

How Many Women?

October 1, 2018 | 85 upvotes | by [Whisper](#)

Kitten is still struggling to come to terms with having to share my attention with FunSize, not to mention the occasional plate. FunSize, of course, is experienced at this, and has no issues, but Kitten feels threatened by her very presence, and won't talk to her for long enough to bond and stop seeing her as a threat.

Since Kitten is actually Dr. Kitten, PhD, she likes to intellectualize things that upset her, thinking about them in abstract terms rather than as they relate to her personally. This gives her emotional distance so she can cope. So the other day (I actually started writing this sometime back, so it was a while ago now), she hits me with this question:

"How does polygamy [by which she means polygyny] fit into evo psych? How did monogamy [by which she means monogyny] form?"

Fleshing out the gist of my answer into a complete description for TRP:

Polygyny is a mating strategy optimized for replacing combat losses, because one man can easily keep multiple women pregnant. It's used by warlike societies, or those with high male-specific mortality rates.

Monogyny is a mating strategy optimized for appeasing low-tier males, because it guarantees them a mate. It's used by peaceful societies which depend on beta male labour and cooperation for their prosperity.

Polygyny's effect upon the Sexual Marketplace is to increase the availability of apex males.

This benefits:

[Read the rest on trp.red...](#)

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

[deleted] • 47 points • 1 October, 2018 07:17 PM*

Whisper: This is a bit long but hoping you'll read and respond to this as I've tried to refute your arguments without resorting to any personal attacks that the others have employed.

TLDR: There is a lot of evidence that sexual monogamy was actually really important for civilization as it advanced into the agricultural phase from its hunter gather roots. This does not mean, however, that it is in any man's interest today to be sexually monogamous, as it only benefits the individual male if there are legal and cultural frameworks in place to actually enforce it. Also, note that I'm neither a practicing Christian nor a TRADCON.

Main Response:

This is something sounds like it makes sense, but it really could not be further from the truth. Monogamy can best be described as a sort of advancement that makes a civilization more powerful, similar to the progression from clans to tribes to kingdoms or republics, or the development of organized religion, or from living in mud huts to wooden houses.

Genetic studies show that at the dawn of agriculture, there was massive sexual inequality, with something like 1 in 17 men (probably the landowners) reproducing, down from about 40% of men before that.

<https://psmag.com/environment/17-to-1-reproductive-success>

Such a society would have been incredibly unstable. The 16 out of 17 males that did not reproduce would have had absolutely no stake in the society, and we can imagine that the rulers were probably constantly being overthrown and replaced.

Enter monogamy (reinforced by religion). Any society that adopted this practice would have become incredibly powerful. It would have gained much needed stability and the men in it would have been more motivated to defend it. It would only have to spring up once or a few times anywhere in the world for it to easily spread and come to dominate most agricultural societies, either through conquest or through the "adopt my neighbor's obviously superior practice" method. Now that great mass of males were getting some pussy, the leader could turn them outwards and direct their aggression against neighbors in order to take their land.

I think the one piece of evidence that you do have is the gender imbalance. While it's true that less advanced societies probably had much higher male mortality rates which would have led to an excess of females over males, I think that this is more true of hunter-gatherer type societies, where despite the lower absolute number of casualties from warfare, losing a few men from your clan or tribe could really take a bite out of the sex ratio. Agricultural societies had more absolute death from warfare only because the population was higher, but the actual % of men killed was simply not high enough to create the imbalances you're talking about.

There would have been an excess of females over males in agricultural societies, but not as huge as you are suggesting. Some from very poor families that could not afford a dowry probably would have found work as prostitutes and females from defeated enemies would of course become slaves, and could be used sexually by their masters. I think in this sense we do see some limited polygyny, but only in the sense of the absolute lowest women in the society being used as slaves or prostitutes.

I think we can look no further than the Roman Republic for some evidence here. During it's expansionary phase (before the debauchery that may or may not have actually existed with the later Romans), this was a very sexually conservative society, at least for the women. Women were married off young and having sex with another man's wife would have been a capital offense. Culturally, they placed a huge value on virtuous and

chaste women. Yet the early Romans were one of the most warlike people that ever lived. Their lives essentially revolved around war and agriculture. Their extreme sexual conservatism allowed them to direct their energy outward and to conquer the Mediterranean world.

I think this also torpedoed the absurd idea often bandied about that sexual conservatism is somehow an invention of Christianity. This is ridiculous. Sexual conservatism is an invention of AGRICULTURE. An agricultural society that has evolved beyond a clan/tribal organization where everyone knows everyone else cannot survive without it.

Now none of this is to say that we should be sexually conservative today. This whole thing only works with the social and legal framework in place to enforce it, which clearly no longer exists. So feel free to channel your inner hunter gatherer warlord and create that harem to your heart's content.

Ramesses_ • 26 points • 1 October, 2018 08:51 PM

I think the simplest evidence of our inherent monogamy is how we feel about other dudes fucking our women: horrified. We did not evolve to share but we did evolve to fuck around. And that's true of both sexes.

[deleted] • 9 points • 1 October, 2018 11:50 PM*

This feeling would not preclude polygyny though (1 man + 2 or more women). I think that in a pure state of nature, we are quasi-monogamous. Some of the top status males will be polygynous, some males will be monogamous, and some will be shut out of the sexual market place. The natural lifespan of these relationships would likely not be "for life" like in marriage, but almost certainly would be long enough to keep the father around until the child can at least walk.

Some people (not talking about OP) actually believe that our natural state is like a polygamous chimpanzee fuck-fest, but this is absurd on its face. There is clear evidence that this is not true. Mate guarding is a completely natural feeling. No one teaches us to do it. We wouldn't feel the urge to mate guard if women were meant to openly sleep around. Both males and females also produce pair bonding hormones after sex that encourage coupling. This is also a natural feeling and denying it is as silly as claiming we are 100% monogamous.

KeffirLime • 6 points • 2 October, 2018 06:46 AM*

Mate guarding has more to do with courting a prospective mate for the continuation of life, and then the protection of that prospective mate before/after life has been born, and less to do with a monogamous instinct.

If you've ever had multiple women, you will find that your mate guarding instinct still kicks in when any one of your prospects are under threat.

uebermacht[] • 4 points • 1 October, 2018 10:27 PM

TRP 101: Women share a high value man than a faithful loser.

Ramesses_ • 11 points • 1 October, 2018 11:17 PM

That's not untrue but be aware of the context. Women will happily share alphas for sex but rarely will they ever be happy to share commitment (resources).

To illustrate think of all the tales of soft polygamy on the red pill (including this one): it's one man who has given his commitment to a main girl and she's happy to stick with him while he fucks other girls. That's very different to true polygamy where multiple women share a husband or boyfriend exclusively. The women the dude is banging on the side aren't *also* exclusive to him except in exceedingly rare cases.

In the reverse the same concept applies. Men will "share" a hot girl over snagging a single fat uggo for themselves who no one else is fucking. Case in point: all our plates. They are almost always fucking other guys. But we keep fucking them even though we could go way down the scale and get exclusive sex from a very unattractive woman.

Women want a man's commitment (resources) exclusively for herself. Men want a woman's body exclusively for himself. These are two sides of the same coin. Neither sex is *happy* to share though they will. The real key difference is that men want to be first and women want to be last. A woman's past matters far more to us and almost not at all to them. A man's future resources are what they are obsessed with locking down.

KeffirLime • 5 points • 2 October, 2018 07:18 AM

The women the dude is banging on the side aren't *also* exclusive to him
all our plates. They are almost always fucking other guys

You're talking about post-birth control behaviour, which is not reflective of our biological nature. If anything it serves as a caveat to our biological nature.

For men fucking around would result in increased probability of his genetic material being passed on.

For women without birth control, it would lead to pregnancy(vulnerable) and close post natal care. It's in her best interest to only select the best mate possible for procreation.

it's one man who has given his commitment to a main girl and she's happy to stick with him
while he fucks other girls

Because she is getting the security she requires, while still obtaining a high value male

That's very different to true polygamy where multiple women share a husband or boyfriend
exclusively

They all receive the security they require, while still obtaining a high value male.

Men will "share" a hot girl over snagging a single fat uggo for themselves who no one else is
fucking

Natural selection. Men selecting for highest possible value mate. They will gladly fuck the hot women and the fat uggo, increases his gene's chances

Women want a man's commitment (resources) exclusively for herself.

She wants the resources, if she can get that, she is happy.

Men want a woman's body exclusively for himself.

They want first option to fuck(impregnate for procreation and passing of genes)

[deleted] • 2 points • 1 October, 2018 11:52 PM

Women will happily share alphas for sex but rarely will they ever be happy to share
commitment (resources).

It's hard to know if this is driven by culture or biology though. In some cultures women will in fact share a man on an equal status. In the west this is rarely the case (plates notwithstanding) due

to our long tradition of monogamous marriage. One woman is usually the "official" mate and the others have some sort of mistress status.

dr_warlock • 7 points • 1 October, 2018 11:33 PM*

The rulers of a 'monogamous society' (ie Kings, emperors, popes, high priests, the rich) had multiple women, even a harem guarded by defeated enemies whose dick and balls were cut off and replaced with a lead pipe in the urethra (eunuchs). A main woman and family, the rest were cucked men, pregnant sex slaves/servants, and side bitches. Multiple families hanging around. Monogamy is for the masses.

[deleted] • 5 points • 1 October, 2018 11:38 PM*

I did address that in my post. Aristocrats would take their female slaves and poor women whose families could not afford a dowry may have ended up as prostitutes, even a sexually chaste society like Republican Rome where there were no kings, emperors, popes, or eunuchs.

Chaddeus_Rex • 2 points • 2 October, 2018 12:59 AM

Patricians in Republican Rome HAD harems though...go read about the orgies they engaged in. Particularly this was popular with successful Consuls and was part of their Triumph.

Emperors arose from the Consular class. And Consuls themselves were like mini Emperors in Republican Rome. Especially during the time of Julius Caesar.

[deleted] • 2 points • 2 October, 2018 01:05 AM

Patricians in Republican Rome HAD harems though...go read about the orgies they engaged in. Particularly this was popular with successful Consuls and was part of their Triumph.

Never heard of this... can you provide a source? Consuls were not mini emperors. They were mini chief executives whose term lasted one year. They were firmly part of the aristocracy. Also Caesar is the tail end of the Republic. This was during the time period when Romans themselves were lamenting the loss of their virtuous past. I'm more referring to the early and mid republican period.

Chaddeus_Rex • 2 points • 2 October, 2018 01:24 AM

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016230959290009S>

Chaddeus_Rex • 0 points • 2 October, 2018 01:19 AM

Never heard of this... can you provide a source?

Go read any introductory textbook on Roman history. I forget which one i used in my classics course.

Consuls were not mini emperors. They were mini chief executives whose term lasted one year.

No...they were mini-emperors for the simple reason that they had absolute power in executive decisions in times of war and did not need to go through the senate. Case in point Cincinnatus who willingly gave up power after defeating the enemies of Rome. This was so rare that he was made into a legend in the Republic.

[deleted] • 3 points • 2 October, 2018 01:53 AM

Cincinnatus is famous for holding the office of dictator, not consul. This was a special office that was used in emergencies. Not going to converse further with you since you're so far off the mark on everything.

Chaddeus_Rex • 1 point • 2 October, 2018 04:00 PM

He was Consul but held the office of Dictator. Only a Consul could hold it.

You clearly dont know shit about history. Why are you arguing? You cant even read a link properly and here you are arguing with me. Fucking hilarious.

zue3 • 2 points • 8 October, 2018 12:16 AM

Cannot agree more. I dunno what the op thinks he was trying to say originally but it was a load of horseshit. Thanks for pointing it out and refuting it so I didn't have to.

Whisper[S] • 3 points • 2 October, 2018 12:23 AM

I've tried to refute your arguments

You haven't refuted them. You've reworded them, and agreed with every single thing I said. Which makes me wonder what on earth you *thought* I was saying.

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 October, 2018 01:32 PM

You haven't refuted them. You've reworded them, and agreed with every single thing I said.

I was surprised that I had to scroll down this far to see this.

[deleted] • 13 points • 1 October, 2018 06:01 PM

Linking to the website; I like it.

Learned a new word, too.

uebermacht[] • 8 points • 1 October, 2018 06:13 PM

I would like to give you reddit gold for this gem of information, Whisper. However reddit does not earn to be invested into anymore.

redpillschool • 14 points • 1 October, 2018 06:34 PM

If you tip on TRP.RED, authors get payouts in bitcoin.

sorry_mommy • -6 points • 1 October, 2018 06:51 PM*

Money for TRP wisdom? Donator-only sections? How long til a full pay-wall?

redpillschool • 16 points • 1 October, 2018 06:59 PM

And this will be the real death of TRP.

Money for TRP wisdom? Donator-only sections? How long til a full pay-wall?

This generation and your gimme-gimme attitudes.

Did you know that TRP.RED has been a personal project for me for years, and I've been working and

paying for work on it for years just to put us in a position that men wouldn't lose this valuable content and connection in the very likely case that reddit pulls the plug on us.

And despite donations, if I were to count every penny I've spent on this project I am still very clearly in the red and if this project keeps moving forward at this rate I will likely never really break even.

And I do all of this in an effort to keep this information free and flowing.

And Whisper gives his time to write these articles on the absolutely free for all blog platform we've been developing. And you can gain all the value from this post without doing anything for him in return.

And some kiddo on Reddit decides to bitch about this because he thinks he deserves the fruit of all of our labors for free. Because I added the ability to tip content makers for their service. TIPS.

The good news is for you, kid, is that we're going to keep on truckin' despite your complete lack of respect for the men here doing real work for other men. We will remain committed to the free flow of communication and information between men.

We're not doing it for you. We're doing it for men.

Just know I'm not going to stop you from participating in the community and deriving value from it. But if you had an ounce of integrity you'd either leave a tip for Whisper or apologize for shitting on this mountain of work we've been doing.

Whisper[S] • 4 points • 2 October, 2018 01:07 AM

This is the same sort of jackass who gets mad at buskers for passing the hat. Probably still that phase of life where mommy and daddy are paying for tuition, rent, and groceries.

I swear sometimes you and I should just shut down the whole thing and start teaching thousand-dollars-a-head seminars for beta herbs, not because I need the money, but because people who have paid for something will be incentivized to fucking listen.

If /u/sorry_mommy is so afraid of being exploited that he's triggered just by seeing a tip jar on the counter, then he is going to have some serious work to do to shed his loser mindset.

sorry_mommy • 0 points • 1 October, 2018 09:02 PM

I know it's a project that has been under development for years, for, I thought, a noble purpose. Now you're telling me it was for profit? This doesn't sit well.

TRP has, in my mind, always been a great open community for all to participate. I thought TRP.red was a sort of basement-project fallback in case the inevitable happened to the subreddit.

I totally respect you and the others for putting in your time, effort, skills, and knowledge into building such a website. But that's all I'll ever pay - respect and gratitude. If you wanna ask for donations to cover site costs and shit, that's one thing; but when I see cyber-begging for TIPS (what is this, MFC?), I thought I read something about premium-member-only content, and advertisements all on top of it...

I'm not here to tell you how to do your business, just to anonymously bitch about shit that doesn't concern me on the internet.

tl;dr: thanks for everything and I'll shut up now

IVlaskerade • 3 points • 1 October, 2018 09:19 PM

Now you're telling me it was for profit? This doesn't sit well.

A) No they aren't. They're telling you that it's never going to turn a profit.

B) You aren't required to pay for *anything*.

C) What's wrong with making money on the side?

redpillschool • 3 points • 2 October, 2018 02:20 AM

Gonna need to get your eyes checked. I said I'm doing it *despite the lack of profit*.

Rian_Stone • 5 points • 1 October, 2018 07:11 PM*

deleted

LiveAFTSOV3 points 1 October, 2018 07:31 PM [recovered]

It doesnt even have to be money just offer something of value.

Money just makes trading easier cus we can all agree on it.

If not, you fix my plumbing ill inspect your engine

Rian_Stone • 1 point • 1 October, 2018 07:33 PM*

deleted

KeffirLime • 1 point • 1 October, 2018 09:01 PM

A culture of support would go a long way to preserving authentic, original, quality content.

When it comes for free to you know that it comes at the cost of the creator. Be that in time or money.

FredLetsPlays3 points 1 October, 2018 08:05 PM* [recovered]

You couldnt give gold even if you wanted, gilding isn't possible on quarantined subreddits

red_philosopher • 2 points • 1 October, 2018 08:16 PM

I had some ideas covering this topic some time ago. I argued that men have a dual mating strategy as well, to appease each if the female mating strategies. Each has their pros and cons, and the best approach is to achieve both, much as women are wont to do.

Good wisdom. It looks like TRP.Red is underway.

j_arbuckle2012 • 1 point • 1 October, 2018 11:36 PM*

This. r- and K-selection. Many women, low investment, or one woman, high investment. Driven entirely by economic, cultural, and environmental factors. The Red Pill is really nothing more than a reaction from society going from the veneer of K to r. Its true shift to r happened at the time of the industrial revolution, we just didn't notice and were kept deliberately ignorant.

Rian_Stone • 4 points • 1 October, 2018 06:14 PM*

deleted

LiveAFTSOV0 points 1 October, 2018 06:57 PM* [recovered]

Im sure being a Terpers plate is one of Kitten's holiday-time fantasies

Rian_Stone • 2 points • 1 October, 2018 06:58 PM*

deleted

thepanda37 • 3 points • 1 October, 2018 06:18 PM*

That's the type of poster that gets vanguarded now?

Tell me more about how peaceful were ancient rome and greece and, you know, any civilization that was built on the nuclear family and monogamy. Arabs conquered most of the ancient world pretty much as soon as Islam put *restrictions* on polygamy.

It's good to refer to history, but not in this atrocious manner.

FieldLine • 8 points • 1 October, 2018 07:25 PM*

Back in the good ol' days, the only men who came home at the end of a day fighting the barbarians were the "alpha males". So polygyny not only made sense, but was required to populate a new generation of men capable of tearing the limbs off members of the enemy hoard.

As society became more civilized, monogamy became the necessary default because the "beta" men weren't being killed anymore and needed some kind of (sexual) outlet since women would rather share an "alpha" male than get exclusivity from a "beta" one. And as we all know, guys who don't have access to pussy tend to Elliot Rodger themselves into the media.

Consider what's happening today in all the "shithole countries": because all the Allahus are sexually suppressed they are Akbarring themselves for whatever cause they are told to believe in by their leadership. It's much easy to control someone when you don't allow them to fullfill their basic biological needs.

Aha, you will say, in that case monogamy is *good* for society as a whole. You'd be correct in arriving at that conclusion, but that way of life ain't coming back.

IMO this whole problem could be easily solved if the all the college thots and whores would give that weird guy in freshman bio a blowjob once in a while.

That's the type of poster that gets vanguarded now?

Nope. The type of poster who gets a vanguard tag is *someone who helped create TRP*.

Oops.

[deleted] • 1 point • 2 October, 2018 01:58 AM

Agree with this. Very similar to what I wrote in my comment up top.

[deleted] • 7 points • 1 October, 2018 07:13 PM*

Youre making a totally counterfactual argument - all succesful societies/civilizations are monogomous or mostly monogomous. There is literature proving polygamous societies to be more violent and less sustainable in the long term than monogamous ones.

thepanda37 • 1 point • 1 October, 2018 07:24 PM

What do you think I'm saying? "Successful" is not a contradiction to "warlike", on the contrary, which in turn is not the same as "violent", on the contrary.

[deleted] • 1 point • 1 October, 2018 07:41 PM

I can see what youre saying, and I agree with you totally from an individual perspective, but peace is

key to long term prosperity, otherwise we'd still be nomadic and tribalistic. Islam is still monotheistic and emphasizes monogamy if less so than Christianity. But vikings were gone almost entirely by the 12th century, pagans in Europe by the late 15th - violent societies do not bring long term success, therefore monogamy is the gender dynamic selected for by human history and evolution.

Rian_Stone • 7 points • 1 October, 2018 06:56 PM

Damn, was really hoping the tourists would stay away after the quarantine

thepanda37 • 7 points • 1 October, 2018 08:26 PM

There used to be more of a consensus here, that the strongest society was that of enforced virtue on women. Now it seems that it's overrun by boys larping as Conan the Barbarian upvoting threads like these.

[deleted] • 1 point • 2 October, 2018 12:58 AM

This is 100% true. They'll even link to videos with Rollo where he basically says the same thing as us. There was a post not long ago where Rollo is on some guy's podcast and they talk about how monogamy used to work in the west and the effects of its decline.

Winterknight82475125 • 2 points • 2 October, 2018 12:22 AM

Ehh... you can stop now bro. it's ok, Kavanaugh will get confirmed and you can cry about it somewhere else.

redpillschool • 5 points • 1 October, 2018 06:33 PM

That's the type of poster that gets vanguarded now?

You must be new here. Whisper's not just a vanguard, he's the grand daddy of all vanguards. He was spitting red pill truths before the invention of time itself.

Whisper[S] • 8 points • 1 October, 2018 06:56 PM

Cut the poor lad a break. He thinks ancient Greece and Rome were monogynous, so his struggle is clearly tough enough already.

DocMerlin • 3 points • 1 October, 2018 09:48 PM

Rome (mostly-ish) was, they saw the polygyny as barbarous.

Whisper[S] • 2 points • 2 October, 2018 12:39 AM

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016230959290009S>

You're confusing monogamy with monogyny.

thepanda37 • 2 points • 2 October, 2018 10:51 AM*

What? That's exactly what you're doing, have you even read the article that you google searched in 2 seconds? The conclusion of the intro shows precisely why your characterization of monogamy and polygyny is wrong, and your premise false.

Endorsed posters used to be the ones who knew their stuff, not the ones denying that monogamy in Europe was the norm for thousands of years.

thepanda37 • 2 points • 2 October, 2018 10:34 AM

My dude, I'm not the one applying *monogyny* to humans.

KeffirLime • 1 point • 2 October, 2018 11:20 AM

I'm not sure who told you it can't apply to humans

thepanda37 • 2 points • 2 October, 2018 11:29 AM

Because it just doesn't. Well, as far as it's not just a weird (and wrong) way of saying monogamy.

KeffirLime • 1 point • 2 October, 2018 12:32 PM

Humans are mammals, we are animals. It's different to monogamy. Monogyny is focused on the male perspective, the male has only one partner and the female is free to have multiple. Monogamy is where both the female and male select to only have one partner.

thepanda37 • 1 point • 2 October, 2018 12:41 PM

Exactly, and this doesn't even apply to mammals. Unless you're inventing a cumbersome way to define alpha and beta. With humans, something like this would have to mean a shortage of women, which in turn would have to mean massive stress on the society, the sort of which undoubtedly would lead to some hierarchy with *polygamy* on top.

KeffirLime • 1 point • 2 October, 2018 02:43 PM

It's a framework, and can apply to any conscious being that adopts that framework, for whatever reason, be it biological or cultural.

something like this would have to mean a shortage of women

Or cultural influence

Could be someone loyal to their wife while she fucks around.

thepanda37 • 1 point • 4 October, 2018 09:21 PM*

No it's simply a term from zoology that afaik doesn't even apply to mammals at all, this has nothing to do with cultural influence. Again, unless you just mean to say *monogamy*, or maybe polyandry or, in your example - "cuck". Which OP did not, because he wanted to sound more photosynthesis than his PhD girlfriend or whatever, who very clearly did mean *monogamy*.

TheRedRand • 1 point • 9 October, 2018 01:06 AM

I've read about polyandry, where multiple men are legally married to one woman. From what I understood, this happens when resources are very scarce and the men must all work just to care for and provide for a child. Say Husband #1 is married, but has to leave his wife and child to fight or gather resources and the wife and child are left without much to survive on at all - enter Husband #2. Husband #2 is usually picked by Husband #1, and has his full approval, and is usually a brother or close relative, in order to preserve bloodlines should the wife become pregnant by Husband #2 if Husband #1 is away. It's really interesting.

ex_addict_bro • 5 points • 1 October, 2018 08:13 PM

Dude probably thinks “señior endorsed” are Mexicans

Whisper[S] • 5 points • 2 October, 2018 01:44 AM

Now I want to EC a Mexican just so we can give him this flair.

max_peenor • 1 point • 1 October, 2018 08:41 PM

Uh, no. They didn't take Byzantine. They never broke into Europe. They barely held the Berbers. They got stopped buttoke my Mongols, who in turned crushed the last Arab Caliphate (and had a good time trotting horses over the last Arab Caliph). Tuko-Mongolians did most of what you are thinking about, though they got stopped buttcold by the Europeans.

Chaddeus_Rex • 1 point • 2 October, 2018 01:24 AM

Not Europeans, but smelly Russians

max_peenor • 1 point • 2 October, 2018 02:16 AM

The Russians dealt with different moguls and it was over a century before (sorry, can't remember the exact dates. I'm thinking 1350 v 1480, but I'm pulling that out of my ass).

Chaddeus_Rex • 0 points • 2 October, 2018 01:05 AM

Neither Ancient Greece nor Rome where particulairly monogamous. Especially not the warlike races amongst them (the Spartans). Monogamy is detrimental to a warrior society, because everyone seeks to protect their own, but if paternity is indeterminate its easier to succeed.

Also, fyi, Islam was never monogamous and allows open Polygamy. Early Islam was especially Polygamous and allowed the particulairly devout (those who killed most infidels) many wives.

[deleted] • 1 point • 2 October, 2018 01:08 AM

Monogamy is detrimental to a warrior society, because everyone seeks to protect their own, but if paternity is indeterminate its easier to succeed.

That anyone could come to this conclusion is absurd beyond imagination.

thepanda37 • 1 point • 2 October, 2018 07:39 AM

you're either wrong or missing my point. dude, being able to fuck all the slaves you can is not polygamy in this context. Polygamy has always been both cause and effect of chaos and decadence. It's called enjoy the decline, not rise of the barbarians, for a reason.

Chaddeus_Rex • 1 point • 2 October, 2018 03:59 PM

But the Romans didnt only fuck slaves. They often jad freewomen as mistresses.

Read the link, monogamy was implemented by Augustus for purely selfish, competitive reasons.

thepanda37 • 1 point • 4 October, 2018 09:18 PM

"Selfish" as it brought the order that was needed by bringing to an end the practice of individuals accumulating wealth while breeding a class of bastards entitled to nothing. "Mistresses" = by that logic no monogamous society existed ever. That doesn't make for a polygamous society, in fact, it all rather showcases the divide between the patricians and the rest of roman society which led to

the Senate's downfall.

Chaddeus_Rex • 1 point • 5 October, 2018 03:10 PM

"Selfish" as it brought the order that was needed by bringing to an end the practice of individuals accumulating wealth

Nonsense. This practice existed from the days of the early republic. It motivated people to try to gain the highest position possible to get access to women.

"Mistresses" = by that logic no monogamous society existed ever.

Yes. If there is no stigma on having mistresses in society, it essentially creates a harem which by definition is polygamy. 'Marriage' is just one of many rituals to say that this women belongs to a particular man.

it all rather showcases the divide between the patricians and the rest of roman society which led to the Senate's downfall

What led to the senates downfall, was clever men (like Julius Ceasar or Sulla or Octavian) seeing an opportunity for self aggrandizement and using their talents to take it via the route of 'dictator'.

VasiliyZaitzev • 2 points • 1 October, 2018 07:55 PM

Polygyny also gives low status women access to high status men. At least young, hot low status women.

Have you considered tying kitten up? It will take "responsibility" away from her, and she and FunSize can explore the new power dynamic.

griz3lda • 1 point • 2 October, 2018 02:24 AM

Nope. If she's insecure she needs to have a chance to parade around like the alpha female for a minute. Tie FunSize up. Let Kitten say what she wants you to do to her (in a co-domming way, not you serving her way). I do this w my LTR alllll the time and she loves it, and stays out of the way for the rest of the times I meet up w the other girls. It's just a game, so this won't set bossy expectations for the real relationship. And if FunSize is so chill she should be down.

LiveAFTSOV1 points 1 October, 2018 06:57 PM* **[recovered]**

TRP.Red Wont let me comment on your post, it keeps saying, comment cannot be blank even tho I wrote this:

Our lives are a battle ground! Great fucking post whisper.

I got a question though, what do you think about steering women to revolve their entire lives around you, slowly, through tough love and domination? *"Im growing, grow with me or my branches will break your ceiling!"*

You know, showing her that other women are seeking what you as a man can offer, and giving her a chance to uplift / change herself to meet our personal standards?

I see it as virtuous & right, + I get to keep the bond/time I built with that individual if they make it through the changes & grow stronger -- would really like to consider your take on it.

People in such conditions need to find ways to act on the sexual realpolitik (or the relationship/hookup won't

work at all) without being publicly shamed (which tends to happen to women whose men are less monogynous than the standard, or to men who are less polygynous than the standard).

Im currently living in a Polygynous relationship now, main girl with the freedom to meet up and fuck any girl I want (had damn near 20 last month, was a crazy vacation.)

I put myself on blast on my personal facebook all the time, talking about my polygynous life and how happy the women I share it with are -- the normies all seem to love my facebook musings.

Ill conclude with this thot : "You care for your women, so act like it. She isn't irreplaceable, so dont act like that. Give her the opportunity to be everything she can for you and if she cant, kick her to the curb!"

j_arbuckle2012 • 3 points • 1 October, 2018 11:21 PM

Bleh. Your subcommunication will out. The medium is the message dude. Don't do it overtly, just present her the choice with your actions.

Zech4riah • 1 point • 1 October, 2018 07:34 PM

Nice post when it comes to content but I actually have easier time reading clinical studies in the medical field than this post. I had to read many sentences 3-4 times to understand what you are saying.

I'm not a native speaker so you can take this feedback with a grain of salt.

[deleted] • 1 point • 1 October, 2018 10:24 PM*

This is interesting. Could you point me towards what it is based on?

What is interesting now is that women can potentially out-resource us. So even beta bux should start to dwindle. It's weird to think the majority of us will still end up monogamous, despite all the bashing it gets and the clear negatives of it.

Whisper[S] • 3 points • 2 October, 2018 02:08 AM

There are plenty of available sources on historical sexual practices.

The thing this article is that early-stage TRPers are gonna hate it, because it points out that their affection for monogyny is a result of their early-stage values. Makes them feel like I'm calling them losers.

Early-stage TRPers want a girlfriend, because spinning plates is hard. And they want "no cheating" because they're worried about her loyalty to them.

More experienced guys don't care, because spinning plates isn't hard for them. And they are more worried about being trapped than being abandoned.

[deleted] • 1 point • 2 October, 2018 09:33 AM*

The thing this article is that early-stage TRPers are gonna hate it, because it points out that their affection for monogyny is a result of their early-stage values. Makes them feel like I'm calling them losers.

I dont know if theyd feel that bad about it. Well I personally find this kind of stuff very interesting but it's fairly hard to relate it to society today (most of the time). At the very least it's complex.

Polygyny is a mating strategy optimized for replacing combat losses, because one man can easily keep multiple women pregnant.

The problem here is that women don't want to share. I read that before monogamy, human men were loners who would rock up and impregnate a female, and then fuck off to the next one.

As people realised the strength in numbers, resources in the tribe had to be shared.

The men saw that they had to tolerate sexual competition in order to increase the strength of the tribe. So a new warrior meant competition but also improved survival chances and resource gathering.

A new woman in the tribe got shat on by the other women as they didn't wanna share the man's resources.

All this might be related in a hard-wiring sense, but I don't hold too much value in this as relates to modern times. This is chiefly because if I'm sleeping with multiple women then I'm not sharing my resources cos hopefully I'm not getting them pregnant. There are no real resources involved, aside from my free time. The true test of a woman accepting you taking on other lover's is if you wind up having a family together.

Imagine our culture as it is, but without birth control?

arythmetic • 1 point • 3 October, 2018 08:39 AM

Great pull toward trp-red at the end there. I'm gripped.