

OkCupid's Depressing Confirmation of the 80/20 Rule - The Majority of Men are Invisible to Women

704 upvotes | 25 January, 2017 | by diomedes777

This is an old article and I'm sure a lot of you have either seen it or at least heard of it before. I feel like it deserves a refreshed look and discussion for anyone who hasn't seen it. This was a *monumental* redpill when I first saw it.

Check it out [here](#).

OkCupid has revealed (I'm actually pretty surprised this post is still up to be honest) the nature in which men rate women on their site vs. the way women rate men.

The graphs speak for themselves. While men rate women on a somewhat symmetric and even bell curve, the way women rate male attractiveness implies that 80% of men are unsatisfactory to the female users of this site.

Average men are deemed to be universally undesirable among all women. We have to understand that a woman with an SMV point-score of say, 2 out of 10, is rating men anywhere from 2 to 3, even 4 points above her in SMV as being undesirable and unattractive.

I consider myself an 8, maybe 8.5 at the moment. I've been told this by women so that's mostly what I'm going off. I'm in the best shape of my life. I experience this phenomenon first hand constantly as I'm sure many of you guys do as well. Objectively ugly women approach me from a place of entitlement; they are flabbergasted when I turn them down or ignore them and will hound me for days or weeks after, refusing to believe that a man they've actively shown interest in has rejected their vagina.

This happened at the gym recently; a fat little pilsbury-dough-boy lookalike from my gym added me on Facebook and would not stop hounding me, despite me ignoring every single one of her messages. It was just mind-blowing. This girl is a 2. She then proceeded to spread rumors about me to people at my gym, telling them I was gay and that she'd heard I had a small dick.

If this girl is approaching me, we can be god-damn sure that the men at her equal SMV level or even slightly above are *repugnant* to her. She just doesn't see these men as sexual objects. They are just slaves; scenery even; to her.

The implications of this are as follows. *Men who are average or below average are invisible to women.* Only the top 20% of men have their pick of sexual partners. 80% of men are not having sex and are treated as mere disposable workhorses. This is simply biology. It's inescapable.

I hypothesize that this is a direct result of the contraceptive pill and the female sexual liberation that followed. Women no longer had to think about sleeping with educated, wealthy, stable men

who were often perhaps not particularly sexually desirable in the same way a broke, ripped outlaw biker is. In order to raise their children in a safe and healthy environment women had to, at least to some degree, choose their sexual partners based on the provider qualities of the man, necessarily forgoing men that would otherwise make her pussy drip; for the sake of her children. After the pill, women fuck whoever they want. It's total unchained hypergamy and the result is women following their biological imperative to mate with the strongest, most tingle-inducing alpha males they can find. I'm sure pre-pill the female chart on OkC would look somewhat more similar to the male's chart. Women marry their beta-bux, dry up after 1 year, become repulsed by him and then with the knowledge that they will be supported by the government no matter what, that they can fuck freely with no implications of pregnancy or punishment, are free to follow their hypergamy to it's absolute extent.

The cold, brutal reality of hypergamy is that women are inherently aware of the power their vagina commands. They're aware of the gynocentric nature of our society. They know their vagina has been the catalyst of wars and development of human civilization. This means they feel entitled to the strongest men. If all around them they see men unanimously falling over themselves to get a whiff of a pussy, they are only going to choose the men who they will feel good about giving their pussy to; the men who will make them *feel good* about their decision to give away their treasure because they understand the inherent biological worth of said treasure.

Sleeping with an average or below average man for a woman is repugnant to her and her biology prevents her from doing so by making these men invisible to her. They are simply part of the scenery. For a woman to sleep with an average or ugly man she is risking her reputation and she is risking destroying her fragile solipsistic conception of herself and her place within the sexual hierarchy.

Nothing is going to reverse this. Lift heavy. Lift like your life depends on it - because it does. As an average man you are entitled to nothing and deserve nothing. If you stay average, you have only yourself to blame when the women in your life are fucking more attractive, richer men than you. You can either sit around and feel hopeless at the situation or you can, to the best of your ability, do something about it and push yourself up into that 20%.

Then you can post here and laugh about how you turned down that delusional little fatty at your gym.

Comments

Paladin2903 • 256 points • 25 January, 2017 01:26 PM*

It's very simple. Online ~~whoring~~ "dating" has turned women into hypergamous neo-prostitute monsters. Dating is now a business, for women. Hell, they don't even view you as a human with feelings, anymore. You're simply a list of statistics.

The attention they receive on these platforms have made them believe that they're all God's gift to the Earth.

They don't understand that roughly 80% of men would stick it in pretty much any female. They don't realize that these men simply want to pump them and dump them, and are just sweet talking them, feeding them lies, and are only artificially pumping up their ego, in order to fuck them.

The longer guys participate in these online "dating" games, the worse women will get, and the more power they (men) will take from themselves. You keep feeding the beast machine, then you have no one to blame but yourselves.

HumanSockPuppet • 129 points • 25 January, 2017 06:35 PM

It's not like women suddenly became this way in the last hundred years. Women have always been this way.

The only difference is now this kind of behaviour is celebrated by the culture rather than policed by it.

But you know what? **You should be happy.**

Not many men truly understand that women are so easily to beguile, so simple and inexpensive to manipulate. By attending this subreddit you are learning the secret to having success and joy at the expense of every other man who doesn't figure it out.

Women WANT you to "get it". They WANT to be your plaything. So get out there and start exploiting them the way they were meant to be exploited. It's your carnival now.

saamenrofringslikeLBJ • points • 25 January, 2017 07:19 PM **[recovered]**

The whole point is that they don't want to be your plaything unless you are 8 or above. So then the question is really, can any man become an 8/10? I don't think so. What OP describes is real and fucking degrading to experience:

landwhale comes up and is touchy feely

traffic accident tells her friends how you are all over her

bomb craters getting their entire social circle against you for not wanting a piece of that

A buddy wanted help on Tinder, he was getting maybe 1 match every 2nd week (city of less than 1mill) and it wasn't pretty, a good 3 scores below him. He is an above average earner, not muscly but healthy medium, good dude but the 5-7's will not ever match him. I'm not advocating at all to wallow in self pity, but you have to fight hard to get some edge and muscles can take you to a 7 but unless your face is an 8 you will never get to 8 with only muscle. Money can take you all the way but it is retarded from a strategic standpoint.

HumanSockPuppet • 53 points • 25 January, 2017 07:45 PM

The whole point is that they don't want to be your plaything unless you are 8 or above.

And you think women, with their "feelz before realz" approach to everything, are equipped to accurately judge your value?

The Red Pill is all about teaching you how to fake your value as higher than it is, so that you can get laid while you work on getting it as high as possible through hard work and discipline.

A buddy wanted help on Tinder, he was getting maybe 1 match every 2nd week (city of less than 1mill) and it wasn't pretty, a good 3 scores below him.

Tinder is a meat farm tilted in women's favour. It should only be a supplement to your daily flirtation efforts. Day and night game should be your primary hunting grounds, because you only build social sensitivity/calibration in person.

Rawrination • 11 points • 25 January, 2017 09:23 PM

Exactly.

I've got a profile on a few dating sites, but I mostly just leave them alone like a crab pot/fish trap. Check in on them every week or so and brows, but don't expect much from them, despite having been laid and having had several relationships through them... all with women a few steps lower than I on the SMV ladder.

lenin1928 • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 06:05 AM

Can confirm. Online dating sites are almost useless compared to game in person. Use it mostly it for hard to find women, women into fetishes, different nationalities and the like. Otherwise these sites are just for ego stroking and gaining likes based on your face and body; a true females paradise of endless validation and attention.

Thotwrecker • 9 points • 26 January, 2017 09:51 AM

Any man can become an 8. Let's describe an 8 as the minimum viable product required to do decently on the dating market and occupy the AF role instead of the BB. To do that, you don't need 1%er qualities, you need basically 1-2 years of lifting and dieting, maybe 6 months of intense social practice where you go out 2 times a week and talk to a shit ton of girls (and guys and really anyone you can) to grow your social circle and social skills, and enough money to afford a place in a hip area, a decent car. You have to be able to afford to have style - good haircuts, threads that have some kind of cohesion, good shoes, etc. You have to be willing to get lasik / contacts, go get a vocal coach if you can't speak without stuttering or you have a bad accent, go get braces if you have janky teeth. You have to be willing to use good face products and learn how to shave / groom yourself.

None of that is unreasonable. If you cannot do that, then spend ~2 years improving yourself and doing nothing but that. That's what monk mode is for - becoming an 8, becoming an "MVP".

Your face is not really that relevant at all OFF OF tinder / okc. If you are ugly as shit, you have no business on a site where the main form of marketing yourself is your face. In social venues, you get to be judged by your walk, posture, tone, confidence, dress, physique, and face. That makes an ugly face way less dealbreaking.

It's delusional to think every guy can do well on tinder. But fuck tinder anyway, go in the real world and learn how to actually use your faculties, not a marketing page for yourself. Short people, poor people, ugly people, indian/asians, etc, whatever your problem is, there is a solution and provided you are in good health and don't have mental problems, you can get to an 8. Getting to a ten I'd agree is delusional, but 8 is doable for like 95% of males. At the end of the day, if you want it and you really think your face is the issue, get surgery.

I actually got a nosejob after getting my nose broken in a fight and having my nasal pathways

blocked - really fucking miserable when they got infected and healed crooked, but I ponied up the cash and got it done right at a top place. It hurt my wallet like hell, but after all was said and done, my face looked a lot better than before. Fuck you parents genetics.

Obviously I don't think any male needs to view cosmetic surgery as a necessary for improving SMV, but my point is if you have to do what's required. I got lasik and ditched the beta buck nerd glasses, that got me at least a point. Etc. You can say "but I'm broke too" and then yeah, that's where I'd tell you it will take years. If you're broke ugly AND socially stunted, you have to budget like 4-5 years to fully go from a 2 to an 8, but it is doable.

ECTD • 17 points • 25 January, 2017 07:51 PM

As you get older the scale changes a bit for men. Wealth and status become more important, and having an average body is increasingly worthwhile for you and your dating strategy. So, can a man become an 8? Depends where he is starting from, but wealth and status can certainly edge you up if you have them, not to mention game has always been important, but older women are more and more likely to understand game at that point because they rode the CC for their youth and now understand that they're increasingly worthless because men don't go for decaying fruit.

There are psychological effects too then can raise value. Specifically, your perceived status is undeniably the most useful thing in attracting women. Whether wealthy or not as long as you can exude the confidence and exhilarating ride that women want, women will gladly hop on to your dick.

SpeakerToRedditors • points • 25 January, 2017 11:16 PM [recovered]

Wealth and status become more important, and having an average body is increasingly worthwhile for you and your dating strategy.

that makes you a target to be a provider.

women still want Chad.

BoobToArmRatio • 3 points • 26 January, 2017 02:37 AM

If you are truly red pill why does it matter what they target you for? You're going to be pumping and dumping them anyway..

Rawrination • -2 points • 25 January, 2017 09:25 PM

Yup, and having a guitar and a leather jacket doesn't hurt. Wether or not you have any idea how to play the guitar. Just having it increases likely hood of getting laid by around 10%-20%

Tie5o11 • 16 points • 25 January, 2017 10:37 PM

God forbid he ever consider going out and chatting up girls in public like men did for the first 100,000 or whatever generations...

[deleted] • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 10:50 PM

That is not the contentious point here, not everything has to be an "X or" statement. Like OP mentioned, which agree 100% with and have seen it happen to myself and others constantly, is that if you are an attractive man at 8/10 but not 10/10, the runt of the litter will seek you out.

Luckyluke23 • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 04:22 AM

The whole point is that they don't want to be your plaything unless you are 8 or above.

this is what the problem is. I've been told by my friends I'm a VERY likeable guy and they ask me why i don't have a gf. I just shrug my shoulders at them.

I just assume i'm under an 8 so.

adam_varg • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 02:06 PM

Being 8/10 would make you top 10%. 20% is 7/10 which isnt hard to achieve for most men give todays standard.

vengefully_yours • 11 points • 26 January, 2017 06:59 AM

Was talking to a guy ten years younger (38) than I am the other day. He was bragging about how he can pull tail, because he has money, a nice car and is 6' tall. He's been going after 35-60 year old single moms. Says he spends lots of money on them and get laid. Told him he's doing it wrong and the 20 year old girl in the group agreed with me. He can't get in her pants, but I can. And I won't pay a dime to do it. If you're paying for pussy, you're doing it wrong.

mnemos_1 • 5 points • 26 January, 2017 09:07 AM

The salt resulting from hitting him with that revelation could probably have created another Dead Sea, I imagine. This after bragging about dropping cash on post-wall women who are all-but-begging for the merest taste of the validation they experienced in their days riding the CC.

vandaalen • 7 points • 25 January, 2017 10:44 PM

Amen.

Guys need to understand that the abundance of sex through the unlimited availability through online dating also applies to them, once they have reached a certain level of attractiveness.

There is always a next bitch waiting to be fucked by you on tinder and once you have a decent value, women will always know as well.

Once you reach a certain SMV women will inevitably fall in love with you if you fucked them more than once and fucked them right and righteously.

It's beyond ridiculous what they are willing to do then and knowing that you can pull pussy from tinder without having to leave the house, in fact you could even do it from her bed while she is laying besides you, will help her act right.

MrBellsprout123 • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 12:10 AM

This is a great point.

Women today CRAVE masculinity like a fish outta water with so many beta males. Once you've made yourself into a man thats attractive, while simultaneously "getting it", women will flock to you like you're feeding ducks bread. Its insane how easy it is once you understand what's happening.

The_rectumwrecker • 1 point • 27 January, 2017 09:21 AM

I did that while laying in the bed of one of my plates. She got up to take a shower and I started swiping because I was bored. I have like 53 matches that I haven't messaged yet because I don't have time, and about 30 convos going on. Tinder game has been really tough (but not impossible) for me though, going out and meeting girls in the field is infinitely easier.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 11:50 PM

It's fantastic in my opinion.

I don't know why everyone is bitching about girls being miserable and dtf. Works in guys favor unless you want kids.

Getzabelz • points • 25 January, 2017 02:45 PM [recovered]

Sad to say but this is true, I am from Spain and almost any girl before any other thing will ask if you have a car or motorbike, for them we are only numbers in a excel spreadsheet...

Even my actual GF who I met through Loovoo was like this, now she wants me to be romantic because she is in love, too bad her tactics won't work on me, I know she's only with me because I am the highest SMV she's ever been with, if at any point i stop being it she will change..

Rawrination • 27 points • 25 January, 2017 09:20 PM

Even my actual GF who I met through Loovoo was like this, now she wants me to be romantic because she is in love, too bad her tactics won't work on me, I know she's only with me because I am the highest SMV she's ever been with, if at any point i stop being it she will change..

Yeah time and time again, girl falls in love with me, then I fall in love with her, then she falls out of love with me and dumps my dumb ass. Trying to learn from that mistake. Never give up on being the best SMV you can be. Or they will let you down and desert you.

Jax77789 • 4 points • 26 January, 2017 11:00 AM

"Or they will let you down and desert you."

You should never fear that.

aanarchist • 8 points • 25 January, 2017 10:57 PM

you're doing it wrong you're not supposed to answer her questions, you're supposed to let her feel out who you are and how good it feels to be around you and with you. she doesn't care about any of that deep down. you're still a pussy slave if you're trying to do shit you don't want to just so that your gf will like you so that she will have sex with you. i mean if you're ok with being a 20% man who accepts a 80% woman, that's on you bro.

[deleted] • 20 points • 25 January, 2017 06:22 PM

They don't realize that these men simply want to pump them and dump them

Don't act like women don't want to get laid. I've had decent success escalating very quickly on new accounts. Based on my experience there are tons of single moms just wanting to be entertained and laid. My go to is a couple games of pool then ask them back to my place. Then they go away. They aren't interested 2 weeks later when I circle back around. I tend to get 1/4 to come back for repeat business as a plate and they last 5-6 bangs then they're gone.

Rawrination • 4 points • 25 January, 2017 09:26 PM

Maybe learn a few tricks about giving them the most mind shattering orgasms of their life. So even if they hate you they still want to come back around every now and then.

thederpill • 6 points • 25 January, 2017 11:09 PM

Seems like a lot of effort, which makes me feel like a woman's slave. Doing sexual shit exclusively for her should be reserved for very deserving behaviour. I aim to have different goals in sex

The_rectumwrecker • 2 points • 27 January, 2017 09:32 AM

Dude, that's the dumbest thing I've ever heard. Making a woman orgasm is pretty much the manliest you could ever feel. When you have to help her flip over her mattress because the top side is one large puddle your ego will be fucking huge. They will never forget that and will always call you for a good fuck. My Dad told me once (and he was most definitely correct) that there are basically two sex modes in every girl, there is getting her pussy and getting her GOOD pussy. Don't be the chump just getting the pussy, get the GOOD stuff that she pulls out all of the stops for.

[deleted] • 6 points • 25 January, 2017 09:46 PM

Nah, there are girls out there that don't want to get attached. Many of them are newly single and just want to bang around; makes sense because I wanted the same thing when I was newly single

Rawrination • 6 points • 25 January, 2017 09:51 PM

Oh ... duh. XD I wasn't even thinking about it from that angle. And sorry for coming across as an asshole.

[deleted] • 6 points • 25 January, 2017 09:59 PM

Its cool. I realize that you were projecting because your D game is weak. [emoji that signifies that I'm just joshing you]

Rawrination • 5 points • 25 January, 2017 10:01 PM

Its extra funny cause its true. Bad car wreck. Most everything below the belt doesn't work properly. Still have working fingers and tongue though ;) :-P

max_peenor • 26 points • 25 January, 2017 04:06 PM

The longer guys participate in these online "dating" games, the worse women will get

Pussy on a platter? Yeah, that's never going to stop. There is only one way this ever stops--the collapse of social order. When rape gangs rove over the smoldering ashes of western civilization women will suddenly become big fans of pair bonding again. Head on over to ISIS territory and I bet you'll find plenty of women that wished they were married off young to that one guy instead of now serving as wife-of-the-hour to various ISIS fighters.

And how can you contribute to this social reordering? Nope, there is actually no need for violence. Just DO NEVER MARRY.

zephyrprime • 9 points • 25 January, 2017 07:54 PM

"They don't understand that roughly 80% of men would stick it in pretty much any female. "

Because of their solipsism, it is extremely hard for them to imagine that men don't share their own criteria and modus operandi.

[deleted] • 9 points • 25 January, 2017 08:52 PM

Sadly the same goes in reverse. A lot of men, myself included in the past, think women think like they do.

HonestUser • 0 points • 25 January, 2017 10:22 PM

Are women really solpilitic? I thought they are suppose to be more empathetic, compassionate and understanding?

TurgidMeatWand • 8 points • 26 January, 2017 12:35 AM

That's what they want you to think so they can claim moral superiority. Truth is they are just as shitty and selfish as the rest of us.

HonestUser • 0 points • 26 January, 2017 12:38 AM

They seem pretty good at it or at least faking it then

TurgidMeatWand • 5 points • 26 January, 2017 12:45 AM

So is any man willing to listen to you for 5 minutes. Women aren't special and don't have magical powers just like men.

Men are encouraged to be stoic and hide their feelings, women are encouraged to be emotional and share. So yeah women are more practiced at it , but you can still be selfish piece of shit even if you gave someone a hug because their mom died.

Returnofthemack3 • 5 points • 25 January, 2017 10:03 PM

anyone that denies this has not been involved in the dating game. It's fucking ruthless, WAY more ruthless than it was 10 years ago I can tell you that. Things were similar but with the propagation of smart phones, dating sites, and a zillion apps, it has gotten SO MUCH worse.

I think some of the older guys can agree with this. 8-10 years ago it wasnt this bad

[deleted] • 4 points • 26 January, 2017 04:27 AM

I agree. I had a paying (\$30/month?) Match account years ago.

It was still relatively slim pickings as I was in school and skinny, but I still got on average 1 new lay every month while active and had many women (usually 4s to 6s) messaging me first.

So it wasn't an oasis, but it was not a total desert either.

This is because there was still a taboo around online dating and it was a paid site, I think. Most of the girls I met were new in town and home bodies. This was before facebook took off and free online dating and before smart phones.

SpeakerToRedditors • points • 25 January, 2017 11:10 PM **[recovered]**

They don't understand that roughly 80% of men would stick it in pretty much any female.

Amazingly, This is true except for the bottom 20% of the female spectrum who know Chat Thundercock is there to just pump and dump them.

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 04:29 AM

That graph is really informative and conforms with my experience.

When I've gone for an easy lay with a really fat chick at a bar, I usually got shot down.

Once you get to know the fat chick, then they are usually easier though.

Sorry to admit that I know this!

LuckyLuke23 • 4 points • 26 January, 2017 04:20 AM

The attention they receive on these platforms have made them believe that they're all God's gift to the Earth.

it's not just online dating man... it's pretty much EVERYTHING in life now. men have become so thirsty since feminism fucked them up.

theotherthyme • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 05:57 AM

Disposable workhorse. Can confirm.

Sdom1 • 1 point • 29 January, 2017 08:25 PM

...hypergamous **monsters**.

Dude, they're not monsters. They can't help liking alphas any more than you can help liking big tits and a .7 Waist/Hip ratio. It's hardwired.

Just use your knowledge to shape yourself into something they like more, or jerk off in your basement.

skrrttt • -3 points • 25 January, 2017 04:55 PM

So should i make a tinder and talk shit one every girl

The__Tren__Train • 4 points • 25 January, 2017 10:39 PM

no...you should spend your time improving yourself

MattyAnon • 74 points • 25 January, 2017 01:50 PM

I hypothesize that this is a direct result of the contraceptive pill and the female sexual liberation that followed.

It's a universal female trait. When selecting for sex, pick the best genes. 10% of men can easily impregnate all the women, so why shouldn't they all get the best genes?

The change in recent times is the move away from marriage, for-life monogamy and marrying young. This means that 1-1 pair matching no longer happens and the 80-20 rule becomes prevalent, reverting us to the natural state of women.

You can either sit around and feel hopeless at the situation or you can, to the best of your ability, do something about it and push yourself up into that 20%.

Top 20% is true, but you don't have to be top 20% at everything. And social credit counts for a LOT. eg fame. You can be the shortest ugliest little brute and women will flock if you're famous - fame being the ultimate social credit.

yomo86 • 21 points • 25 January, 2017 04:35 PM

The ironic part is that the rat experiment applies here. I forgot the name of it but as far as I remember, when only the top rats mated the betas cared only about themselves ie. grooming and/or gathering food. The female rats raised their spawn alone. This happens right now.

MattyAnon • 21 points • 25 January, 2017 07:03 PM

The female rats raised their spawn alone. This happens right now.

This happens with women, raising their children alone with nothing more than family support, child support, alimony payments and government help.

[deleted] • 8 points • 25 January, 2017 07:39 PM

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_B._Calhoun#Mouse_experiments

yomo86 • 8 points • 25 January, 2017 08:57 PM

Ah thank you. The population collapsed completly in the end.

Rawrination • 11 points • 25 January, 2017 09:33 PM

Which is where the West has been heading for a long time.

I hope the imminent threat of Islamic invasion wakes people up, but Feminist culture is self destructive one way or the other.

Pillredpopper • 2 points • 7 February, 2017 07:45 PM

Evident now as feminism has aligned itself with Islam in some kind of weird S&M symbiotic mess. The men in Europe standby while pretty blonde German and Swede women show up to greet muslim immigrants with flowers despite the rising crime and rape everyone is aware of. They are so starved for manly men they are willing import thier own demise just to look good to thier friends on social media and gain that temporary boost ego boost

spikeybumpy • 6 points • 25 January, 2017 08:56 PM

Calhoun's mouse experiments.

From the wiki page: "Among the aberrations in behavior were the following: expulsion of young before weaning was complete, wounding of young, increase in homosexual behavior, inability of dominant males to maintain the defense of their territory and females, aggressive behavior of females, passivity of non-dominant males with increased attacks on each other which were not defended against"

edit: imo this mirrors the effects of overcrowding and 1st world ennui (skewed sexual dynamics being but one part of this) when applied to human society.

diomedes777[S] • 18 points • 25 January, 2017 02:11 PM

Yep, that's exactly what I was trying to say with the hypothesis about the pill/sexual liberation. It reverts us back to the natural state of female nature because any external societal constrictions put in place from traditional marriage arrangements and not having contraception are all out the window at this point

MattyAnon • 20 points • 25 January, 2017 02:41 PM

The pill is an interesting one though, because a large chunk of the female population is both non-pregnant and hormonally drugged up to the point where their mind and body behaves exactly as if it was pregnant.

That's going to cause some warped effects on society.

[deleted] • 23 points • 25 January, 2017 04:56 PM

I honestly don't know what's worse - western women which are constantly on pill, or eastern European women that use abortion instead of birth control. Just take a look in case you don't know how bad it is. It's fucking insane.

Problem with eastern Europe is sex is generally still a taboo here. People who are uptight about sex are less likely to be honest about having it, therefore less likely to go on birth control. In many countries (including mine) condoms cannot be purchased online, and there are no condom vending machines. So the only way to get them is to purchase overpriced Durex in supermarkets or go to the

pharmacy to purchase normal priced condoms. My aunt is a pharmacist and one time when she was visiting us, she told us a story how her friend's 17 year old daughter purchased condoms at her pharmacy and she promptly ratted her out to her mother. So that's how you get all those unplanned pregnancies, people stop purchasing condoms due to social stigma. Every abortion carries a risk (although small), but average eastern European woman is more likely to perform multiple abortions during her lifetime and therefore increase the risk that something goes wrong. Most unplanned pregnancies happen in marriages, where spouses recklessly fuck without contraception, and if pregnancy occurs they just abort.

MattyAnon • 9 points • 25 January, 2017 07:14 PM

Just take a look in case you don't know how bad it is. It's fucking insane.

A quick check on the facts on this for a few countries suggests it's spot on. Fucking terrifying.

[deleted] • 7 points • 25 January, 2017 09:31 PM

Yeah, it's horrible. We have no sex ed at school, and parents almost never talk about sex and birth control with their teens. STD testing is taboo as well. With lack of use of contraception, only God knows what do we have around here.

thederpill • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 11:17 PM

My gf is polish and very anti abortion. I was ready to call bullshit but true enough Poland and Portugal are lower rates than anywhere in all Europe. Lol.

razorts • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 11:24 AM

its illegal in Poland, pole chicks just go to Lithuania to do it, Portugal was illegal too just few years before data was taken, people would still go to Spain.

GroundhogLiberator • 7 points • 25 January, 2017 08:18 PM

If you use abortion rates as a metric, apparently Portugal is the least degenerate country in Europe.

I also like how Ireland's rate falls perfectly into the green range.

Rawrination • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 09:30 PM

What's the other large dark blue area ?

[deleted] • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 11:10 PM

Poland. Ireland and Poland are still pretty catholic countries, and abortion is effectively illegal. I'm not sure about Portugal.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 04:34 AM

This is percentage data and that can be unreliable to answer certain questions.

Imagine a country where illegitimate birth is very frowned upon. They use birth control, but if a pregnancy outside of marriage occurs then it will be aborted because of shame and also no hand outs for single moms.

With percentages, you don't know if it is 5 out of 10 to make 50% of 0.5 million out of a million.

Just pointing out another math perspective.

I can't tell either way with the data at hand.

[deleted] • 9 points • 25 January, 2017 06:37 PM

And this is what makes me skeptical of male contraceptive injections. WTF is it going to do to my masculinity?

Googling around it sounds like lower Testosterone and maybe brain damage from autoimmune disorders are the side effects.

MattyAnon • 6 points • 25 January, 2017 07:17 PM

WTF is it going to do to my masculinity?

I'm extremely dubious any hormones will make men infertile without incredible side effects.

Non-ovulation is a natural state for women during pregnancy.

There is no similar natural state for men that can be hormonally emulated.

Vasalgel might work though.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 07:13 PM

so if the women are hormonally drugged up, Im sure the men are too.

How do we get rid of these shitty, added hormones in ourselves?

MattyAnon • 6 points • 25 January, 2017 07:19 PM

so if the women are hormonally drugged up, Im sure the men are too.

Only the ones taking the pill.

The male "drugged up" is the blue pill disney-esque dream that has infected men, along with non-manual labour causing a drop in T.

Hit the gym, read TRP, treat feminism as the lie it is, and learn only from real life rather than media and you'll be fine.

[deleted] • 4 points • 25 January, 2017 08:29 PM*

I made the Exodus!

You wanna remove all the comments you've ever made on reddit, and overwrite them with a message like this one?

Easy! First install:

Chrome: TamperMonkey

Firefox: GreaseMonkey

Safari: NinjaKit

Opera: Violent Monkey

IE: AdGuard (in Advanced Mode)

... then install this GreaseMonkey script. Go to your comments, and click that nifty new OVERWRITE button! (Do this for each page of comments)

Buh-bye, reddit!

Rawrination • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 09:31 PM

You mean like in our air and water and food and the ground ? Yeah... not really sure other than try and eat as healthy as possible and drink filtered water.

[deleted] • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 09:41 PM*

I made the Exodus!

You wanna remove all the comments you've ever made on reddit, and overwrite them with a message like this one?

Easy! First install:

Chrome: TamperMonkey

Firefox: GreaseMonkey

Safari: NinjaKit

Opera: Violent Monkey

IE: AdGuard (in Advanced Mode)

... then install this GreaseMonkey script. Go to your comments, and click that nifty new OVERWRITE button! (Do this for each page of comments)

Buh-bye, reddit!

Rawrination • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 09:55 PM

Oh WOW. Thanks for the link! Bookmarked and will look over more later. Who knows how much junk we are exposed to!?

atifhere • 24 points • 25 January, 2017 05:34 PM

We will see a decline in IQ level if we completely allow women to make choices. Women will prefer to get fucked by aggressive reckless thug or the dumb anti-science allaho akbar immigrant, over such alpha who pushes the society forward. We will be de-evolving back to the baboon like society.

MattyAnon • 5 points • 25 January, 2017 07:16 PM

We will be de-evolving back to the baboon like society

Counterpoint: how did we get this far then? Marriage is too modern to have an impact on intelligence.

MotherMoon7 • 17 points • 25 January, 2017 08:02 PM

monogamy of some kind has been socially enforced one way or another almost forever, even primitive tribes in the amazon are mainly monogamous, probably because most men understand that it's common sense that women's natural impulses need to be controlled. The breakdown is occurring due to feminism and birth control, we are basically in uncharted territory.

RobertCarraway • 1 point • 27 January, 2017 12:49 AM

Marriage is too modern to have an impact on intelligence

With strong selection pressures, considerable change can take place in as little as 8 generations or so. That Russian lab domesticated foxes in like 50 years. Marriage has had plenty of time to mold us.

MattyAnon • 1 point • 27 January, 2017 07:42 PM

Marriage has had plenty of time to mold us.

Interesting. How long has marriage existed for? How much have women been faithful within the marriage?

Men have adapted to be somewhat commitment-phobic for a reason ...

Johknee5 • -5 points • 25 January, 2017 07:58 PM

Okay buddy, let's not correlate "anti-science" with being a beta. Those who question science, and not taking it at bold face truth, are often the most confident in making their own decisions.

Try not to throw political vocabulary into a debate around biology.

atifhere • 0 points • 27 January, 2017 04:15 PM

You dont seem to know what you are talking about

Johknee5 • 1 point • 27 January, 2017 05:49 PM

Yea the world was once flat according to Science. You're right, I have no idea what I'm talking about b/c Science said so.

You're so Alpha b/c you Science bro.

atifhere • 1 point • 28 January, 2017 02:34 PM

You don't seem to comprehend what my point is or you are simply a muslim. Anti-science are the ones who rejects evidence which don't fits their worldview.

Johknee5 • 2 points • 28 January, 2017 06:43 PM

I'm not sure you're comprehending what's being said. Critical thinkers, those who ask questions of authority and "truth", are Alpha. You said those who deny science were beta. I'm correcting you. There's a shit ton of "science" that needs to be questioned and fought against, not blindly accepted like a beta does.

atifhere • 1 point • 30 January, 2017 08:15 PM

I called Muslims anti-science, not the betas

OakLegs • 1 point • 4 February, 2017 08:17 PM

Yea the world was once flat according to Science

This is simply not true. You have no clue what you're talking about.

The scientific method was not around when people thought he earth was flat. People proved it was round as early as 330 BC.

Your overall point that science is not always correct is true. But it does represent our best understanding of the world around us. All new findings in science go through rigoulrous peer review and if they don't hold up, it is generally dismissed quickly. Climate change, for instance, has gone through countless studies by international scientists and the overwhelming majority of them show that it is real, and that humans are causing it.

Could the findings be wrong? Sure, it's within the realm of possibility, but the possibility of them being right is so much greater.

alexman91 • 11 points • 25 January, 2017 05:54 PM

"best genes" "top 10%" while they have great bodies alpha attitude or a trust fund. it doesnt mean they are the best it just means women tingle for it. lots of supersmart, successful, creative men get passed up for drugdealers, mc bikers and such. women arent committing to eugenics but dysgenics. 400 years from now humanity iq will have dropped 20 points and everyone is a hardcore psychopath with a warlord/tribal attitude and the betas that keep the cogs of civilization spinning will have been breed out.

[deleted] • 14 points • 25 January, 2017 06:39 PM

"Best" from an evolutionary sense only means survival and reproduction. Evolution gives no fucks about morals, space travel, invention, fun, happiness etc, except for where it enables survival and reproduction.

alexman91 • 6 points • 25 January, 2017 07:03 PM

i'd say the thing that separates us from animals is our ability and drive to surpass that. so are women human? they act more like animals.

[deleted] • 6 points • 25 January, 2017 08:33 PM*

I made the Exodus!

You wanna remove all the comments you've ever made on reddit, and overwrite them with a message like this one?

Easy! First install:

Chrome: TamperMonkey

Firefox: GreaseMonkey

Safari: NinjaKit

Opera: Violent Monkey

IE: AdGuard (in Advanced Mode)

... then install this GreaseMonkey script. Go to your comments, and click that nifty new OVERWRITE button! (Do this for each page of comments)

Buh-bye, reddit!

thederpill • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 11:19 PM

Comments like this tend to give this sub a bad name.

HonestyOverCivility • 5 points • 25 January, 2017 11:23 PM

Factor in the welfare state phenomenon and the encouragement of "Capt save a hoe" dynamics and why wouldn't a woman go after top 20% guys

harkrank • points • 27 January, 2017 12:29 AM **[recovered]**

The difference in gene quality between men is ridiculously small. The difference in reproductive possibility for children who are raised with their father is not small. Genes are not that important.

MattyAnon • 2 points • 27 January, 2017 07:41 PM

The difference in gene quality between men is ridiculously small.

Disagree. The difference between the 5th and 95th percentile is *massive*. One is in prison and barely able to learn how to read and write, the other is working out his Chad body on the way to his Mensa meeting.

Cesare_MA • 2 points • 30 January, 2017 04:36 AM

I swear look at guys like Kodak Black and 1-2 years ago Gucci Mane. Both ugly af but they do just fine because their fame makes up for it.

doncucker89 • 1 point • 20 February, 2017 02:23 PM

Who knows about these guys sex lives. For all we know they are BB.

Cesare_MA • 1 point • 20 February, 2017 02:31 PM

Gucci is absolutely not BB. Dude's been in jail more times than I was in detention in elementary school.

doncucker89 • 1 point • 6 March, 2017 02:45 AM

Getting locked up doesn't make you alpha dumbass.

MrBellsprout123 • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 12:14 AM

Yeah the top 20% is kind of an iffy rule. I'm sure its accurate online where 20% of the profiles are getting all the responses. But in real life and approaching, its not that simple. You don't need to be an 8/10 in the looks department to sleep with women. Just some decent clothes, a crib to take them back to, and just the balls to walk up to them and ask for their number and the confidence to back it up, you should be fine.

RedditAdminsSuck_88 • 62 points • 25 January, 2017 02:10 PM

Social Media is further tipping the scales.

Back when I had a Facebook, or Instagram account, you'd see fat ass women, 3/10 on their best day, getting hundreds of likes and glowing comments from thirsty men for the most basic pictures. Didn't even need a provocative pose or wearing little clothing. They could post a picture of themselves taking a shit on the toilet and it would get 100s of thirsty likes and comments.

Now if a 3/10 fat ass can get that kind of validation, think about what a 5 gets.

Over inflated sense of self worth.

I think in the next decade or two we will see spikes in female suicides because of this. That will be the first social media generation to hit the wall, and they will be lonely, because social media told them their value is greater than what it really is. They won't be able to figure out why their mating options are so bad.

mill58 • 23 points • 25 January, 2017 04:47 PM

This is getting worst day by day and they have a "move" about how fat women are beautiful too and some other bs... you can now see fit women and fat women together in clothes commercials but of course a fat man is still f*king ugly.

These days even fat women want high value men and don't give a chance to below average men... this really have to stop...

The sad part is that I see a lot of average and fit men with these fat women all the time because that pussy is served to them in silver plates and it is too easy to eat it and not reject it.

Hillarysdildo_2016 • 10 points • 25 January, 2017 05:50 PM*

Nah they're too weak to pull the trigger (pun intended). Instead what you'll witness is more of the same-- medicated, depressed, washed-up, pumped and dumped, LONELY, empty shells of what they could have been, expressing righteous indignation at the patriarchy and marching about how this is all men's fault.

And you know what, they'd be right in a way. But not the way they think.

For that see my other post "Feminism, the King, and You."

ozaku7 • 10 points • 25 January, 2017 03:47 PM

Kind of overblown. I have some women on my Facebook feed that post more of their tits than the rest of their body, still hot, but don't get more likes than my pic during Tough Mudder.

takethedive • 35 points • 25 January, 2017 04:31 PM

The thing is, you had to run a *Tough Mudder*. Men who regularly seek to exceed their physical limits will nod and say "Good job, bro" -- but the other 80% of men and 80%+ of women *could not even attempt it*.

And when you think about having to run a Tough Mudder to measure up to just another pair of tits...

Docbear64 • 15 points • 25 January, 2017 04:47 PM*

Exactly what I was going to say . We're comparing effort and discipline - driven accomplishments to a pair of tits . Amount of investment to return of attention is staggeringly out of balance.

ozaku7 • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 08:24 PM

Take into account that it's much easier to like a Tough Mudder pic, or a pic of myself with messy hair and a Falcon sitting on my hand which got more "Facebook" likes than her tits too. Notice how I quote Facebook, as people (mostly men) will definitely all like her tittyshots, but won't bother clicking "Like" for reasons such as not being perceived as a pervert or whatever. It's much easier to like a Tough Mudder pic, because it's associated with support. It's a lot easier to say "Nice pics of your Tough Mudder run!" vs "Nice titshot", as in her case, it's obvious she shows them off. As for the fatasses, it's just a bunch of people supporting their friend and kissing their ass, while they will all believe that they should just get there asses off the couch and ducttape their mouths shut until they have lost enough weight to be considered healthy.

People like what shouldn't be liked to improve their public image. Like what they genuinely like. And don't "Like" what they really like, for the sake of preserving a positive public image. Not in all cases is this true, but we can both agree that likes are meaningless and that social media is full of narcissistic crap that screams for peer approval to feed one's ego.

Returnofthemack3 • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 10:41 PM

and most guys that run a 'tough mudder' are still not getting the amount of likes as a girl with tits. I'm assuming the poster above is fairly well regarded, because if he truly competes with some of the 'hot chicks' I know on fb, he's talking about getting 150 plus likes for the dumbest photos ever. Sometimes over that

sonder_one • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 03:36 AM

I've run five Mudders, and I actually RUN them. My picks tend to get < 5 likes. I am in great shape, but still not attractive.

curiously_crazy • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 03:02 AM

Back when I had a Facebook

Good job getting rid of Facebook.

I ditched it because I was slowly becoming detached from the people in my life that mattered. Much easier to just fire off a quick message or hit a 'like' button instead of actually speaking to them in person and having

good conversation over a few beers. Most of my good mates have now also ditched it.

If that's not enough reason the privacy issue sure as fuck is, but that's a different matter altogether.

Walkebe • 27 points • 25 January, 2017 03:11 PM

I wonder if this sense of entitlement has melded into other aspects of women's lives, like employment. We recently interviewed and offered a job to a fairly attractive post wall 8. She accepted and simply did not show up for the job on her agreed upon starting date. She didn't even bother to let us know and didn't respond to our calls or emails. Like she was flaking on a date or something.

TryDoingSomethingNew • 15 points • 25 January, 2017 05:10 PM

Can anybody say they're surprised any more?

I'm not.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 11:24 PM

I've seen men ghost jobs before too.

metallica11 • 23 points • 25 January, 2017 05:41 PM

It's not 80/20 anymore. It's closer to 95/5 if you want to talk about ease and consistency attracting women that are objectively considered somewhat attracted.

Don't believe me? Go to environment where there are a mix of people that represent society with an female friend/etc that is decently attractive. Mid Level Grocery Store. Sports Bar. Park

Ask them if there any attractive men around. Often times they will start looking, have a puzzled look on their face and say "I don't know, I can't really find any". Or they will say some bullshit to the affect of "well, I PERSONALLY don't find any of these men attractive, but its not to say another girl will".

The funny thing is, if you keep doing this with different women you find that #1 - they struggle to find an attractive men, even if their are a large amount of men around, and #2 - when they do point out one, they are all usually the same type (tall, hair, fasionable, good looking etc), which negates the whole "well blah blah these are ones I find attractive only"

[deleted] • 8 points • 26 January, 2017 04:41 AM

I agree. But female sexuality is reactive to a degree. If a guy she didn't notice walks up confidently, then she is more likely to suddenly wonder why she did not see that guy in the crowd (after obviously overlooking him).

Online dating is much closer to the scenario you described.

metallica11 • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 03:01 PM

agreed - that is why online dating should not be your only medium for meeting women. but I also think it has bled into real life as well

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 11:07 PM

You're right, but online is just way, way worse.

All_Beans_August • 9 points • 25 January, 2017 11:14 PM

In person women respond to social cues...

Master1176 • 30 points • 25 January, 2017 03:25 PM

Think of it this way: if you're gonna be born ugly, better to be an ugly man than an ugly woman. If you're an ugly man, at least you have a shot to make something of your life.

bigboymatthew • 12 points • 25 January, 2017 08:48 PM

Men look at women. Women look at other women.

ozaku7 • 50 points • 25 January, 2017 03:39 PM

So I made a fake account on OKCupid like 46 hours ago. Chose some random blond hottie for the profile picture and a profile full of bullcrap. I wasn't surprised by the amount of attention she got, but most of the attention was downright cheap and spineless. Stupid corny jokes that made me cringe, every second "Like" I made was a match (big surprise), tons of "Hello" and especially dudes that have no game at all. Oh, she's been called beautiful a ton of times too.

Like the previous RP fellow from 2 days ago who posted about his field report of online dating, he was completely right. Like him, I lost the respect to men on OKCupid, and I wouldn't date a single of them if I were Linn, unless I was a fucking whore who was thirsty for any dick. But I could just feel my male pussy dry up and crack apart to dust. One seemed decent, but he had to fuck it up by "hoping Linn is doing alright, hoping she's not bothering her and being sorry for not calling her by her name since she didn't have any in her profile". if I were Linn, this hot Scandinavian blonde model, I would have a hard time getting fucked on OkCupid, seriously. Spineless, unoriginal and cliché bullcrap, fucking boring. I'm even pissed I did it, and I'm fucking ashamed that these guys call themselves "Men". That's why 80 out of 100 men are simply not noticed. Because they SUCK.

400 likes, 450 profile visits, 160 messages within 48 hours. Only one guy made me laugh and would make a decent chance of at least a date if I were this Linn I made up, but I simply lost him between all those 160 guys that messaged me and just stopped bothering spending any more time to find him. It's pathetic. Women are not to blame for their shit, it's the betas. I, as a man, catfished entire Orlando with a norwegian model, and I lost respect to most of the man after just 20 messages, got downright annoyed after number 80. I was done after 120... I'd rather be a single virgin instead of fucking one of them. Even a blonde would have a hard time fucking these guys because 80 out of 20 would definitely chicken out or just killed the mood so much that it would be nothing but self-rape.

RedditAdminsSuck_88 • 20 points • 25 January, 2017 06:10 PM

I don't even have to install a fake account. I just watch my sisters(who are higher value) use Tinder. It's ridiculous how beta and thirsty the men they match with are. They take so damn long to finally escalate into logistics. They beat around the bush with dumb openers and jokes and "trying to get to know you" bullshit that bores women to death.

Women like men who are forward, direct and get right to what they want.

[deleted] • 9 points • 25 January, 2017 06:23 PM

can you imagine those guys on a real date in real life? I'd prefer not to. They used to watch from afar in the bars and pubs. But now, NOW, they *may* get to talk to a girl just like in the movies! Talking about their day, their work, their siblings, their dog, all the good stuff on the way to BB

Online dating is a way for social awkward dumbos to get something in their bed. Male and female alike. I've been debating this sort of things to the 5-7s and the 8-10s I've matched lately; it's interesting to see their answers. The first group being very, very defensive. Why am I so cocky! They never got so much attention! Can't blame them. The second group was very interested in getting out of this Tinder crap and

setting up a date. They will give their phone number. However good luck not being swarmed and lost among the millions of desperate single new yorkers.

curiously_crazy • 4 points • 26 January, 2017 03:31 AM

It is amusing though.

I created a profile recently to see what all the fuss was about, and to get an objective view on what's been thrown around on here and bb's misc.

Holy shit is all I can say. Most of the girls that initiate are maybe a 4 or 5 at best... now I'm no Chad, but I am 6'3 at 90KG with a decent face and good genetics. If I don't reply I'll sometimes get a second message along the lines of "Thanks for checking out my profile but you're not all that yourself you know". What. In. The. Fuck?!? Not only are they ordinary but obnoxious and rude to boot. Def stick to meeting chicks in your day to day life instead of on that cesspool of magnificence.

I do get the occasional message from a 7 but without fail all are hitting the wall and early 30's.

The__Tren__Train • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 11:26 PM

I made a gay POF account using my real pics

had over 400 gays messaging me :(

made a straight one using my real pics...got 1 single mom messaging me LOL

ozaku7 • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 03:38 PM

Haha, yup. Gays are alot more open to it. They just go visual and want to bang. But even the gay community is very fucked up. One of my best friends is gay. Behaves like a straight guy, except he's more into 40-50 y/o guys instead of young chicks. He told me that there are gay men out there that go bareback on purpose to they can finally contract HIV, so they can just start taking pills to atleast keep it under control. Because some believe they will catch it sooner or later anyway, so why not right away... It must be that anything that loves cock has the fucked up unfunctional mind of a toddler. My friend is the better one, but ironically, he has kissed with more chicks than with men, it's hilarious and I make fun of him by saying he's just a closet straight, lol.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 03:17 AM

I just slapped together a profile a few hours ago with one picture, a sarcastic description, and a bunch of non sense for the questionnaire parts, I literally did the exact opposite of what you described by sending sarcastic/insulting messages to these women and my mailbox is blowing up right now. Ive never had so many replies before and Ive been trying online dating for a few years now. Thanks for sharing this. Keep in mind Im probably a 6 on the scale, receding hairline, in alright shape. Gotta get back to these broads though.

ozaku7 • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 03:36 PM

Who cares how you look when you have to compare to spineless men that don't even have shit for brains when it comes to women. Looks are low value compared to your actions. I would recommend every RP man to just make a bullshit profile, pretending to be a hot chick, and experience the kind of men they attract. I find it a very good practical example of how men approach women, how they treat them, and that 99% or all beta's or some wannabe alphas that act all tough but stop messaging you the moment you make clear that they aren't "the man". It's also a way to debunk that women on online dating get to fuck half their matches, because mentally, not only would she have to convince herself, but even convince the guy because 99% of them are such a pussy. It's pathetic.

helgisson • 62 points • 25 January, 2017 12:27 PM

Depressing? Why? Most guys will not put in the effort to improve themselves. Simply by lifting, dressing well, and practicing game you're already doing more than a lot of guys ever will.

103342 • 121 points • 25 January, 2017 12:49 PM

Genetics and social context dictate more in a person's life than this sub is willing to admit.

But this might be too much of a "redpill" for TRP to swallow.

iliketreeslikereally • 52 points • 25 January, 2017 01:38 PM*

That's true but that kind of information does not help you grow.

Yes, there are hard limits, but we're here to discuss how to improve ourselves, not to whine. If anything, women should be a helluva lot more worried about genes than men - their physical attractiveness is doubly important.

103342 • 18 points • 25 January, 2017 01:46 PM

That's true but that kind of information does not help you grow.

You are wrong.

You guys need to stop pussyfooting around hard truths, it would do wonders for this sub.

If there is one thing I've learned in my life is that people that do this waste too much of their most valuable resource: time.

iliketreeslikereally • 27 points • 25 January, 2017 01:52 PM

No one said anything about pussyfooting, all I'm saying is there's no point talking about it. Acknowledge it and move on.

I'm in a good place genetically so it doesn't affect me, but even if it did, there's nothing to do about it. Maximize your potential either way.

Omnibrad • 18 points • 25 January, 2017 05:36 PM

"Genetics" is largely the first excuse given by men who do not want to improve themselves.

Five_Decades • 16 points • 25 January, 2017 04:32 PM*

I think a lot of guys in the red pill or pua movement are dependent on female validation (whether they admit it or not) and being forced to admit that the ability to obtain female validation is mostly out of your hands is hard to admit. The Horatio Alger story is more soothing.

But it is mostly luck. Your appearance is mostly (but not totally) genetic. Personality is largely genetic. Social context is mostly luck. You can change these things a bit, but there are limits. And for a lot of guys changing them requires more energy than the reward obtained for working on changing them

MrSaiyan_333_ • 7 points • 25 January, 2017 09:19 PM

Working on yourself should be a reward by itself. Becoming a confident badass with great lifestyle and social skills is great, even if there still won't be any women around.

Five_Decades • 7 points • 25 January, 2017 09:37 PM

Working on yourself is a laudable goal, but only some forms of self improvement increase

your smv. Some of the more gratifying forms of self improvement have little effect in smv, or a negative effect (abandoning a stressful but high paying job for a lower paying job you enjoy or early retirement as an example).

Rawrination • 4 points • 25 January, 2017 09:45 PM

Yep.

I try to look at most things in life as a cost/benefit analysis.

No woman is "out of my league", but plenty (almost all), are not worth the sheer amount of effort I would have to put in to get right now. And the few that are willing right now are so far below my ideal, I end up sabotaging the relationship almost on purpose.

thederpill • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 11:30 PM

There are some women with the ability to act sensibly albeit invariably below the standard you could get. Ltrs & family should happen there if you want some quality of life or a family.

Solistx • points • 25 January, 2017 02:02 PM **[recovered]**

Hey Im very curios about the context of your earlier comment. Could you explain in detail what you mean?

103342 • 7 points • 25 January, 2017 02:20 PM

There's not that much to it really.

Simply put: a guy that is born in a rich and influential family will absolutely crush the majority of low/middle class average men.

This goes for genetics as well. But social context illustrates my point quite well.

diomedes777[S] • 22 points • 25 January, 2017 02:38 PM

In my experience I really do believe genetics trump most everything else. An exceptionally physically attractive man, a 9+, has an almost awe-inspiring aura that I think just scrambles women's circuitry. These men can be dirt poor. Put them next to a physically average but loaded man in a Ferrari and she will fuck the poor 9 100% of the time. She will shack up with the average rich man, push for marriage and kids, but she'll be fucking that bum 9 on the side and her pussy will be choosing him every.single.time. and there is nothing the average millionaire husband can do. He will never be a 9. He can do every steroid cycle under the sun, get every cosmetic surgery available to him and he'll never command and dominate a woman's pussy in the way a naturally beautiful man does.

Platos_slow_brother • 14 points • 25 January, 2017 03:56 PM

Can confirm.

Source: I had a buddy who is Greek-god handsome. You should see the interest he generates in women just walking down the street in a suit. They nearly break their necks looking at him as he passes by.

103342 • 14 points • 25 January, 2017 02:49 PM

Depends on your social context. But you are right in a way imo.

I was lucky to have good genetics (good-looking face) and I didn't even realized how easy it was for me until I had to live with a group of ugly dudes.

I learned the same way by being born in a middle/upper class family in Brazil and having to live in a very poor area for a couple of years.

When you are used to limitations or advantages it gets hard for you to put yourself in another person's place, anything that you work hard for most of the times doesn't even get close to the things you are actually given, these are usually the things that make you who you are.

For me, my opinion is that money trumps everything when it comes to sex. Women will never love anyone but themselves and sometimes their children, and I'm over that "redpill" a long fucking time ago. They won't love you for being good-looking or rich. But they will fuck you, and that is the only thing that really is valuable in most of them.

diomedes777[S] • 13 points • 25 January, 2017 03:00 PM

I don't believe believe women even love themselves. They invest in and exclusively only worship men who make them feel, to some degree, like garbage. They are slaves to nonsensical emotional turbulence and that's all they understand. Emotional roller coasters and sex, these are the things that make up the mind of a woman.

Rawrination • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 09:49 PM

Learning how to exploit this is the path to demigod-hood.

zephyrprime • 4 points • 25 January, 2017 08:01 PM

Women don't love themselves. They only love their children.

helgisson • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 11:10 PM

A waste of time would be theorizing about the importance of genetics when you could instead be focusing on ways to improve yourself with the DNA you were given.

RedditAdminsSuck_88 • 0 points • 25 January, 2017 06:12 PM

Let me guess, you're indian

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 04:46 AM

Another hard truth is that if you are a 6 and dating a 6, then she will be hit on by men that are much better looking than both you and her.

She is much more likely to cheat because there is a significant male population more attractive than you.

So, not only do high SMV males win in recruiting but also in retention.

This is not to say that chads do not get cheated on to, with the affair partner sometimes being less attractive.

How ever this is more rare.

If you are a male and not significantly above average, then you will likely get cheated on one or

more times in your life. The chances of your relationship ending by the woman cheating as a way to branch swing (and then simply saying they met someone else, sounding innocent) is very high. This is partly why these males this is likely to happen to are also more likely to mate guard and be jealous/insecure.

beginner_ • 1 point • 27 January, 2017 06:42 AM

At least trying is better than playing video games and watching porn all day. No regrets.

zephyrprime • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 07:59 PM

souly important.

Not really because they can reproduce and do reproduce even if they are ugly.

iliketreeslikereally • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 08:38 AM

I'm talking about dating & living, not reproducing.

thederpill • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 11:26 PM

Women are much less likely to die childless than men it's not new

[deleted] • 5 points • 25 January, 2017 06:24 PM

Genetics

if by genetics you mean crying out at the gods that thermodynamics isn't fair.

Five_Decades • 9 points • 25 January, 2017 04:28 PM

How handsome you are is mostly genetic and determined in the womb.

Athleticism is something you can change, but again, genetics. For some guys they would need radical changes in lifestyle, activity and diet combined with multiple drugs if not surgeries to achieve an aesthetically pleasing body.

Point being, for a lot of guys the juice isn't worth the squeeze.

diomedes777[S] • 11 points • 25 January, 2017 02:18 PM

Have to agree this sub has softened considerably recently. At the end of the day genetics and biology are everything. We HAVE to accept this. These are truths that need to be discussed because they are inherent to TRP; yes they're fucking uncomfortable but they need to be explored and theorized. It seems any posts that suggest sexual interaction, attraction and social dynamics are often out of our control just get flamed and shat on by noobies who are still in the denial phase.

Scymnus • 21 points • 25 January, 2017 04:22 PM

It's because it's irrelevant, exactly because these factors are out of our control. This sub is about sexual strategy, and it's very poor strategy to spend time talking about factors you have no control over.

We're not here to help guys create excuses for themselves, we're here to help them get laid.

segagaga • 0 points • 25 January, 2017 11:56 PM

I thought we were here to help them improve themselves, getting laid might be a nice perk, a

rewarding side quest, but it is not and never should be the goal.

harkrank • points • 27 January, 2017 01:02 AM [recovered]

Then you are misunderstood.

segagaga • 1 point • 27 January, 2017 01:08 AM

Do you mean that you think I misunderstand, or that others have misunderstood me?

This is why grammar matters kids.

harkrank • points • 27 January, 2017 01:21 AM [recovered]

The Red Pill: Discussion of sexual strategy in a culture increasingly lacking a positive identity for men.

You are mistaken.

segagaga • 1 point • 27 January, 2017 07:30 AM

I *am* talking about a positive identity for men.

patches93 • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 08:14 PM

Yes, those factors are out of our control, and that exact reason is why they are not worth talking about. We should certainly acknowledge them and our inability to influence them, but do that and move on.

The point of this sub is to discuss facets of sexual strategy we do have control over, not lament the ones we don't.

In other words, "Grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change, Courage to change the things I can, and wisdom to know the difference."

Serenity here could also be read as frame if you want to look at it that way.

Edit: could, not can

helgisson • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 11:16 PM

Beware concern trolling. The way I look at it is, if you're born ugly, TRP gives you two choices.

1. Be an ugly dude who's ripped, well dressed and awesome in every way except looks.
2. Whine about your DNA

Your choice. Saying this sub is soft because they choose to focus on what they CAN control doesn't hold up.

SW9876 • 8 points • 25 January, 2017 05:02 PM

Any man that is jacked, has good game, and takes care of himself will slay women. Do taller men have it easier? Yes. Do certain guys gain muscle faster? Yes. But ultimately the only limiting factor is you.

NowEarDis • points • 25 January, 2017 07:06 PM [recovered]

Any man that is jacked, has good game, and takes care of himself will slay women.

No. Your face will determine whether you slay or not.

SW9876 • -1 points • 25 January, 2017 08:12 PM

That is completely and utterly wrong. If that's your attitude than why the fuck are you even here.
You should just gtfo

beginner_ • 1 point • 27 January, 2017 06:41 AM

Bernie Eccelstone is short, ugly and from working class family.

mrCS84usn • 15 points • 25 January, 2017 01:30 PM

I think one of the biggest gripes that I see is that men are turned down by women that are within [or even below] their "league." That is compounded by the fact that men are still the pursuers, so they are chasing women that aren't even on par with them.

Most men indeed don't do much to improve themselves, but neither do most women.

mehdreamer • 15 points • 25 January, 2017 03:23 PM

I've spent two years reducing my body fat and improving my style. I didn't change anything on my online dating results.

I went from 4 to 5.5 or 6. Not enough for Tinder/OKC.

Face genetics is important. Despite having low body fat, my face didn't improve a lot. Face is very important. Muscle too, I agree but Face bone(Jaw, cheekbones, eye area, etc) is even more.

LiteSoul • 4 points • 26 January, 2017 01:10 AM

Developing muscle helps to get a better aesthetic face, keep on lifting

Wollingwight • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 05:48 PM

Yes. Let them feel free to be depressed and give up. Just makes it easier for the rest of us.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 11:18 PM

if everyone did this then you wouldnt be top 20% you'd just be one of many fit guys. The only way to be the top 20% is to have a bottom 80%

Archwinger • 8 points • 25 January, 2017 06:56 PM

There are two factors in play.

First, most men are not picky. Many men will fuck a 4 or 5, especially if they don't have to put in much effort. So a reasonably attractive man will hit up a dating site and message every single girl there that's a 4 or higher, and just see what he gets.

Second, women now use the internet to streamline the dating process. It's not that an average man is terrible to her. It's just that she got 100 messages today, so she only needs to respond to the top 10 to get laid tonight. The other 90 don't get a reply.

Fast forward a few years, and women who are a 5 or 6 at best are used to sitting back and getting messages from reasonably attractive guys with absolutely zero effort. If you show them 100 online dating profiles and ask them "which of these guys would you end up meeting and fucking", their honest answer is going to be the best 10 of them. Because it's just that easy. It's not that the rest of the men suck that much. It's that an average guy is a goldfish in the shark pond. He's so tiny, the sharks don't even bother eating him. No time with all of the other fish around.

FieldLine • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 05:17 AM*

So what does this mean, practically, for the guy who wants to bang really hot chicks?

It seems that there are two possibilities:

- 1) Literally be better than everyone else. Become a shark in the pond. This assumes that it isn't particularly difficult to be the cream of the crop in this particular instance, since it's realistically impossible to be the *best* in a given field in most other areas of life. Rather, in other areas, success is found by being innovative and playing the social game rather than "brute forcing" your way to success through sheer skill.
- 2) Settle for 6-7s, and "get lucky" once in a while.

Obviously option 2 isn't really a possibility for our red pill man. But I have trouble understanding how to truly navigate the modern dating market to consistently score. I'm fit, getting more muscular by the month. Sociable, outgoing. Kick ass hobbies. Huge social network/leverage. On track to make a shit ton of money after I graduate. And best of all, I do it all for myself.

But I'm still not the best of the best, and I likely never will be, kind of how I'll never be the very best Muay Thai fighter or pianist or mathematician. I can be great, but not the best.

I can get laid by some bar slut like any other moron, but those 10s don't consistently notice me, for your reasons stated above. It's not that I'm not on her radar, it's that her radar has too many blips to get consistently picked out of the crowd.

[deleted] • 9 points • 25 January, 2017 10:11 PM

This is also a huge factor in why women say they are so oppressed. They don't see all of the low SMV men in crappy jobs that are 99% male, they only see that there are more male CEOs than female. You don't see them complaining about how there aren't as many women sanitation workers.

-rwsr-xr-x • points • 25 January, 2017 10:58 PM [recovered]

OkCupid, Match and POF and Tinder are demonstrably fraudulent, each in their own way. They're also owned by Match, along with about 40 other dating properties.

I've been personally tracking the fraud on Match this year in a monstrous spreadsheet and my analysis is shocking: over 90% of the total profiles for women in the US are fraudulent, and almost every single one is internally created by Match themselves.

They sometimes screw up and end up making public, profiles with the automation in the summary, or truncated profiles with range data not even exposed in the options when you create a profile or sign up as a new member.

Hundreds and hundreds of "new" profiles show up all within about the same 60 minute span every morning, across the US. If you do the math, it's physically impossible for even a team of people working together to create profiles that fast, even with scripts. And who is paying them? Occams Razor wins out here. Also, you'll see profiles get created as new, then get reported, go dark, and days later, under the same unique UID, show up somewhere else in the US as "new" in that state, with a new name, new age, writeup and other data. These aren't values a user can change on the front end, only on the back end.

They also lock these profiles so you can't find them with a keyword or username search, while a test profile you create with the **same exact username and content**, does show up in the search.

So much more, but I've personally reported over 6500 fake profiles in the last 3 months alone, and they do nothing to stop it. In fact, the faster I report them, the higher the number of fake profiles show up the very next day. Anywhere from 600-900 fake profiles show up every single day.

OkCupid will send fake likes and views using **your profile** to encourage others to click around into your profile

and elsewhere on the site. I've left my profile dormant for 2 months, then I go back and log in and see that suddenly I have dozens of "Favorites" for profiles I've never even visited, and way outside my area. My password is 42 characters, completely random and complex, so it's not that someone is using my profile. Also, you can't favorite someone unless you've actually *visited* their profile. All of these fake favorites are for profiles that have never been visited by me, not even once.

POF has a similar scam going, which I've caught and proven dozens of times. In fact, they recently removed a linked feature of their site that makes this easy to prove, but the script is still there, just no longer linked from any page.

Googles fraud investigation department was notified of all of the fraudulent email accounts Match was using (38, across 6500 fake profiles), and the FTC was notified of every infraction and fraudulent profile reported on all three sites.

Don't ever give any of these a single dime, it's just wasting your money.

cuteman • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 02:11 AM

Who owns Match? IAC. Where Chelsea Clinton is on the Board of Directors.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 05:01 AM

This is very interesting and could be a story on network television. People eat this shit up. It seems that you are very thorough in your approach. My only suggestion is doing some sort of probability/stats analysis on anything quantifiable you have observed. People love to hear things like "the chances of this happening is 1 in (some huge number)" and then compare that to something they can visualize like lottery or throwing darts blindfolded or card playing etc.

Paladin2903 • 1 point • 27 January, 2017 12:15 PM*

Completely **AGREE**. Very good post. Online dating is like the casino. It's rigged against you.

I liken it to online poker -- another complete fraud. I used to play a lot, and it was confirmed that many of the sites I used to play on used to blatantly cheat and, many times, you were actually playing against their computer-created bot.

So, you had the illusion of control, but you actually lost the moment you sat down to play. This is how online dating is.

I mean, just look at the Ashley Madison hack. It was confirmed that the ratio of men to women was 9 to 1. Believe me, it's no different with any of these other sites.

They need to keep you coming back for more. That's how they make money. They aren't in the business of morals. They're in the business of making money.

Five_Decades • 19 points • 25 January, 2017 04:25 PM

It's really not even the top 20%, it is more the top 5% of men.

But statistically, 80-95% of men cannot be in the top 5-20%. If you could push a button and make every man athletic and fit, women would just pick the top 5-20% of those men. Women select men who are superior to other men regarding smv.

For most men, being in the top echelons of smv is not realistic. For them going mgtow or hoping they find a decent woman in their league who hasn't been corrupted by modern dating culture is their only hope.

[deleted] • 4 points • 25 January, 2017 08:38 PM

Because most men are lazy, overweight and don't go to the gym. This is why TRP stresses lifting above all

else, because most men look like this:

<https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2013/10/this-is-the-average-mans-body/280194/>

bigmfkr • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 08:03 AM

It's more like 0.05%

How fucking difficult is it to do the math? It's surprising how bad people here are with basic fractions.

20% is one in every five. No, it's not like that.

5% is one in every twenty. Better, but still no.

0.05% is one man in every 2,000 that women find very attractive. **This** is the reality. Not the top two.

Gambarim • points • 25 January, 2017 02:00 PM [recovered]

What do the best male profiles look like for reference?

waitinforaneightfold • 4 points • 25 January, 2017 02:08 PM

bro just message girls that arent as hot as you - #1 advice right there

11-Eleven-11 • 0 points • 26 January, 2017 12:33 AM

Or just don't do online dating because then you're matching with landwhales and shit. I consider myself a 7 and I can barely match with a 5.

penguin_brigade • 10 points • 25 January, 2017 03:27 PM

This isn't that surprising and it speaks to the nature of men and women. It's why nearly every woman has a guy (fwb, bf, husband) and usually only one, whereas way more men have zero and can go months without having sex while other men keep multiple women around. Me personally I really prefer it this way, but I may be in the minority.

[deleted] • 5 points • 26 January, 2017 04:53 AM

Women think 3 months is a long time to go without sex. Which is hilarious compared to what many men go through especially given the difference in sex drive.

Unnормally • 14 points • 25 January, 2017 02:32 PM*

Can confirm. My experience with OkCupid was pretty awful. I'd like to think I'm a 5-6/10. I'm a thin, geeky build, but far from ugly. And I have a decent occupation, etc, etc.

Send out dozens of carefully hand-crafted messages to prospective dates, commenting on the things I liked about their profile, and what things I felt we had in common, or what I would like to discuss. I got *ONE* reply. The others don't even bother rejecting me. I just get ignored. Let alone I never got any messages from women looking to talk to me. Totally a woman's market.

That one reply, she seemed ok, we went on a date. She was a bit on the fat side. Probably at least 50 pounds heavier than me. (I mean, I'm 150-ish). She just wasn't all that interesting. Little motivation, and all that. I'd have rated her a 4 maybe. Her personality could have been far worse, I'll give her that.

BreathOfDick • 12 points • 25 January, 2017 02:53 PM

Careful hand crafted messages?

docbloodmoney • 3 points • 26 January, 2017 06:56 PM

he means he spends an hour thinking of long faggy messages that dry women right up, especially when

combined with a picture of his pencil neck

Unnормally • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 03:08 PM

Much more careful than I put into reddit. :P I typo'd careful twice, and forgot I meant to put carefully.
>.>

Or if you are questioning what I meant. I put a lot of effort into that initial contact with each potential date, rather than coming up with some standard message to copy paste and send in mass.

Master1176 • 4 points • 25 January, 2017 03:28 PM

My advice would be to neg and neg hard in every email, and send 100s of copied and pasted emails. I used to go the route of individualized messages and it never got me anywhere. Oh, and lists. For some reason bitches love lists.. every email I sent with a list had like a 50 percent response rate.

dr_warlock • 12 points • 25 January, 2017 04:30 PM

"I'm a thin, geeky build"

He doesnt need special hand crafted messages or PUA advice, /u/Unnормally needs to fuckin lift.

Unnормally • 9 points • 25 January, 2017 04:35 PM

For sure. Don't have to tell me twice.

Master1176 • -7 points • 25 January, 2017 09:47 PM

Thanks for telling me what the fuck to do, whoremonger. And yeah, I've never heard the advice to lift before. Thanks for the newflash. This sub is about sexual strategy, and I just gave him some sexual strategy. Where the fuck do you think you are?

dr_warlock • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 04:10 AM

None of that other shit's gonna work if he has a "thin geeky body".

Umbrifer • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 03:41 PM

Could you explain more about this? specifically lists? I consider myself a 7.5 - 8.5 when clean - shaven. I read profiles and send short, offhand non-sexual but personalized messages while I'm on the shitter or the train or something. Responses are rare. I occasionally get messaged by women however they are always uglier than I will accept and I ignore them. I know I need better pics and will probably update them next week because a photographer buddy of mine owes me a favor. But if the message construction stays the same I don't see much progress.

behindtheline40 • 6 points • 25 January, 2017 05:42 PM

Alright man never give carefully handcrafted messages. Looks like you care. You dont care. So message accrodingly. Message something funny or witty. Short and sweet. Dont be a try hard. For the pics - never ever post a selfie. Some of my most successful pics are where i was caught candidly in a social environment, occasionally shirtless. Not flexing in the mirror. You'll look lonely. Also start lifting forsure. Also go get your heartbroken

Umbrifer • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 05:49 PM

Just got back into my lifting routine after a torn Achilles tendon and I'm feeling great so far. My heart's been broken already but I'm not mad anymore. After all she gave me the

greatest gift of all and sent me here. I'll send out some quips on OKC today and see what happens.

Umbrifer • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 05:54 PM

Do you get sexual with your first message?

Master1176 • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 09:43 PM

Let's say her profile says she wants a humble guy, loves one direction, and works with puppies. Your email is: 1) I'm so humble I can't even tell you how awesome I am. 2) one direction sucks 3) I have a puppy named spot, blah blah

Just be funny and mildly sexual. Oh, and lift. But you didn't need me to tell you that part.

poopcasso • 20 points • 25 January, 2017 01:48 PM

I don't see any problems here. This uneven balance is almost only existent on online dating.

1. These online bitches are literal whores. Good for fucking, that's it. And the top 20% physically attractive men that gets to fuck them knows this. These men ain't gonna settle with a tinder whore. So the whores end up staying on tinder forever until they settle for a beta bux. Which they both rightly deserve. We lose nothing here. In fact, I'd argue we gain something, as all the whores have outed themselves.
2. Charisma and genuine confidence is big part of attraction irl. If you're a leader, both men and women will sense it. These traits don't show up online, where physical attractiveness is king. Irl, you only have to date down one level. And you can date up depending on your perceived smv.

[deleted] • 16 points • 25 January, 2017 04:48 PM

So the whores end up staying on tinder forever until they settle for a beta bux.

This right here ^

I recently logged on to my POF and OKCupid Profile I had from like 3 years ago. About 75 percent of the women online in my area where THE SAME WOMEN I FUCKED THREE YEARS AGO.

They literally stay on those sites forever because it's an endless cycle of the top 20 percent of dicks lined up to fill their holes at the push of a button...with FREE SHIPPING. A few of my friends messaged the same girls as I did, and they ONLY responded to myself and another friend I consider to be in the top 20, while completely ignoring the messages from the other guys. These girls literally have a bottomless buffet of cocks, but eventually when they hit the wall and the top 20 are not lined up as far as the eye can see, they will go settle for the beta provider and he will be paying for her terrible kids and dried, worn, and abused pussy.

max_peenor • 5 points • 25 January, 2017 04:09 PM

These men ain't gonna settle with a tinder whore.

These men shouldn't settle for anyone. Why chain yourself to a cow when all the foxes will milk your balls for free?

everyone_wins • 29 points • 25 January, 2017 02:46 PM

It goes the other way too though. I barely notice women who aren't attractive.

Five_Decades • 34 points • 25 January, 2017 04:41 PM

Yes but our standards follow a bell curve distribution. Women's standards follow a power law distribution.

Omnibrad • 13 points • 25 January, 2017 05:39 PM

A 3/10 woman will receive more attention than a 7/10 man. You can't compare the apex of men to the bottom dregs of women and expect a fair conclusion. The point is that attractive eliminates 80% of the male population, which is just not true "the other way."

[deleted] • 6 points • 25 January, 2017 10:17 PM

It's because most men are desperate dumb asses that will line up to fuck anyone with a cunt...

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 11:19 PM

I'm dumb founded with the ugliest girls I work with (2-3). They all either have bf or multiple guys who are trying to bang them. I would fuck my couch cushions over these chicks and I don't get laid that much

Rawrination • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 09:42 PM

Even an ugly woman can look ok with the lights off.

Hell if she has a good personality and a tight pussy she might feel amazing and be possible LTR material.

In my experience a fat woman is still higher on the internet smv than a man in good shape but poor.

[deleted] • 11 points • 25 January, 2017 05:03 PM

80% of men celebrate getting laid like they've just won the World Cup.

20% couldn't give a fuck because it's just another game.

empatheticapathetic • 6 points • 25 January, 2017 06:17 PM

I'm not sure if I've read too many of these threads but I just can't see how to succeed anymore. I see plenty of couples out there where the guy isn't top 20%, might be shorter than me or something but this guy has somehow got a plate/gf/something and I just don't get it when I read studies like this.

I believe it definitely. The girl that brought me here was a 5 and she couldn't have ditched me fast enough to get a taste of chads dick in a bathroom stall for 5 seconds. I've been reading for 1.5 years and just don't even know where to begin with trying with women. I don't expect to win or it to go well so what's the fucking point when everyone else is more attractive than me, or has something better than me.

ArkAngelEV • 6 points • 25 January, 2017 06:33 PM

Don't place all the blame on the pill. Those innate desires and tendencies have been there since MITOCHONDRIAL FUCKING EVE. All contraception has done is unleash and accelerated their true nature. Nothing more

spikeybumpy • 5 points • 25 January, 2017 09:07 PM

Men are already at a loss the moment they package themselves into a box of statistics (job, body type, education etc.) and put that box to market on a counter next to hundreds of other, fairly similar, boxes.

Atticus_Crowley • 5 points • 25 January, 2017 09:25 PM

I brought this story up to a female friend of mine and she agreed with the results. She then also pulled up her OKC and showed me the profiles of the kind of dudes out there, and after seeing that, I don't so much think that

the 80-20 thing is pure hypergamy, but in fact...just the ratio of men with some semblance of social skills. Profiles for dudes are bad. Just bad.

scottishredpill • 9 points • 25 January, 2017 01:31 PM

I'm confused why you would even add her on Facebook, or your full name. Da fuk?

diomedes777[S] • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 02:09 PM

She found me through a mutual friend and sent a request, her display pic is just a silhouette too so I wasn't even sure who she was

RealMcGonzo • 6 points • 25 January, 2017 09:32 PM

I know this chick, she must weigh fucking 500 pounds. And this Indian (red dot, not feather) was hitting on her. In shape (or thin, anyway), had a decent job, wore normal clothes, pretty americanized, some money, pretty symmetrical. Worked in the same industry (education). And this fat broad totally blew him off. I mean, this chick is a stone cold zero - she should have been thanking her lucky fucking stars that anything with a dick was interested. But oh no, she's gotta turn him down. Felt sorry for the guy - JFC turned down by the very lowest scrapings of bottom of the barrel. Yuck.

[deleted] • 4 points • 25 January, 2017 11:49 PM

I doubts it's still 80/20. Nowadays it's probably more like 5-10% of men will get attention and the rest are just in the background.

IGoYouStayTwoAutumns • 5 points • 26 January, 2017 01:08 AM

I think the key takeaway from the article is to look at that graph, and look to the very right of the X-axis, where you see the top notch guys (the fifth line, OKC uses a 1-5 star ranking system for all profiles).

Note that, at the top ranking, the 5-Star guys, they account for 4% of OKC's male profiles.

Now consider this: the 80 / 20 principle (often talked about on here) applies TO ITSELF as well. So yes, 20% of the men are having sex with 80% of the women. But then, on top of that:

4% of the men (20% of 20%) are having sex with 64% of the women (80% of 80%).

Isn't it wonderful when the numbers line up so beautifully?

I think it's important for men to self-improve, absolutely. Get to the gym, lift. Dress better. Educate yourself. Practice a little game if it pleases you.

But gents, seriously, if you think you're gonna hit the gym for a few months, buy a new outfit, then roll on out and start banging 9s, I've got a bridge in Brooklyn to sell you... Again, LOOK AT THOSE NUMBERS. Unless you are in the VERY top few percentage points of ALL men within, say, a 20-minute drive, forget it, you're out. It ain't gonna happen. That's not to say it's totally hopeless, and you won't get laid ever, but I really do think people on this sub need to open their eyes a bit, with regard to how ruthlessly efficient and optimized the sexual marketplace has now become (for women). Particularly with regard to online and mobile dating. If you're not at the very, very top, it's going to become increasingly harder (if not impossible) to get anything at all (and I say this as someone who does pretty well in one of the toughest SMPs in North America, LA.)

One of my best friends is a beautiful stripper (worthy of her own post, surely, nothing will Red Pill you faster than having a stripper / escort for a bestie), we were hanging out recently, and I mentioned how, if given the choice, a hot guy (a 9) would rather hook up with a 7 girl that's available RIGHT NOW as opposed to gaming a 9 girl for weeks on end (and who, let's face it, might not pan out at any rate). My friend was totally shocked when I said this. Like, to her, WHY on earth would you take a 7 when you could possibly have the 9 at a later

date? I told her Look, for men, it's all about convenience, the sure bet. Particularly when you get older. If a bunch of women present themselves to a guy, he's going with the first available one (within limits, after you get down to the 6s it's like Eh, why bother). But yeah, a guy will always take the easier thing, absolutely.

But to her, she just couldn't wrap her head around it: like, why would you NOT hook up THE BEST POSSIBLE OPTION if given the chance? **Because for her, THAT'S ALL SHE KNOWS. Anything below a 9 DOESN'T EXIST. Guys who are 8s and below, they're like furniture to her. Like a table lamp. They just aren't a part of her reality.** And what's really fascinating is how finely tuned the hypergamy radar becomes. Example:

A 9.5 guy says "Let's hook up right now." A 9.6 guy says "I'm busy, let's hook up in 3 days." In this situation (where she can only pick one, let's say they're best friends), the girl will opt for the 9.6.

She'd rather be the 2nd, 3rd, 5th, even 10th choice of the 9.6, than the FIRST choice of the 9.5. (I'm not even kidding here, I've seen this play out with her, in person, many many times.)

THAT, my friends, is how ridiculously efficient the SMP is these days. Roosh had a post once about how, in the future, the only guys who will get laid are the one that 1) do steroids, 2) are mini-celebrities, and 3) spend their lives spam approaching. I think we're coming up on that day sooner than any of us would like to think.

But yeah, enough of this "Top 20%" nonsense. It's not enough guys. Top 4% or better, and really it's more about the Top 2% if you really wanna get going.

AvengerSentinel • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 02:32 AM*

You wanna know something? Often, I look at the wives/girlfriends of celebrities and think to myself, "That's it? With all the status he accumulated, that's who he ended up with?" I know personality is a factor as well, and as long as the guy's happy, all the power to him, but your posts definitely bring an interesting dimension to TRP because there aren't that many people here (AFAIK) who live right in the heart of what's probably the most competitive SMP in the US (Los Angeles).

Like you mentioned before, LA is full of people (both men and women) who were the most attractive in their small towns before they moved out there, so what happens if you're a ripped personal trainer surrounded by a bunch of other ripped personal trainers and/or aspiring models? Some guys will have to resort to Machiavellian tactics to get the one up over other guys (thus turning them into genuine bad boys that women can't get enough of).

Something I've been telling other guys (your posts add credence to this) is that pussy is not the end-all be-all, and to find something in their life that they love more than getting laid (which I admit, takes some time, effort, and self-restraint). I mean, it's possible that someone can land their dream woman and have a "happily ever after" existence (although swallowing the pill shows the odds of this happening are not favorable), but what if a guy busts his ass, snags a 9.2....only to have her drop her panties for a guy just slightly more alpha than him a few weeks later? At a certain point, guys should really ask themselves "How much of myself am I investing towards getting laid, and is this the best use of my time?" I've listened to interviews of people who are wealthy, and they're like "Yeah, I'm rich, I could be even richer but I don't want the added stress, the more stuff you own, the more problems you have". People here should definitely keep in mind that, if they want to nail the creme de la creme, the competition is going to be ferocious (but if that's truly what they want, they should go for it).

Something else I ruminate about (since some of the posts here can be rather scornful and misogynistic) is, can you really blame women? Back in the days, women married men for security and men sought them out because they wouldn't have gotten poon otherwise. So if a woman can support herself financially, is it that surprising if she chooses getting railed out by studs and alphas over investing her time/energy/resources towards rearing a family? Why choose a mellow domestic life over the roller coaster thrill of being screwed by men at the top of their game? If a guy realizes that, as long as he self-actualizes and socializes, he can

bang quality women, why would he want to give up his freedom/money/interests? I honestly don't think the average man is any better at resisting temptation than the average woman.

IGoYouStayTwoAutumns • 3 points • 26 January, 2017 10:58 PM

Often, I look at the wives/girlfriends of celebrities and think to myself, "That's it? With all the status he accumulated, that's who he ended up with?"

I've met and interacted with a few celebs here and there, and occasionally their wives / girlfriends as well. In every instance, the girl's just a girl, nothing more or less, possibly no one you'd even glance at twice on the street, but usually very warm, funny, outgoing, gracious, etc etc. When these guys "settle" it's usually with the nice housewife-y type of girl, and not their female movie star equivalent (a supermodel etc). Of course the housewife type is no guarantee of long-term success, but it stacks the odds in your favor. Try to wife up a supermodel, pop star, movie star etc, and you're just asking for the woman to cheat on you within 2 years or less. (Not to say that male celebs are paragons of virtue, but they seem to be better at managing a wife while getting a little strange on the side every now and again. Female celebs, on the other hand, have one quickie with the hot bad boy bartender, think they're suddenly in love, they found their soulmate, and then trash their marriage to their celeb husband like a week later.)

what if a guy busts his ass, snags a 9.2....only to have her drop her panties for a guy just slightly more alpha than him a few weeks later?

This is a big problem I have with this sub, actually. I think the theory is absolutely on point when it comes to a straightforward "How to increase you lay count" scenario. Implement these rules (however counter-intuitive they may seem), and see an instant improvement with how well you do with women. Got it. Did it myself, still do. It works. Totally on board.

Problem is, too many men on here seem to think that they're gonna hit the gym, dress better, earn more money, master game, rip their way through a few dozen easy lays, and then, wow, lo and behold, they're gonna meet THAT ONE SPECIAL SNOWFLAKE, "the one who's not like the rest", and then they're gonna settle down in an exclusive, committed, monogamous, long-term relationship, keeping their woman devoted and faithful by using Red Pill "relationship game" (strong alpha lead, dread game tactics when needed etc).

And I hate to be the bearer of bad tidings for everyone here, but it just ain't gonna happen. You'll get the girl for as long as you get her, and when she meets someone new (which happens every day), and this person tickles her fancy (which, at some point very soon, he will), she's gonna sleep with him, and there's nothing you can do about it. Doesn't matter how alpha you are, how ripped / shredded / jacked you are, how tight your game is. Your women will cheat. End of story.

Monogamy only works in a society in which the rules are enforced by everyone from all sides, and breaking those rules results in SEVERE consequences. Now that we live in a society where non-monogamy (sexual promiscuity) is not only accepted but ACTIVELY ENCOURAGED from all sides (particularly by and for women), it's become quite a bit more difficult. Add in smart phones and mobile hook up apps (which make finding a newer, better partner just a matter of tapping your phone a few times), and you have the death knell for relationships.

Truth is, if you've really swallowed and internalized the Red Pill, if you really get the theory about what's going on between the sexes, how intergender dynamics really works, then you realize that, ultimately, **MGTOW is the only possible endgame out of all this.**

Consider:

-- Hypergamy

- Briffault's Law
- Dual Sexual Strategy
- Emotional Primacy
- AWALT

Add all that together plus the infinite, always-on connectivity that social media and hook up apps (like Tinder) provide, and the math only adds up, CAN only add up, one way: women will continue acquiring new sexual partners at an ever increasing rate, until such time as they hit a kind of "time wall", at which point it's just a matter of: "I can't fuck any more new guys this week, I just can't squeeze it into my schedule. I had a new guy for lunch, another right after work, and another right before bed every single day this week, plus a few more here and there, that's more than 20 guys, I'm beat, I need to break for a day, gotta catch up on my sleep."

All this will happen automatically, by the way, with AI digital assistants that will do it all for you. Women will enter their preferences ("I only want guys who are 9.8 or higher within a 20 minute radius") and the app will just send them on over whenever she indicates she has a free 15 minute window to bang. That'll be it. **You'll have a few jacked studs running around each and every city, having sex as their full-time jobs, and all the other men: they get nothing.**

| can you really blame women?

Nope, not all. If us guys had the opportunity we'd be doing the exact same thing. Hell, some men I know (celebs among them) who have vast amounts of money and fame actually DO this exact same thing, albeit with escort services. I know a famous male pop star who has LA's finest escort service right on his phone, every night he just taps a pic (or two, or three) and the girls show up, they do their thing, and then off they go. So he's racking up one or two new chicks every day (at least), but then, you think, well he's a famous pop star, of course he does that.

What no one considers is that ALL WOMAN are now "famous pop stars" too. And they act, and have sex, as such.

| I honestly don't think the average man is any better at resisting temptation than the average woman.

Slightly better, but not much. I've been reading Tarot for 20 years now, have had MANY clients, most of them women asking about relationships but I've basically seen and heard it all at this point. Somebody asked me once "Men and women, who cheats more? And how much?" I thought for a second and then said (we're talking about long-term relationships here, like marriages): **"75% of all men cheat, 99% of all women cheat."** The querent asked me "Why not 100% of women?" I said: "Well, actually, it probably is 100% of women, I just want to allow for the fact that there may be one exception to the rule, one black swan out there somewhere, one unicorn, a woman who's never cheated. But in my 20 years of reading Tarot and interacting with hundreds, possibly thousands of clients, honestly I've never seen it. Nor do I expect to."

That was pre-TRP. Now, post-TRP, I still stand by the statement.

[deleted] • 5 points • 26 January, 2017 02:58 AM

Fuck online. You are better picking up woman on the streets. Girl stares for to long just cold approach. I promise rejections are much less.

Bandos15 • 16 points • 25 January, 2017 11:59 AM

I believe getting into that 20% is possible at the moment. With more men waking up to the 80/20 rule I fear it

will get very hard soon.

duglles • points • 25 January, 2017 01:47 PM [recovered]

Maybe at a younger age, sure I can see your point. I'm in my 40's and being in the top 20% is not that hard. Most of the "competition" are overweight, lazy, thirsty as fuck weak asses seeking approval.

Dress well, be confident, lift and you're there.

TryDoingSomethingNew • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 05:10 PM

Agreed! However I often lie about my age, saying I'm 10-11 years younger in order to greatly increase the odds for getting younger women.

diomedes777[S] • 13 points • 25 January, 2017 12:07 PM

I think, slowly, guys are waking up and becoming aware of the choices presented to them. Either grind and fight tooth-and-nail to get to that 20% or fade away. That's it.

Of course the depressing reality is that there will always be men who, despite grinding and dedicating themselves to lifting and pursuing their goals, are just simply not physically attractive enough to compete with the ever skyrocketing standards hypergamy is being afforded in our current society.

pjanimikula • 4 points • 25 January, 2017 10:05 PM

How about live any way you please, and bang actual whores?

adam_varg • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 02:34 PM

Because its not challenge so nowhere as rewarding and satysfying for lot of men.

pjanimikula • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 04:51 PM

It is a challenge to get to the piont where you can afford it whenever you want it and mentally, to fully enjoy it without guilt, shame or other bs.

80/20 is generous prediction. How many natural pussy slayers you know? They are extremely rare. Even guys like Mystery had to develop rules and persona to hide behind to realize his full potential. And that guy was the shit ten years ago. Incredible, insane magnetism.

I've jokingly said the other day that Frank Reynolds was hard-core TRP. If you are not Brad Pitt next best option for a great life is to be like Frank.

adam_varg • 1 point • 27 January, 2017 10:15 AM

1. All i am saying i would rather jerk off than pay for sex even if you would be in financial situation where i light my smokes with benjamins.
2. I dont give a fuck about being slayer. I got my share of variety and will get more. But just fucking some random hottie to get one more notch? Why? Not satysfying, at all. Most men can do it. Dominating shit out of her so she willing to do literally anything i want and thank me for it after?

There is lot of men like that. Propably even more than those who want push numbers.

Actually even just fucking some hottie isnt satisfying for me already. I need to get her so into me and love getting fucked by me so much she willing to do everything in bed for me and then thank me for all that nasty shit i did to her.

Shiva-Lingam • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 12:29 PM

I believe it would be harder mostly online. As much as you can make a great profile, a male model would still have an advantage over you online. In real life most people - including that same male model - would be frightened to cold approach especially during the day and can't hold frame in many situations, so your balls of steel and frame control would give you a definite advantage over those same people that can mostly only get attention online.

DavoAmazo • points • 25 January, 2017 12:07 PM **[recovered]**

Just means a little more work you gotta put in.

saibot83 • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 03:05 PM

That's a good thing no? Survival of the fittest and all.

Five_Decades • 15 points • 25 January, 2017 04:45 PM

Define fittest. We are not living in the savannahs of Africa now.

Drug dealers, rappers, petty criminals, the tragically vain, etc passing on their DNA while engineers, scientists, volunteers who build wells in Africa so people have clean drinking water, etc fade into nothingness is not helping the species.

The less education a woman has, the more children she has. That is not survival of the fittest.

http://cdn.theatlantic.com/static/mt/assets/hua_hsu/cohenfertility2.jpg

[deleted] • 5 points • 25 January, 2017 05:08 PM

The 'plenty more fish in the sea' idea only applies to the top 20%.

Unless you harpoon a whale and even she won't be hooked for long.

Downvotesohoy • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 09:55 PM

Yup. I'm an above average looking guy. But can't for the life of me get matched with even average looking girls on Tinder. There's a lot of parts about TRP I disagree with, but this is factual down to the core. If you keep yourself in shape, have clean skin, are well groomed, and have straight teeth, you can't expect the females you match with to process any of these positive traits themselves.

If you're a 7 you'll be very very lucky if you get matched with a 6. Even more lucky if she actually responds to you.

gotyournumberm8 • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 04:38 PM

Top comment is true but bitchy as fuck. Accept reality and take action. We all know women are empty and moronic. Have you actually seen most mens profiles online and their icebreaker messages though? They look like they were made in 5 minutes from a horny idiot with no long term strategy. Decide exactly what you want, build an online persona and at least the image of an exciting life. If you're going to do something, go deeply into it. Then you'll reap the rewards. Concentrate your Forces as Robert Greene says.

PetililPuff • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 06:42 PM

I don't actually think physical appearance / body is necessarily the key component. I think natural, true attraction is actually very chemical. A woman with a natural hormonal rhythm/cycle (not on birth control), is of course, going to be attracted to men who are good reproductive partners *for her*.. As in, her level of attraction is going to

be based on the man's hormones and genes rather than his visual appearance. Granted, some physical traits of men go hand in hand with good hormonal & reproductive genes (like a strong jawline). But like, having say a 6-pack doesn't. Even men that are less fertile can achieve that. Likewise, high intelligence doesn't always go hand in hand with fertility. But very low intelligence can be chemical/genetic, so intelligence would factor in to some extent.

So in a natural environment, women and men will both be attracted to the most fertile / or best reproductive mates for their individual genes. Because genetic compatibility is also a factor... Just because a man and woman are both very fertile doesn't mean that they are genetically compatible for reproducing the healthiest children.

Of course, we're really screwing with nature in so many ways. Unhealthy diets messing with hormones, birth control, online dating (because you can't experience a *chemical* attraction over the internet), purposefully seeking out partners based on material possessions rather than chemical attraction, plastic surgery (visual appearance not matching DNA/genetics), possibly even heavy use of makeup, etc.

In a perfect world without these factors, I think monogamy would make absolute sense. Because reproductive success is far more individual than the whole "10% of men are the best partners for all women" (or vice versa)... It's more like... Every individual man/woman is only compatible with a small portion of the population. And the people included in that portion are going to be different for every individual.

aanarchist • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 10:56 PM

i'm seeing someone atm who's got an orbiter who is literally a foot taller than me, more aggressive, more athletic, more rich, the list goes on. i'm the better man because i live on a higher level of consciousness, and am more pleasant to be around and get her excited spending time with me, good conversation etc. being a "20% man" isn't something you quantify with numbers, it's simply accepting the responsibility that comes with the freedom to make your own decisions. most people on here are still slaves and always will be because it's the red pill reddit bandwagon now making their decisions for them, instead of the blue pill. make your own decisions, do what you think is right, do what makes you happy.

Havikz • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 11:35 PM

Feminists talk about unrealistic standards of women, when in reality it's women who have unrealistic standards of men and require them to spend 4 hours a day lifting iron yet also somehow have a solid job. To be even worth considering a man has to sacrifice so much to even get an eye glance, when the average woman who barely tries is still regarded to as attractive.

veritableill • 3 points • 26 January, 2017 03:33 PM

There are so many paradoxes in this 'manosphere'. I'm not 20% material, so until i'm 20% then fuck the rest? Be stoic, talking too much is effeminate, but you need to have game and control the narrative. There's an old stereotype about writers being depressed, so therefore is everything i'm reading on here some depressed persons writings? Don't be a workhorse, make a lot of money though. I'll add this to the countless meditations and contradictions of this fucked up world, or whatever. Talking about bullshit celebrities and media, and basically all forms of escapism make me HAPPY. So why try so hard to be a contrarian if this place preaches IDGAF. All women are hypergamous, so are men. I make decisions based on feelings. I have anger issues and am not in control of my emotions at all times, and in general people make decisions based on feelings. Hence the business dinner, where your belly is full and you're more apt to make courageous decisions, and the wine of course. But these are all rational, testosterone laden men who know what they want and use this aggression for good. Be antisocial its attractive, be popular it makes more money, creativity is the art of making money. I'm so tired of this place, I get it, lift, tell lies, be machiavellian, read robert greenes laws of power. Next? Everytime I read this

statistic its just like "ok so find somewhere where you are the 20%", so like an island? Thailand maybe?

Entropy-7 • 5 points • 25 January, 2017 10:44 PM

Stop complaining and do something about it.

I am no prize: I say that I am a 6 who presents as a 7 and can score 8s from time to time.

But really, *game up* gents. OKCupid has been my go-to place for decades. If you are not getting laid, you are doing something wrong. I live in China now so my last half dozen GFs are here, but before that. . . living in motherfucking Toronto (the complete asshole of the dating world) I could still do ok.

Women *want to have sex*, women *want boyfriends*.

ONE TIME OFFER: If you are in Toronto and aren't getting anything, I will personally coach you. I fly back to China Feb 17 and I am committed to this girl, so no funny business for me.

I am not a PUA or anything but I am fed up with you shitheads complaining.

WTF OP, if you are a 8.5 why are you not banging 9s?

Stand and deliver or let's get this show on the road.

The_Driver1979 • 5 points • 25 January, 2017 05:24 PM

This is all true but for a lot of people all the lifting in the world won't make a bit of difference.

Katayani108 • 5 points • 25 January, 2017 08:22 PM

Just understand that average women are invisible too. Recently a co-worker told me he rejected a girl because she had one single hair on her nipple. Can you imagine as a man, being rejected because of a hair? He said she would have been a 10 if not for that. I simply told him his story spoke more of him than it did of her.

Cunt_Robber • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 07:29 PM

I wonder... Is the root of hypergamy the birth control pill?

Before its implementation, women were naturally restricted in their sexual escapades, not to mention further stigmatized by society. I'm not saying "hey let's go back 100 years cause things were better then" but I also suspect that with the advent of birth control for women the floodgates opened.

RandomActsThrow7 • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 08:44 PM

As an aside, I only just noticed how biased that OKCupid article was written. Despite the ridiculous implications for women, the writer continues to denigrate the male results of the study and downplay the female results. Some examples:

When it comes down to actually choosing targets, men choose the modelesque.

This statement comes after the writer shows that men are incredibly fair when determining attractiveness. It comes out to almost a perfect bell-curve, but while males are great at fairly determining attractiveness, they message 4/5's most often. I mean, **of course. People are more inclined to pursue someone they are more attracted to than ones they are just moderately attracted to.** Instead of being understanding, the writer calls this "**male pattern madness**".

We should expect the same treatment for the women, especially since they have shown they are far worse than men and just awful in generally at fairly determining attractiveness, right?

As you can see from the gray line, women rate an incredible 80% of guys as worse-looking than medium. Very harsh. On the other hand, when it comes to actual messaging, women shift their expectations only just

slightly ahead of the curve, which is a healthier pattern than guys' pursuing the all-but-unattainable.

Are you kidding, here? Calling women harsh is not even a denouncement, and then he praises women because they message a little less harshly than their own incredibly harsh determinance of attractiveness in males. Then comes the worst thing, in my eyes. He presents the chart of messages to men and women according to their attractiveness, and the hottest women get ~26x the messages the lowest rated women do. The hottest men get ~11x the messages the lowest rated men do. This is what the writer has to say:

This graph also dramatically illustrates just how much more important a woman's looks are than a guy's.

NO IT FUCKING DOESN'T. These are absolute numbers, not averaged, thus the writer is comparing absolute numbers. **Men message massively more often than women.** So if the site is 50% men and 50% women, and men send 10/100 messages to the hottest women and women send 1/10 messages to the hottest men, **that obviously doesn't mean looks are 10x more important to men than to women**, because the percentages are the same.

The raw data is great, but the conclusions the writer draws are bullshit and he should be ashamed.

Cristoff13 • 1 point • 27 January, 2017 11:41 AM*

I thought the analysis did separate the pool for male from female senders and was valid? I admit I've never been that good at statistics.

But if the article's analysis is correct after all I have a theory for why men are so biased towards messaging the most attractive women. Its not out of some stupid stubbornness. I get the impression the less attractive women are almost as picky as the most attractive ones. If you have virtually the same chance of success with the more attractive women, then why not try your luck with them?

chadjugo • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 11:41 PM

"To women, you're either the shit or you don't exist"

blackoutedfast • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 11:46 PM

you need to honestly evaluate your strengths and weaknesses and then focus on the environment that allows you to advertise and emphasize the strongest components of your smv.

if you are in the top % in terms of appearance, then yeah tinder/bumble/okcupud can be great. but it's honestly probably not even worth the minimal effort for an average looking guy because you're going to end up with the fugly landwhale scraps.

if you're not super hot but you're popular and outgoing, focus more on social circle game. social proof and preselection counts for a lot. become the clear alpha in a fun, high smv clique and girls will see that.

if you're more of a loner but very charismatic, try daygame. most of the girls on tinder have met up with plenty of hot chads who turned out to be lame and boring. girls that would have left swiped your picture are much more willing to give you a shot in real life (assuming you're not weird and awkward)

if you're ugly, no friends, and no game then forget about girls for a while and focus on lifting and reading the sidebar

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 12:15 AM

Look at how much more women love their kids than their husbands. So much more that is is like dividing by zero (isn't a reasonable question). They also live vicariously through their children.

It's no wonder they want to raise a baby with the best genes possible and will cheat or be pumped and dumped to

do so (small sacrifice for their baby and themselves).

Entropy-7 • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 12:57 AM

I am no chad. Get in their face and display some skill.

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 01:34 AM

Everyone should absolutely lift, but you don't need to look good or be rich to get laid with 9's and 10's

billsmashole • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 02:23 AM

I think this is true of women too. But maybe to a lesser degree. If a woman is overweight or just terrible looking, they are invisible. Also if they are too old. So maybe it's more like 50/50 for them or 40/60.

constellationofsuns • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 06:51 AM

Correlation does not imply causation (more research is needed). Plus this study has some bias and could be interpreted in many different ways.

RenoIDeter92i • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 08:55 AM

"She then proceeded to spread rumors about me to people at my gym, telling them I was gay and that she'd heard I had a small dick." Imao

TALzFGxawb • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 04:49 PM

i remember years ago looking at okcupid and thinking the people on there were hot. like, nearly half were physically hot enough. probably around 20% after considering their profile. the mindset was "i'd fuck them. does their personality match enough that i have a chance?"

now i'm at the point where if my FWBs all get boyfriends or something, i know that i can find new ones. and if i look at okcupid now, maybe 1% are physically attractive to me, and it actually goes up (to like 2%) if i read their profile. the mindset is "are they hot+fun+interesting enough for me to spend time on?"

most women are in a state like that. they already have guys fucking them, so they're coming from abundance, and won't accept the dregs that are 90+% of people on okc. guys on okc are mostly not getting laid, so anything is better than nothing

TL;DR: your graph will look more like the woman's if you're getting laid (or can easily). abundance mentality

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 04:55 PM

I actually don't disagree with the women.

Men seem to want to date a supermodel, and let their own fat ass just do what it's gonna do. Get in shape. Take care in what you eat, and put down the damn Xbox controller. If, however, you are content with a 5 girl, and you are a 5 as well, then game on!

I lean toward 8-9 women, as the 10 is simple too much into herself. The 8-9 has a chance to be willing to give some. I am the same way. I am a solid 8, 9 in Alabama, prob a 6 in Los Angeles or New York. I'm not just talking looks, but I don't earn as much money as I should be, because I need some flexibility at work and can't be completely consumed by the day job. That's my rules, and that's how I set my life up, so I tend to live modestly as a result.

Dating online is shit. My experience with tinder is great evidence. Women are on a "hook-up" app, and will clearly state "not looking for a hook-up". EYE ROLL.

If they don't state this, I swipe right. When I actually meet them, it's a rare woman who doesn't then start to fall

in love with a brotha, and I have to remind them that, hey, we met on Tinder. What do you expect?

schmolch • 4 points • 25 January, 2017 07:21 PM

I hate to defend them bitches, but if you observe men and women at a beach, lake or swimming pool you will notice that most females look decent (or at least have a feminine physique) while 95% of men look like a gender-neutral disfigured sack of shit. If women cared as little about their looks as men these graphs would look the same.

clme • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 01:45 PM

What's the motivation for the post? Is your ranking of 8 mostly due to genetics, or you were an ugly fat a while ago and you became an 8? If the latter, I understand the desire to give back to the community. If the former, however, what gives? A superiority complex?

diomedes777[S] • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 02:13 PM

Not sure what you're asking here. I'm just using, for reference, my attractiveness 'level' to get my overall point across. No bragging.

Wordlessjaguar03 • 5 points • 25 January, 2017 03:12 PM

He's basically asking what makes you an 8? Were you gifted with it genetically or did you improve some how to be that? Like I was gifted genetically, but I put hard work into my appearance. I'm an 8-9. I lift regularly, I'm relatively young, have a professional job where I make decent money, I play a sport on a men's club, I'm working toward a masters degree, and I come from an extremely wealthy family. I would also like to add I'm 6'1.

crash1082 • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 09:52 PM

How are you guys rating yourselves, honestly. Are you basing this off celebrities? If Brad Pitt in his prime is a 10, who's an 8?

Wordlessjaguar03 • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 10:04 PM

I'm rating myself off the fact I was a male model for a little...

crash1082 • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 10:07 PM

Realizing I'm basically a 6

diomedes777[S] • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 12:28 AM

My face is genetically an 8. I'm 6'0" and dark. I worked very fucking hard for my body which I would say has pushed me up at least .5 SMV. I'm not wealthy and have hardly anything to my name, I'm just talking about pure physical appearance here.

Brad Pitt physically is probably an 8.5-9. His wealth status and fame push him to 10. Johnny Depp in his prime is a 9 and is currently a 7

I would rate guys like David gandy, Jason mamoa, tom hardy or Sean o'pry as being physical 10's.

Wordlessjaguar03 • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 01:11 AM*

You can't be a 8-10 as a guy without status

bowie747 • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 09:23 PM*

Decent post OP. This information **has** been spouted repeatedly here but it was probably time for a review. And you did a good job laying it all out. Except where are the fucking graphs man?!

Also I'd like to point out that, while men are primarily attracted to a woman's appearance, women are primarily attracted to a man's presence (frame, game, confidence etc). With his appearance taking a close second. Dating sites like OKC cannot capture a man's presence, therefore women only perceive the most physically attractive men as viable partners. Men have effectively given up their best weapon in online dating.

Edit: I would additionally like to point out that 80/20 is natural. If you look at other higher mammals and primates you will see that only the top males reproduce. The only reason we think otherwise is because society has created rules that pair off men and women 1:1 because it creates stability (all men are happy). We're merely reverting to how nature intended it. This is why men are so naturally competitive, because only the strongest get to fuck honeys. So don't complain about hypergamy or chicks bring whores, this nature. Adapt or die.

diomedes777[S] • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 12:20 AM

Thank you man. I linked the graphs right at the beginning of the post, up the top.

Totally agree that 80/20 is natural selection. It only seems shocking to us because for as long as civilized society has been thriving we've placed societal boundaries on female sexuality. Now that we're in completely uncharted waters, those boundaries are gone and we're just seeing the most undiluted, purest form of female nature that exists.

thisornothing • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 04:22 PM

This works both ways - I barely notice unattractive women. And really, if you're attractive and interesting, none of this should bother you. If you look and act like an IT geek / computer janitor, then you've got some work ahead of you to fix the vibe you're giving off.

Don't let this upset or anger you, just use it as a motivation to improve yourself. Bitterness isn't attractive to anybody.

tino125 • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 07:44 PM

Depressing? This is fucking awesome. Get yourself in the top 20% (or better, top 5%). Have life on easy mode. Its that fucking simple!

mancozbi • 2 points • 25 January, 2017 05:29 PM*

1. It's not just the liberation of women and the contraceptive pill that caused this. It's also the welfare state. In the western world a woman doesn't need to marry a wealthy provider to be sure that her children will thrive and even survive. The state provides health, education and security without the need to be wealthy. (You see this slightly less in the USA, there you need a job to get health insurance, good education costs money etc.)
2. Muscles are not the total key to female sexual attraction. Women are attracted to men with any of the following attributes: good looks, assertiveness, a very good education, an impressive profession, proficiency at something artsy. The list is long, very subjective and culturally biased. Just saying that lifting is not everything.

wohlstand • points • 25 January, 2017 05:32 PM [recovered]

Your lifting theory seems flawed too because wha about for example this guy?

<http://imgur.com/bNhqG7Z>

And one of his exes (Heidi Klum) also was together with some pretty "built" guys.

jocomoco • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 06:58 PM

I would say that it is 99% vs 1%.

The real game is that you can differentiate yourself in the 99%.

The 99% is all the same, its a flat distribution. The top of the 99% is almost as good as the bottom. Most women don't get the 1% so the real game is to be different from the 99% by other means than attractiveness.

zephyrprime • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 07:53 PM

Women have always been hypergamous but the pill really unchained their hypergamy

creepyThrowawayP • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 08:27 PM

Just wait 10 years from now it's going to change from "80% of men are invisible to women" to "where have all the good men gone?"

lolligagger3000 • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 09:40 PM

I'm not really into online dating so let me ask a question:

Do you have the ability to at least show some frame?

Because if not you'd have to be 100% looks and that's an easy way to lose against chads

BlxckTxpes • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 10:42 PM

And this is exactly why when I was on dating sites, I don't pay for "full features" because it's a waste of fucking money. And chances don't raise of me finding someone.

helpwithhalloween • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 11:42 PM

But the article states that women still messaged equally, with women messaging average men at the highest rate. Men still only messaged the most attractive women...?

SpaceViolet • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 12:55 AM

to mate with the strongest, most tingle-inducing alpha males

Some good writing here among the wokeness

user1312421 • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 02:00 AM

I don't think your interpretation of the data provided is solid. I'll explain below

the way women rate male attractiveness implies that 80% of men are unsatisfactory to the female users of this site

This is based on the ratings of attractiveness. When looking at the distribution of messages initiated by women, it falls just ahead of the bell curve (much more reasonable than the comparable distribution for men). In terms of being satisfactory, I would think that who you're willing to go out of your way to message is a decent indicator of who is satisfactory to you.

I experience this phenomenon first hand constantly as I'm sure many of you guys do as well. Objectively ugly women approach me from a place of entitlement

Your experiences with this, while I'm sure are genuine, are not what the data in this blog post is suggesting

would happen. On the contrary, when looking at response rates of attractive men messaging unattractive women, it appears the women are actually a lot less receptive than if an average man had messaged them. This is almost the exact opposite of what you are describing.

It's total unchained hypergamy and the result is women following their biological imperative to mate with the strongest, most tingle-inducing alpha males they can find

In the graphs showing messages received as a function of attractiveness for both men and women, it actually looks like us men are following this type of 'seek out the alphas' mentality a lot more than women. For women, the most attractive among them receive almost all the attention, whereas the least attractive receive next to nothing.

If you're going to use an article online as evidence for something, make sure you actually read and understand what the article is saying

mickey__ • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 09:27 PM

One question- why don't you show your face so we could know what 8.5 look like?

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 January, 2017 05:50 AM

A million sperm. A few eggs.

Betterthanuatlife • 1 point • 27 January, 2017 06:47 AM

Why repost something that has been proven and spouted on here a thousand times before? Yeah hypergamy exist, so fucking what?

thederpill • 1 point • 27 January, 2017 03:51 PM

Dumbest thing you ever heard wow. So I take it you are amazing in bed well done.

That aside, I'm 40 and prefer to fuck women who love to fuck and come easy from vaginal sex.

I have had women who take too long to 'warm up'. Just not a fan of going down on a woman for an hour.

MeisterMGTOW • 1 point • 28 January, 2017 10:59 AM

I'm mgtow. I don't give a shit.

ser0402 • 1 point • 1 February, 2017 09:53 AM

I think it's hilarious that the go to hail mary insults for rejected/pissed/otherwise annoyed women (in my experiences and this post) seem to be along the lines of "haha you're gay" or "you have a small dick", like those two things are inherently bad (small dick may be unfortunate depending on how small and if you can use it right, but it's not a bad thing). And both are things you have no choice in.

Anything to try and demasculate and humiliate you in front of others I guess.

sectandmew • 1 point • 3 February, 2017 02:53 AM

Is there a way to get an honest rating of how hot you are?

exit_sandman • 3 points • 25 January, 2017 02:10 PM

While relevant, that topic is old news by now.

takkun22 • 1 point • 25 January, 2017 06:41 PM

ok, while this is true, you didn't really acknowledge the crux of article, which was that looks actually matter

much less to women than they do to men

diomedes777[S] • 2 points • 26 January, 2017 12:17 AM

This is simply not true and I would actually argue the opposite

takkun22 • 1 point • 26 January, 2017 03:03 AM

it says explicitly in the article and backs it up with data

newName543456 • 1 point • 27 January, 2017 07:55 AM

Most attractive guys get 10x more messages than least attractive ones.

More attractive women get over 25x more messages than least attractive ones.

BFD. Clearly looks do matter a whole lot to women, whether it translates into 10x, 20x, 50x more messages is irrelevant at this point. Treating 10x more messages as "much less" than 25x more messages is misleading at best.