

# Red Pill Science: UCLA researchers compile evidence women's dualistic mating strategy

January 16, 2016 | 765 upvotes | by [thiasus](#)

---

**tl;dr:** alpha fucks beta bux is only the nickname for a scientifically proven phenomenon, women's dualistic mating strategy. This thread highlights the conclusion of a UCLA meta review on the topic.

**Body:**

If you've hung around TRP for a while, you've probably already seen this study. For those who don't have, here it is in all its glory:

## [Women's Sexual Strategies: The Evolution of Long-Term Bonds and Extrapair Sex](#)

Notice the URL: this is from UCLA's own site. If you, God forbid, end up debating this shit with feminists, ask them if UCLA is a misogynist organization and then dump this on their heads.

Who are the authors?

[Elizabeth Pillsworth](#) is an Assistant Professor of Evolutionary Anthropology at UCLA.

[Martie G. Haselton](#) is a Professor at the UCLA Department of Psychology.

They are both white female academics working in a liberal university of a liberal American state. Fewer people could be less suspect of being biased against women or holding misogynistic views. Let's see what they conclude.

**I'll break down their conclusions and attach the relevant TRP lingo where appropriate:**

- Across all cultures, women deploy a dualistic sexual strategy: Coupling (beta bux) and Dual Mating (alpha fucks)
- Coupling (beta bux), meaning the formation of a long-term 'monogamous' relationship with a provider, is necessitated by human infants requiring long years of high resource expenditure before they are independent.
- Evidence indicates that for the purpose of Coupling (beta bux), women seek out men that display characteristics like ability to provide (bux), kindness and reliability. When selection is constrained, women will prioritize the ability to provide (bux).
- Women will display Commitment Skepticism (shit testing and comfort testing) with their Coupling partner (beta bux), requesting a variety of displays on his part (failed shit tests) to guarantee he'll be willing to commit once they have coupled (and she's likely pregnant). This is because a wrong investment on the woman's part would prove disastrous for her, leaving her without her Coupling mate's resources (beta bux).
- Dual Mating (alpha fucks) is a strategy in which women seek to reproduce with men offering better genes (alpha) than their Coupling partner (beta), while retaining the commitment (bux) of the Coupling partner
- Women are specifically drawn to Dual Mating during the fertile phase of the ovulatory cycle, and women in long-term relationships display a **larger** attraction to Dual Mating than otherwise

- For dual mating, women prefer men with the following (alpha) characteristics: body and facial symmetry, facial masculinity (large jaw, prominent brow), dominance, deeper voice, physical size (in relation to their partner)
- Evidence of Dual Mating is the adaptation to sperm competition (the relatively large-sized testes in men follow the pattern in other primates of larger testes = more sperm competition), the commonality of extrapair mating (cheating, with around 20% of women admitting to at least one lifetime instance), and the development of jealousy (which is **not** ubiquitous among primates) in males, including to the point of violence

## Conclusions:

- alpha fucks, beta bucks is evolutionarily ingrained in human females and guarantees their best reproductive success
- the scientific evidence for it is multi-dimensional and overwhelming
- alpha and beta characteristics are hardwired, not cultural; cultural and social context can add something on top but can never replace or overcome instinctual behaviour
- LIFT, become assertive and learn to speak with a proper voice

---

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

---

## Comments

---

The\_Red\_Paw • 109 points • 16 January, 2016 04:48 PM

Funny thing is this is hardly news. I'm 48 now, and my journey to the Redpill started a loooong time ago. It must be twenty years ago I saw a program that studied women in bars and concluded the ones shaking their asses the hardest and showing the most skin were married women, ovulating. Their conclusion then was identical. Alpha fucks, beta bucks.

At the time I was in deep, bitter bluepill territory (after a vicious, textbook case of AWALT divorce rape to a woman I never even married), and the show blew my little mind. It was the beginning of my journey to the Redpill, before the internet was even a big thing.

[deleted] • 15 points • 16 January, 2016 05:50 PM

I am genuinely curious about how your experienced divorce rape from a woman you weren't married to. Was this a legally enforced thing, or more social situation?

The\_Red\_Paw • 113 points • 16 January, 2016 07:13 PM\*

In some states, (like Washington, where I live) if you live with a woman, fuck her and mix your money (say by opening a business or buying a house), the state considers it a 'meretricious marriage'.

If you break up the courts don't want to hear your problems. It's a binary decision. Married or not. Saying 'I do' isn't what counts.

I was living with her, I was fucking her, and I bought the house we were renting. Literally THE NEXT DAY she broke up with me and demanded well over 1/2 my money.

Many, many other sordid and eye-popping fuckovers later she got it.

Fighting it was the dumbest mistake of all, the entire family law system is stacked so hard that it's like trying to reason on r feminism. You will be penalized HARD for the facts.

I could write a book about it, but people wouldn't believe it and they'd sell it as fiction/horror.

EDIT: And frankly I'm embarrassed I was ever that stupid.

[deleted] • 34 points • 16 January, 2016 08:39 PM

Whew, that fills my rage quota for the day. That's the kinda stuff that would have me on a rampage shooting spree if it happened to me.

The\_Red\_Paw • 31 points • 16 January, 2016 08:43 PM

Heh. If I told you the rest of the story, you'd use C-4 and ricin.

(now I'm gunna be on a list at the NSA for using both those words in a sentence)

Duliticolaparadoxa • 15 points • 17 January, 2016 12:53 AM

You weren't stupid. You were approaching an illogical situation with logic, which put you at a disadvantage. You have to learn the rules of the game to play effectively, and you went into the game assuming it was based on the rules of reality, so you never had a chance.

Don't be mad, you lost a round in the game and it hurt and it set you back but you learned from it and now you are a stronger player for it. Anything you walk away from that affords you a lesson is a gift.

The\_Red\_Paw • 14 points • 17 January, 2016 12:57 AM

It's the gift that keeps on giving. I had to refinance the house I just bought to pay her off, meaning I've been making extra payments for 20 years.

LyricBaritone • 4 points • 17 January, 2016 05:35 AM

Damn, that's savage. I never would've thought something like that could happen.

anonymoustrper • 5 points • 17 January, 2016 04:38 AM

I could write a book about it, but people wouldn't believe it and they'd sell it as fiction/horror.

Probably you should try selling it. At the least, you'll get over it at best, you'll make more than the money you lost.

bur\_ner\_ • 6 points • 16 January, 2016 07:42 PM

Oh my!! It would sell as horror because that is exactly what it is.

All\_In123 • 2 points • 17 January, 2016 05:08 AM

Wait so how did you mix money? I thought you bought the house.

The\_Red\_Paw • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 08:41 PM

If you are married, the state automatically assumes any money the couple have is a 50/50 split. Yes, I paid for the house, and the state awarded her nearly all the equity I just paid for, not just half.

thenarrowpath • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 05:27 PM

You should a detailed post on this.

Taikal • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 05:18 AM

I could write a book about it, but people wouldn't believe it and they'd sell it as fiction/horror.

Why don't you write it?

EDIT: And frankly I'm embarrassed I was ever that stupid.

You weren't stupid. You were naive.

The\_Red\_Paw • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 12:27 PM

I don't write it because

A) I'm not going to be that whiny 'look at me, I'm a victim' guy.

B) Nobody has offered me a cash advance. Writing a book is a lot of work and I have a short attention span.

C) I don't particularly want to relive every moment of the thing. What I've described here is a tiny fraction of the fucked upedness, the sliver that was germane to this discussion.

D) Really, if I wrote the whole story out, nobody would believe me,

E) I don't want to be lightning rod for the entire misandryst, false accusation culture. Those bitches already ruined my life once.

F) I now embody the concept of wu wei. Doing something by doing nothing. I don't do business with women or women owned or helmed companies (like Yahoo). I'm retired now but I never hired a woman when I still owned a business (which was easy as bitches don't apply to do hard work), and even though it's illegal I habitually charged more to women as they are simply harder to work with. The only time I argue with women is when I'm feeling frisky and want to make them cry.

Women cannot win this war they have started, the outcome is ordained by biology.

I can live out my remaining years insulated from the decline, knowing the experiment called 'democracy' has failed. By definition, 1/2 the people are below average intelligence, but they still get to vote.

I have no kids, so in another 25 years (or, realistically, less) I won't care if the sun goes supernova. Nothing of me or mine will be here.

Taikal • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 12:59 PM

You attitude is selfish, because you could spare lots of grief to other naive men. They don't need a whole book from you: a few pages would do. Maybe you will reconsider this issue a few years from now. Being selfish is entirely within your rights, of course, so please don't take mine as an insult. I wish you awesome luck for the remainder of your life.

Swiss\_Cheese9797 • 1 point • 20 January, 2016 03:31 PM

Any way you could find that again?

0xdada • 32 points • 16 January, 2016 04:14 PM

One of these evo-psych summaries, if not this one, should be on the sidebar.

CRITICAL9 • 63 points • 16 January, 2016 04:16 PM

This should be included in the sidebar, scientific evidence like this will be very helpful to newcomers who are still on the fence.

neuschwaben • 168 points • 16 January, 2016 03:43 PM **[recovered]**

Social psychologists and PR guys at the turn of the century figured this out, and have spent the last 100 years exploiting women's nature to sell more toasters at the cost of western civilization.

**EDIT:** Bernays (Freud's nephew), is the man behind fluoridated water, feminists smoking, bacon and eggs, banana republics, and maybe best of all, **he Rebranded propaganda as Public Relations.** oh, and he was \*Kosher.

Steve\_Wiener • 34 points • 16 January, 2016 06:59 PM

I'm gonna need you to explain that comment.

xiaojimi • 17 points • 17 January, 2016 01:01 AM

There's a seminal documentary, Century of the Self, explaining in detail the work of Bernays and how he moulded mass media to become subtle, manipulating and very political.

baraka29 • 7 points • 17 January, 2016 04:41 PM

The Century of the Self

<https://vimeo.com/10245146>

It's in 3 parts, they are all on Vimeo. All of Adam Curtis' documentaries (The Power of Nightmares, The Trap, All Watched Over by Machines of Loving Grace) are must watch

WakandaDrama • 6 points • 17 January, 2016 12:58 PM

That documentary gave me nightmares. About as bad as researching the JFK assassination. Knowing events are fabricated for money and power of a rich oligarchy was overwhelming, every conspiracy theory I joked about was damn true, if not worse!

IVlaskerade • 25 points • 17 January, 2016 12:02 AM

Bernays pretty much invented the field of Public Relations in its current form.

All of the things listed are regarded as great successes of PR.

[deleted] • 27 points • 17 January, 2016 03:01 AM

Jews are behind most of this shit. I know how that sounds, and I know you think I'm automatically a nazi for thinking this, but it's true. Seriously, look into it for yourself. I used to be in denial about it, then I actually did some research and found that pretty much everyone in Psychology, critical theory, feminism and marxism is jewish. It's just an undeniable fact at this point.

GayLubeOil • 27 points • 17 January, 2016 09:09 AM

**Plot Twist:** 1/3 to 1/5 of TRP Senior Endorsed are Jews.

[deleted] • 27 points • 17 January, 2016 10:47 AM

TRP is a plot by Jews to undermine the very backbone of Western civilization... feminism.

[deleted] 17 January, 2016 03:30 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 02:05 AM\*

What kind of Americans have you been hanging out with? Our humor is very frequently sarcastic. Maybe you thought I was slavic because I was drunk when I wrote that comment?

[deleted] • 5 points • 17 January, 2016 03:03 PM

Shalom, and when i get Sr. EC, the ratio rises.

[deleted] • 3 points • 18 January, 2016 03:03 AM

Not saying that all jews are bad or anti-men or anything like that. I'm just pointing that the jewish intellectual scene has created a disproportionate amount of the Anti-male, anti-tradition and anti-capitalist movements, particularly after ww2.

GayLubeOil • 5 points • 18 January, 2016 05:18 AM

If you were part of a culture that prized intellectualism in a sea of people obsessed with bread and circus eventually you would be tempted to start taking advantage.

Who do you think is going to grow up to be more intelligent, A kid who spends time with his fat father watching football or a kid that has to learn a right to left language with no vowels?

[deleted] • 24 points • 17 January, 2016 03:09 AM

Well, Jews are disproportionately represented in academia in general. It takes a certain mix of intelligence, arrogance and obliviousness to propagate much of this stuff so I wouldn't be surprised that the group comprising 0.2% of the world population but 20% of all Nobel Prize Winners would be involved in this.

nutty\_bi • 5 points • 17 January, 2016 03:48 AM

They've also stuffed the Nobel prize committee and as such hook up their fellow Jews.

[deleted] • 26 points • 17 January, 2016 04:21 AM

Because Albert Einstein, Richard Feynman and co. didn't deserve their Nobels. /s

Stevonz12315 points 17 January, 2016 12:11 PM **[recovered]**

It's simply down to the culture/genetics. Ashkenazi jews have an average IQ of 121.

[deleted] • 7 points • 17 January, 2016 01:37 PM

Plus baldness, tay-sachs and a hooked ass beak.

nutty\_bi • 2 points • 17 January, 2016 03:48 PM

As well as Crohn's disease, shortness, and mental illness.

nutty\_bi • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 03:44 PM

Yeah, pick the two smartest Jews to represent all of Nobel prize winners. Good argument trick.

nzgs • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 11:18 AM

Think you're in the wrong sub if you're into anti-semite conspiracy theories.

It's always amusing how (usually whites) are so quick to label certain races as less intelligent, yet also so quick to dismiss certain ethnicities of having superior intelligence. It's always some conspiracy at play. The main reason Jews have received so much persecution anywhere they go is because they tend to be intelligent, and there's nothing socialists/collectivists hate more than bright opportunistic enterprising successful people. All the jews did to be the victims of genocide in Germany, was to put the native Germans out of business.

(I am white by the way).

nutty\_bi • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 02:47 PM

Jews are behind Communism. Sure, they're smart. But that feeds into their nation wrecking ways. When's the last time you saw a dumb villain?

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 03:04 AM

This is a good point, but I don't think explains the huge domination of jews in the feminist and marxist academic communities.

It's way more than 20%, it's like 90%.

[deleted] • 14 points • 17 January, 2016 04:16 AM

I highly recommend The Culture of Critique if you want to go down the rabbit hole. The Js impact on modern moral and social decay is staggering. It's easy for someone to throw an ad hominem at you, but it's your duty as a man to think critically.

redestofthereds • 11 points • 17 January, 2016 06:59 AM

I started it this week and I'm still not done with the 20 something page preface.

This excerpt of an Amazon review sums it up:

Don't expect an easy read, sentences such as "Evolutionary conceptualizations of ethnocentrism emphasize the utility of ethnocentrism in group competition" (p.xxiv) or how about "The dynamic contextualist perspective conceptualizes development as a dialectical interaction between organism and environment"(p.40)!!!!!!That kind of writing had me reaching for the whiskey to numb the pain.

Imagine speaking this way to somebody. I would've been like "uh- huh, uh-huh. Evolutionary conceptualization, yeah sure. Gotcha!".

No wonder this book is unknown.

EdgarAllanPwn • 5 points • 17 January, 2016 02:19 PM

And it in no way needs to be that convoluted, all that to say it's a combination of nature AND nurture. I hate when self-importance gets slipped into writings.

redestofthereds • 5 points • 17 January, 2016 06:45 AM

And Hollywood. Don't forget Hollywood. They're super over represented in the media. I mean look at Game of Thrones:Both of the of the producers are Jewish and even the book that inspired George RR Martin was written by a French Jew.

Or JJ Abrams. He once said that he wanted people of different backgrounds just for the sake of having a mix of people.

nzgs • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 11:23 AM

And then you look at the fields of Anarchism, Austrian Economics, Libertarianism, and see that they are also dominated by Jews. Because academia in general is dominated by Jews, on all sides.

You're seeing what you want to see. It would be really sad if TRP turned into yet another anti-semite circle jerk like so many other subs. Anti-semitism is the bastion of the dumb collectivist, which is why so many SJWs are anti-semites.

JayViceroy • 1 point • 20 January, 2016 08:15 AM

I don't know why you're getting downvoted. Jews are at the top of so many different areas of society because they are also on average the smartest people on the planet. And no I'm not Jewish, but have a lot of friends that excel in so many different sectors it's pretty obvious.

[deleted] 17 January, 2016 04:10 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 03:06 AM

Yes not every one that is feminist, anti-white etc. is jewish, but the intellectual foundation for all



that shit was laid down by jews. It's an undeniable fact.

cariboo\_j • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 01:42 AM\*

watch the BBC documentary Century of the Self.

Pretty good history of Bernays' ideas and how they were implemented by marketing firms, and more worryingly in election campaigns in America and the UK.

(Hint: appeal to the most base and irrational desires of the masses and the lowest common denominator)

[deleted] 16 January, 2016 07:44 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 16 January, 2016 08:17 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 23 points • 16 January, 2016 10:22 PM

I watched that documentary. It was one of the most life changing things I have ever seen. It completely changed my views on religion, government, and humans as a whole. Humans are not as complex as we believe we are.

Agu001 • 4 points • 17 January, 2016 09:45 AM

Which documentary please?

Poster you responded to has deleted his comment.

baraka29 • 5 points • 17 January, 2016 04:41 PM

The Century of the Self

<https://vimeo.com/10245146>

It's in 3 parts, they are all on Vimeo. All of Adam Curtis' documentaries (The Power of Nightmares, The Trap, All Watched Over by Machines of Loving Graces) are must watch

aroploen91 • 3 points • 17 January, 2016 03:39 AM

Blowing stoopidhigh's mind must be a daunting task

Kyfhomyoba • 3 points • 16 January, 2016 11:36 PM

Bernays' book is probably on google. Chomsky's *Manufacturing Consent* is pretty good, but IIRC mostly deals with beating the war drums.

TRPMaidenSlayer • 4 points • 17 January, 2016 04:19 PM

Getting offtopic, but if anyone is interested in PR, check out the book *Trust Me, I'm Lying*. Not going to say there's any RP examples in there or whatever. It's just a current state of things, and will help explain how so many people get shit information online from supposedly "reputable" sources - especially feminists.

Kathulos • 5 points • 16 January, 2016 07:55 PM

Research Edward Barnays who is regarded by many as the father of public relations.

[deleted] 17 January, 2016 02:43 PM

[permanently deleted]

Kathulos • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 04:15 PM

Haven't read any of them. Just knew that was the starting point for the answer to your above question.

Veqq • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 06:12 AM

Read Bernay's books, google.

freefm • 5 points • 17 January, 2016 04:34 AM

But how exactly did Bernays use this particular female dual mating/coupling strategy to sell stuff?

freefm • 3 points • 16 January, 2016 08:12 PM

This is a super interesting idea, but can you expand on it, or link to more information please!?

herculesisagreatguy • -14 points • 16 January, 2016 09:59 PM

His source: [http://rationalwiki.org/wiki/International\\_Jewish\\_conspiracy](http://rationalwiki.org/wiki/International_Jewish_conspiracy)

tksmase • 24 points • 16 January, 2016 11:23 PM

Label the guy as conspiracy theorist 'weirdo' while also drawing a race card?! Mom, I want to disintegrate arguments like this guy!

Five\_Decades • 82 points • 16 January, 2016 04:06 PM

I made a post on TRP and it got deleted, but it was about shit testing in frogs. The female frog would 'accidentally' nudge the male frog. If the male frog held his ground, the female frog would stick with him. If the male frog got scared or ran off the female abandoned the male because a male frog like that couldn't guard her or her offspring.

So shit testing transcends humans, other species do it too. Women are trying to test if the man they are with is reliable, strong and stable.

Kathulos • 8 points • 16 January, 2016 08:03 PM

Sounds like an interesting read. Perhaps it was the auto mod that deleted your post. Accumulate some upvotes and try again. I would be interested in reading it. Here is an upvote to help you with the cause.

RPAternate42 • 14 points • 16 January, 2016 08:05 PM

Remember, she isn't just looking for you to pass shit tests, she's looking for you to fail them too.

If she sees you as an Alpha, at first site, and shit tests you, and you *pass*, then you have convinced her that you are truly that alpha she saw. If you fail that test, and other tests, she will see you as a Beta who presents as an Alpha; for her this is *ideal* because she may get the genetic winnings of an Alpha and the provisioning of a Beta.

If you are presenting to her as a Beta at first site she will still shit test you if she hasn't already written you off as a "creep." If you pass, she may be more inclined to believe you are actually not a beta. If you pass her plethora of tests, whatever they are, she may see you as an alpha, though you may not physically present as an alpha, superficially.

Passing tests up front is key because if she gets used to you being a beta and suddenly start acting like an alpha, (like when RP is discovered or a DB marriage becomes intolerable) she will rebel but stay because her dualistic strategy tells her that she may have the alpha she desires who has proven his provisioning capability, already.

She doesn't always test you for strength... she also tests you for weakness because, either way, she wins.

netherlanddwarf • 9 points • 16 January, 2016 10:45 PM

The test is, "are you good enough for my eggs".

RPAternate42 • 5 points • 17 January, 2016 01:15 AM

The test is simultaneously: Are you good enough for my eggs AND/OR are you good enough for my babies.

[deleted] • 6 points • 16 January, 2016 11:11 PM

My GMAT prep book had a reading section on female birds that would shack up with males outside their species and produce hybrids to gain access to resources. They would often also cuck the beta bird.

CopperFox3c • 32 points • 16 January, 2016 03:59 PM\*

Those two have published a slew of related scientific articles on the subject of women's mating strategy, many of them highly cited (hundreds of citations), and many of them supporting TRP theory.

Google Scholar link

AFPJ • 17 points • 17 January, 2016 03:59 AM

Tbh the hidden conclusion from this post that people need to understand(not "know", this is important) is:

A woman's interest in you (and therefore loyalty to you and willingness to be with you) will fluctuate daily & it doesn't take into account your personal history together - only what's in it for her now, in both relative and absolute terms.

You want to "understand" women? **Whenever you're with one, just pretend you've only known each other for a week, and reset this counter every day, for the rest of your life and all their actions suddenly make sense.**

Vuking • 3 points • 17 January, 2016 08:53 AM

Very interesting...

Would you mind elaborating and even giving real-world practical examples/situation?

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 06:12 AM

Very underrated comment right here.

[deleted] • 27 points • 16 January, 2016 04:23 PM

I'm curious on what's the other side of the coin, what male's mating strategy looks like. Because from what i've read men are supposed to want to fuck as many women as they can, but at the same time there are the ones settling for relationships.

[deleted] • 22 points • 17 January, 2016 04:14 AM

The reason guys settle for relationships is because otherwise they wouldn't get any sex at all. **In a free**

**sexual market (before civilization), only 1 in 17 males got to have sex.**

When the population exploded due to agriculture, this became unfeasible because you need 100% of men working to make agriculture work, and a man who doesn't get any sex doesn't feel like sacrificing his life for the good of civilization. So around the time agriculture booms, so does institutionalized religion as a method of keeping men from lazing around and women from concentrating on only the top 5% of alphas.

In this new world, women are guaranteed resources and men are guaranteed sex. This worked for thousands of years until feminism came around. This led to the belief that sex shouldn't be law enforced but resources should be, even after divorce. Men of course opt out of this ~~marital~~ slavery contract as evidenced by 70% of males aged 20-34 not marrying.

What is essentially happening is a reversal to pre-civilization gender dynamics, except that men who let themselves get shamed into getting married ("*a real man gets married and has kids*", "*you should grow up*", "*buy a house instead of renting that bachelor pad*") live in perpetual slavery. Think about it, they literally have to work at gunpoint. Miss a payment and gang of heavily armed government agents will kick down your door and lock you up in jail. *Where have all the good men gone?*

Maybe the pendulum will swing back. Maybe women themselves will come to see that monogamy may be a social construct but at least it had a function. But don't hope on it because it might now happen soon. In the meantime just keep working on becoming Chad and becoming part of the class of males that gets access to sex. Think about that when you need to hit that last rep: **sex or slavery**

reigorius • 6 points • 17 January, 2016 10:18 AM

For one male, seventeen females reproduced. Stating 1:17 had sex is catchy, but not what the article writes about. The hypothesis in your linked article (thnx) suggests something cultural like power-wealth combo that made males take it all. But nothing conclusive. Current number is 1:4 to 5.

Anyways, lift. As usual.

[deleted] • 3 points • 17 January, 2016 07:22 PM

That CNSNews article was good but...

"perpetual adolescence" "Far too many young men have failed to make a normal progression into adult roles of responsibility and self-sufficiency, roles generally associated with marriage and fatherhood,"

Could you be anymore insulting to half the population?

"And that means the girls have to live by the guys' demands. And that means less romance.

No, that means less free drinks, dinners, movies, and shopping sprees sweetheart

One of the comments from the article...

30 year old single man chiming in and loving it. No bitterness here. Just pure ecstasy as I clear 130k per year. Go on trips to Asia at least twice per year for a full on f-fest of young, beautiful, feminine women. Drive a brand new BMW, live in a beach community and eat steak every other day. No way in heck would I ever put that up to chance on a modern, selfish, brat American woman.

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 09:53 AM

Goes to show how BP media is

[deleted] • 30 points • 16 January, 2016 06:45 PM

men's strategy is to fuck as many girls as possible. there are reasons that guys don't, but i would say it's probably most likely that they don't because of social incentives (peer pressure, consequences of divorce) and effort (don't know how to, don't want to put in the energy). getting laid is just a matter of showing up for girls, guys have to put in work.

Red\_August • 6 points • 17 January, 2016 01:55 AM

Many of the 'social incentives' are often very much the fabrication of women who rule the social game with their power of shaming. Many men abandon their very own primal directive to participate in an LTR -- in direct conflict with their own strategy -- because they are lulled into it by the siren songs and the promises of the female. It should be remarked however that men will fall on a spectrum here with some easily taken in and others steadfastly refusing (alpha).

Women need men to survive and will go to great lengths to work whatever system is at hand to achieve this. If we weren't the same specie, it would be labelled a parasitic relationship. Sometimes the parasite needs to provide some benefit in return.

It never ceases to amaze me how quick men are to abandon their pursuit of chasing and mating with many women by accepting monogamy for nearly nothing in return. That's the power of women.

reigorius • 6 points • 17 January, 2016 10:12 AM\*

The promise of companionship, the availability of sex on a regular base without much effort, the shared experiences, are all concepts guys float on when entering a long term relationship.

Except, we keep forgetting that companionship should be sought-after among our male friends, which covers the shared experiences and the regular sex can be had with plates.

Although it does take more effort initially. But the hunt in itself fuels our masculinity.

Red\_August • 5 points • 17 January, 2016 12:40 PM

Precisely, and shared memories with male friends will likely be shared again for life. Every LTR is like pressing the reset button.

Men now need to reinvent a social structure post marriage 2.0.

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 09:20 AM

companionship should be sought-after among our male friends

you can not be as affectionate with men as you can with women though and that makes a big difference, at least to me, on how fulfilling the companionship can be.

reigorius • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 09:53 AM

If you mean physical, than yes. If you mean emotional, maybe. If you mean brotherly love, then no. I hug my buddy when I see him. I don't need to hold his hands or kiss his face to strengthen the bond. We do that by being together and doing stuff. Bitches come and go, male friends stay.

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 11:15 AM

I think friendship (brotherly love) can happen the same regardless of gender, it just becomes so much more complicated with women because of all the ulterior interests at stake, similar to combining work and friends and how it can cause conflict; but like a

double edged sword it involves more risk but the reward is also more satisfying. Whether with a guy you won't be seeking sex or commitment or resources (well maybe) so it's easier to be genuine with each other, but still, you are usually bound to how much entertainment and you provide to each other, so i think it is as rare to find a bro that you can trust to talk about your problems and have them genuinely care, the difference is that with men the motives for friendship are usually very clear.

vitringur • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 02:31 PM

You can just as easily say that "fucking as many girls as possible" is also parasitic, in the terms of having loads of women raise your children without providing them with resources and protection to do so.

Women bear the costs of having children and raising them, thus enabling men to continue their gene pool. Of course they are going to try to get something in return.

ImHereAtLast3 points 17 January, 2016 03:27 PM [recovered]

And this is why Vasalgel, even as a concept, is so popular among this community. Like female hormonal contraception, Vasalgel (and possibly other competing forms of male contraception) will enable us to have our cake and eat it too when it comes to sex and relationships. It will also remove the burden of pregnancy from women, therefore minimizing the parasitic nature of the interaction.

vitringur • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 11:56 PM

Well, we already have contraceptions. Nothing drastic will change with another one.

We are still evolved around sex leading to children. Knowing that there is no pregnancy doesn't change the emotional roller coaster that follows an active sex life.

Just like knowing there are no monsters doesn't stop people from being afraid of the dark, etc.

ImHereAtLast • 1 points • 18 January, 2016 02:16 PM [recovered]

What distinguishes Vasalgel from other forms of contraception is that it's entirely covert; women will have no idea who does and does not have it. It'll also be the first male-specific contraception that will enable men to have unprotected sex without the fear of subsequent impregnation, a privilege that women have enjoyed for half a century.

I'm not saying Vasalgel will have any effect on the emotions attached to sex. I'm saying it will be damn good insurance against baby-hungry women who conveniently "forget" to take their pill for three months.

And much to the dismay of feminists, Vasalgel would ultimately endow men with the power to control when conception occurs; Feminists hate it so much because it really is a discreet, undetectable mechanism through which men will be able to appropriate the power of fertility away from women en masse. I'm not saying this is how it should be used, but this certainly will have an effect on society if it passes FDA standards and is released.

vitringur • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 07:08 PM

Why do you say feminists hate it?

ImHereAtLast • 1 points • 19 January, 2016 12:26 AM [recovered]

In all fairness, I've met self-identified feminists who say they wouldn't have a problem with it. However, the National Organization for Women has, I believe on more than one occasion, publicly opposed the development of male contraception.

I would speculate that feminists will hate male contraception because they'd perceive it as a threat to the monopoly women have on fertility; feminists consistently oppose programs, laws, and changes to culture that draw power away from women. For the feminists who have power in our culture, maintaining that power is more important to them than working towards equality.

vitringur • 1 point • 19 January, 2016 03:46 AM

Then just say that the National Organization for Women thinks such and such.

There are loads of different private organizations and groups all around the world that in one way or another claim to be feminists. They have widely different views on different subjects.

The rest of your answer is, like you say, speculation. Based on unsupported preconceptions.

Red\_August • 2 points • 17 January, 2016 11:25 PM

The point that was being made here is that the typical man today is getting a raw deal. In fact, the entire culture places the man in a disadvantageous starting position, a position he doesn't even question.

vitringur • -1 points • 17 January, 2016 11:53 PM

There are quite a few problems with a statement like that. First of all, you are just guessing. Everyone has their own idea of the "typical man" and many would disagree with what you are claiming.

People often generalise when they are in fact talking about them selves.

Do you feel that you had a disadvantage at birth compared to women? Compared to other people? Compared to the average man? Were you not skeptical about your social scenario? Were you not the type to question things? Are you gullible?

It's a shame so many Red Pillers feel the need to victimise themselves, claim the world is unfair and feel sorry for themselves. That's the type of shit they bash the feminists for doing.

In ordinary biology, It is the male rather than the female that acts as a parasite. He is the one that injects his semen into the woman which starts to draw nutrients from her and causing problems with mobility and health.

The woman in return tries to get something from the man. Or just anybody else if that fails.

Red\_August • 2 points • 18 January, 2016 01:42 AM

Am I guessing? Are you guessing? Feminist would disagree with what I claim.

What's your point? Do you have any information to add? Educate me, elucidate me. All I'm reading is "you're just guessing".

Where's the victimisation in this thread? I'm suggesting that men should negotiate a better deal. Focus. I know that some men victimise themselves on TRP but you're reading that meme into everything you see on TRP like a one-trick pony. Why don't you add some



value? Add content, reasoned information -- add something rather than just make a blanket useless statement.

Do you genuinely think that women have it harder than men in today's western world as far as sexual politics are concerned? Have you read TRP at all? Next, do you think men would stand to gain in better negotiating their arrangement when coupling? Yes or no? But I digress. *Personally, this era suits me fantastically well* but it clearly doesn't work for most men, even many here on TRP. Again, what is your point? What are you claiming? You haven't advanced any information.

You've added absolutely no value to this thread. The parasitism was a euphemism and the zygote is the parasite, not the man. You're doing the female hypo-agency thing again.

vitringur • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 02:21 AM

I was pointing out that you were not adding any information in the first place. You just put forward your own personal feelings on the issue with no indication of them being true at all.

You didn't even define the premise. In what way are men at an disadvantage from the start? What start? All men?

What deal is it that men should negotiate better?

The original point was that the relationship between a man and a woman could be described as a parasitic one, where the woman sucks out the man's energy and resources. I just pointed out that originally that was something men traded for their children sucking the energy and resources from the mother.

TRP philosophy is highly based on evolutionary arguments, and I just put it back in evolutionary context. Women bear all the costs of raising children. The optimal strategy for men is to impregnate loads of different women without spending any resources on them. That is the parasitic nature of man that women are trying to protect themselves against.

[deleted] • 9 points • 16 January, 2016 08:04 PM

What about men who can get to fuck a lot of women but given the option they'd rather have a solid LTR? Isn't that against their instincts? Even though it's kind of an instinct itself.

[deleted] • 26 points • 16 January, 2016 09:02 PM

people aren't 'rational actors' meaning that people don't strictly do things that are in their "best" interest. it's what makes predictive models of human behavior (e.g. economics) so difficult and flawed. you can always say "this person should do this thing in this scenario to get the greatest benefit" but that doesn't mean they will.

his reason for being strictly monogamous doesn't make sense as a sexual strategy for procreation, but he still is. that doesn't mean the instinct for multiple partners isn't there, it is, but he isn't acting on it. it's impossible to conceive every reason he made this decision and even if we asked him and he gave us a legit sounding reason he might not even know.

we know AWALT AF/BB and yet NAWALT because while the instinct IS AWALT, the result can be NAWALT. we can turn it around and say AMALT, every guy DOES have the instinct to fuck as many 10's as is humanly possible, and yet NAMALT in actions.



i'm not a slave to instinct, neither are you, nor she, nor he.

imagine you know two girl who are equivalent in all ways except two: physical beauty and their interest in you over time. girl A is a 10, but only interested in you after you achieve success. girl B is a 7, but interested in you regardless of success. assuming 0 success at the beginning of your timeline, and then 100 at the end, should girl A approach you once you get to a success level of 90, you might tell her to fuck off and stick with girl B because you resent her. that's not the best sexual strategy, but you still did it. an ape wouldn't.

this is why it's so important to be observant with any potential LTRs and really take your time and screen like a motherfucker. AWALT, but are her actions NAWALT?

[deleted] • 8 points • 16 January, 2016 09:34 PM

I think you vastly underestimate the number of married dudes who have side pieces. Indeed the quality male *without* a side piece seems to be the minority throughout history. Its the truly mediocre males who have to spend their whole time/energy/resources retaining one female (who is probably some other males sidepiece) that are actualy monogamous.

alphbux • 5 points • 17 January, 2016 08:28 AM

Isn't that against their instincts?

In evolution men have two strategies to ensure their genes get out there. One is the shotgun approach where they hit anything that moves. Most men will fuck sluts, but their instincts tell them never to LTR them. This strategy can mean they will scatter offspring around the place.

However a good quality female mate will produce that mans best genetic offspring, so in that instance it might be worth his time to put in some parental investment to ensure the best of his best will have the best chance possible.

So it's a mix of two strategies for a male.

[deleted] • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 05:06 AM

Probably because we still have maternal instincts to look after our offspring. Dudes can still get baby crazy, and (I'm assuming these Men are settling into a LTR AFTER fucking a bunch of Women) it just gets easier to settle into a relationship afterwards and have a family.

KinTraumaJide • 1 point • 16 January, 2016 11:24 PM

Speak for yourself, I make them work their asses off for it.

[deleted] • 8 points • 16 January, 2016 09:30 PM

There seems to be a sort of r mating strategy time period to males and a K mating strategy time period to men.

Most guys when they are young they have high T levels and want to smash anything 5+. This is the time men are most likely to accrue bastards. The equivalent to this would be young/juvenile members of a tribe being warriors, running around raping and pillaging neighboring tribes etc.

As they get older, T levels drop, and they decide to pursue a K mating strategy with one or two females. This would be the equivalent of being a hunter gatherer or farmer later in history. Maybe they pursue r type on the side, but K type dominates their day to day.

If you smash random girls all the time there is no point in investing in their offspring because the chances it

is yours is probably fairly poor. In return they are unlikely to invest anything in you when you are old and feeble.

If you smash the same girl/girls daily any offspring she has are likely yours and worthy of time/investment so they can provide for you in later life.

singeblanc • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 01:23 PM

OK, so T is testosterone, but WTF is r and K?

[deleted] • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 07:55 PM

r and K are mating strategies in the natural world.

r is high volume low investment breeding. A frog would be an example of r breeding. They lay a bunch of eggs and peace out.

K parenting is low volume high investment breeding. An elephant would be an example. They are pregnant for like a year+ and their infants need support for years.

A man who is an r breeder would be pumping and dumping girls all the time with bastards in multiple states or countries. A man who is a K breeder would be married with one or two kids, a fat college fund for them, goes to all their hockey games, gets them braces, pays for lessons/tutors, etc.

Females by design are basically biologically incapable of r type. Some do it (they get knocked up every year and have welfare pay for them) but generally and historically speaking r mating is beyond the capability of female humans.

Denswend • 3 points • 16 January, 2016 09:58 PM

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Madonna%E2%80%93whore\\_complex](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Madonna%E2%80%93whore_complex)

The\_Red\_Paw • 8 points • 16 January, 2016 04:52 PM

The ones that settle for relationships are the betas who cannot mash who they want.

The Alphas banging these wives may be married too, but they are not settled down.

FreeRadical5 • 16 points • 16 January, 2016 08:04 PM

I recently got in a relationship with a girl who was fucking me for months exclusively while she knew I was fucking other girls. At any time I had at least 3 plates for over a year. Yet it started to feel very meaningless to fuck other girls because I just had a better time hanging out with that one girl. Every single time.

The breaking point came when I scored a new 8.5/10 plate and fucked her on the very first time I met her. With my dick inside her, all I felt inside was general apathy.

So I LTRed my favorite plate and so far have been nothing but happy. Part of the decision to go exclusive definitely was to secure the commitment of this girl, but a bigger part was just a vacation from the boring chore that constantly hunting for new plates became and the little pleasure it provided. I might get to a point where I miss it, I might negotiate non-exclusivity again.

reigorius • 7 points • 17 January, 2016 10:23 AM

I thought I was the only one. The feeling of apathy when you spear another pussy. I view dating more or less as work. Going on countless dates to hone my skills. And be ready in the rare event I catch a goody.

Good luck with the LTR

Natural\_RP • 8 points • 16 January, 2016 08:48 PM

Are you new here? Is your plan to marry up and get divorce raped? I can't possibly see what you stand to gain from exclusivity.

You should always demand monogamy from your plates but not for yourself. If you have high enough SMV your plates will accept this.

Regardless why would you even enter into an exclusive agreement? What if you suddenly have the chance to easily bang a 10 that you really just want to bang, even if it's just once? It makes virtually zero sense. I mean if it's making your happy just to bang one girl that do that, but don't promise her you'll never fuck anyone else.

FreeRadical5 • 14 points • 16 January, 2016 09:39 PM

I've been a regular here over 2 years, this is a throwaway account.

No of course I won't marry her, that is out of the question. I honestly didn't see myself getting in a relationship for a good 2 years while I was regularly spinning plates. And yes most of my plates did agree to being exclusive and ok with me seeing other girls including this one.

I surprised both myself and this girl when I wanted to start a exclusive relationship with her. Scoring new girls and fucking them till they eventually moved on in a few months just wasn't doing it for me anymore. As much fun as it is, I started craving something deeper. I felt the time spent with most plates was very scripted, shallow, lacking in sentiment and just wasted. While it is nice to be praised for being the hot guy she just wants to use as a dildo... there are 0 real feelings involved by either party. I started to crave someone caring about me more deeply.

It got to a point that a simple walk down the street with her started to feel more fun than taking the anal cherry of a new plate. To top it off, I could tell she was really holding back on becoming completely vulnerable due the inherent instability of our arrangement. I also felt I could enjoy her a lot more if I'd just be willing to give her a real chance.

So I decided to take a risk and give it a go, against all rational thought. I haven't felt this much peace in a long time. It feels absolutely incredible and liberating. I know she's still a girl that is capable of cheating and all manners of degenerate behavior in the right circumstance. But aren't we all? I took a risk and I'm enjoying the rewards. So far I love being in love... didn't think I'd feel that again. (Don't worry...Haven't told her that yet)

I should note however that this isn't just any girl. I've been with ~30 girls and not one of them was ANYTHING like her. She's so generous that I have to constantly stop her from over spending on me. She is confident and competent in life yet so submissive that I can slap her across the face and she will not challenge me (not that I do). So caring that she'd rather take the hit herself than let it harm me. I have never seen anything like it, but then again I am wearing rose colored glasses right now.

Natural\_RP • 18 points • 16 January, 2016 10:02 PM

You have oneitis my friend. As I stated above, I don't agree with it but it's your life obviously you should do what makes you happy.

However that said remember the RP rules: Never marry, Never cohabitate, never have children an never put yourself at risk. If you can force yourself to follow those rules, have at it.

FreeRadical5 • 3 points • 17 January, 2016 05:40 AM\*

Agreed. Just shared my story to say that sometimes a relationship is a conscious choice despite having all the knowledge and options. I can force myself to keep her as a plate and continue my previous lifestyle but honestly I am just enjoying life much more now. Of course this too may be a phase.

[deleted] 16 January, 2016 10:54 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

FreeRadical5 • 9 points • 17 January, 2016 05:38 AM

It probably is, but what is the harm in that? I am under no illusion that she is different from other girls. I know this sweet little angle of mine will become a cold apathetic cunt if a much higher SMV guy starts to look like a real option over me. However if indulging in this infatuation for now is bringing me happiness, why not? I know this might get my heart broken eventually but it seems a price worth paying to experience this.

I have accepted her nature and love as being conditional on my SMV and tingle producing ability. It isn't much different than my love for her being dependent on her SMV. It sounds horrible but if she puts on 50lb, it wouldn't be long till I am feeling trapped rather than lucky.

kinklianehoff • 3 points • 17 January, 2016 10:55 PM

great perspectives man. Something that complements this way of thinking; it may feel like you're taking a risk here, but honestly, as long as your resources stay yours, all you are really risking is getting your feelings hurt down the line. Boo friggin hoo.

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 10:25 AM

all you are really risking is getting your feelings hurt down the line. Boo friggin hoo.

Honestly it can be a huge risk depending on how invested you are, the issue is that after certain point it becomes extremely hard to control how much you invest because the more you invest the more emotionally rewarding the relationship feels.

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 10:21 AM

Do you think there's a point where if you find someone of high enough SMV you wouldn't care if you were to find someone else of higher SMV because the difference becomes negligible? Where you would risk more by leaving behind the depth of your relationship to try your luck on someone new? At least I feel this way but I seem to be alone.

The weakspot to this is that if *their* SMV *lowers* then you (or them) won't feel this way anymore.

FreeRadical5 • 2 points • 18 January, 2016 03:13 PM

Their smv certainly plays a huge role. Personally if the girl is lower than an 8 I highly doubt I'd be able to settle for that. Above that level, other hot girls on

the street start to lose their impact on me. But more importantly ones you develop a deep enough connection it does offer significant protection against wanting other hot girls. Time spent with that person becomes so enjoyable that a minor improvement in smv just doesn't tempt me anymore.

Morpheus-Man • -2 points • 17 January, 2016 04:26 AM

Like i said before, bluepill is genetic, no matter how long one practices redpill theory the blue will eventually surface

WakandaDrama • 8 points • 17 January, 2016 01:32 PM

Chasing pussy can get tiresome. The OG Ben Franklin said "Women and wine make the wealth small and the want great." Putting your dick in a hot chick and feeling apathy is a horrid feeling. All that work for another hole, another star fish, another "what have you done for me lately" type.

Chicks who dig you and actually invested just get wetter. Being around a chick who wont shit test you can be a relief.

That being said, I trust no one, not even my own mother. Watch that chick, and choke her during sex every now and then

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 10:04 AM

And yes most of my plates did agree to being exclusive and ok with me seeing other girls including this one.

How do you negotiate this with your plates? How do you put it into words to them?

FreeRadical5 • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 03:07 PM

For most of them I didn't really care. For the girls that I liked enough to care, it was offered long before I requested it. All I did is casually mention "you should never assume exclusivity unless it's explicitly stated" from the beginning. That puts the ball in their court to negotiate for it if they want. And they often don't even try.

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 06:30 PM

Oh! I misread it, i understand now. I thought you said that they agreed on being exclusive to you while you were not exclusive to them.

FreeRadical5 • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 08:06 PM

You didn't misread. That's what I said. The girls usually just offer exclusivity after that. If you don't offer it in return, most will still stay and now you have that deal.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 January, 2016 02:26 AM

Oh I would have thought they wouldn't be keeping a deal like that once you turn them down.

no\_horse\_girls • 1 point • 16 January, 2016 05:13 PM

Is this true? Do men not form families? I'm speaking about throughout history, not just today.

[deleted] • 16 points • 16 January, 2016 06:43 PM

Historically Alphas were the resource holders.

They were Alpha Bucks.

Alphas do not do any one thing over another, they do as the like and anyone who prescribes to you what an Alpha should or shouldn't be doing has a ways to go yet. There are a lot of "Alpha" men who are loving fathers and caring Husbands.

adam-l • 9 points • 16 January, 2016 09:43 PM

**Alpha** – Socially dominant. Somebody who displays high value, or traits that are sexually attractive to women. Alpha can refer to a man who exhibits alpha behaviors (more alpha tendencies than beta), but *usually used to describe individual behaviors themselves*.

**Beta** – Traits of provision: either providing resources or validation to others, women (and perhaps men). Beta traits display low value to women if they are are put on too strong or too early in meeting- giving without equity. Beta can be used to describe individual behaviors, as well as people who have an overwhelming amount of *beta properties* (opposed to alpha).

I think there is a good reason that the TRP terminology focuses on "alpha" and "beta" **behaviors** rather than **personalities**. I understand the need for a codified terminology, but discussing in way of "Alpha" does this and "beta" does that is too schematic, in my opinion, and could cover up the gender dynamics.

[deleted] 16 January, 2016 11:01 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 3 points • 17 January, 2016 03:56 AM

Betas are also more engaged. When hypergamy is kept in check Betas have skin in the game. An alpha with five plates isn't necessarily more productive. Where as life long virgin Betas will be much less productive and you get rampant mgtow movements since what is the point of success, buying a house, or being a good consumer if you are living alone with your cats. The machine is starved and society suffers. That's where we are now.

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 10:35 AM

Stability for society required women to be unable to provision for themselves without a man.

This is waaay too much of an assumption

[deleted] • 6 points • 16 January, 2016 09:40 PM

Historically, tribal times, early agriculture, early civilization, etc. you basically got as many females as you could afford/attract.

It was kind of like Mormonism is today; if you could afford 1 wife +kids, thats how many you got. If you could afford 6 wives + children, thats how many you got.

The market restrictions we see today (the idea of one man one woman monogamy) are relatively recent inventions. Really monogamy is the best way to keep everyone just barely satisfied most of the time.

With the rise of feminism and the welfare state paying for all their bastards, harems are making a

comeback.

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 10:37 AM

It was kind of like Mormonism is today; if you could afford 1 wife +kids, thats how many you got. If you could afford 6 wives + children, thats how many you got.

How great would it be that the social norm were that women have to be monogamous but men don't, and having women get shamed if they did otherwise.

JimmyJiangh • 3 points • 16 January, 2016 07:50 PM

I'd guess harems for high status men also occurred.

[deleted] 16 January, 2016 06:55 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

Natural\_RP • 13 points • 16 January, 2016 08:55 PM

Sigh. Sigh at you so hard. AWALT is a safety precaution. It's much like "all guns are loaded." Obviously all guns are not always loaded *but you treat them as they are because the consequences of not doing so can be dire.*

Are all woman skanks that over value themselves with a dualistic mating strategy? No. But we are going to treat them as they are until proven otherwise, because again *the consequences of not doing so can be dire.*

Divorce rape, getting cucked, being forced to raise and pay for children not your own OR not being allowed to raise children that ARE YOURS!

The system and women today are insane. The red pill is simply a way for men to survive and game that system.

[deleted] • 10 points • 16 January, 2016 09:46 PM

Your analogy would be true if bullets could magically appear in your gun out of thin air in a moments notice.

A girl can go from a NAWALT "unicorn" to a gutter slut in the blink of an eye. All she needs to do is be "triggered" for lack of a better word. They are like "The Manchuria Skank" just waiting for their code word to activate them.

Instinctual programming will not be denied. Will every addict relapse and blow up everything around them? Not everyone, but pretty close.

Natural\_RP • 5 points • 16 January, 2016 09:57 PM

I don't disagree with you. But your stance should always be to have as much fun and sex *with as little risk as possible.*

Actively letting a woman sleep around is not risk I'm willing to take, nor should you.

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 January, 2016 10:23 PM

Of course not. I never meant to suggest otherwise.

[deleted] 17 January, 2016 03:20 PM\*

[permanently deleted]



Natural\_RP • 3 points • 17 January, 2016 05:40 PM

The risks are entirely real. The stats back that up. Around 20% of men are raising children that aren't their own, and that's just what we believe from the data we have. Over 50% of marriages end in divorce. That is just the start.

The facts agree with me and your feelz agree with you. It feels good to be right.

[deleted] 17 January, 2016 09:44 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 10:54 AM

You are right that those with stable happy relationships are never going to end up finding their way to this place through google. But you are wrong to believe that the RP mindset is anything but the best way to approach the gender dynamic. Also divorce being at around 40% is still very high, and it goes without saying that just because people are married doesn't mean they have a good marriage, considering how mediocre the average person is i'd say that over 50% of the married non-divorced people have a shitty unfulfilling marriage.

Natural\_RP • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 05:50 PM

Well stats in my country is on average 40.7% apparently. If you combine that with people generally being in terrible marriages and others who won't divorce due to religious or financial reasons on top all those people who live common law for years then break up (what would have been required to be a marriage a short while ago) likely well over 50% of people at least *should* be divorced or considered divorced. That's probably why "the myth won't die."

As for step fathers being a victim or cuckolding? No, not when it comes to the dictionary definition. HOWEVER the word seems to be evolving to include different things, such as the AF/BB idea.

So that would mean that yes a woman fucked an alpha which gave her "tingles" and now has some beta raising and her supporting her alpha child. Which in the mind of more red pillers would make that step father a cuck.

He has however (through stupidity) done this to himself, so is he a victim? I would say yes. If a conman cons a idiot, is the idiot still a victim? Yes.

[deleted] 16 January, 2016 07:36 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 January, 2016 09:42 PM

Yeah but pro athletes still smash whoever they want.

just because they put a ring on a former "Miss Colorado" doesn't mean he doesn't still smash whoever he wants.

See Brett Favre, Mark Chmura, that Baltimore Raven with like 11 bastards, etc.

[deleted] 16 January, 2016 09:46 PM

[permanently deleted]



[deleted] • 3 points • 16 January, 2016 09:56 PM

There is a difference between a beta and an alpha who made an extremely risky decision.

Also a lot of these alpha married dudes you know will be worn down to a little nub by the time their wives are done with them.

Some may be alpha enough to keep their wife in line, but its a damn few.

[deleted] • 3 points • 17 January, 2016 05:16 AM

if 20% of the men are having 80% of the sex, then your genes want to know if you are part of the 20% or part of the 80%. If you are part of the 20%, then your genes tell you to be a total sexual predator and maximize on your quantity of sex as much as possible. I think this is determined by how many sexual partners you get between 12 years old and 18 years old. On the other hand, if you are a virgin at age 18, your genes go "I must be part of the 80%", so your genes make you into a nice guy who wants monogamy, because if you can get a girl, you better keep her.

bigrock45 • 8 points • 17 January, 2016 06:30 AM

I think the problem is repressed sexuality and self actualization. If like myself you grew up with a mom who was narcissistic and told you men were bad. You grew up being ashamed of wanting to hit on girls and thought it made you worse than you already were, as well as disappointing people. Thats what makes people beta, not genes

alphbux • 2 points • 17 January, 2016 08:34 AM

I've read similar about this elsewhere in evo psych. That males that are lower value are more susceptible to committing rape in order to pass their genes on.

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 11:02 AM

Also more likely to commit school shootings boop

Stalgrim • 25 points • 16 January, 2016 05:07 PM

While that system is fairly obvious. I mean it developed over a series of millennia I think we can all see it for what it is. What I'm interested in is the modern system that's developed in the last few decades that allows for funneling of beta dollars into a divorced woman's bank account while her former partner works his ass off to just continue living and out of jail. Meanwhile this divorcee woman can go off with whichever partner she prefers, with her former partners resources.

nzgs • 12 points • 16 January, 2016 06:07 PM

This ties into research that shows how a woman's partner criteria changes during the month according to her cycle - when ovulating she favours AF traits and when not ovulating she favours BB traits.

Guys spend so much time arguing about whether women are attracted to money or muscles or what, when the truth is they want both, at different times and for different reasons. Very very few men can provide both adequately, so women defer to this dualistic mating strategy instead.

Red\_August • 5 points • 17 January, 2016 02:18 AM

I would nuance that a little bit. Women have always and always will be looking for the top shelf sperm. She's more inclined to mate when she is fertile. She thus is seemingly looking to mate with alphas when she is

fertile. The thing is, if she had a choice, she would only mate with alphas, regardless of cycle.

A women doesn't 'mate' with a beta-provider. What she's really doing is 'trading' and that's the difference. She's trading sex for security and shelter because women cannot live without men. When we lived in bands 200,000 years ago, there were no beta-providers as we know them today. They didn't need to exist because a woman could find all her security needs met by the the whole band (tribe) -- shelter, protection, help with children, etc.

[deleted] • 4 points • 17 January, 2016 04:53 AM

I think the issue with BB is that although it does get you to spend time with a woman, it doesn't get her desire to fuck you. She will fuck you as much as necessary, and she might legitimately enjoy it, but you'll never feel that primal urge of a woman longing for your seed.

stunningandbrave • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 01:43 PM

They want Dr. Sixpack Monstercock.

[deleted] • 7 points • 17 January, 2016 03:12 AM\*

**A note for intrinsically beta males:** The thing is that beta orbiting works as a sexual strategy, very often. Not speaking for myself, but i've met a lot of beta orbiters that were simply persistent whilst his target woman could never find an alpha to stick around. It's not a very fun life being a woman's second place fall-back guy but if you're a short, stumpy looking man with a 5/10 face and average paycheck you don't have much choice about it really.

I'm just saying this because a lot of guys simply cannot be alpha - it's impossible. You have to be honest with yourselves and if you're going to be a beta male, then learn to play the game as a beta male. Make sure it is known that you're looking for sex, and then just be persistent. Be that available guy that sticks around until the woman gives up.

This friend of mine named Andy does this. He's 5'4" and a round stoutly looking guy with a short ugly haircut, and a boring round face with soft features. He's very average and a very 'nice guy'. His gaming tactic is to do what I said above and it works for him. He gets women that are higher SMV than him by going on a lot of "friends only" dates, but with the clear intentions that he's a sexual being that wants to fuck. It takes him probabaly 15x the effort of an alpha male to get his dick wet but eventually it works. He stays right in their minds by texting often and asking these women out constantly. He envelopes them with his presence and just keeps cracking at that eggshell till he strikes gold.

[deleted] • 2 points • 17 January, 2016 11:33 AM

This sounds like a sad pitiful life to me. But hey, who am I to judge? He probably gets laid more than me at the moment...

[deleted] • 2 points • 17 January, 2016 11:42 AM

He does pretty well considering. The women are always really into him in his relationships as well. He's happy with life.

[deleted] • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 11:49 PM

Fuck that. I refuse to settle being a "nice guy". I may be disadvantaged at the moment, and have to work harder, but I'll be damned if I sink back into nice guyness after discovering this place.

foldpak111 • 14 points • 16 January, 2016 05:23 PM

You just can't make this shit up.

filthyass • 120 points • 16 January, 2016 03:42 PM

I often wonder whether it's even necessary to include the RP terminology when writing stuff like this. This is legitimate science, couldn't you just allow us to draw our own conclusions based on the facts? I mean, I'm a smart guy. I don't need to have my hand held through an article about mating strategy.

I removed all of the RP terms and re-posted below. Thoughts?

## Women's Sexual Strategies: The Evolution of Long-Term Bonds and Extrapair Sex

Who are the authors?

Elizabeth Pillsworth is an Assistant Professor of Evolutionary Anthropology at UCLA.

Martie G. Haselton is a Professor at the UCLA Department of Psychology.

**I'll break down their conclusions:**

Across all cultures, women deploy a dualistic sexual strategy: Coupling and Dual Mating

Coupling, meaning the formation of a long-term 'monogamous' relationship with a provider, is necessitated by human infants requiring long years of high resource expenditure before they are independent.

Evidence indicates that for the purpose of Coupling, women seek out men that display characteristics like ability to provide, kindness and reliability. When selection is constrained, women will prioritize the ability to provide.

Women will display Commitment Skepticism with their Coupling partner, requesting a variety of displays on his part to guarantee he'll be willing to commit once they have coupled (and she's likely pregnant). This is because a wrong investment on the woman's part would prove disastrous for her, leaving her without her Coupling mate's resources.

Dual Mating is a strategy in which women seek to reproduce with men offering better genes than their Coupling partner, while retaining the commitment of the Coupling partner

Women are specifically drawn to Dual Mating during the fertile phase of the ovulatory cycle, and women in long-term relationships display a **larger** attraction to Dual Mating than otherwise

For dual mating, women prefer men with the following characteristics: body and facial symmetry, facial masculinity (large jaw, prominent brow), dominance, deeper voice, physical size (in relation to their partner)

Evidence of Dual Mating is the adaptation to sperm competition (the relatively large-sized testes in men follow the pattern in other primates of larger testes = more sperm competition), the commonality of extrapair mating (cheating, with around 20% of women admitting to at least one lifetime instance), and the development of jealousy (which is **not** ubiquitous among primates) in males, including to the point of violence

[deleted] • 12 points • 16 January, 2016 04:32 PM

I find that when you make it sound sciencey and put it in terms of animals people will agree with you and say it makes sense. However, as soon as you says its between men and women people act as though the idea is absurd. Usually you'll here something to the effect of "but humans are rational thinkers! We've overcome all that!"

[deleted] • 26 points • 16 January, 2016 05:05 PM

I often wonder whether it's even necessary to include the RP terminology when writing stuff like this. This is legitimate science, couldn't you just allow us to draw our own conclusions based on the facts? I mean, I'm a smart guy. I don't need to have my hand held through an article about mating strategy.

Because if you don't include the TRP connection then all he's doing is copying and pasting. There's something legitimate about a poster adding his own work or interpretation.

foldpak111 • 8 points • 16 January, 2016 06:56 PM

I do like both versions, though.

thiasus[S] • 74 points • 16 January, 2016 04:19 PM

couldn't you just allow us to draw our own conclusions based on the facts?

First, I'm not allowing you to draw your own conclusions either way. I'm condensing the article based on my own understanding and reading on it, which means what you are reading are **my** conclusions from their work. If you want to draw your own, you need to read the article, and that goes for **anything** that is posted here or elsewhere.

Second, the intended audience includes you, who evidently already understands the lingo, and the many guys who are new to TRP, not really clear on the lingo and most certainly not really convinced that this stuff is even legitimate. Showing explicitly what legitimate science says that exactly mirrors our own modeling is intended for them.

PoorlyTimedPun • 4 points • 16 January, 2016 11:00 PM

I appreciate it. Am new to all this...found myself here after a wierd year in my relationship that I'm sort of stuck in (we have a kid), with a woman that I do love but am struggling to regain the power in my relationship. The things I've learned in TRP have been by far the most helpful, and being new I really appreciate stuff like this making the connections easier to understand and relate to.

EightyJay • 26 points • 16 January, 2016 04:47 PM

Yea, OP puts in the work and some one w no effort provides criticism. I use to put a lot of work into helping less informed folks in other forums (investing, real estate, entrepreneurship). Then you get these lazy responses offer how you could have offered a better post (vs just taking / accepting or appreciating the value of the submission) and I quickly loose interest.

obama\_loves\_nsa • 2 points • 17 January, 2016 08:17 PM

I appreciate your commentary interspersed in the article you pasted.

Keep doing that. Intelligent primates can read the original around your comments pretty easily. Not sure why there's a complaint

d1sun • 18 points • 16 January, 2016 03:58 PM **[recovered]**

I agree. There was no need to overdo the AB/BB lingo.

[deleted] • 8 points • 16 January, 2016 07:04 PM\*

Seconded.

Though I will be honest in admitting that the language in OP's post troubled me because I would more likely to fall into the beta bux category. Sometimes its difficult to tell when you're being taken advantage of when you assume you're in a decent relationship.

systemshock869 • 2 points • 17 January, 2016 05:57 AM [recovered]

You haven't read much here, have you? Welcome to the suck

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 January, 2016 09:49 PM

The "pure text" would be a good argument when engaged with a NAWALT enthusiast.

The annotated text is another example to the RP inductee that yes indeed this shit is verifiable reality.

Both are useful.

0xdada • 6 points • 16 January, 2016 04:20 PM

Totally for TRP language on this. They could have taken their hypothesis' directly from this sub.

[deleted] • 5 points • 16 January, 2016 04:05 PM

It makes it easier to read and more relate-able for us.

magus678 • 5 points • 16 January, 2016 04:34 PM

I think in this case the science can stand on its own. Repackaging dilutes the message

Fuck\_shadow\_bans • 3 points • 16 January, 2016 06:41 PM

That actually made it significantly less clear in a TRP context, which is where we are.

TheReformist94 • 2 points • 16 January, 2016 04:52 PM

i honestly dont see why TRP doesnt advocate infidelity in todays climate where monogamy is not enforced. this biology is here, right in TRP's face that a women's sexual strategy is INHERENTLY DISHONEST, and HER CHEATING IS KEY AND CORE TO HER AF:BB STRATEGY. knowingly making a man raise another man's child is on the same moral plane as a man raping a women. you rape a woman's sex, she rape's your time and committment. they are hardwired to do this shit, what do you owe to her going out with her to keep sex on tap and not spin plates in the background? they do it all the time

[deleted] • 5 points • 16 January, 2016 06:28 PM

nothing. this is what's weird about everything to me: we are concerned with what is their best strategy for reproduction and ignore our own - spreading our seed.

Natural\_RP • 5 points • 16 January, 2016 08:43 PM

women. you rape a woman's sex, she rape's your time and committment. they are hardwired to do this shit, what do you owe to her going out with her to keep sex on tap and not spin plates in the background? they do it all the time

Who isn't advocating infidelity, or any tip, trick or scam you can use to get laid and further your own agenda? You should use every resource available to you.

Women these days are worthless and think they deserve everything (perfect alpha) simply because they are pretty skinny. Bullshit.

TL;DR All in fair in love and war, and make no mistake gentlemen this is a war.

Lurker\_IV • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 10:46 PM

I often wonder whether it's even necessary to include the RP terminology when writing stuff like this.

Its very necessary. TRP promotes a fairly respectful and, dare I say, moral culture for individuals to succeed in life and fuck a lot of women of course. The scientific study information can be interpreted in some very bad, non-TRP, ways. Such as it justifies betas being suspicious, controlling, manipulative, and constantly jealous *because science "proves" their women will cheat on them*. That could create a lot of very abusive relationships. And on the flip side women could use this to justify cheating and lying to their partners also. "Science told me to do it."

Look at u/TheReformist94 below. It only took two hours for these guys start using this study to justify infidelity and cuckolding as many men as they can. Did these idiots forget how easy paternity testing is? Their comments already justify the abusive relationships I just mentioned.

I'm not disagreeing with the science. I think its good also that TRP philosophy has some science backing it also. **But we cannot replace ethics and morality with "scientific justifications."** Can you imagine the headlines, "TRP openly advocates infidelity and getting other men's wives pregnant! Use 'science' as justification." It would bring unimaginable backlash and vilification against TRP.

TheReformist94 • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 08:52 PM

I didnt justify cuckolding men.I justify and encourage cheating on your LTR with single women if you have to. Cuckoldry is the optimum sexual strategy for any woman who is in the bottom 85% who cant lock down an alpha.if you know a woman is gonna branch swing on your ass at the drop of a hat,go ahead and be loyal,but dont expect your loyalty to pay off when someone better than you comes along. By remaining fsithful to a woman who cudnt give two fucks about you all you are doing is maximising her serial monogamy whilst you surrender your polygamy.women are inherently dishonest so you owe nothing to be.all is fair is love and war.I will fuck over a woman but wont knowingly fuck over a married man.

Lurker\_IV • 1 point • 19 January, 2016 12:01 AM

Despite all the logical and scientific reasoning and the bleak picture you paint with it actual rates of men raising someone else's children are less than 5% almost everywhere. Last I read its around 3% in the US and less in many places. Our ethics and culture overcome the biological drive almost entirely and make it a rare occurrence.

This is why using the study to justify things is a bad idea.

surgeon\_general • 6 points • 16 January, 2016 07:20 PM

OP says "cheating, with around 20% of women admitting to at least one lifetime instance." That stat has to be way off, right?

Kathulos • 11 points • 16 January, 2016 08:18 PM

Women never lie when making rape or domestic violence allegations. Why would you think they might lie on a survey? I think you are just threatened by strong independent women. /s

rztzz • 3 points • 17 January, 2016 03:42 AM

I believe it's closer to 50% for both genders

waldo888 • 4 points • 16 January, 2016 07:46 PM

It is interesting to note that if the woman is single/ has less orbiters more beta qualities should be shown to her. Once she has her beta options, no more betaness required from new mate.

I also found it interesting that failing shit tests is necessary to maintain commitment. And passing them to

maintain attraction. Now how to balance this in your relationships is the hard part.

[deleted] • 2 points • 17 January, 2016 11:30 AM

I am genuinely curious for an example. This is a very interesting theory on relationship dynamics.

ajm2247 • 5 points • 16 January, 2016 08:47 PM

The key is to be the alpha and the beta, pretty simple outlook on life.

sqerl • 3 points • 16 January, 2016 10:45 PM\*

## Conclusions:

LIFT, become assertive and learn to speak with a proper voice.

Or if you're the beta/The Blue Pill, keep orbiting. She'll choose you to raise Chad's kid ~~when she's done with Chad~~ when he's done with her.

Obvious edit.

[deleted] • 2 points • 17 January, 2016 03:18 AM

Orbiting IS the only tactic for beta males though. You've got to stop feeding the ugly, short men of low incomes with this deluded fantasy that they can be the alpha male lol. It literally never happens.

faded\_jester • 6 points • 16 January, 2016 07:55 PM

All humans want to have their cake and eat it too. Any men here who wouldn't like a great wife to raise your kids and a smoking hot mistress to have fun with on the weekend?

The biggest difference is men are willing to admit it...women just pretend they are angels and get "offended" lol.

I\_TRY\_TO\_BE\_POSITIVE • 3 points • 16 January, 2016 07:49 PM

One possibility in presenting this evolutionary analysis of mating adaptations is that women may come to better understand the logic of their desires and perhaps make more informed decisions about whether to follow them.

This is what a voice of reason looks like.

palacepsy6706 • 3 points • 17 January, 2016 01:43 AM

Evidence indicates that for the purpose of Coupling (beta bux), women seek out men that display characteristics like ability to provide (bux), kindness and reliability. When selection is constrained, women will prioritize the ability to provide (bux).

Interesting point, particularly the last point, when you consider western civilisation's transition from small agrarian communities to heavily populated urban environments, with the rise of social media and Tinder. Where once there wasn't much selection and women had to make do with whatever dudes were in the community, now they can find all the AF they want with only a few swipes of a finger.

[deleted] • 3 points • 17 January, 2016 04:21 AM

This is a really important post. It provides evidence of what is actually going down. It's not like a conspiracy, mind you, but a realization and awakening (as is always said on this sub), that your chances of a happy beta



relationship surviving is a poor one, and you, as the beta bux male, will pay for. Seen it just this morning.... ugh.

augizzz999 • 7 points • 16 January, 2016 04:56 PM

TRP should use this post as armor against feminist logic. Sticky it.

[deleted] • 35 points • 16 January, 2016 05:11 PM

There is no feminist logic and you can't use science against them.

augizzz999 • 11 points • 16 January, 2016 05:32 PM

You can't use logic against feminists, but you can try to reason with the swarm people that come after the noise they create.

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 January, 2016 05:45 PM

I agree you can. You see a reason though?

augizzz999 • 2 points • 16 January, 2016 06:18 PM

Just to keep fat bitches screaming.

[deleted] 16 January, 2016 11:08 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

Fedora\_Tipper\_ • 1 point • 16 January, 2016 07:39 PM

He means that even if you show hard logic, like stats, history, and behavior patterns they still deny it saying it's been skewed or just plain out say you're wrong by shouting louder than you.

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 January, 2016 08:54 PM

Are you responding to the right guy? I was the one who said it was useless to argue with them. And then I asked why he was bothering talking to people about these things in the first place.

RPAternate42 • 4 points • 16 January, 2016 08:06 PM

"feminist logic"

-r-thathappened

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 January, 2016 04:00 PM

How come the concept of a marriage survived as long as it did? Because of the social stigma of cheating/adultery?

Five\_Decades • 33 points • 16 January, 2016 04:09 PM\*

One reason is that marriage helps keep social stability. The environment we have now, where the top 5-20% of males monopolize all the women means that 80-95% of men are locked out of the mating market. Men who are locked out of the mating market and who do not have children can become unstable as they get older, which will result in violent revolt. Some of the mass shootings that have occurred are due to beta males who feel locked out of mating and out of society. In history, these males would team up and overthrow the government.

Mating after the sexual revolution



Oxdada • 5 points • 16 January, 2016 04:13 PM

To keep them in line, give them bread and circuses...and wives.

[deleted] • 11 points • 16 January, 2016 05:29 PM

Video games and porn for the millennium generation. I honestly don't think betas would mind this lifestyle that much if women would just plainly state what they want.

Five\_Decades • 2 points • 16 January, 2016 04:15 PM

And religion. Religion, wives and entertainment.

Oxdada • 13 points • 16 January, 2016 04:16 PM

Thought religion was part of circuses.

MattyAnon • 14 points • 16 January, 2016 05:15 PM

Women needed the security *in the olden days*.

Because:

Raising 5+ children was necessary and huge amount of work (less schooling, food harder to prepare, clothes expensive, etc)

No social support from Daddy Taxpayer

No hope of remarrying or picking up a carrier past age 35

For their part, men said "If I have to marry, I'm going to marry a hot/good one.". So it was in women's best interests to marry, and divorce wasn't granted on a whim. Alimony was to enforce the male end of the bargain.

The female side of the bargain (sex, support of the man) was never enforced, and this side often sucked for many men - dead bedrooms abounded in the olden days too.

eddiac • 6 points • 16 January, 2016 04:37 PM\*

because marriage is about alpha kings throwing one female per beta to make them shut the fuck up and work for them, while kings and the alpha nobility enjoy a harem and infinite resources. betas instinctively feel like they owe him one since otherwise they would end up with no kids and destroyed in a fight with an alpha as such they are happy with monogamy.

JohnCashMoney • 2 points • 16 January, 2016 05:20 PM

Much the same conclusions came out in studies of primates. This is evolutionary psychology 101 and it is deeply ingrained in the psyche since our distant ancestors millions of years ago.

[deleted] • 2 points • 16 January, 2016 06:29 PM

My theory: Looking back thousands of years ago this was the same thing. You could visibly see a provider by his body and only the ones that could work together to hunt could survive. You could only provide if you were a fit kind of guy that could be a good hunter. Though this drifted apart when we became settled and wealthy. There's still need for a provider but the sexual arousal remained as it was (because one is dependent on the environment: being a provider; the other is a hard-wired emotion that is not).

[deleted] • 2 points • 17 January, 2016 11:46 AM

Im late to the discussion. But dont we men do roughly the same? All those stories of men enjoying the stability

of a marriage with the advantages it had whilst enjoying sneaking out to have affairs with younger women? This is a classic story...

whydoievenreply • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 02:37 PM

Men have different priorities since their investment in passing on their genes is very low compared to women (9 month child bearing and then raising kids). So it doesn't make sense for men to look for a woman who will provide for him and his offspring. That's why men don't care about resources.

Men's strategy is also dualistic the first strategy would be to have as many offspring with different women as possible, increasing the chances of survival for some of his offspring even though some of them will die.

The other strategy is reproduce with one woman and make sure the offspring survives by providing resources. The draw back of this is the possibility of being cuckolded into raising another man's kid with would reduce chances of successfully passing genes.

Men can use these strategies in separate or at the same time.

mensafloyd • 2 points • 16 January, 2016 05:07 PM

thiasus,

Excellent write up! Keep up the good work!

improvingme63 • 1 point • 16 January, 2016 08:07 PM

This is a damn good AWALT post. I'm gonna read the report when I get home, but I enjoyed the break-down. Thanks!

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 January, 2016 09:40 PM

That journal paper is a really good read

darkstar1031 • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 05:47 AM

Just gonna put this right here.

strat\_op • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 02:43 PM

Great article which also proves that the optimal mating strategy is Alpha Bux:

"[...] women with relatively symmetrical partners actually showed an increase in attraction to their own longterm mates at midcycle. [...] the women who rated their partners highest on sexual attractiveness showed no evidence of an increase in extrapair desires near ovulation."

Redasshole • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 09:02 PM

alpha and beta characteristics are hardwired

don't understand this one right here. Do you mean men are born alpha or beta or that women have already categorized characteristics in two ways which are alpha and beta...?

lumberjackinla • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 02:03 AM

does any one have access to her thesis. It would be interesting to read. Please post if you can upload it from ucla network

Eugenics2015 • 1 point • 16 January, 2016 07:22 PM

This is why i say that TRP and the manosphere is legitimate science.

The minds and logic of red pill men are just as good as anything that comes out of a research university. Good find.

[deleted] • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 03:57 AM

Pretty funny how human males have the largest relative penis size among all species. Our women are literally such whores that being able to scrape out the cum of the guy before you was an evolutionary advantage.

reigorius • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 10:37 AM

Doesn't surprise me as I see how much girls intensely enjoy being fucked. I honestly believe girls feel more and better than us men.

[deleted] 16 January, 2016 05:16 PM

[permanently deleted]

thiasus[S] • 6 points • 16 January, 2016 05:41 PM

If you cherry pick the article

Go ahead, show I did that. My conclusions are condensed from their "Discussion" chapter and from the one immediately preceding it which illustrates and details the two sexual strategies. Show what you think I left out that changes their conclusions.

verdantsound • 2 points • 16 January, 2016 08:02 PM

My experience with good, but no chemistry relationships? Completely stable women with loving families that adored me. I couldn't leave fast enough.

Wait, you don't like women with loving families?

yGTWgtNrco • -2 points • 16 January, 2016 06:50 PM

They are both white female academics working in a liberal university of a liberal American state.

So what? Academics are hired to do research. I would say these two are displaying academics at its best. Their nature would predispose them to want to conclude otherwise, yet they still let the facts lead their conclusions and not the other way around, which is what I've seen most academics do. Drs. Pillsworth and Haselton, you exemplify how all academics should conduct their research in all fields.

What's the fact that they're white have to do with anything? Or that they are female? Or that California is liberal -- it's not, except compared to the rest of the country.

EdgarAllanPwn • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 03:27 PM

You missed the point and simultaneously hit the point on the head at the same time. Including that bio of the researchers helps validate that this research is (presumably) clear of any personal bias.

yGTWgtNrco • 1 point • 18 January, 2016 02:32 AM

No, I disagreed with the original commenters premise that simply because the two researchers are women and work at a liberal institution in a liberal part of the country does not necessitate that they will draw the conclusions that trp seems to want to rail against.

sterlinghtsmi • -1 points • 17 January, 2016 01:19 PM

The study doesn't mention the ability of men or women who actually live their lives based on character, integrity or loyalty. There are men and women who conduct themselves with a moral compass and can exercise self-control and not just fuck based on evolutionary instincts. There are good girls out there...don't write them all off yet. Just be Alpha enough to land them.

whydoievenreply • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 02:41 PM

Illusions, Mr. Anderson. Vagaries of perception. Temporary constructs of a feeble human intellect trying desperately to justify an existence that is without meaning or purpose. And all of them as artificial as the Matrix itself, although... only a human mind could invent something as insipid as love.

sterlinghtsmi • 0 points • 17 January, 2016 03:19 PM

Live your life like a movie you script, don't live your life based on a scripted movie.

0xdada • -8 points • 16 January, 2016 03:28 PM

"It's science."