

# Best Daygame Theory – The Overkill Discussion Part 2

Krauser PUA | 24 March, 2015 | by krauserpua

---

**Taking r-selection seriously: A review of Nick Krauser's Daygame Overkill** by Rouge Engineer

## Introduction

When it comes to evolutionary fitness, women are cold, calculating creatures. And brutally realistic: of their partners and themselves. Women may fantasize about securing the attention of an Alpha for life, but alone, in the silence of a room, most women know they're unlikely to achieve this. With Alphas, the most they can hope to secure is the briefest of moments. Adventurous moments. Moments to last a lifetime. And they do.

Alpha fucks, beta bucks. Secure the genetic seed of the momentary passing of an Alpha, secure the resources of an all-too-numerous beta. Optimal female strategy – at least for the teeming crowd of 6s, 7s, and low 8s (a different strategy might well be optimal for higher 8s and 9s). This fact, this most fundamental of social facts, illuminates much social commentary on the manosphere. The red pill. The forbidden knowledge. But oddly, this knowledge hasn't been put to work in game itself. Yes, dual mating strategy is talked about in the game literature – but as a basic worldview. It rarely, if ever, informs, shapes, crafts practical game strategy. This knowledge hasn't been – weaponised. Until now.

Overkill takes female dual mating strategy seriously – and attempts to weaponise it in the form of a set of behavioural strategies devised to increase the likelihood of triggering women's propensity to engage in quick, fast r-selection mating behaviour – adventure sex – rather than k-selection mating behaviour. Or more simply, to help ensure a certain signal or vibe is given that increases the chances of women responding to you as a perceived Alpha rather than perceived Beta.

## The theoretical model

Overkill's chief theoretical innovation is charting the spectrum between the dual mating strategies. What would the ideal or idealised Alpha look like? What would the idealised Beta look like? Clearly the ideal Alpha would be the ideal Lover – someone a woman fucks for the thrill (conscious reason), for the fitter genes (unconscious reason). Someone anonymous. Someone fleeting. Think the 6 foot 5, masculine, jaw lined, raw masculine vibe guys herding women from the dance floor into the cubicles as effortlessly as shepherds shepherding sheep into the fold. The ideal Beta would be the ideal Provider – someone a woman fucks purely for resources (\$\$\$). Think the ugly, greasy, hunchback desperados walking awkwardly out of knocking shops.

Between these two extremes, these two ideals innocent of any pretence, is 99% of reality: sugar daddies, flings, harems, husbands, good boyfriends, bad boyfriends. The spectrum of rationalisations (– having a sugar daddy doesn't make me a prostitute – oh yes it does, luv). Between these two extremes, most socio-sexual interactions operate. This is where men do battle every single day, with themselves, with other men, with women – whether knowingly or unknowingly. According to Krauser, the spectrum between Idealised Alpha (Lover or L) and Idealised Beta (Provider or P) can be charted as follows:

***L-range:*** *knowing harem members, fuck buddies (who sometimes are unknowingly members of a harem), r-selected boyfriend, r-selected husband.*

(Krauser orders this slightly differently and omits the concept of r-selected husband (perhaps because the concept is incoherent?)) – this ordering reflects my own ordering of degrees of – Alphaness. After all,

securing a woman who is knowingly a member of a harem, accepting being a side bitch, a loyal side bitch â€” this surely more of an accomplishment than securing the r-selected love of a girlfriend?).

***P-range:** k-selected boyfriends, k-selected husbands, sugar daddies.*

Itâ€™s obviously in a manâ€™s best interests to be within the L-range. No question. Yes we have our different preferences. Some would be happiest with a harem. Others with an old skool wifey. And indeed our preferences change with time. Doesnâ€™t matter which particular arrangement we seek: whether harem, fuckbuddy, short-term girlfriend, long-term girlfriend, wifey, the L-range of the spectrum is where to be. We all know the kind of lives that the overwhelming majority of men who occupy the P-range of the spectrum endure.

Now comes the flash of realisation.

Only Alphas will trigger L-range responses â€” whether she is willing to act as a quickie, as a fuckbuddy or even consciously a member of your burgeoning harem. Geeks, nice boys, average boys, good guys: their behavioural signals will only activate P-range responses.Â But by definition Alphas are rare. By definition, only rare, Alpha behavioural signals will activate L-range responses: balls, vibe, masculinity, mastery.

The more your game signals such rare traits, the more likely you will activate a womanâ€™s L-range responses. The less your game signals such traits, the less likely those responses will be triggered â€” which means being defaulted and pigeonholed along the P-range, with all that involves.Â We now have a solid basis for day game: the best kind of day game â€” perhaps even the only one worthy of the name game, as anything less would seem to be a mere numbers strategy â€” will be the day game that seeks to harness and amplify such signal to maximise the chances of triggering L-range responses.

Do existing day game models model this effectively? Mostly they do not. Â Theyâ€™ll have some occasional Alpha melodies, bits and pieces of effective signalling, true, but also an incredible amount of Nice Guy noise â€” noise that drowns out any good stuff. If you doubt this, think about so-called granddad game. This strategy, from a well-know node in the manosphere, is to mentally pretend youâ€™re a granddad and rabbit on and on about topics when talking to a woman. How likely is that to ignite that secret passion for the Alpha male laying deep within each womanâ€™s heart?

Enter **Daygame Overkill**. Overkill presents not only the theoretical viewpoint above in greater detail but presents a set of behavioural skills shaped by that viewpoint â€” the practical model, as demonstrated by Krauser over a generous number of infields.Â What are these behavioural skills? Thatâ€™s the price of admission and so I won't be giving details here. But suffice to say itâ€™s holistic: not simply verbal communication, words and tonality, but also physical and deep vibe communication, working in unison to spark a vibe and subliminally communicate it.



### **The practical (demonstrated) model**

Broadly, the theoretical model is sound. Accordingly, the practical model should be years ahead of other day game models. In my judgement, it is. Itâ€™s pure quality.

Does that mean itâ€™s perfect? Not at all and nor does Krauser even hint that it is. One of joys of Daygame Overkill is that because Krauser discusses the theoretical model in detail, you can refine the practical model according to your own theoretical understanding and experience. For my own part, I believe the practical model has some healthy scope for further development and calibration. In any quest for knowledge, especially forbidden knowledge, this is only natural. In my judgement, some things should be amped up, some things need to be toned down, and some more contextual sensitivity is needed. Action this and the L-signal will be all the more clearer and louder.

**(1) Amping up the innuendo** –Â In my experience, eye-contact, touching and innuendos are the workhorses of day game attraction: be or become a natural at this and much of the work is already done. Krauserâ€™s practical model excels at eye contact and touching but innuendo seems underused. Indeed, there are quite a number of missed opportunities for innuendo. One missed opportunity I couldnâ€™t forget is Infield 2, where Krauser is describing the woman as both chocolate and caramel. She is loving it. â€œFirst Iâ€™m chocolate and now Iâ€™m caramelâ€ she purrs. Krauser replies: â€œIt means youâ€™re very sweetâ€. Sweet? Ok, but how about this: â€œDelicious. It means youâ€™re deliciousâ€. Say it slowly. With the right kind of smile. Better, right? Small change, clearer signalling.

**(2) Toning down micro bursts of Mr Nice Guy** –Â In the Infields, I believe thereâ€™s an occasional frequency of micro Mr Nice Guy bursts (spikes?) â€ which soon adds up, weakening the L-signal. Some examples: in Infield 1, Krauser makes an incredible physical move.Â Iâ€™m not going to reveal it here – the move alone is worth the price of admission. The verbal part of the move begins with â€œSorry I needed toâ€. However, this could be stronger: in general, â€œexcuse meâ€ is more masculine: â€œExcuse me, I neededâ€. Also, at the end of sets, Krauser usually says: â€œLet me take your numberâ€. Better: â€œIâ€™ll take your numberâ€. Finally, at the very end of sets, Krauser shakes hands. Better: Kiss cheeks goodbye at least, lips preferably. Especially in Europe, where thatâ€™s normal. Small changes, sharper signal. Micro dominance adds up to macro dominance. It might not seem a big deal to us consciously â€ but subconsciously, which scans for and scrutinizes every bit of behavioural information received, it can be a big deal, that leaky noise that betrays the otherwise silent submarine.

**(3) When L-responses present, escalate to new location** –Â Krauser secured the Infield 1 woman within a few minutes. Impressive. But he continued the set for another 7 or so minutes, entirely unnecessary in my judgement, during which the conversation got a little awkward in places, the vibe weakened in places. He scored her on the date on the other day â€ which goes to show how strong the initial opening and stacking was. But I was surprised the set continued for so long when it was obvious Krauser could have done a same-day lay: she was merely heading to the library, nothing important, he opens and she likes it, she quickly loves it, she was giving off solid L-range responses. At this point, itâ€™s time to say, â€œLetâ€™s go for a drinkâ€, grab her hand and go. The rest is c(l)ockwork. Done deal. Indeed, she seemed disappointed at the end of the set, as if disappointed the encounter ended with a simple number swap. Even in the Q&A after the infield the question was raised why a same-day wasnâ€™t initiated.

Krauserâ€™s default is to â€œget number, date another timeâ€ – and he has good reasons. One reason is that he doesnâ€™t want to take the risk of spending 3 hours with a woman if ultimately sheâ€™s not interested beyond being entertained (if sheâ€™s to flake, better that it happens on whatsapp). Another reason is the opportunity cost of day gaming other girls and collecting other numbers.

I totally understand these reasons. But we should also be aware of the risks this default. In this specific case, because her L-range responses were quickly activated, the continued street conversation started sounding and looking unnatural, awkward. This risked backfiring and shutting down L-range activation. Her L-range activation was quick and strong and so survived this prolonging of the street conversation, but a weaker activation might not have survived. In other cases, weaker L-range activity might be sufficient for a same day lay but unstable, not lasting to the next day (maybe the reason for the ultimate outcome of Infield 2?) â€ so better to strike when the iron is temporarily hot.Â This doesnâ€™t mean â€œget number, date another timeâ€ shouldnâ€™t be the default. But it does show the need to be aware of the L-responses and to have the confidence to escalate to a new location quickly once L-responses are activated â€ exactly as an Alpha would. Once L-responses are activated, the risk of a woman wasting your time when initiating an instant date will be greatly reduced.

## **Conclusion**

Daygame Overkill consists of two parts: the theoretical model and the practical (demonstrated) model. The theoretical based is solid. The practical model is quality. Not perfect (what is?) but quality. There is something for everyone. Beginners will see what's possible and will save a lot of wasted time on dead ends and YouTube monkeys. Intermediate will upgrade their behavioural signalling, from Nice Guy to Adventure Guy. Advanced gamers will have a basis for understanding why what has worked worked and so a basis for further improvement and refinement.

By giving such a sound theoretical model, Daygame Overkill allows us to refine the practical model according to our own understanding and experiences. It provides a basis for developing our skills and to keep developing. And all this for standard hourly rate of a whore. You lucky gits.



[Daygame Overkill is available for immediate access here](#)

---

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