

Red Pill Logic: Briffault's law, Bateman and Peak Hypergamy

Black Label Logic | 2 February, 2017 | by Black Label Logic



GO FOR IT. I DON'T WANT TO WORK THAT HARD.

I read a couple of rational male posts recently that were concerned with Open Hypergamy and Peak Hypergamy, as I was reading them, it became clear that this is a function of what is encapsulated in a quote from my previous article "[A Woman's Resume](#)": *"Men spend their entire lives fighting to get credit for their virtuous behavior, women spend theirs fighting to avoid punishment for their depraved behaviors."*

Hypergamy has historically been controlled through men holding and being able to exercise overt power, often granted by social factors such as religion and tradition. This power would directly control hypergamy through ensuring that women could not engage in their strategy of "*Alpha Fucks/Beta Bucks*" without significant risk and major consequences. The *Scarlet Letter* by Nathaniel Hawthorne, is a great example of how a woman branded an adulteress, is relegated to a life in poverty and shame as a single mother in a Puritan community in the 1600s. The narrative of the book aside, this exemplifies the risk-reward balance between Alpha Fucks and Beta Bucks. The cost of attaining or attempting to attain high quality genetics from a man with whom she will be unable to secure a long-term relationship is the risk that she will be found out, and thus sacrifice her opportunity to secure beta bucks.

A female victory in the sexual market place is attained through being able to secure both of the end states sought, successful attainment of high quality genetics, and successful attainment of long-term provision. Traditionally, both would be sought from the same man, though the end result of this would be a case of settling in both cases. The mathematics here is simple, if one uses the percentages given by the [Pareto Principle](#), that only 20% of men have the potential alpha genetics, then it follows that either a state of polygamy or a state of reproductive laissez-faire would be required in order for women to secure access to these genetics.

Briffault's Law and Hypergamy

Men can make as much cheap sperm as they like, however provision is a more costly endeavor. As above, many women can secure high value reproductive material from the same man without any degradation of quality of the material. However, women sharing a provider will result in poorer quality and quantity of provision for each woman as this is a zero-sum game as opposed to the reproductive material, which is not a zero-sum game.

Briffault's law is famous within the sphere and states that:

The female, not the male, determines all the conditions of the animal family. Where the female can derive no benefit from association with the male, no such association takes place. — Robert Briffault, *The Mothers*, Vol. I, p. 191

From the perspective of Alpha fucks, this means that once the mother has derived the benefit of his genetics, she can derive no further benefit from this association. However, Beta Bucks is a running contribution. In this sense the alphas contribution is momentary, while the beta association is prolonged due to the longer period when provision will be required. This explains the tendency of females to put off sex with beta males, in order to ensure that a long-term commitment to provide will be forthcoming.

Less spoken about in the sphere are the 3 corrolaries to Briffault's law:

Past benefit provided by the male does not provide for continued or future association.

This is often demonstrated by those Alphas who enjoyed association with the female during her party years, but who have fallen out of favor as she reaches her epiphany phase. Sheryl Sandberg's famous quote demonstrates this:

"When looking for a life partner, my advice to women is date all of them: the bad boys, the cool boys, the commitment-phobic boys, the crazy boys. But do not marry them. The things that make the bad boys sexy do not make them good husbands. When it comes time to settle down, find someone who wants an equal partner. Someone who thinks women should be smart, opinionated and ambitious. Someone who values fairness and expects or, even better, wants to do his share in the home. These men exist and, trust me, over time, nothing is sexier." Sheryl Sandberg: "Women, Work and the Will to Lead"

What Sandberg inadvertently states here is that her association with bad boys back in her party years, is no guarantee for her continued or future association with them once she has decided that she wants a husband. Sandberg does lie to both herself and other women in this case, as "*Beta Bucks*" is the very definition of negotiating attraction, and thus an Alpha widow will never feel the tingles she craves after settling for Beta. This is also true for her association with the beta male, once she no longer receives what she perceives as adequate compensation, she will eject from the union.

Any agreement where the male provides a current benefit in return for a promise of future association is null and void as soon as the male has provided the benefit.

This is often demonstrated by [White Knights and Orbiters](#) in that they do provide benefits to the female but do not receive the benefits of a future association. These males can be viewed in terms of reproduction as Beta Bucks with no benefit gained for themselves. This is a case of prematurely realized hypergamy, wherein the woman engages in a form of Alpha Fucks/Beta Bucks at the same time, deriving beta bucks benefits from orbiters or white knights, while deriving Alpha fucks optimization from her boyfriend(s).

The third and final correlate to Briffault's law and perhaps the most complex:

A promise of future benefit has limited influence on current/future association, with the influence inversely proportionate to the length of time until the benefit will be given and directly proportionate to the degree to which the female trusts the male.

What this law states is that a man who makes a promise to a woman of a future benefit, has limited influence depending on trust and time until the woman realizes the benefit. In essence, how long does she have to wait until he pays out, and how likely is he to pay out. This is a classic case of delayed gratification and probability that can be likened to an option, wherein the woman has to perform in order to ensure that the man will pay out. A classic example is an alpha who promises his mistress that he will leave his wife for her once the time is right, over time if her trust is reduced or the perceived benefit declines in value, the promise will hold less sway over her hypergamy.

Bateman's Principle

Angus John Bateman was an English geneticist that suggested that reproductive variance is greater in males than in females. His argument was that as men can produce millions of sperm with little effort and females invest much more in their eggs, females would be more inherently careful when it comes to reproduction. A human male is capable of producing more offspring by mating with more females, but the female will not realize more offspring by mating with more than one male. In Bateman's theory this results in sexual selection where men compete with each other and females become choosy about which males to mate with. This means that men are fundamentally promiscuous and females are fundamentally selection.

This finding is often summarized as "*Eggs are expensive, sperm is cheap*", perhaps a major difference between humans and the fruit flies that Bateman conducted his research on, is the human life-span and relatively long time gestation and time to maturity for human offspring. At the very least, this creates a necessity for support in the female, both throughout her 9 month long pregnancy, where she is weak and vulnerable, but also for the 10 – 16 years before her children become capable adults. Our society that is constructed at least to some degree around financial resources, and the role of financial resources to ensure a more risk adjusted life where more reproduction can take place may also contribute.

This creates an interesting dualistic approach, where one could argue that sperm is cheap, but provision is not necessarily so. The energy to produce sperm is negligible, however for a man to dedicate perhaps decades of his life to the provision and protection of a single female, giving up both the ability to maximize his own reproduction, and a large portion of his labor is not. However, this is what marriage represents, a mechanism to enforce a long-term transfer of resources to the woman in exchange for [monopolistic access to her eggs](#).

Now this makes sense, a transaction consisting of expensive resources for expensive eggs, the male is not maximizing his reproductive potential as he gives up other women and thus gives up some volume of offspring. However, the woman is not maximizing her reproductive potential either. She trades some upside from being able to secure varied genetic material for her offspring for security, a classic risk/reward trade-off on both sides of the equation.

Summary and Conclusions

To return to the quote by which this article began, men fight their entire life to get their reward for acting and enabling female sexual strategy as outlined by Briffault's law and Bateman's principle. A beta male and an alpha male both provide cheap sperm to fertilize expensive eggs, however, the latter does so at little cost to himself, the former at a massive cost to himself as provision is expensive. The goal of the present paradigm is for men will continue to increase their own sexual market value, while accepting an increasingly raw deal in the mating market, where their contributions are not accurately valued and the female contributions are valued exorbitantly.

Women on the other hand fight their entire lives not to be devalued for the behaviors that have traditionally lead to a drastic reduction in their sexual market value. The acceptance and marketing of single-mothers for instance, a situation in which a new man will not only take on the responsibilities of raising and financing the children of another man, but also has proof that his woman has no problems leaving one man once a better deal presents itself, is core to Briffault's law and its corollaries.

He will know that she most likely has had three to four times the number of partners than the equivalent woman 50 – 100 years ago, and that she has been raised in a society that is centered on the validation of female entitlement. That if he should find himself years from now facing her in court, and god forbid she has had another child or two by him, he will be [raked over the coals](#) for child support as it is better for the state to lay this burden on the individual man, as it knows that there is no such thing as a single-mother who is self-financing. Three variables have been manipulated in order to remove the requirement of females to engage in subterfuge and instead being able to operate in the open.

A) The increasing acceptance of single mothers and female promiscuity in society

This removes from women the need to keep the alpha paternity from their beta bucks partner. While it has always been possible for a woman to secure genetic material of high quality, and get a beta bucks relationship afterwards, she would have to do so without the man knowing. The ability to secure this and land a man who "man's up" and marries her, is a much more simple solution.

This ensures that a female is free to enjoy the benefit of Briffault's law.

B) The prevalence of female friendly divorce

The prevalence of female friendly and easy divorce, ensures that the trade-off in B can be ended at the woman's convenience regardless of whether the other party has upheld their side of the contract.

Marriage is after all a contract that is the formalization of defense against the third corollary to Briffault's law, in that it ensures that both parties uphold their part of the deal.

C) The prevalence of female friendly divorce settlements

This ensures that a woman once she has snared Beta Bucks can divorce him and still derive economic benefits. In essence, alimony and the utilization of child support legislation as defacto alimony, enables a woman to realize the economic benefits from the beta bucks association without having to provide her side of the equation.

This is the embodiment of Briffault's second and third corollary, in that the female can secure future benefit without offering anything in return.

D) The perspective that females are inherently virtuous and must do what is right for them.

This is an addition to the former three factors and perhaps the core principle that is sought in order to enable female depravity. The veneration of the woman who does what is right for her, is inherently permissive of any behaviors, regardless of consequences to those around her. The ability to be viewed as

virtuous despite engaging in behaviors that are impulsive, damaging, destructive and depraved, is a super-power of sorts and requires massive cognitive dissonance on the part of your average blue pill man.

These four factors serve to enable women to engage in their dualistic sexual strategy without fear of repercussions, and without the need for subterfuge. The red pill is the awakening to these behaviors and social developments that seek to alter the balance between the sexes to the point where males will accept steadily poorer deals and women will receive increasingly better deals.

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](#)

Archived from theredarchive.com