Tom Torero fakes an infield kiss close

Krauser PUA | 12 December, 2014 | by krauserpua

The latest scandal-of-the-week is that famous daygame instructor Tom Torero was caught out having hired an actress to appear in a $\hat{a} \square k$ iss close $\hat{a} \square v$ ideo \hat{A} recorded outside Selfridges on Oxford Street in summer 2012. \hat{A} I can't stay out of it because: (I) the hater who found out about the actress set up fake forum accounts as $\hat{a} \square k$ rauserpua $\hat{a} \square$ in order to blame the scandal on me (ii) Tom is the main co-creator of the London Daygame Model that I use and teach (iii) Tom is a personal friend of mine. \hat{A} So, here's my response. First the facts:

- Yes, Tom *did* fake that infield as he has admitted <u>on his website here</u>.
- No, I didn't know he had faked it until he admitted it to me in a private message shortly before posting his public admission.

It's incredibly difficult to get accurate information about the sexual market place. Both men and women lie about everything be it notch counts, intentions, quality and so on. It's also incredibly difficult to get accurate information about the seduction process because it's a necessarily private affair which you can't simply film. Girls won't react naturally if they know a camera is on, they won't want you to record them due to fears over their reputation, and there are additional legal issues if you're recording in a situation that has the $\hat{a} \square$ assumption of privacy $\hat{a} \square$. Nothing new here, but it creates a huge transparency problem which is ruthlessly exploited by the charlatans and fakes in the PUA industry who will either lie, evade or use smoke'n'mirrors to convey a credibility to their customers that they don't deserve.

As players / wannabe players, you are fully aware how difficult it is to decide who you can trust. Which teacher? Which system? What is a reasonably expectation of success?

That's why there's such a big reaction to Tom's infield revelation. For several years he had distinguished himself as someone who *could* be trusted by virtue of his copious library of infield recordings on the street, on dates, and even in the bedroom. People could watch the videos, conclude $\hat{a} \square$ Tom is legit $\hat{a} \square$ and this tough issue was resolved. The realisation that **one of these videos is fake** suddenly upsets the apple cart. People are asking themselves $\hat{a} \square$ so is he just another charlatan? $\hat{a} \square$

I predict there will be two types of reaction to this news based upon whether the recipient has met Tom personally and seen him in action, or hasn't.

People Who Don't Know Tom $\hat{a} \square \square$ Earnest students of Game will quite reasonably conclude he's a fraud, that this video expose is damning evidence, and that he can thus be thrown in the dustbin alongside Mehow, Vince Kelvin, David DeAngelo and others who have been either caught faking or otherwise never proved their bona fides. I can't say I blame them. It's important to be skeptical of people's claims and to demand evidence. It's reasonable to give special weight to those incidents which suggest dishonesty. In addition to genuine students of the Game, the PUAhater crowd will also seize on this as further evidence that Game Doesn't Work. Tom was an average-looking man banging hot girls (something which can't happen according to the Looks-Money-Status crowd) so the fact he faked one video will immediately lead them to include every single one of his successes was faked. There's not much to say about that. PUAhater's are mentally ill. Let them wallow in their own misery.

People Who Do Know Tom $\hat{a} \square \square$ What's interesting to me is that over the years Tom has taught hundreds of students, and hundreds more have used the day game model he created with me (and others). Literally hundreds of people have seen Tom live in-set with their own eyes in unfakeable interactions. Hundreds have been live in-set themselves implementing advice they got from Tom and then seeing the

effect it has on the girls. These people have enough direct evidence of their own eyes that (i) Tom's daygame skills are for real and (ii) the London Daygame Model works, that the fact Tom got caught redhanded faking one infield doesn't really matter. Yes, it was a bad thing to do. But no, it doesn't shake their confidence in the model or Tom's abilities as a coach.

What's my opinion?

Tom shouldn't have done this because it was dishonest. However, it's small potatoes. I remember watching the video back in 2012 and thinking $\hat{a} \square$ pretty weak set, no big deal $\hat{a} \square$ and never thinking of it again. It'll all blow over and we'll all continue hitting the streets, banging hot girls, and tweaking the model. I'm certainly *not* going to distance myself from Tom to $\hat{a} \square$ protect my reputation $\hat{a} \square$. He's my friend and I've seen with my own eyes that his daygame skills are for real.

Tom is an elite-level daygamer, possibly more skilled than I am. You're well within your rights to cut him off your $\hat{a} \square \square$ guy to listen to $\hat{a} \square \square$ list after this video expose but if you do so you'll be missing out.

Archived from theredarchive.com