and doesn't have to be a bully to fuck women?
That's the man that's fucking the women.

[deleted] • 0 points • 29 July, 2015 04:30 AM

And there are plenty of bullies that end up cleaning toilets with their bare hands for a living. A boost in testosterone from beating the shit out of someone might make Mary Sue soak her panties but in the end money, networking and education are what cement your status in the world.

Thinking that just because you treat someone else like shit elevates your standing means that you're just another hamster.

IntoTheBlight • 0 points • 29 July, 2015 04:30 AM

I broke up w a girl (3 year ltr) and she showed up at my apartment complex 9:10am the next day just as I am

heading out the door to jump in my car and head to work. I was already leaving 5 min later than normal, and she demanded to talk. I said we'll talk later, but she wasn't having it.

She stood behind my car and refused to move. After 3-4 min of trying to convince her to move, I told her "I'm leaving and I'm gonna back up, so your GONNA have to move"!

I backed up an inch and she's screeching "He's gonna hit me with his car"! Keep in mind, this is an apartment community so there's 2 buildings on either side of us, and I'm in the small strip of parking lot between them. 9AM on a Wednesday. Bitch tries to pull that shit on me!

Of course I stop and try to get her to calm tf down, she's hysterical in tears. Hug her, whatever, thinking a moment with her might cool her flame but noooooooo so I had to go, I slowly backed up while she hurled invective in my rear view...

I hadn't thought about that in so long. Remembering how she started drinking, and the fists to my face that came with it. She only caught me good once in the jaw. It was a third times a charm thing, she got her three chances, failed, and I cut the cord.

She went full slag after I dumped her. Word of her exploits traveled far and wide amongst many social circles.

[deleted] • 0 points • 29 July, 2015 08:20 AM

Some of the bullying will actually just be alpha shit-testing, right?

Cyralea[S] • 0 points • 29 July, 2015 01:05 PM

Yep. It's not socially acceptable to throw fists in most circles once you're older, but establishing social hierarchy is still important. The bullying is more subtle, in the form of shit tests and power plays.

Sdom1 • 0 points • 29 July, 2015 04:19 PM

The conclusions drawn by Wong are one of the stupidest things I've read all week. She has done something I'd have thought difficult - her theory is even dumber than the one that states that bullies are bullies because they have low self-esteem.

Let's apply some REAL Redpill thinking here, shall we? By Redpill I mean based on actual empirical observation and a neutral perspective, rather than wishful thinking.

The first mistake Wong makes is that she conflates natural competition and establishing a social hierarchy with bullying. There are several important differences, the first being that the people who are bullied are never competitors for the alpha position, and bullying tends to be done by groups. The bully (or bullies) generally seeks out his or her victim and torments or intimidates them repeatedly.

The second is that oftentimes bullies already have several outlets for competitive behavior. They bully anyway. So it isn't just pent-up aggression or anything.

The causes of bullying are pretty easy to figure out, if you've ever known one. The biggest factor is a lack of empathy. That Wong discovered bullies have it pretty good is not surprising. If they had ever been on the receiving end of the treatment, most wouldn't do it to others.

Another is that many people have a natural desire to hurt other people. It has nothing to do with being strong or alpha - women savage each other all the time, sometimes even tormenting someone to commit suicide and showing no remorse afterwards.

So when you get these tendencies, which aren't counterbalanced by having experienced how the other half lives, you have a recipe for bullying, which is really known by the older words persecution and torment.

Articles like this are another artifact of the liberal bullshit mindset - they are desperate to paint everything as positive and find a positive and easy solution for every problem.

Cyralea[S] • 0 points • 29 July, 2015 04:27 PM

Your aggressiveness is refreshing. That said, I don't entirely agree on some points.

The first mistake Wong makes is that she conflates natural competition and establishing a social hierarchy with bullying. There are several important differences, the first being that the people who are bullied are never competitors for the alpha position, and bullying tends to be done by groups

While this is true, it's because there's little added benefit for middle schoolers to tackle their direct competition head on, as compared to picking on the weak target. Bullying establishes your social dominance via signalling, not just to the person you've just beat up. When groups pick on the social misfits, they've signalled to everyone that they're the social leaders.

The second is that oftentimes bullies already have several outlets for competitive behavior. They bully anyway. So it isn't just pent-up aggression or anything.

This is more an issue with the logistics of channelling aggression. Competition doesn't achieve social hierarchy to the degree that bullying does, so it can't be a complete replacement. There might be other potential avenues.

The biggest factor is a lack of empathy. That Wong discovered bullies have it pretty good is not surprising. If they had ever been on the receiving end of the treatment, most wouldn't do it to others.

You're right about the first point. High testosterone is actually correlated with low empathy. That said, it's not often the case of ignorance; demonstrating what it's like to be on the receiving end isn't necessarily sufficient, it will result in the high-testosterone individual competing harder to simply win, and never be a victim.

Another is that many people have a natural desire to hurt other people.

Again, correlated with high testosterone. High estrogen results in the precise opposite, excessive empathy and emotional aversion to causing pain in others.

Articles like this are another artifact of the liberal bullshit mindset - they are desperate to paint everything as positive and find a positive and easy solution for every problem.

I agree that this is often the case, but I think they're actually touting the commonly held liberal notion that masculinity is a sign of a weak, insecure person. They're suggesting that masculinity is innate, which is refreshing to see coming out of academia.

Sdom1 • 1 point • 29 July, 2015 09:02 PM

High testosterone is actually correlated with low empathy.

Then what do you think is going on with the girls who hound other girls into suicide or close to it? And then claim they don't feel bad at all?

I really think the female reputation for empathy is way overrated. They are empathetic depending on *who you are*. Think about the horror stories you hear here, divorce rape, false accusations, etc.

I agree that this is often the case, but I think they're actually touting the commonly held liberal notion that masculinity is a sign of a weak, insecure person. They're suggesting that masculinity is innate, which is refreshing to see coming out of academia.

No, they are equating masculinity with the propensity to bully. Don't fall for it. This will lend support to SJW efforts to emasculate us, since, you know, high testosterone has been correlated with bullying and

all. The recommendation to put aggressive kids in activities where aggressiveness is rewarded is funny because that generally already happens. Big, strong, aggressive boy? He's already been channeled into football, wrestling, etc.

Bullying behavior has little to nothing to do with testosterone levels. Overtly competitive behavior, brawling, etc? Sure. Just remember, bullying starts long before testosterone plays a significant role in behavior and is engaged in by women at least as much.

Something that would be more convincing would be to do bloodwork on bullies and see how it comes back in terms of testosterone levels. I bet you see normal levels and variance.

Basically, like everything leftists believe, this study seems to abrogate personal responsibility for one's actions, and denies that people can change their behavior.

Throway99038 • 0 points • 29 July, 2015 09:19 PM

As someone who has suffered bullying i am gonna give a different perspective. Bullies are like Hyenas. Most of them work in packs and derive strength from numbers. They specifically target kids who are perceived as weak. It can depend on looks or race or anything that they think makes them weak. I wasn't nerdy or weak looking i know that, but i was picked upon by the assholes simple cause i belong to a minority and i was different from them. I tried fighting back whenever i can, but you can do so much when you are outnumbered. Bullies enjoy inflicting pain upon others. They don't care how much it hurts the person getting bullied. Like Hyenas who kill a prey and start eating it without caring to put the animal out of misery, unlike lions who kill a prey first by breaking it's neck so to make sure he suffers the least amount possible. Yes being a lion is good, but most of these bullies are Hyenas. Personally i say be strong, don't derive your strengths by putting others down, that's just fucking weak. Be like a lion, kill when you need to and just chill out rest of the time.

plentyoffishes • -1 points • 29 July, 2015 11:22 AM

"Rates of depression"

This is nonsense. The vast majority of men would NEVER admit to being depressed.

This is a bullshit statistic that shows nothing about how happy people actually are.

Kool_Kings • -1 points • 29 July, 2015 10:17 PM

Calling bullying masculinity is about the stupidest thing I ever heard, and I'm not using hyperbole.

Bullies are in fact pathetic little faggots regardless of their physical dominance or their Dunning-Kruger self esteem.

jborbzcomment score below threshold • -7 points • 28 July, 2015 08:58 PM

Just wanted to stop by and say a quick "fuck you" on behalf of all us liberal rpers.

gabrielshkelstein • -2 points • 29 July, 2015 12:36 AM

Isn't liberal red piller an oxymoron?

cariboo_j • 4 points • 29 July, 2015 02:05 AM

Pretty sure RP strives to be a-political. The whole left/right tribalism is for morons.

gabrielshkelstein • -3 points • 29 July, 2015 02:18 AM

but RP views are very consistent with the current, conservative platform, perhaps even further to the right.

cariboo_j • 4 points • 29 July, 2015 03:00 AM

There are certain factions in TRP who look back wistfully at the 1950's and long for traditional gender roles. But the current advice of spinning plates is not really compatible with American-style social conservatism. The mainstream right is still telling men to get married.