

Of Lobsters and Serial Murder

Black Label Logic | 8 February, 2018 | by Black Label Logic



In [last week's essay](#), I began an analysis of dominance hierarchies, that I will continue in this essay. I recommend reading last week's first.

Humans have many explanatory frameworks, we use physics to explain the natural world, at the most base level these are explanations of what caused an observation to happen. A research framework comes in one out of two broad categories. It can try to explain the “What” of something, or the “Why” of something. In the case of the red pill, the [old seduction community](#) was very much focused on what, “What makes that guy more successful with women”, “What do women want” and “What do women actually behave like”.

In the red pill, most of the “research” as of late has been focused on the “why”, “Why do women pick the mates they do”, “Why do women prefer these characteristics in mates”, “Why do women require higher investment from these men before they'll have sex, but less investment from this other group of men.”

As the observations were made, theories invented, and experiments conducted, many men came to the conclusion that the old framework ([the blue pill](#)) was flawed as an explanatory framework for intersexual dynamics. If one were to look at the blue pill illusion as an explanatory framework that seeks to explain intersexual dynamics and the human mating dance, there are simply too many observations that it does not explain.

- Why do women divorce men who are loyal, conscientious, predictable, loving, high earners and intelligent?
- Why are women “not happy” when they find themselves married to the type of man the traditional view would define as a catch?
- Why do women prefer bad boys?
- Why did this guy have to take her on four dates and didn't even get laid, when she hooked up with that guy after knowing him for 5 minutes?

This means that there are observations for which the explanatory framework has no real explanation.

The End Justifies The Criteria

If asked, what is the point behind intersexual dynamics, or to put in a less academic term the human mating rituals? I'm sure that many would answer "To find a mate that one can have children with", if the only acceptable configuration that one can think of for such a relationship is a long-term pair-bonded and state sanctioned union, then it follows that the criteria of for a "good mate" would follow this end goal. If one were to spend the rest of one's natural life with someone and raise children as part of a team, one would want that person to be loyal, devoted, self-sacrificing, conscientious, loving, and stable, among a myriad of traits.

In fact, the traits that make a good long-term partner are most likely many of the traits that make a person a good employee or citizen as well. I mean, you want someone who is honest, follows the law, do their best to improve their little piece of the world and is loyal, in short, someone who has "grown the hell up" and "sorted themselves out".

The characteristics that Dr. Peterson often mentions in his work, on how men need to "grow up", "stand up straight", and become pro-social, virtuous men so that they may climb the dominance hierarchy and thus become the type of men women choose as their husbands and to father their children. Is the same explanatory framework I was presented with throughout most of my childhood. Boy meets girl, boy is nice to girl, girl and boy live happily ever after. One can break this down into signal interest through asking her out, demonstrate provider capabilities, pro-social characteristics, and virtue, then be rewarded by the female's appreciation.

This model goes a long way towards explaining dating and relationships within the traditional model of long-term monogamous relationships. However, there is much data that it does not explain. For instance, one could argue that men may be putting all their pro-social characteristics that have been central in the old dating model into their OKCupid and Match.com data, and thus the selection criteria on these platforms reflect the old model of women looking for pro-social boyfriends and husbands. However, it does not explain Tinder, which reduces the selection criteria purely to appearance, and has a Gini coefficient rating worse than 95% of countries. [1]

Thus, just like "discrimination" is perhaps one variable in soup of variables when it comes to explaining the earnings gap, the characteristics identified by traditional models, only explain part of the equation, not the whole.

It explains why women seek out husbands that are more put together than them, who earn more than them, who are smarter than them and stronger than them. It does not explain why they in Rollo's favorite example bang some guy 5 minutes after meeting him in the foam party in Cancun on spring break, while making another man wait 5 dates for sex.

This is the problem with the model, it presupposes that the only valid configuration for a sexual relationship is within a long-term relationship. Thus it can only be used as a model if the goal is to follow the blue pill illusion.

The Anti-Social Model

Recently I tweeted out that the most successful man in terms of gene pool impact was Genghis Khan, a man who by most codes of morality would be anything but a symbol of virtue and moral good. In Peterson terms, he would be an agent of chaos more than a disciple of order. This was both an interesting fact I found, but also a tongue-in-cheek joke aimed at those who insist on including various moral

dimensions a central variables when dealing with [reproductive fitness](#).

I can see the motivation in doing so, because if one were to view humanity as a whole, along a series of dimensions, such as sustainability, technological development, peace, health and many others, it is an inevitable conclusion that it requires men who are inherently pro-social in their behavior. A society filled with anti-social men is likely to devolve into chaos in short order, because they are acting out of self-interest and self-gratification, without considering the consequences to anyone except themselves.

One can see why a society with many men like Genghis would often fail to reach or even aspire to the levels of civilization and cooperation required to maximize such variables. Naturally the means by which conflict is negotiated matters, in a society where words are used to engage in- and resolve conflict, the consequences are not as severe as one in which actual violence is accepted, or in fact encouraged.

One of the bigger surprises for my relatively young self at the time, still believing that women wanted a nice, polite, generous, selfless, dutiful and thoughtful man, was that men such as Richard Ramirez (The Night Stalker), Charles Manson and Ted Bundy received hundreds of love letters from women of all ages and variations. These 3 men all got married while either on trial or after being convicted of over 50 murders between them. (14 Ramirez, 30+ for Bundy, 7 for Manson).

These men were hardly the type of men that any man should aspire to, but their appeal to large numbers of women dwarfs what most men experience in their life. If the criteria for intersexual success was being pro-social and serial killers get hundreds if not thousands of women writing them love letters, then your average worker ant, 5 ft 10, 25 – 30% body fat, making \$50k – \$60k a year, at a normal white or blue collar job, dressed in cargo shorts and a sportsball jersey should have to beat women off with a stick. This is clearly not the case.

What dawned on me was that understanding Dr. Peterson's perspective on intersexual dynamics and thus the traditional perspective, is quite easy. Based on a discussion between Dr. Peterson and Sam Harris on truth, Dr. Peterson verbalized his definition of "Truth" as nestled within an evolutionary moral imperative, whereby anything that leads to the destruction of the human species, could not be true by his definition. This obviously departs quite radically from the normal definition of truth but gives a very good insight into the blue pill framework, morality comes first and everything is subservient to ethics.

If one nestles intersexual dynamics within a moral framework, where the ultimate goal is the survival of the human species and the means by which one does so is to maintain order. Then "Alpha fucks" can obviously not be true, because "Alpha fucks" is chaos, "Beta Bucks" is order. If women select men from a pro-social dominance hierarchy, meaning those men who are high IQ, high in conscientiousness, agreeableness and virtuous, then this creates order.

However, if women select their mates based on an anti-social dominance hierarchy, meaning those men who are low in agreeableness, low in conscientiousness, low in neuroticism, high in extroversion and not necessarily high in IQ, then it that creates chaos. Assume for a minute that what made a Bundy, Manson or Ramirez were 100% heritable traits, as I mentioned in biology this means that within a few generations every man will have those traits.

How long does the human species survive? Well, it may survive for a long time, but how long does civilization last? It falls into the type of Mad Max inspired wasteland dominated by violent warlords within a generation or two.

Summary and Conclusions

The most memorable quote I ever heard in the soon to be 15 or so years where I've read manosphere

literature was the introduction to an early David DeAngelo seminar, “Attraction isn’t a choice”, this was later complimented by Roissy and Rollo almost a decade later, with the puzzle piece of “negotiated attraction.

To draw on my [understanding of Freud](#), “Alpha Fucks” is ID driven, “Beta Bucks” is super-ego driven. Put in different terms, with “Alpha fucks” the sex is an end in itself, with beta bucks, sex is a means to an end. A woman fucks Alpha because she wants to fuck Alpha, she fucks Beta because she wants something from Beta.

However, as Freud very accurately pointed out living in larger social groups, having civilizations and a modern economy dependent on specialization and trade, requires that the super-ego and ego are in control of the ID. Women are just as, if not more prone to fall in line with what they are told from the greater group, so women know that the group wants them to desire and reproduce with the man who is conscientious, agreeable loyal, humble, maybe a bit anxious, has sorted himself out and is a virtuous pillar of the community.

This benefits society on many levels, it maintains order, the economy, peace and prosperity. However, what would happen in nature if a man who is conscientious, agreeable, anxious, not extremely extroverted, runs into a man who is carefree, confident bordering on narcissistic, disagreeable and extroverted? The former man loses, because his value to a woman comes from the context of the society in which they live. The latter man wins because his value to a woman is part of who he is, it has not been bestowed upon him by the world, but taken from the world by strength of will.

A note:

I recently launched a [Patreon page](#) where I will be posting additional content every month for those who support me and I will do a Google Hangout for the highest tier Patrons (limited to 10 people).

I’ve also had some requests for consults, which I’ve declined up until now, but due to demand I’ve chosen to open up for doing some consults on request. For details please check out my [Consulting and Patreon Page](#)

[As always you can buy my book Gendernomics at Amazon.com as both paperback and Kindle](#)

Sources

[1]
<https://medium.com/@worstonlinedater/tinder-experiments-ii-guys-unless-you-are-really-hot-you-are-probably-better-off-not-wasting-your-2ddf370a6e9a>

Archived from theredarchive.com