

# 8,000 YEARS AGO, 17 WOMEN REPRODUCED FOR EVERY ONE MAN

100 upvotes | 26 October, 2017 | by Ludakrit

---

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

---

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

---

# Comments

---

[deleted] • 56 points • 26 October, 2017 02:21 PM

The 80/20 rule has existed for longer than I realised.

[deleted] 26 October, 2017 03:31 PM

[deleted]

NietzscheExplosion • 30 points • 26 October, 2017 04:35 PM

No when she chooses 17/1 is the result.

Civilization tries to pull it to 1/1, but we really never got better than 4/1.

78561 • 15 points • 26 October, 2017 05:41 PM

I think if men chooses... kill the men of the competing tribes and rape their women

NietzscheExplosion • 13 points • 26 October, 2017 06:28 PM

A common misconception. Yes in those times conflicts did happen, but in very limited ways.

There was simply too much space for large scale warfare. Those times were FAR more peaceful than even our world today!

fmanly • 13 points • 26 October, 2017 04:50 PM

This isn't just the choice of the 17 females. This is also the choice of the 1 male.

In a society where women can choose, or in a society where 1/17 men can force the other 16 to do whatever they want them to, then you get this result.

I bet that is actually the norm throughout human history. Democracy and liberty are certainly not the norm going back in time.

logicAndFury • 6 points • 26 October, 2017 08:55 PM

I agree, men throwing each other under the bus for woman is as old as time. Wonder if it is only cause of the positive feedback loop evolution creates

fmanly • 1 point • 27 October, 2017 02:13 PM

Stardusk recently did a video on this topic. It is like Cypher in The Matrix wanting to go back to being blue-pilled. The red pill isn't necessarily a recipe for happiness - sometimes ignorance can be bliss.

It probably isn't the only cause of evolutionary improvement, but sexual dimorphism is very common and there is clearly a reason for that. If you look at caste-based animals like ants and bees it gets taken to an entirely different level.

[deleted] 26 October, 2017 03:35 PM\*

[deleted]

[deleted] 26 October, 2017 03:43 PM

[deleted]

[deleted] 26 October, 2017 03:47 PM\*

[deleted]

[deleted] • 5 points • 26 October, 2017 07:19 PM

I agree. The women's choice to reproduce with "physically best looking male" no matter of the intelligence of that male leads society to degeneration. Therefore, I think that while smart people still exist, some sort of "genetic improvement" should be implemented in medicine, so that every unborn fetus should have genetic medical treatment (without knowledge of his Chad-fucking mother), so that genes of Chad are altered and replaced with genes of most intelligent people. This can fully destroy women's mating strategy and it is the only hope for humanity.

FritzLn • 3 points • 27 October, 2017 05:36 AM

damn this would be a great movie plot

logicAndFury • 1 point • 26 October, 2017 08:53 PM

Yep, the female gender became the filter and besides trying to find the best farmer, they failed.

And now we have the masses of idiots

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 October, 2017 12:58 AM

IE where brains not brawn matter

Anybody with brains can work out and get fit. Too many people use "I am very smart" as an excuse not to stay in shape.

The thing is, fitness is only a small part of what women select for mating. The behavior that should be corrected among women should be the things that men can't change, like height, hair and facial features.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 October, 2017 01:14 AM

Imagine if we took the top 5% of women looks wise and bred them with the top .5% of men intelligence wise.

Pz5 • 1 point • 26 October, 2017 08:11 PM

Perhaps we are looking at ancient gold diggers. Women choose wealth over the average man.

Mr-5-5 • 2 points • 26 October, 2017 04:46 PM

Is 80 percent women? or 80 percent beta males?

[deleted] 26 October, 2017 05:02 PM

[deleted]

Mr-5-5 • 4 points • 26 October, 2017 05:14 PM

Thank you !

fmanly • 5 points • 26 October, 2017 05:13 PM

Beta males. Women in general always seek to mate with the best male possible. Men are happy to mate with multiple women, and women would rather mate with the man all the other women are mating with than have one weaker man all to themselves.

Essentially humans are polygamous by nature.

[deleted] • 22 points • 26 October, 2017 04:18 PM\*

Legalize RAPE

NietzscheExplosion • 11 points • 26 October, 2017 04:37 PM

Neolithic, or immediately post neolithic Chad was really just a super farmer or someone who could protect or trade or pilfer the goods.

That basically covers the 4 main archetypes. Some of these bitches probably fucked all 4.

LetsGoAllTheWhey • 2 points • 26 October, 2017 05:24 PM

Or maybe they just clubbed some hot bitch on the head and fucked her. I doubt there were any laws protecting women then.

Also, with all the battles between tribes a lot of women were taken by the winners and kept as whatever (hoes, slaves, wives).

NietzscheExplosion • 1 point • 26 October, 2017 06:29 PM

Later... much later.

1v1crown • 11 points • 26 October, 2017 03:33 PM

Damn wish I lived back then... I'd have 17 bitches.

Duchat • 21 points • 26 October, 2017 03:57 PM

You would have a minimum of 116 problems then.

delta9mm • 7 points • 26 October, 2017 03:59 PM

IMO everyone alive today is the descendant of a chad, but female genes are junk, and because of that the chad DNA is actually weaker because of female breeding. That's due to the fact that most women reproduce, which means that junk DNA is more likely to happen in females than in males.

fmanly • 16 points • 26 October, 2017 05:02 PM

This isn't true at all. Just as 100% of your DNA was in a Chad at some point, the same is true of those women (well, mitochondria are the exception, but they're the exception for men too).

It isn't a matter of men having good genes and women having bad genes. Overall they basically have the same genes.

What IS different is how they're expressed. Stick the same genes in a man vs a woman and you get larger differences in men. If you take a gene that makes somebody physically stronger it will make the man a lot stronger than the woman (when both are compared to the average for their sex). If you take a gene that makes somebody weaker it will make the man a lot weaker (when both are compared to the average for their sex).

Basically women are relatively generic and uniform, while men showcase their genes. Men are the

genetic risk-takers. Evolution has opted to make women the safe bet, and men the disposable experiments. The job of women is to make sure there is a next generation, and that it comes from the best men. The job of men is to either be the best man, to help the best man's kids survive, or to die and get out of the way for the best man and his kids.

Yeah, it is a cruel system, but it works.

Look at bees. For one queen you'll have hundreds of drones. Exactly one of them gets to mate, once. Their only real purpose is to be disposable test subjects to figure out which genes result in the best flying endurance. The one that does the best passes on his sperm to the queen, and then even that one is disposable.

Evolution does what works, not what makes us happy. The happiness part is just chemicals in our brain that gets us to do what evolution needs us to do until we are no longer needed. For human reproductive success men need to climb all over each other to battle ourselves to the top of the heap to get our turn to impregnate some girl. Now, humans mate more than once, so then we get to fight to stay on top of the pile, and each time the girl is fertile she picks the guy on top. That's our job.

Since we have brains we can of course choose not to do our job, but all the chemicals that give us pleasure/etc are still going to nudge us in that direction.

delta9mm • 2 points • 26 October, 2017 07:05 PM

that system is flawed. Nature must be overthrown and a new regime must be installed. *queue villianious speech here* burn every forest, raze every village, leave no mitochondria untorched, leave no keep undefiled, and ensure that the kings daughter has been properly raped *queue rape scene*

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 October, 2017 07:10 PM

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bN5AXq4WvZI>

logicAndFury • 2 points • 26 October, 2017 09:04 PM

Evolution's only purpose is to improve genes, it's the best way in the past. Intelligent design can surpass evolution much more quickly.

Ironically, evolution will eventually be "evolved out" of civilization if it is intellegently managed (kind of a big if).

Think of it this way, your either an animal and have no agency, or you have intelligence and can decide your specy's destiny.

fmanly • 1 point • 27 October, 2017 02:09 PM

Genes vs memes. :)

However, I wouldn't underestimate the role of genes. Intelligence and health have genetic components. Those have huge impacts on the success of a society. You can spend billions of dollars on treatments for diabetes, but if people simply didn't get diabetes you could be spending that money on something else.

ScatteredCastles • 9 points • 26 October, 2017 05:19 PM

Somewhat related...

One of my favorite bits of trivia: we're all the product of incest. You have two parents, four grandparents, eight great-grandparents, and so on. The number of ancestors doubles with each generation going back in time. If you go back 32 generations, perhaps just 700 or 800 years, you have *4.3 billion* ancestors, but that's far greater than

Earth's population back then. The explanation? You're the product of incest; it's guaranteed.

chadbhava • 6 points • 26 October, 2017 07:04 PM

wehuntedlandwhales.com

DereIzNoPoint • 3 points • 26 October, 2017 08:18 PM

This is why the 80/20 meme needs to be ditched, it gives the rich betabux (high-level beta) the false impression they're actually alpha. More accurately the rule is like 85/5 or something like that.

SnapshillBot • 2 points • 26 October, 2017 01:17 PM

Hey all. reddit decided to add an attribute to the reddit API which makes submitting comments an endeavor that becomes difficult. You may not get snapshots periodically while this issue is being resolved.

Sorry about that. :/

Snapshots:

1. *This Post* - archive.org, *megalodon.jp\**, archive.is

I am a bot. (Info / Contact)

DigitalScetis • 2 points • 26 October, 2017 03:59 PM

Simple Mendelian Genetics can explain this result without having to rely on myths of stone age chad and his seventeen moisty hoes.

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 October, 2017 04:27 PM

If that were the case why would there be a dramatic drop in the graph on the left?

DigitalScetis • 2 points • 26 October, 2017 05:06 PM

A few reasons.

Sampling error might be a reason, since the study does not measure the same sample for mDNA and Y-haplogroup. They have two different samples, and the summary makes it sound as if they are the same sample tested.

Another reason is that there's a drop in human beings *in general* around that time: plague, most likely. You'll get a drop in Y-haplogroup expression, because that's coming from the 46 chromosomes that make up the human genetic code. mDNA, however, is *mitochondrial DNA* that says less about what populations *in particular* survived, but rather, that *the species as a whole* survived.

That women survived to reproduce is a given, since we wouldn't have survived today without them. But the data say little as to *which women* survived. If they could find some haplogroup on the chromosome, or somehow measure the variation in the X sex chromosome, we'd have a better picture of what happened with populations of women.

But the Y-group measured? It actually says very little about which males were having sex, who was reproducing, and how many women per man men were reproducing with.

All it measures is how many Y-groups exist today, compared with what scientists *speculate* might have existed at one time, based upon a rather hypothetical calculation of the probability of mutations over a span of 10,000 years or so.

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 October, 2017 05:14 PM

Thanks for the explanation :)

NietzscheExplosion • 1 point • 26 October, 2017 07:23 PM

Paradigm shift. Food production allowed more free time.

The\_Law\_of\_the\_Land • 2 points • 26 October, 2017 08:56 PM

And I'm calling BULLSHIT due to logic and common sense.

Common sense would tell us that 8000 years ago, 17 women most of whom would be pregnant starting 15 and dead by 30 can't contribute much in the fields. It is on the backs of men that society has been built. Sorry but females the primary source of labor in a pre-industrial age just sounds too stupid even for these pseudoscientists.

Now the logical argument against this, mitochondrial DNA mtDNA (see the works of geneticist Spencer Wells) can not be tracked through lineage with any accuracy. Also, you can only Y-DNA lineage for males. How the fuck do you draw a conclusion that the 3.5 billion females on the planet were subject to the same rules as the males in the sample population.

Finally if you observe more primitive human tribes today, you will notice that most all men in the tribe will mate. The agreement to trade your labor to the tribe for a m8 is a requirement which primitive man knew better than liberal paleo-geneticists.

.....

WHY? WHY LIE about the origins of man?

...

1. Man did not build civilization, women did. All 17 of them. He was just a sperm donor who spent all his time fucking to ensure that he produced hundreds of babies.
2. There was a great cataclysmic event that occurred 8000-10000 years go, that nearly ended man kind and brought our numbers down to a handful of survivors but it's one of those points of cognitive dissonance that the "scientific" community will never acknowledge. Instead we have to come up with retarded theories like this to explain why there was a bottleneck in the genetics of humanity.

DigitalScetis • 1 point • 27 October, 2017 01:35 PM

Thank you.

NietzscheExplosion • 1 point • 27 October, 2017 04:06 PM

DNA doesn't lie, that's what breaks people's minds. Hard truth.

vornash2 • 1 point • 19 January, 2018 08:35 AM

The chart is not exactly saying that primitive man didn't mate. It clearly shows a roughly equal reproduction at 50,000 years ago, which is surprising and reflects what we see in primitive (socialistic) societies that share everything.

Then you get agriculture, and suddenly something major changes in the way people behave. Slavery begins as a useful tool to acquire labor at no cost and suddenly leaders in egypt's lush Nile river valley are building pyramids to bury themselves. Since no historical record exists from 8000 years ago, we don't know what really went down. But it didn't take long for Egyptian civilization and others to boot up in a major way.

The early farmers and a few men may have made slaves of many men, killed others who resisted slavery, but

kept many of the women around for breeding and other less demanding chores.

The article is also suggesting recent evolution exists and part of it is cultural. So maybe it doesn't take millions of years to produce profound changes. And 80/20 is a cultural and generic artifact of agricultural and monogamy was also a cultural attempt to bring it back into balance, but it was incomplete.

Reprogramming\_Life • 0 points • 26 October, 2017 07:39 PM\*

I'm skeptical of any DNA evidence that goes back more than a generation or two, tbh, really altogether. I read some articles that said those ancestry tests are pretty much mostly bullshit. If they can't even come close to accurately tracing back the dna history of someone who's alive, how the fuck are they going to do it for people who died 8k years ago? lol It's bullshit to push an agenda, for funding, or just to get their names in a paper/article. It's pretty much a bunch of overpaid people guessing and manipulating data to fit their guess or concluding things based on nothing.

Scientists supposedly have this deep knowledge and understanding of DNA yet how many genetic diseases have been cured even through prevention? Fucking 0, none, nada. I wouldn't be surprised one bit if DNA is a scam, not that it doesn't exist but in how it's presented to us.

If you really want to see how scary it is, read up on how bullshit DNA analysis for crimes is utter bullshit when it gets someone convicted or gets them off a charge years after the fact. It's just another control mechanism. Again, I'm not denying DNA exist but scientists understanding of DNA itself, I think they know very little about it. <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2016/06/a-reasonable-doubt/480747/> Here's one of the articles I've read about it in the past.

If they had any real understanding of DNA super chads would be produced in female volunteers for the military or in an artificial womb. lol FOH with claims they know how many men reproduced per woman.

DigitalScetis • 2 points • 27 October, 2017 01:48 PM

What surprises me, in this particular case, isn't how we *pretend* to know more than we do about genetics.

It's that we don't even apply the simple knowledge that *we know* to be true in favor of wild theories that 16 men didn't get laid 10,000 years ago, and one man got laid 17 times more often.

That's what happens when we use something like the Y-chromosome in offspring as a proxy for getting laid. It is about as foolish as using eye color in offspring as a proxy for getting laid.

[deleted] 26 October, 2017 08:39 PM

[deleted]

[deleted] 27 October, 2017 06:55 AM

[removed]

[deleted] 27 October, 2017 09:34 AM

[deleted]