

Rational Compromise In Selecting A Man

2006 June 27

by Anthony Glenn <aglenn@pcug.org.au>
File: Rational Compromise In Selecting A Man.odt

This paper is directed to women seeking to select a man to have a relationship with. Many an unattached woman is dissatisfied with the quality of the men available to her as a potential boyfriend. She feels that there must be something wrong. Somebody is to blame, and it isn't her because she works so hard to be acceptable to men. This paper discusses some of the factors involved in an attempt to show why things are so, and what she can do about the situation. Feedback is welcomed.

Scientific Approach

In this document, I have tried to be careful, truthful and firmly scientific. If you want to understand human beings (women included), look carefully at what they actually do. What they say they want is not the same thing as what they reveal they really do want, by their actions. A lot of this stuff is actually subconscious, hard-coded in the genes. I am a firm believer in selfish gene theory [1] (See *References* at the end of this document). This document is an attempt to come up with some good theories regarding the actual behaviour of men and women.

Pay careful attention to who is telling you something. We humans have a strong tendency to try to manipulate the behaviour of others. It is not exactly "lying", but a tendency to modify our statements in a manner designed get other people to do what we want. Many people do not even know that they are doing it. They would be offended by any suggestion that they are not being truthful. Only careful examination of their statements can reveal the bias. In particular, most women are a very consistent source of misinformation about their own real behaviour.

The behaviour of women often does not make sense to men. The cause is the misinformation and the lack of good theories about the actual behaviour of real women. "There is darkness in the heart of woman." Men are somewhat better at staying away from the darkness, but we men can by no means claim to be innocent.

Men try to manipulate women, but their attempts are amateur compared to women. Women spend a lot more time thinking about relationships than most men do. Manipulation is a favourite technique amongst women. Of course, assertiveness would be better, morally speaking, but that takes courage. Women are smaller and weaker than men so they are more afraid to be assertive. Women tell each other commonly-held myths about relationships, so even though they might spend more time on thinking about relationships, their perception of reality is still not good.

Men can be roughly divided into three groups – alphas, betas, and gammas. Alphas are wildly successful with women. Betas get there with some effort. Gammas are in dire strife. The poor gamma has no woman and he is finding it very difficult to get one.

Alphas do not have a problem with women, so they have no motivation to understand the reality of actual female behaviour. Women are easy. Alphas might believe almost any rubbish anyone says. Any statement about women from an alpha man should be treated with great skepticism. Note that elected politicians are almost all alphas, because being an alpha helps considerably in being elected. So, when a male politician talks about the behaviour of women, he almost certainly does not know what he is talking about.

Betas struggled to form a relationship with a woman, but all that is fixed now. Betas believe the misinformation from women. A beta is fearful of losing his relationship with his woman. The last thing he wants to do is disagree with the conventional wisdom amongst women. Besides, he has work to do and obligations to meet. His statements about women are also worthless.

Only the lonely gamma has the motivation to understand what is really going on. He is seeing women saying one thing and doing the opposite. He is thinking, "What the ????" Lots of gammas are not bright enough or too busy to try to figure it out. A few gammas have the brains and the determination to work at it and gain insight. Those men are some of the few who might get to understand women. Not many contribute their honest thoughts to the public discourse. Those men, and some scientists specialising in the field, are the only source of reliable information about the behaviour of women.

Statements about women from religious organisers (priests, rabbis, mullahs, etc., plus their hangers-on) can also be dismissed. Their doctrine requires them to present certain religious fantasies as reality, so their grasp on reality is poor. They have written doctrine which they are not allowed to deviate from, regardless of any incoming facts. They take vows of obedience. Disruptive ideas are not welcome. For example, look at what happens to Catholic theologians who disagree with the Pope. There is also the protection of the revenue. All religions are social clubs, run mostly by men and paid for mostly by women. A religion must remain acceptable to its financial supporters. Religions are service providers and it is overwhelmingly women providing the money. Antagonising those women, by disagreeing with them, is not going to be on the menu. If somebody else persuades the women of the truth of some formerly unpopular doctrine, then a religion might eventually follow, but it will never lead.

Understanding women has been a long and difficult task. It is nowhere near complete, even now. This document is just a point on the way.

Relationship Bargain

In the game of relationships, every rational person tries to get the best possible bargain for themselves. Women want the best possible male genes, plus they want a man who offers them a nice life and plenty of resources for raising the children she hopes to have with him. Some men (alphas) are attractive enough to be able to make a selection amongst women, but most men just have to take what they can get. Men have to make offers to lots of women, more or less randomly, in the hope that one of them might accept. Women generally do not make explicit offers to men, they just hang around and hope some man they want makes an offer to them. Men propose, women decide.

Attractive men and women find the game very easy. They are alphas. The men make offers and usually get accepted. The women get offers from attractive men and accept. However most men and women are not considered very attractive by the opposite sex. For them, the game is a lot more difficult. The men get angry because they suffer continual rejection. The women get angry because the men they want, fail to make an offer, and the men they do not want, make too many offers. However, the men go on doggedly making offers to every woman who will listen. They have no choice. Ultimately, some of the women decide they are tired of the loneliness and accept an offer. Alas, often a woman will indefinitely go on uselessly longing for her "soulmate" and never accept any offer from any man. Many women just give up and decide they do not want a man at all.

Biological "selfish gene" theory says there is some sort of ranking for possible sexual partners, with unattractive persons at the bottom and the best ones at the top. Both men and women try to establish a relationship with the best opposite-sex person they can.

Consider the situation of a woman of moderate attractiveness and suppose a free market, perfect information and universal agreement amongst women about the ranking of available

men. If she chooses the best man available, she is likely to be disappointed since he will not choose her. Since he is the best, he has lots of offers from women and he will not choose her since she is of moderate attractiveness. He will select a better woman. So, in order to get a relationship started, without going through too much painful rejection, she is wisest to select a man of approximately the same level of attractiveness as herself. That is the process of engaging in a “rational compromise”. She tries to get the best possible bargain for herself.

The same logic applies to men. Of course, nearly everybody is of “moderate attractiveness”. Perfect people do not exist in practice. So, **everybody** must engage in rational compromise. That means you cannot simply expect to get perfection in all things. You must rationally weigh deficiencies in various areas against each other. This document is intended to improve the standard of your decision making, so you will be more able to correctly compromise rationally, thereby maximising your happiness.

Luckily for you, the competition, all those other available women out there, mostly have not read information like this document. They are making dreadful mistakes, which will cost them dear. Some of them are marrying awful men, thereby removing themselves from the competition, leaving some of the nicest men available for you. Your task is to learn how to pick yourself a good one, out of the men which are actually available to you.

There are also lots of nasty men out there and many women have not figured out what to do about that. However, the situation is actually just as bad for men, there are a lot of nasty women out there as well. Nasty people are everywhere. We all just have to cope with that.

Relationship Phase Definitions

Our relationships with the opposite sex go through phases. Regarding men, a woman has two degrees of freedom. One degree is whether she has a man or not. The other is whether she **wants** to have a man or not. Two to the power two is four (simple mathematical fact). So, every woman is in one of four phases, as follows:

Normal

She has a man and she wants to keep him. All those married women out there in suburbia, living with and loving their men, they are normal. A woman in the normal phase is not available for a new relationship.

Naysayer

She does not have a man and she does not want one. She says “no” to all offers from all men. She declines to make herself available for a new relationship. It is reasonable to assess a woman as a naysayer, if she has had no man and has declined all offers from men, for a period of two years, regardless of whether she self-describes herself as a naysayer.

Divorcing

She has a man, but she does not want him. She might be living apart, separated, going through a legal divorce or living with her man but declining to follow the four rules for keeping him happy (see below). The relationship with that man is doomed. A woman in the divorcing phase is too busy getting rid of the existing man to be interested in a new relationship. Once she has successfully ended her existing relationship (which may be before or after her legal divorce), then she automatically becomes either a naysayer or lonely.

Lonely

She does not have a man, but she does want to have one. This is the only phase in which a woman is interested in forming a new relationship with a man.

Men

Similarly, with equivalent definitions, men can be divided into normal, naysayer, divorcing and lonely. A naysayer man is a man who has no woman and declines to make any serious genuine offers to any woman (who is believed to be lonely). If a man has been that way over

the last two years, it is reasonable to assess him as a naysayer, regardless of how he describes himself.

Possible Objections

It might be objected; what about a woman who has two men? Say she has a husband and a lover. She is actually normal, because she has a man and she wants to keep him. What about a woman who has a man, but is looking for another one? She is normal too. She stays normal while ever she has at least one man and wants to keep him. The same rule applies to men.

What about prostitutes? Prostitutes provide a service, which happens to be sexual, in exchange for money or some other valuable consideration. Prostitution is her job. She is a service provider, exactly the same as anybody else who has a paying job. Prostitutes remind us of that when they call themselves “working girls”. Her relationship with her clients is strictly commercial. It lasts as long as she is hired for and that is it. Nobody expects it to be a normal man-woman relationship. What phase she is in is determined without reference to anything she might be doing with her client(s).

For example, suppose a female prostitute started off as a naysayer, but she was hired on by a man for a year, then about six months into the job, she decided that she liked this man and was willing to stay with him regardless of whether he paid her. At that point, she has gone from naysayer, stopping at lonely for only an instant, and has become normal. She might be the only one who knows. If she does not tell anybody, then it is impossible for an external observer to tell that her phase has changed.

Hence, it is not always possible to tell what phase another person is in. The best an external observer can do is try to collect the true facts as accurately as can be done, then decide carefully. Since true facts are sometimes hard to get, due to lying or other factors, the possibility of error must always be considered. That situation is entirely normal in science. Data with errors is just the usual thing which science deals with all the time.

Cycling Through the Phases

We all cycle through the phases all our lives. We start off as naysayers, which is the phase in childhood. Eventually, we decide we are lonely and prove it by making genuine offers or being genuinely willing to accept one. If a relationship starts, we become normal. If the relationship later ends, we become divorcing. When the divorce is finished, we become naysayers again. Some of us spend only an instant as a naysayer and proceed immediately to lonely. Some of us spend years as a naysayer. A partner dying is the equivalent of going through an instant divorce.

We cycle around and around: naysayer, lonely, normal, divorcing, then back to naysayer. It is vaguely like the phases of the moon. However, the time the moon spends in each of its phases is fixed by the laws of physics, but relationship phases last for highly variable periods of time. The moon is like a clock which runs at a constant speed, but human beings are like clocks that only move in response to events.

Occasionally someone might go backwards, for example being lonely for a while, then giving up and going back to being a naysayer. It only stops when we die. Those are our little human lives. Our “task” in life is to spend as much time as we can being happy. Human happiness tends to be maximised when we are in the normal phase. That is the way our biology has made us.

The Great Woman Shortage

By far the largest influence on the ratio of available men to available women is the reluctance by many women to enter into a new relationship with a man. Many unattached women simply decline all offers from all men. They also decline to make any offers themselves and they do not make themselves available to any type of introduction service. They are in the naysayer phase. These women have voluntarily decided to adopt a celibate lifestyle. For older women,

this is frequently a decision they stick to for the rest of their lives. The vast majority of women who do not have a man, do not have one precisely because they do not want one. All these women, when offered a man, can immediately think of reasons why that particular man is not suitable. It is reasonable to conclude that, if an unattached woman, who has no health or other serious problems, has declined all offers from men for a period of two years or longer, then she has voluntarily chosen not to have a man. She is a naysayer.

Many women rationalise the situation along the lines, "I have not met Mr Right, yet." There are always better men out there, but not finding even one of acceptable quality over two years is a clear indication that finding a man is no longer important to her. There are many ways for a woman who really wants to have a man to find one, such as newspapers, the internet, introduction agencies, asking friends, social clubs, etc. Everybody needs to recognise that, it is the woman deliberately making herself unavailable, which is the real reason why she does not have a man. It is not some external circumstance being imposed on her against her will, it is her own voluntary choice. She should not be regarded as a victim, by herself or anybody else. She runs her own life. Since it is she who has the power, then she is the one who bears the responsibility. People should not get sympathy for self-inflicted injuries.

Women face many pressures, social and otherwise, which encourage them to be naysayers. When she is in her formative years, under the legal age of consent, she is legally forbidden to have any kind of sex life. Her human rights have been legally taken away, for "safety". She is denied access to information about men, sex and relationships, on the grounds that she is "too young". Once she reaches the age of consent, she has already suffered years of denial. Her education has reached a stage where she is very busy academically, she does not have the time. Her parents may discourage her from having a boyfriend. There may be said to be, "plenty of time for that, later." The naysayer lifestyle continues.

Ultimately, her education finishes, but the job starts. Some employers demand overtime, often unpaid. She finally has some privacy. However, she has been reading up on contraception, venereal disease, AIDS, violence by men against women, money problems and many other relationship difficulties. It all seems horrifyingly complicated and dangerous. It is so much simpler, just to keep on with the naysaying. She could be well into her twenties by the time she finally makes up her mind, "I have to get a boyfriend." Then she has to actually do something effective to make it happen.

Meanwhile, her whole formative years have passed by, with no loving relationship with any man at all. How can she function well with a man, when her relationship education has been so neglected? Human beings tend to learn things best when they are at the right age for it. For example, the best age to learn language is very early childhood. Young children learn a new language very easily and perfectly. Most adults struggle severely to learn a new language and never ever do it perfectly. When would be the best time to learn sex and relationships? Answer, start at puberty, keep learning hard until the early twenties, then go down to a program of lifetime learning. Starting in mid twenties is too late. Many women never catch up, they think men are "too difficult".

Even worse, when a woman is just learning about men, she may mistakenly fall in love with a nasty man. Liking "bad boys" is an immature stage along the way to maturity. She does not yet have the judgement to avoid the nasty men, so she is vulnerable. Nasty men deliberately target young naive women. She does not yet have the toughness to cope with a nasty man. Then her nasty man hurts her, as nasty men do, with the usual bad behaviour. A few nasty men later, she can easily come to the conclusion that all men are nasty. Being a naysayer then looks like a good option to her. I am convinced this is where quite a few lesbians come from. A few nasty men can spoil a lot of women for all men.

For intelligent people, education is becoming progressively longer and more arduous. The pressures on the time of students are becoming more severe. Knowledge continues to expand.

Fees to attend university are rising. The result of the fees is debt, which further delays the day when someone has enough money to start their own household. Society is imposing debt slavery upon the young and intelligent, which is a very foolish and immoral policy. So the age when a woman can actually start her sex life is being pushed up. It is now late twenties for many women. Meanwhile, human biology has not changed the age when her libido dies. So the window of opportunity, when she has the desire to get herself a man, is closing. More and more women are simply deciding never to have a man.

Many religious groups teach, "No sex before marriage." That advice is "safe". Many men are being cautious, these days, and insist on checking that their woman has a working libido, before taking the huge legal step of marrying her. The only way of doing that is to have sex with her, often, then see how she copes. Verbal assurances are worthless, due to the likelihood of lying. A woman who is following the religious teaching is guaranteed to find herself in conflict with her cautious boyfriend, over sex. Their long term prospects are not good. An acrimonious break up is likely.

Testosterone is the hormone which produces libido. Both men and women make it, but men make a lot more, into advanced age. Women make less. After the twenties, a woman's own testosterone levels fall with age, so as the years go by, she feels less and less interested in having a man. There is an easy way for an older woman to get more testosterone, have sex with a man. However, if she declines to do that, she gets into a vicious cycle. No sex means low testosterone, low testosterone means no sex. Many older women never break out of that.

A major cause of women being naysayers, is the relationship-breakdown and child-custody patterns in current society. Over 50 percent of marriages end in divorce, nearly all less formal unions break down sooner or later. At the end of a marriage, the woman is typically given most of the property and the custody of the children. Then what happens? The woman has to work to get enough money to support herself and her children, she also looks after the children. She has almost no spare time. She doesn't have the privacy to pursue love affairs. She feels that she may be unattractive to men because she's not as young and pretty as she was at her first marriage. She doesn't want any more children, so she sees no reason to have a man. She doubts that any man would be able to have a good relationship with her existing children. She may feel scarred by the experience of the relationship breakdown, so she is reluctant to start another. She says, "Been there, done that. I do not want another man." Result: she stays out of the pool of available women.

After a divorce, the ex-husband moves out and, being male, his libido still works (due to the testosterone). He wants another woman. His job continues. He might be able to arrange things so he pays no or minimal maintenance. He has time, money and privacy for love affairs. Women don't mind older men. Usually, he gets a girlfriend. Result: one man has "used up" two women. This happens on a large scale in every society, so a lot of women become unavailable.

Often, a wealthy alpha man finds that he can attract a second woman even while still married to the first. The second woman becomes a mistress, she knows she is a mistress, but chooses to stay with him anyway. So one man has effectively got two wives, one legal and one covert. The wife "suspects" (he makes sure she "suspects"), and he uses this to keep her obedient by threatening to leave her, thereby plunging her into poverty. Not a nice situation for the wife, but a great one for the husband. This weapon of manipulation has been handed to him by the mistress, it is she who has control, it is she who bears the moral responsibility for the human suffering that her actions cause. It is she who has decided to remove herself from the pool of available women and try to steal another woman's man. The single man, whom she could have formed a relationship with, knows nothing of these machinations, he just stays lonely.

Instances of effective polygamy result in less available women. This also happens, even where marriage is not involved, just single men and women interacting with each other. The reason

is that a man will not tolerate unfaithfulness in his woman, but a woman often will tolerate unfaithfulness in her man. So we get some alpha men with many girlfriends each, and almost no women with more than one boyfriend. A man will not tolerate unfaithfulness because if he does, he runs the risk of paying for the raising of another man's children if his woman should become pregnant to some other man. That would clearly be very much contrary to his genetic self-interest. This is one of the few issues where a man is willing to himself terminate his relationship with a woman. A woman can afford to tolerate unfaithfulness in her man provided she gets enough money to have as many children as she wants. Her genetic self-interest is not otherwise involved. Hence, we had sultans (who were immensely rich) with harems. Even today, some women seem to like being in harems, legal or otherwise. Polyandry is very rare. Once again, the pool of available women shrinks.

Some women consider themselves superior to men. This is not confined to lesbians. The magazine *Woman's Weekly* has a section "Mere Male", where funny stories are told at the expense of men. Some women are dismissive of the level of intelligence they find amongst men. The Child Support Agency (part of the Australian government) has been mentioned in parliament for its hostile attitude to men. Professor Germaine Greer wrote a book "The Female Eunuch" [2] which mentioned that some men are hostile to women and treat some women badly. Unfortunately, she forgot to emphasise the word "some" and she neglected to mention that very many women get treated very well by their men. Similar books have been written by other women. These books encourage a victim mentality amongst women.

Police and support services often find themselves dealing with violence by men against women. There are numerous "helping" leaflets portraying men as perpetrators and women as victims. Accordingly, the Australian government, in 2004, conducted a campaign against men being violent against women. In that campaign, no mention was made of the ways that women have to be horrible to men, of which there are plenty. All that, further reinforces a victim mentality amongst women. So, why would a woman want to have anything to do with someone (a man) who was inferior and likely to victimise her? The messages from society make it seem that it would be better to be hostile to men. Women thinking that way, tend not to make themselves available to men.

Women can get away with behaviour which would be socially disapproved of in men. That is another indication that women have the power in relationships and men do not. A woman may fail to indicate her true wishes in some matter, then get upset when her man misinterprets the deliberately defective communications from her. An example was given by blogger Samantha Brett [4]. A woman was returning home after a plane trip. Her man asks whether she would like to be picked up from the airport. She said, "No", but then criticised him for lack of perception when he failed to pick her up from the airport. Clearly, the root cause of the problem was the woman not being honest about her wishes in the first place. However, men tolerate that sort of behaviour out of a woman. Should a man do the same thing to his woman, she would simply point out, "You said you did not want to be picked up." Any further attempts to complain by him would result in more serious conflict. So, she can get away with deliberate miscommunication, but he cannot. Therefore, she has the power. Note carefully, nice women, to their credit, regard such tactics as unfair, and decline to use them.

An examination of advertisements for escort services, and similar, always reveals far more advertisements offering services to men than there are for services to women. So lots of men are buying, but few women are buying. The surplus of available men cannot find any available women, so they buy the service, instead. There are businesses that offer telephone chat lines to men and women so that they can meet new people. Typically, men have to pay over \$70 per hour for this service. Women get an unlimited time for the price of a local call. The business owners have had to cut their price to women to zero, but they can charge men a high price. This price signal is a clear indication that the business is having difficulty attracting enough women. So there has to be a shortage of women using the service.

There is a huge pornography industry. Almost all the output of this industry is directed at lonely men trying to make themselves feel better. The prostitution industry also overwhelmingly serves lonely men. Nightclubs are places where lonely men can get to meet women. However, every nightclub employs bouncers at the door, who are instructed to keep out men who are not accompanied by a woman, once there are too many men compared to women, inside the nightclub. So lonely men often find themselves denied entry. Meanwhile, women are never refused entry. (A very popular nightclub might have to refuse entry to both men and women in the event that it becomes too crowded for safety, but that is a most unusual situation.) Look at the people inside any club or pub where there is no restriction on entry; you will find a large surplus of men.

Due to the factors given above, the great woman shortage is real. Thus, an available woman becomes a rare and valued thing. Some dating clubs call them “golden unicorns”, to emphasise their rarity. This is why some women expect men to give them everything. They don’t continue with the hard subjects at school; why bother? Some man will provide economic support. Is there a problem? Let a man fix it. Women place relentless pressure on their men to produce more money, she doesn’t care how. If you are wondering why people are so beastly to each other in the world, this pressure has got a lot to do with it.

There is fierce competition amongst lonely men for the small pool of lonely women. The consequence of the woman shortage is that most men have to take what they can get. The last time a man exercises any significant power in the game of relationships is when he decides which women to make an offer to and which ones not to. If a woman accepts him, he is then dependent on her good will, because he knows how difficult it is for him to get another woman. If a woman is interested in him, a man tends to want to have a relationship with her. The attractive men are largely married by the age of 35. That has serious consequences for unmarried women over the age of 30. After she gets to the age of 35, the supply of attractive single men is greatly diminished. She will have to compromise. However, due to many women deciding to be naysayers, there is a permanent oversupply of lonely men. The good news for women is that there is a permanent surplus of nice men. The bad news is that there is also a permanent surplus of nasty men. Judgement continues to be required.

The female libido dies off faster than the men do. Lots of women are effectively dead as sexual beings by the age of 40. For the rest of their lives, they are determined naysayers. Meanwhile, men's libidos keep on working right up to old age, due to their high production of testosterone. This is how it happens that there are far more lonely men than there are lonely women.

The Great Man Shortage

Some women claim that they do not have a relationship with a man because there is alleged to be some shortage of men. Not quite right. Whether there is a shortage or glut of something, is determined by the price. The price of men is lower than women, and probably always will be. A woman can bring only herself to a relationship and that is considered quite normal and acceptable. A man usually brings himself plus a large amount of money, either actual or in the form of an earning capacity (for example, a good steady job). In other words, **he** has to sweeten the deal with money to get **her** interested. She contributes just herself. He puts in himself and his money. Since his money has value, therefore, he is worth less than her.

To see that there really is a surplus of available men, introduction sites on the internet provide most instructive numbers. Select a site and try doing a search for women seeking men. Narrow your search to a restricted geographical area, age range and maybe some other restraints. That is to get a reasonably small number of “hits”, to avoid any site-imposed limit on the number of hits reported. Note how many women. Then keep the search the same except search for men seeking women. Note how many men. It is nothing unusual for the number of

men to be **ten times** the number of women. Try it and reassure yourself that there really are a lot more available men than there are available women. The great man shortage is a myth.

It is sometimes objected that male homosexuality reduces the available pool of eligible males, so it does but only to a minor extent. The incidence of male homosexuality is only about 10 percent of the adult male population and is largely cancelled out by lesbianism in the female population. Lesbianism is around 7 percent of the adult female population. Further, many male homosexuals are interested in women as well, so their homosexuality can be regarded as merely a dangerous hobby.

Direct violence by women against men is rare because women tend to be smaller and weaker. However, proxy violence by women against men, where a woman uses an intermediary with access to violence, such as bosses, the legal system or government agencies, that is much more common. That tends to intimidate men, thereby reducing the supply. Men get more cautious about trustworthiness in women, but keep on wanting a woman. The surplus of men remains.

So why is it that there are still women who say there is a shortage of men? Even though there really is no shortage of men, the glut isn't as massive as it used to be. The reason is the advance of modern science and medicine. Due to refrigeration, electricity, clean water, adequate drains and sewers, better nutrition (all advances in science), everybody is healthier, and child mortality has dropped right down. So women need to have less children to reproduce themselves. Advances in medicine have almost wiped out deaths in childbirth, formerly a major killer of women. So the wives keep on living. The supply of widowers has dried up. In evolutionary terms, up until a mere instant ago, women were accustomed to the situation where the female competition for the few very attractive men was continually dying in childbirth. All a woman had to do if she missed out getting a really nice man when she was young, was wait around a few years and one would fall into her lap, because her sister women were dying in childbirth. She never had to compromise. The only thing she really had to worry about was staying socially acceptable so she would continue to move in the right social circles. Hence the social conformity of women, their reluctance to be active on issues of importance to society (that might involve disagreeing with somebody important). Needless to say, the plight of the lonely gamma men did not concern the women at all.

Behaviour is often genetically determined, so there are still lots of women around who are firmly convinced that the world owes her a wonderful man (an alpha male, her "soulmate"). She has kept herself nice, fought off all those advances from low-life men who are not worthy of her hand. So where is he? What has gone wrong? There must be a terrible man shortage! Meanwhile, she is waiting and waiting, getting older, getting bitter, but refusing to compromise.

The changes we are seeing, allow men to apply greater selection pressure against women. Ultimately, this is going to improve the standard of women and the human species as a whole, which is a good thing. The selection pressure acts most heavily against women who happen not to have a nice man and have reached an age such that they will need to compromise in their selection of a man. If she refuses to compromise, and continues to long uselessly for men now out of her reach, she will not get any man, and leave no descendants. If her genetic material was inferior, that would be a good thing. However, it happens most to the best and brightest among women because they each try to get a man who is "better" than her. Women try to "marry up". So the good women go looking for the wonderful men, who are very rare. Then, when she finally realises that it is not working, she finds that the good men have been snapped up long since, leaving her with the necessity to compromise.

She finds that difficult because, typically, she will have had a few doomed relationships with alpha men, along the way. So she thinks she just might get another alpha man, but without the defects (or other female competition) which doomed the former relationships. Successfully

realising that, no, she is not going to get a nice alpha and that she is going to have to pick a gamma, is too much for her. It is the death of her expectations, a hard thing for any human being to cope with. She never gets another man. The result is, the highly beneficial contribution to the quality of the human gene pool, which she could be making, doesn't happen. This is a loss to the whole human race.

Statements about there being a shortage of men are false. It is time those who make such statements faced reality. A woman who keeps saying she doesn't have a man because there is a man shortage, is actually engaged in the process of emotional adjustment to the fact of herself not having any man, because she refuses to compromise.


It may also be a socially acceptable smokescreen for being a naysayer woman. Naysayers are well aware that their naysayer ways are not socially acceptable, so lots of naysayers pretend they are lonely instead. However, their true phase is revealed by their actions. They mysteriously reject all offers from men. "Mr Right" just never shows up. Alternatively, they mysteriously have a few short-term doomed relationships with unsuitable men. Many unattached women are not genuine when they say they want a man. It is all not so mysterious when you realise that there is a spot of deception going on. Deception has a very long history in nature. Many species are well camouflaged. The angler fish fools its victims. Non-poisonous species exist which look just like a poisonous species. Women are just a bit more subtle about the deception, that is all.

Rough Statistical Breakdown

The following table is my own estimate of the percentages in the various phases (as defined above) of both men and women. It is based on a wide variety of observations over many years. I welcome factual feedback which may allow the figures to be further refined.

<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Normal</i>	<i>Naysayer</i>	<i>Divorcing</i>	<i>Lonely</i>
Women	60	30	9	1
Men	55	20	9	16

For easier comparison, below is a chart of the data. A row in the table corresponds to a vertical bar in the chart.



The total numbers of women in the normal, naysayer, divorcing and lonely phases add up to 100% of the adult female population. Likewise, the four phases for men also add up to 100% of the adult male population. The number of the adult female population is approximately equal to the number of the adult male population. That is observed in reality and is one of the expected results of selfish gene theory.

The number of normal women is higher than the number of normal men, due to women being more willing to be in harems than men. I am uncertain how big that bias is. I am roughly guessing 5%. All women who are sharing their man with another woman (or women) are in a harem. That includes quite a few wives and mistresses. The percentage of divorcing women matches the percentage of divorcing men, guesswork again.

The dramatic differences come in the “Naysayer” and “Lonely” columns. Men are much less likely to be a naysayer than women, due to men having more testosterone. The result of the reduced number of naysayer men is an increased number of lonely men. Then there is an extraordinary difference in the “Lonely” column. Note most carefully that there are 16 times as many lonely men as lonely women. Note also that this figure is highly sensitive to the percentage of lonely women, which approaches zero. Were all the lonely women to suddenly get men and thereby make their percentage go to zero, the number of lonely men would only decline by one percent. The result would be 15% lonely men with no lonely women at all.

The fundamental cause of the loneliness problem in society is the high percentage of naysayer women. That is the major factor in loneliness amongst men. The willingness of women to be in harems also contributes. If a relatively small portion of the naysayer women could be persuaded to be lonely instead, then the lonely men would have a much greater chance of being normal, by forming relationships with the lonely women. At present, when 16% of the men are chasing 1% of the women, it must turn out badly.

Naysayer women are also bad for the environment. Suppose we had two houses, one with a naysayer woman and one with a lonely man. The land and materials for two houses is used up. Each house with only one person living in it will use up almost as much energy as it would with two people in it. Now suppose the naysayer woman can be induced to change her mind and become lonely. With luck, the lonely man and woman could then form a relationship and become normal. They could live in the one house. Human happiness would be advanced. The land and materials for the second house need never have been expended. The energy requirement is reduced to near half. This is a great benefit to the environment. Environmentalists should be greatly in favour of women making themselves available to men.

The high percentage of lonely men is a problem for society. These men are unhappy. It is a bad thing to have so many men unhappy for any reason, loneliness or not. We should strive to be an inclusive society where everybody can be happy, as far as possible. A major cause of unhappiness is bad behaviour. That is the thing that society should be trying to minimise, by education or other means. No woman should have to put up with a nasty man, so the presence of nasty men is guaranteed to increase the incidence of loneliness, by provoking more women into being naysayers.

Faithfulness

Male faithfulness tends not to happen because most men are forced by women into the strategy of accepting anything they can get. Alpha men have no need to offer faithfulness, women want them regardless. A man might offer faithfulness, but it is likely to be a last desperate strategy to try to increase his attractiveness to women. Women do not like men who resort to last desperate strategies, so offering faithfulness actually does not work on women. In a relationship, a woman will exert pressure to try to make the man faithful, but faithfulness was never part of the initial selection criteria. Marriage was invented to encourage faithfulness. One effective way of keeping a man faithful is to pick one who is not very

attractive to other women, plus supply him with sex and affection so lavishly that he does not feel like being unfaithful [6]. Lots of women do that. It works and it produces human happiness.

If a woman wants her man to be faithful, she has to compromise regarding other attractive characteristics, usually money. Alpha men are always getting their offers accepted by women. It is very difficult for a woman to find an attractive man who is so trustworthy that he sticks to a decision that he is going to be faithful. A woman would be wise to make faithfulness as easy as possible for her man, by consistently being nice to him. Even then, she may still have to forgive a few lapses. A woman needs her resilience. Those not willing to forgive and forget will not have a long-term relationship.

If you want faithfulness, you have to select for moral fibre, trustworthiness, honesty. Those are good things for having a nice life with him, anyway. There are many men out there whose character is so poor that they are not worth having a relationship with. Such a man will make your life a misery with unfaithfulness, drunkenness, abuse, violence and other defects. Stay away. Since he is on his best behaviour when he is courting you, you will need all your intelligence to find the truth before it is too late.

Men prefer to marry a woman aged from 16 to 30 — obviously to get the fertility and the working libido. If you are a single woman over the age of 35, your pool of available attractive men has shrunk drastically, compared to the situation when you were 25. You will need to compromise, but be careful. A lot of the men who are not worth having are still out there. Not all of them have been married off by foolish women.

The great advantage of faithfulness is that you are safer from the threat of venereal disease. There are diseases, such as AIDS, which are incurable, painful and will kill you, or reduce your life expectancy. Having sex with anybody is not entirely safe, however, diseases cannot spontaneously generate. Having sex with one other person exposes you to any diseases they might already have or might get. You have formed a group of two. If either of you gets a disease, the other one will get it. If both members of the group are faithful, then no new diseases can happen. Groups of three or more are also safe, provided everybody in the group is faithful to the group. That raises the matter of trustworthiness. Do you trust everybody else in the group? The larger the group gets, the more people you are trusting not to go outside the group. Clearly, small stable groups are better. Groups of two are the most popular, but a few people have lived safely in larger groups.

Women in Politics

Why are members of parliament overwhelmingly male? It is the men who are putting themselves up for nomination. The only discrimination against women is that done by their own reluctance to nominate. Women are very successful in politics — once they actually nominate. There are enormous numbers of women — not in the paid workforce, fully supported by their husbands, their children of school age or higher — who have all day to do whatever they please. These women could be politically active. They would be a huge political influence. Where are they? When was the last time you heard of a male politician quivering in his boots for fear of offending women's groups?

Women With Brains

Women with high intelligence often complain that men don't seem to like them because "Men don't like brainy women". This is quite incorrect. A woman with brains is a pleasure to be with, just as a man with brains is. Men are perfectly well aware that a woman of high intelligence will hand on her high intelligence to her children. A man would always prefer to have more intelligent children than less intelligent ones. He knows as well as anyone the increasing importance of intelligence in dealing satisfactorily with a more and more complex world. An intelligent woman is a better wife, a better mother, more capable all round, and can

get a better job and bring in more money to the household. Intelligent women are also often very beautiful as well, they have everything. It is amazing how the lack of intelligence in a woman grates, in the eyes of an intelligent man. She might be a stunningly beautiful woman, in looks, but somehow, she gets to look worse and worse the more he realises that she really isn't very bright. With intelligent women, it goes the other way. She might seem quite ordinary to the outside observer, with obvious faults. But once he gets to know her, he stops seeing her faults, everything about her gets to be "just right", and he gets more and more besotted. He falls heavily in love with her if he gets the slightest encouragement. Intelligence in a woman is a very great advantage. Intelligent women are great, wonderful, terrific.

So why is it that men seem not to like women with high intelligence? The reason is that there are two basic types of men, nice and nasty. The nasty ones are untrustworthy. The standard method of exploiting a woman, used by all nasty men everywhere, is to tell her whatever lies may be necessary to get her having sex with him, marry her if need be, get her pregnant until she has enough children to be just able to support them by herself, then he deserts her and refuses to pay for anything more. He never loved her ever, he was just using her. He only loves himself. The process is called "the seven year itch". The intelligent woman can see through this slimy game, and won't play ball. The nasty man knows that, so he generally doesn't try wasting his time on an intelligent woman. What he needs in a woman is gullibility and some stupidity, but not too much stupidity or she won't be a satisfactory single mother.

So the intelligent woman finds that whenever she displays intelligence, lots of men run away. That is quite all right, it is the nasty ones cutting their losses, and she does not want one of them anyway. A nice man reacts quite differently, he admires the intelligence and only wants her more (for the reasons given above). But he may become more hesitant about approaching her on the grounds "She's too good for me, she won't want me". It is up to the woman to be able to accurately judge the character of men available to her to pick out the nice ones from the nasty ones. Every scrap of intelligence she can bring to bear on this problem is vital to her future happiness. Lots of women are just lucky, and get nice men by happy accident. Many more are unlucky, they get nasty men. Some women consciously choose, they are the ones with intelligence.

Lust, Love and Attachment

The way it goes with us humans is that our sexual relationships go through three stages, (1) lust, (2) love and (3) attachment [8]. Each stage builds on the previous stage. Lust is when you say to yourself, "Ooh, he makes me feel hot. I want him." Lust is a fine thing. If it was not for lust, the human race would have gone extinct. Your relationship is in trouble if there is no lust. Kissing, cuddling and sex are all good for increasing lust.

Love is when you say, "I love him. I want to keep him happy. I want to be with him all the time. I want him to love me." You should be getting love and lust at the same time. It is difficult to get a man to love you without lust, nor should you want that to happen. It is a bad idea for anybody to be trying to have a no-lust-with-love relationship, with the plan that it is going to be a lots-of-lust-with-love relationship later. The human mind has difficulty with that. Things tend to go wrong. See the section below about the love test.

Attachment is when you say, "I am really going to stay with this man. Even if we are having problems, I am going to stay with him and work it out." Attachment is great because, provided you both have it, your relationship with your man is solid and stays solid. Having a marriage certificate does not prove you have attachment. You should check that your man has a similar level of attachment to you as you have to him. If you both have attachment, you can fall out of love with him, work out the problems, then fall back in love with him. Of course, it would be nicer to just be in love all the time, but humans do tend to have problems. Attachment gives you security. If everything goes well, you would normally have lust, love and attachment at the same time. Your man should have the same thing. Getting all that, plus a marriage, plus

children, for a long time, is capable of being done, but nobody should imagine that it is easy. However, many men and women have successfully done it.

Attachment without lust is what happens between parents and children. The love is usually there, but not always. For example, it is hard to love someone who has treated you badly.

Love Test

How do you tell whether someone loves you? There is a very simple test. Someone loves you if they care about your happiness and that care **governs their actions**.

If your “lover” tells lies to you, what does it mean? It means he is trying to deceive you. He loves you not. If he destroys your property, is that caring about your happiness? He loves you not. If he frustrates your wishes without thought and without talking to you about the matter, does he care for you? He loves you not. If he holds views that you are an inferior being whose opinions do not matter, he loves you not. If he carelessly exposes you to the risk of disease, he loves you not. If he violates your human rights, he loves you not. If he destroys your self esteem, he loves you not. If he flies into a rage against you over a trifle, he loves you not.

Whether he says, “I love you” is nowhere near as important as your assessment of his actions. Check whether his intentions are good, not whether his execution of those intentions is perfect. Allow him some mistakes. Nobody is perfect. Unforeseen circumstances may make things turn out contrary to the intention. People forget things. People make mistakes.

If he seeks your opinion on lots of issues, he loves you. If he respects your rights, he loves you. If he has a “no means no” policy, he loves you. When something goes wrong, then he is in there trying to get it fixed, he loves you. If he argues with you, intellectually, trying to get your opinion on some issue the same as his, is he being horrible to you? Not at all. He is trying to get you and him pulling in the same direction. He loves you.

Do not forget, while you are applying the love test to him, he is applying it to you. It is your responsibility to make sure that you pass the test, assuming he is a nice man. If he is nasty, what are you doing hanging around with him? Nasty men do not have a good grip on reality. They are unpredictable, unreasonable and untrustworthy. A nasty man is a time bomb. Sooner or later he will go off, then you will suffer.

Lots of women marry handsome rich exciting interesting men, with a good sense of humour. Alas, some of these women forgot to check whether he really loved her and was sane, stable and reasonable. They are the ones who end up in the divorce courts, weeping and wailing.

The only way for a woman to get really loved is to choose a man who wants to love her and adopt a policy of caring about his happiness. He can only be expected to care about her happiness if she cares about his. Lip service only is not good enough, her care must govern her actions. The same goes for him. She must introspect to see how things are appearing from his point of view. For both partners to be happy, both must adopt a responsible attitude to the other. Men and women do not love each other irrationally; it is not like her parents who love her no matter what she does. She has to be “good value” for him. She also should try her best never to be exploited by him. Rational love is the only kind that lasts. She has to be more careful with her lover than anybody else in her life.

The Importance of Genetics

Women are in charge of quality control on men. It is women who get to decide which men shall have children and which men shall not. That is a *lot* of power. The men are helpless in the face of your power. You decide, nobody else. If a man is nice then he will most likely hand his niceness on to his children. Lots of character traits are under genetic control. If some man has treated you badly, go and interview his mother. Enquire of her why her son is so nasty. Ask whether his father is of exemplary character or not. If not, why did she choose to

have children with that man? Give her a real grilling. Women should expect to be able to justify their choice of men.

The most important decision a woman ever makes in her life is the selection of a man to have children with. Once a baby is conceived, its genetic make-up is fixed for all its life. The results of the mixing of the genes is permanent. The resulting adult will hand their genetic inheritance on to the next generation. Picking an inferior man to have children with, means your children will inherit the inferiority and hand it on to their own descendants for ever.

Society in general has a big stake in who gets to have children. If criminals or disabled persons (where the disability is genetically caused) have children, then criminality and disability will spread through the human population. Criminals and the disabled are tremendously expensive to society. The poor old taxpayer pays something over \$50,000 per year for every criminal locked up in jail. If criminals get to run the government, the whole economy gets wrecked, causing vast human misery. Many third-world countries are gruesome examples. The cost of the care of a disabled person over their whole life can run into millions. A civilised society relies on the vast majority being good little taxpayers and only a few costing the taxpayer money. If the expensive few become many, society will collapse into warfare. The stakes could hardly be higher.

Yet this crucial decision is being made by young women who know not what they do. There are no training courses on how to pick a good husband. Most of the books on the subject are worse than useless. There are no associations formed to warn women away from marrying inferior men. There are no lists of inferior men. There are no lists of superior men. Young women just wander around assessing random offers from men. They make their decisions based on little thought and less education.

Love Killers

Love killers are women who are unable or unwilling to select for being loved. Their judgement is bad. They are mixed up about the difference between nice men and nasty men. They say they want a nice man, but because they lack judgement, they keep on getting nasty men. Her nasty man then fails to give her the satisfactory long-term relationship which she wants. Love killers also keep on dumping nice men, because nice men do things which she incorrectly interprets as nasty or inferior. She fails to realise that the nice man she just dumped was one of the few who would ever have been capable of being attached to her. Love killers have endless relationship problems, they just never seem to be able to get it right. They often end up as permanent naysayers.

Love killers usually *want* to be loved. Lots of them are full romantics, expecting the mighty love to just strike out of nowhere, just like it does in romantic novels. They read a lot of romantic novels. That is because instead of living romance in their lives, they have to read about it. They do that to make themselves feel better, just like lonely men consume pornography to make themselves feel better. If she spent all day brooding over what a disaster her personal life is, she would feel terrible.

Autism is an inability to get along with other people. Autistics are unable to correctly perceive what other people regard as acceptable behaviour, so they make social mistakes. They do not have a good "theory of mind". They are too self centred. A love killer has a strange kind of autism spectrum disorder, where she cannot understand the mind of her man. She might be fine with friends and family, but with her man it is all different. He just has to be what she wants. It is important to her ego that he is a man which other women want, an alpha. She wants to feel that she is winning over those other women. She regards her man as a possession for her own gratification, not as a fully complex human being. She does not understand his state of mind, so she ignores it. Whether he is capable of loving her or not, does not get taken into account until it is too late.

She does things which antagonise her man. There is a whole collection of foolish things which women do to their men, which get the men absolutely seething inside. But because he wants her, he says nothing. Women complain that men “do not communicate their feelings”. That is because he is angry at her and he is biting his tongue. She should think back to when the silence from him began, and see if she can work out anything. Men try hard to maintain their relationships with their women, so him refraining from an outburst is a good idea. Nice men can keep this up for many years, they have self discipline. Nasty men can do it for a little while (at the beginning of the relationship), but later on, they just lose their tempers.

Love killers listen to themselves too much and listen to their man too little. If he complains about some aspect of her behaviour, the message she gets is that he thinks she is nasty. She does not understand that he is objecting to the behaviour, not to her. Once again, she is failing to understand his state of mind.

A love killer is so determined that she is going to have an alpha man that she neglects to check beforehand that he is willing and able to love her, on a long-term basis. She wants him to love her, but that is not the same as making love capability a critical part of the selection criteria, otherwise no relationship. Working out his love capability is difficult, no doubt about it. She needs to understand his state of mind, and that is the precise area where a love killer is weak.

She is usually willing to love him. However, if he fails to love her (namely, passing the love test), she will stay with him, provided she continues to believe that he is an alpha man, plus his behaviour must not actually endanger her safety. Her problem is not that she does not want to be loved, it is that her initial selection was bad and that caused her not to be loved.

Love killers are trying to have a win in the game of life, by doggedly going after alpha men, but it does not work. They are the women who have “bad taste” in men. She is following a faulty strategy. Her “program for living” is buggy and it crashes. It is like a buggy computer program, everything seems to be working, then something happens and the computer freezes up and stops dead. The same thing happens to her relationships. Then she has to re-start with a new relationship. That gets tiresome, just the same as re-starting a crashed computer gets tiresome.

Love killers are amazingly tolerant of male bad behaviour. She wants to believe that he is an alpha male and will excuse almost anything, for example, bad behaviour which hurts other people but not her. These are the women who have children with criminals. She wants to believe that he loves her. She only realises that he does not love her when he makes it glaringly obvious. She just wants what she thinks is superior male genetics. If she perceives him as a winner, that is good enough for her.

However, she will not tolerate any behaviour which indicates that he is not an alpha male. Paradoxically, that includes being too nice to her. If he is too nice, then she says he is “clingy”, “weak”, “a loser”, “boring” or “wimpy”, then she drops him. She will not tolerate him having low social status. Of course, being a gamma is an indication of low social status. Any man who is too nice to her must be desperate, and therefore has low social status. She has an internal “alpha switch” inside her brain. Any man who accidentally sets her switch to “not alpha” is doomed. As soon as he is nice to her she thinks, “I can do better than this bloke.” Then she dumps him.

A love killer has considerable difficulty finding any man who is not nasty. Any time she does find a nice man, she thinks he is inferior. They meet up, he is nice to her, she hates it. He is nervous with her, she hates it. She is meeting nice men at regular intervals in her life, but she dumps them all straight away, always on the grounds that there is “no chemistry”. She gives him the classic love killer speech, “You are a very nice man, you will make some woman a wonderful husband, but you are not for me. Goodbye.” No nice man can actually hang around long enough to be her lover.

Another thing which nice men do, which love killers really hate, is to object to any bad behaviour which she displays. Nasty men do not object and might even encourage her bad behaviour. She gets let into conspiratorial secrets on how the nasty man is getting away with something bad. She feels powerful. If she has bad habits, like smoking, drunkenness or drugs, her nasty man is cool with that. He does the same things. Those straight-laced boring nice men do not do any of those bad things. Nasty men are so much more fun.

Men are placed in an almost impossible situation. If they are too nice, they get dumped. If they are too nasty, they get dumped. He has to somehow be nasty and nice at the same time.

The result of this policy is that she has all kinds of relationship difficulties. She usually ends up with a history of single motherhood, or has no children at all. She has a succession of short term relationships. She ends up complaining, "I do not know any nice men. Not one." It is true, if she has some problem, such as a car breakdown, and she needs someone to come along and help her, no former boyfriend will help.

Love killers are sometimes known as "women who love too much", as a reflection of her tendency to tolerate male bad behaviour. These are the women who get beaten up by their men. It is not so much that she loves him, it is hard to love a man who is maltreating you, but she is convinced that he is an alpha male and she cannot do any better, so she stays. The man will encourage that belief by being arrogant and running her down.

A love killer has a time problem when she is initially picking her man. She knows an alpha male will not wait around while she tests him and makes up her mind. She has to make a decision quickly while he is young, before any superiority is really apparent. So love killers are subject to a peculiar error – they pick a man who acts like an alpha male but who is in fact genetically inferior. Alpha males are supposed to be alpha because they are superior, but some men can pretend to be alpha males very successfully. He will have to tell a few lies, of course, but nasty men do not have a problem with that. She makes her decision based on how he acts towards her, not on any careful examination of verifiable facts.

An Amazing Subset

There is an amazing subset of love killers. These are women who have, by blind chance, managed to marry a nice man, but they get tired of him and dump him. Sometimes, such a woman has had children with her nice man, as well. So there she is, married to a nice man, having had children with him, she is living the dream, right? Not according to her. She does not have attachment, then she falls out of love with him and out of lust with him as well. She seizes on some defect of his, then uses that as a reason to leave him.

A fair number of divorces happen this way. There is a baffled man on one side and a woman who is astonishingly angry about some triviality on the other side. The children have no idea what is going on. The man did not help his case by providing the triviality, but he is human, he cannot help making a few mistakes now and then. Men make a lot of mistakes, loving women forgive them, work through the problems and continue on. But a love killer with no lust, love or attachment, she wants out. She might be still looking for that exciting man of her dreams. She might be sick of men altogether and has decided to be a permanent naysayer.

What has happened is that she has failed to move away from her immature love killer ways. She is committing the same mistake she made long ago when she rejected a nice man. She is just doing it a bit later. The real problem is her failure to truly be in love with her man and her failure to achieve attachment. Not being able to achieve attachment is a brain defect. Some people have got that defect, some people have not. There is likely to be a substantial hereditary component. The true long-term answer to that defect is to breed it out of the human population.

Men have to be careful. Men have to look for signs of love killer tendencies, particularly failure to achieve attachment, in a woman's blood relatives, particularly her mother. If such

tendencies are found, the matter is vexing. Extrapolating from the behaviour of her blood relatives to her is highly uncertain, she *could* be just fine. An alpha man can easily change his woman, but a poor beta or gamma is in trouble. He might be really in love with this woman, and most reluctant to lose her. Relationship education can help, but there is no perfect answer. Men just have to take their chances.

Lesbians

This problem understanding the mind of other people may be the cause of quite a bit of lesbianism. A love killer has difficulty understanding the mind of any man, but she might be good enough to be able to understand the mind of another woman. Men and women do have different brains, they do see things differently. So she finds that her relationships with men are difficult, because she cannot see his viewpoint. He seems to be a member of an alien species. Yet she does understand what women are thinking. So women are “easier”. She has better relationships with women. Lesbianism then looks like a good option.

How To Avoid Being A Love Killer

So how can a woman avoid being a love killer? She has to be much more reluctant to reject nice men. All sorts of defects are attributed to nice men in popular culture, which they do not actually have. She has to remember that nice men are difficult to get to know. The nice men start off very afraid of being rejected. They are not much fun until they calm down a bit. They tell the truth instead of lying to you, so they initially do not look as good as the liars. You also need to remember that it is difficult to judge someone. It takes time. You will make mistakes. When that happens, change your man. In these days of internet dating sites, it is easy to get a new man. Every time you try a new man, you will learn things about men. Do not spend long periods without a man, you are just upsetting yourself and holding up your own education.

Note carefully the bad press which nice men generally have. It is the cowardly practice of victimising whoever is least likely to retaliate. Criticising nasty men can get you into trouble, so criticise the nice men. The same thing can be seen happening in politics. Tyrants, who are repulsive individuals continuously engaged in criminality, are treated with astonishing kindness and their defects are routinely glossed over. Meanwhile, any politician who respects the human rights of others, may expect to be the subject of criticism and demonstrations against their policies. Compare what happens to any democratically-elected politician who dares to criticise a tyrant with what happens to the tyrants themselves. The degree of public adulation is high for tyrants and non-existent for democratically elected politicians. In every tyranny, public criticism of the tyrant will get you punished. There is a double standard being applied, driven by fear of retaliation. Double standards are extremely bad for correct decision making. A woman should adopt a unified standard when judging men. Run the same ruler over all of them.

A woman has to be much more ruthless about deliberate male bad behaviour. If he is often not passing the love test, then she needs to make a decision. Carefully distinguish between things he can control and things he cannot control. Distinguish between error and malice, that is important. His behaviour to others of inferior social rank should weigh heavily. If he displays serious character defects, regardless of whether they hurt you at the time or not, dump him. You are entitled to reject defective men, indeed you should. Take your quality control responsibilities seriously.

Remember that an alpha man has no particular concern about whether you like him or not, so he starts off much more relaxed and fun. Alpha men are the ones who are successful with women, they are good at it. An alpha can get another woman any time he likes. Alpha men are the ones who have had lots of women, so an alpha man is much more likely to be carrying a sexually transmissible disease. He is also much more likely to get tired of you and go off with

another woman. Alpha men have that power. If you are terrified of that power being exercised on you, then alpha men are not for you.

Never be desperate for any one particular man. Getting another man is easy. Getting a particular man may not be easy, he may not make an offer to you, for lots of reasons. If that happens, too bad, move on. Be flexible. Fall in love with a man only after you have verified that he is willing and able to be in love with you. Do not expect him to be in love with you immediately. Love takes time. However, lust is instant, that is yet another reason why lust is good. It is quite okay to be in lust with a man, but not in love with him. Treating you well, respecting your human rights and staying away from obvious character defects is also instant, judge him harshly if you do not get all that.

The amazing thing is, there are always lots of nice men available. Because so many women are naysayers or love killers, there is a permanent surplus of nice men. The nice men are quite successful breeders, those loving women out there love them dearly. They have a lot of children. Maybe they are not as successful as the superior alpha men, but they are definitely doing better than the inferior alphas.

A nice man is a far better bet for you as a woman than any alpha nasty man, because a nice man tends to stay with you and be nice to you. Loving women tend to spend most of their lives being normal and being happy. Love killers spend a lot more time being divorcing, naysayers or lonely. Do yourself a favour, be a loving woman, not a love killer.

No Male Love Killers

Men do not have the problem of being a love killer. A man will never dump a woman because she is too nice to him. She can be as nice as she pleases. More niceness is better. All men want their woman to love them.

Of course, men do have the problem of themselves being nasty or making mistakes, which will tend to cause the failure of relationships. But that is not the same as being a love killer. The critical thing about love killers is that they reject niceness in their man, as evidence of inferiority. A “male love killer” would be a man who perceives niceness in a woman as a disadvantage. There may be men who think like that, but they are a statistically insignificant minority.

Bad Effects of Love Killers

Love killers are a disaster for society as well as themselves. They breed with nasty men, thus increasing the percentage of nasty people in society. The result of that is that political parties advocating nasty policies become more powerful. A criminal gang can take over the government. That is precisely what happened in Saddam-era Iraq. Then being a supporter of the tyranny is a huge advantage in being successful in the society. There is a positive feedback effect occurring, where nastiness is rewarded. Ultimately, the society collapses into continuous warfare, with competing warlords perpetually fighting each other for dominance. Failed states, such as Somalia, are an example of this process.

The effect on women is terrible. With very few exceptions, they are forced down to poverty, with no access to decent health care or proper education for their children. They live lives of misery with their human rights routinely violated. They are treated as second class citizens or worse, no better than animals. They struggle to keep themselves and their children alive, with the father(s) of the children not helping. The women get old and sick at a young age, followed by an early death. This is the exact fate of the vast majority of women in the third world.

There are many examples in the world of countries which have large natural resources, which should be pleasant places to live, but because these countries are run by nasty men, the places are hell-holes. Conversely, there are other countries with poor natural resources, which are pleasant places to live. They are always advanced western democracies. The Scandinavian

countries are examples. The difference between the countries is in the behaviour of the alpha men running the society. Natural resources help, but they cannot overcome bad behaviour by human beings. Criminals are attracted to easy money, so that is why the possession of natural resources is often accompanied by a tyrannical government.

Could love killers really be doing all this? Yes. It is the men who are running society and the men who are doing bad things, but it is the love killers who are rewarding the nasty men in the most effective way possible, by having children with them. An advanced society can tolerate some level of nastiness in the population, but there is some sort of tipping point where the nastiness starts to have a bad effect on society. Society then tends to degenerate. There are many examples of societies which have gone into decline, basically due to a nasty government getting into power. Nazi Germany and Zimbabwe are examples.

The men are a product of their genetic inheritance and their environment. The environment is effectively a confusing factor. To select the best genes, women need to discount environmental factors and try to separate out the genetics. That is hard to do. The men do not have any choice over their own genetics. They just act like men and take what they can get. Men can try to affect society by trying to encourage good behaviour, but nasty men mostly do their evil regardless of any appeals to conscience. The ones with the power to change things are the young women of reproductive age. They are the mistresses of the universe. They are the ones who take the decisions with such vast consequences. It is women who have the power and the responsibility to change the percentage of nasty men.

Some societies tolerate polygamy. Even in advanced societies where polygamy is outlawed, some women voluntarily join harems. The women argue along the lines, "He is the only one with any money who wants me. I need money to pay for my children. I have to accept the relationships with other women." Unfortunately, regardless of the general level of wealth in a society, rich and nasty tend to go around together. Predators often do well, economically. So a woman who selects for wealth is often also selecting for nastiness. Then these women have children with the rich and nasty men, unintentionally making the level of nastiness in the society go up. There are also more angry young men around, because they cannot get a woman. Yet they see rich men with multiple wives, so the angry young men seek revenge. The society then performs worse, economically, due to the higher level of nastiness. The women then get even more desperate to select for wealth. So the harder the women in a society try to select for wealth, the poorer the society becomes. Polygamy is bad because it makes it easier for women to select for wealth, plus it encourages bad behaviour amongst men. The final result is a poverty-stricken society where polygamy is tolerated. Women are reduced to a pathetically low status. Many African countries are examples of this pathology.

The only way out of this cycle of despair is for women to select primarily for niceness and only secondarily for other things. Take care not to confuse niceness with weakness or any of the other deficiencies popularly attributed to nice men.

Distinguishing Between Nice and Weak

Games theory predicts that the optimum policy is to be nice to others who are nice to you, and be nasty to others who are nasty to you, but default to nice when you have no knowledge. Keep your niceness and nastiness in proportion to that displayed by the other person. Take care that your perception of niceness or nastiness is accurate. That doctrine is actually how the legal system in advanced countries is supposed to work. People who have committed no crime are considered nice and are given freedom. Convicted criminals are considered nasty and are treated in a nasty way by being punished. Fair trials constitute an attempt to perceive nice and nasty accurately. Punishment proportional to the crime constitutes making the legal system's degree of nastiness reflect the degree of nastiness of the criminal. The presumption of innocence constitutes defaulting to nice. If the legal system could do all that perfectly, then it

would deliver justice. Real legal systems tend to be imperfect, however. Justice is the ideal to which all good legal systems aspire.

One of the major reasons why a tyranny is so unpleasant is that its legal system does not work that way. It is deliberately perverted so as not to provide justice. There is a culture of impunity for persons in the elite, they can engage in terrible nastiness to non-elite persons, which will go unpunished. Non-elite persons can never rely on a fair trial. If an elite person accuses them of something, punishment is inevitable, regardless of whether the accusation was true or false. The economy of the tyranny is always gravely damaged by the lack of a just legal system.

Both nice and weak people are nice to other nice people. That is easy. Likewise it is easy to be nice to strangers. So niceness in those situations does not help you to distinguish between nice and weak.

Weak people are nice to everybody, regardless of whether the other person is nice or nasty. There is no retaliation against other people being nasty. That is a mistake because it encourages the nasty people to keep on being nasty by imposing no detriment on them. So nasty behaviour will become more common as the nasty people are allowed to “get away with it”. The weak people are unwilling to perceive the nastiness or unwilling to engage in any retaliation. Weakness is often caused by personal cowardice. Weakness is a disastrous policy in the long term because it causes an increase in nastiness. Weakness is not nice.

However, nice people have internalised the basic rules of justice explained in the first paragraph of this section, so they are nice to other nice people and strangers, but nasty to nasty people. That means that bad behaviour gets discouraged. Bad guys get removed from society by being put in jail. The result is that society gets nicer – as desired by nice people.

Notice the importance of the punishment being proportional to the crime. Excessive punishments invite escalation of the conflict, plus they cost too much. Insufficient punishments are ineffective as punishments and leave the nasty person with a net benefit for their bad behaviour, thereby encouraging the bad behaviour. Many societies may be noted getting this proportionality wrong. Minor criminals are punished with extraordinary harshness – which is a foolish waste of the taxpayer's money. Major criminals are punished insufficiently. An example would be the treatment of most white collar criminals, who routinely cause vast losses but spend very little time in jail. Then, when they get out, they live a life of luxury on their ill-gotten gains (hidden where law-enforcement cannot get at it) for the rest of their lives.

The critical difference between nice and weak is the behaviour towards nasty people. Nice people stand up to nasty people and punish them for bad behaviour. The crucial question is, “Does he stand up to the bad guys?” Yes means nice, no means weak. Weak people fail to implement the rules of justice, thereby encouraging injustice. Injustice causes a descent into tyranny and warfare. Failing to correctly distinguish between niceness and weakness is a terrible mistake.

Love Killer Break Ups

Love killers have four kinds of break ups.

Nasty Man Dumps Her

He got tired of her. He got another woman. It is all over. She usually does not get told, he just never calls again. It can take her quite a while to work out what has happened.

She Dumps Her Nasty Man

She cannot take the bad behaviour any more, she has a huge argument with him and tells him it is all over. Nasty men really do not like being dumped, regardless of their own bad behaviour. It is an affront to their manhood. Domestic violence can happen. Ugly contested divorces come from this.

Nice Man Dumps Her

He gets tired of her bad behaviour. He might be lucky enough to get another woman, maybe not. Nice men do sometimes work out for themselves that their relationship with a love killer has no future. Then, in a nice polite way, they leave. She does get told.

She Dumps Her Nice Man

This is standard love killer behaviour. If he knows what is good for him, the nice man leaves and stays gone.

The Standard Excuse

After one of her regular relationship disasters with a nasty man, a love killer's friends and family may notice the pattern and start asking awkward questions. The critical one is, "Why did you pick this guy?" The standard love killer excuse is, "My self esteem was low. I was desperate for love. I thought I could not do any better." It is important to realise that the excuse is a *very clever lie*.

At the time our love killer selected her man, her self esteem was anything but low. She thought she was having a win by picking an alpha man. She thought she was strong enough to cope with anything he could dish out, she thought she was indestructible. She was having fun, what bad behaviour and character defects? She did not care. She was not suffering from low self esteem, she was suffering from over-confidence.

Yet now she is claiming low self esteem, why? Answer, to get *victim status*. The reaction of listeners is, "Oh you poor thing. You picked this low quality man because you thought you were low quality yourself. There, there." After the relationship disaster, it is clear that the man was of low quality, so she is lying to try to justify her choice of a low quality man. Notice that she is definitely lying, because at the time she selected him, she thought he was a *high* quality man. She has never been known to think she was stuck with low quality men. Any time anybody asked her, she was always going for the best there is. She never suffers low self esteem, except maybe straight after a break up. At that time, she is into her naysayer phase, so she is never looking for a man when she has low self esteem. With the delights of victim status, her self esteem recovers, the over-confidence returns, *then* she goes into the lonely phase, ready to do it all again. The wonderful thing about having victim status is that everybody is nice to you. You might even get to cause the person who has victimised you to get punished, thereby getting revenge. Victim status is great. Lots of women are good at getting it. Then they play it up for all it is worth.

How about the "desperate for love" part of the excuse? That is an attempt to conceal her love killer ways. Sure, she wants to be loved, but she refuses to make a rational realistic assessment of whether a man is capable of loving her long-term. All that is too much work and gets in the way of the fun. So she picks a man with such serious character defects that he cannot love her in the long term.

The real answer to the question should be something like, "I was over confident. I did not check this guy out carefully enough. I ignored the warning signs. I forgot about selecting for good character. I ignored his history. I did not check out his blood relatives." Then she would begin a long discussion on how she could avoid making the same mistakes in future. She would take responsibility for her own actions and not seek victim status. Ask yourself, would a love killer do all that?

Tragic End of a Love Killer

Reported in the Sydney Morning Herald [3], was a classic story of the bad effects of being a love killer. A young woman, Adele Lynch had had two children from different fathers. Her daughter, Molly, was 8. Her son, Mason, was 1. Ms Lynch was living in her house with a third man, Aaron Reed, who was thought by neighbours to be an amphetamine user. Ms Lynch and

Mr Reed had a domestic argument which culminated in the house being burnt down and the deaths of Ms Lynch, Mr Reed and Mason. Molly was told to run away by her mother, so Molly survived uninjured.

The late Ms Lynch must take full responsibility for the disaster. Ms Lynch made a poor selection of the father of Molly, he left, presumably at the insistence of Ms Lynch. Ms Lynch made another poor selection with the father of Mason, he also left. The article reports that he also returned on another occasion and had a violent fight with Mr Reed. Ms Lynch had made yet another poor selection with Mr Reed, because that mistake ended up killing her. Ms Lynch had at least three short-term unsatisfactory relationships, which is classic love killer behaviour. She did not learn from the failures of the relationships with the fathers of her children. Her judgement was evidently not improving, based on her selection of Mr Reed. She had a life of unhappiness, featuring violence and arguments.

The newspaper article has a picture which shows Ms Lynch to be quite an attractive young woman. She would easily have been able to get a nice man had she so wished. Had she done so, her tragic end would never have happened. She would be living happily with her nice man and her children. Her children would be descended from the nice man and would have every chance of being fine members of the community. Ms Lynch herself chose a different path. She was not a helpless victim, she was the one exercising the power, running her own life. All the crucial bad decisions were made by Ms Lynch. Perhaps Molly will learn the terrible lesson taught by her mother and try not to repeat her mother's mistakes. We can but hope.

The newspaper article asks why was the tragedy not prevented. It also complains about inadequate government services to deal with domestic violence. The real problem is women like Ms Lynch choosing to be love killers. If society can reduce the incidence of love killers, by education or otherwise, then domestic violence will go down regardless of poor government services. Attack the cause of the problem, not the symptoms.

Love Killer Blames Society

Reported in the Sydney Morning Herald [5] was another sad example of what can happen to a love killer. In 1997 Ms Ingrid Poulson taught English in Thailand. She formed a relationship with a local man, Mr Phitak Kongsom. They were happy at first. They returned to Australia. They had two children. Mr Kongsom deteriorated into violence. In September 2003, Mr Kongsom raped Ms Poulson, then killed her father, their two children and finally himself.

Ms Poulson is now a campaigner for more resources to be put into handling domestic violence. However, the real cause of Ms Poulson's problems was her own initial poor selection of Mr Kongsom. None of her problems would ever have happened had she selected a nice man. Had she done adequate due diligence on Mr Kongsom, she would have had an excellent chance of working out that he was not nice. It is conceivable that Mr Kongsom started out a nice reasonable man, then mysteriously suffered a dramatic adverse personality change, however, that is most unlikely. Far more common is the situation where a nasty man is being careful in order to get a woman. However, they always give out little hints. Then they return to their true nature as time goes by, especially after marriage and children. A woman has to be careful.

Poor initial selection of a man is the precise problem that love killers have. They may make every effort to retrieve the situation, after the initial selection mistake, as Ms Poulson appears to have done. There is no substitute for careful selection. If you find you have made a selection mistake, just leave. Do not try to change the man, that does not work. Do not try to get society to fix your mistakes. Do not allow the man to intimidate you into staying. The stakes are too high, both for yourself and society.

Ms Poulson was greatly victimised by her late husband, but she is also a perpetrator because she selected him and she brought him to Australia. She made the crucial decisions.

Campaigning for changes in the law and resources makes Ms Poulson a kind of politician. She has to expect some criticism from those who do not agree with her policies. Be careful that you are not so impressed by her victim status that you do not see that she is also a perpetrator and a politician.

Ms Poulson appears not to be campaigning for improved education of girls to prevent them from making selection mistakes. The trouble with expecting society to clean up after love killers is that it cannot work long term. Reproduction is involved. The problem will get worse. The love killers will go right on having children with the nasty men. There will be more and more love killers and nasty men. The resources expended on supporting the disastrous choices of the love killers will rise higher and higher. It will all get ugly. Ultimately, something will break.

The real solution is to improve the decision-making of women. Get rid of love killers by educating them out of existence, before they have children. Of course, a few will always slip through. They should be subject to social disapproval, not pandered to as victims of domestic violence. Remember who exercises the power, who made the crucial decisions.

Nice and Nasty Men

Many women think men are “too complicated”. That is true for nasty men, but the good news is that nice men are wonderfully easy to get along with. The nasty men are always thinking up new ways to fool you and make you end up unhappy. It is amazing how clever the nasty men are. You have to admire what a successful bunch of predators they are. What makes it harder, is that lots of them are rich and socially prominent. But **you** do not have to be one of their victims. If you are smart enough and careful enough, you can get and keep a nice man.

Why would you bother being nice to some man? Aren't men all beasts? Don't they deserve to be treated harshly? Women who think that way have been spending far too much time with nasty men. Stop it, cut your losses. A nasty man will always end up treating you badly, regardless of how nice he seems to be at the start. It is not possible to keep him happy permanently. Sooner or later, he will decide he has had enough of you, then your life will become a misery. There will be arguments. There will be hostility. You and he will separate.

The crucial thing to pay attention to when trying to distinguish between a nasty man and a nice one is to work out whether he has a conscience. Of course, women who are themselves a conscience-free zone are going to struggle to do that. Can he tell right from wrong? Does he do the right thing even when it would be convenient to do the wrong thing? How does he treat people and animals over which he has some power? Does he get offended by others doing the wrong thing? One real give-away for nastiness is someone making false and malicious allegations against other people of inferior social position. That is the standard behaviour of psychopaths. If you see that happening, treat it as a large warning sign. Do not object, just say to yourself, “Aha, now I know.”

The reason nice men are nice is that they perceive and do not tolerate their own bad behaviour. They have all made unpunished mistakes, at various times. After a mistake, the nice men say to themselves, “Oops, that was a mistake. Try not to do that again.” Nice men are harder for a woman to hang on to, at first, because he has the judgement to correctly perceive bad behaviour. The fact that he can see his own bad behaviour means that he can see yours as well. If he does not tolerate bad behaviour in himself, he is unlikely to tolerate it in you. Therefore, you have to be careful.

Nasty men think differently. With an unpunished mistake, the nasty men say to themselves, “You beauty, I got away with that. Could be handy.” If a nasty man hurts someone, the hurt is the victim's problem. Nasty men do not care. Their consciences do not work. Not having a working conscience is actually an intellectual defect. It is a symptom of autism. Stay away from defective men. A nasty man is more tolerant of female bad behaviour because he tends

not to see it or not to care, provided it does not adversely affect him. So he never has “uncomfortable” conversations with you where he objects to your bad behaviour to others. However, he will have unpleasant conversations with you any time you fail to conform with his self interest.

White collar criminals are classic cases of nasty men. For example, a “Ponzi Scheme” involves establishing an “investment” company and attracting investors with the promise of extraordinarily high investment returns. Existing investors are paid from the money put in by new investors. The organisers loot the company as much as they can with salaries, fees and bonuses paid to themselves. All such schemes ultimately collapse, which is why they are illegal. Search Google for “ponzi scheme” for full details. After the collapse, there are normally large numbers of distraught former investors who have lost their life savings. The organisers walk away wealthy, if they stay out of jail. The attitude of the organisers is that the losses by the investors is “not my problem”. Vast human misery has been caused and the fact that the men who made it happen do not care, proves they are nasty. However, there are women who will see the wealth of these nasty men, ignore how they came by it, and reward them by having children with them. The long term damage to society, by such immorality amongst the nasty men and the foolish women, is incalculable. All women should be exceptionally careful not to add to such disasters.

Nice men do not just hang around and be nice to some woman for no reason. They have all had bad experiences, so the niceness only gets offered to women who deserve it. If you want your relationship with a nice man to prosper, you have to be nice back to him. You actually do not have a choice. You have to be one of the deserving ones. If you are not nice to your nice man, he can tell, then he will go looking for another woman. The reward for being nice to him is that he is nice to you – then you get to be loved and be happy. It is worth it.

Be more resilient. Adopt a more gung-ho attitude. Things go wrong between men and women. It happens all the time. Do not stress over it. It is not your fault. If you are not having fun with some man, dump him, learn the lessons he has taught you, as best you can, then get another man. That is genuinely the best that can be done by any woman. Take comfort in the fact that you are running the optimum strategy. Be proud that you are a grown up woman and you are strong enough to cope with things going wrong. You have a defined recovery strategy which you use as necessary. It is just the happiness machine working normally. There are nasty men everywhere, you are bound to encounter a few. It is like the general rule for investment, “Let your profits run. Cut your losses.” Having a nice man constitutes making a profit – let it run. Being lonely or suffering a nasty man constitutes making a loss – cut it short.

If more women did that, the nasty men would be a lot more lonely and do a lot less damage. The nice men would have love and happiness. That would be a huge benefit to society. Do your bit.

The Four Rules for Keeping A Man Happy

Many women who read these four rules cannot believe it is that simple. It is. Here they are:

Rule 1: Reciprocal niceness

Pick a nice man in the first place. It is your responsibility to be a nice woman for him. Nice men are hard to distinguish from nasty men, at first. Nice men can be kept happy. Nasty men cannot. Falling in love with a nasty man is a grave error. This rule is the hardest one to do.

Rule 2: Present and pleasant

Spend a lot of time with him. Be polite, assertive, reasonable and generally easy to get along with. You do not have to agree with him on everything. Nice men cope well with you having your own mind. Nasty men want to control you.

Rule 3: Kisses and cuddles

Men like kisses and cuddles, give him lots.

Rule 4: Bed and sex

The only way a man knows his woman truly loves him is when she wants to go to bed with him and willingly has sex with him. The dangers of unwanted pregnancy and venereal disease can arise. There are various techniques for minimising those dangers. You are a grown up woman. Make some decisions, with him, and deal with it. Going to bed with him every night makes it hard for him to sleep with any other woman. Protect your position in his life.

The Dangers

All those normal women out there know what they are doing – they are maximising their happiness. However, a woman faces dangers in her search for a man.

Nasty Men

Nasty men are everywhere. It is up to you to tell the difference between them and the nice men. Be strictly realistic about what a nasty man will and will not do for you. Do not be surprised if he turns out to be more nasty than you thought at first. He is a predator. Predators prey on the weak. His conscience is a fraud. The lion does not suffer a bad conscience when it eats the lamb. It is your job to make sure your lifetime of happiness is not on the menu.

Venereal Disease

Every time you have sex, you run a disease risk. The risk is less for kissing. It is less again for just being near someone else. From the point of view of a disease organism, propagating during sex is a great idea. Lots of sexually transmissible diseases are incurable, fatal, destroy your fertility and cause pain, maybe a lifetime of pain. Unless you decide to be a hermit, there is no way to avoid all disease risk. Deal with it. Acquaint yourself with the unpleasant facts, then plan accordingly. Alpha men are more likely to be harbouring disease than the betas or the gammas. If a man is unwilling to submit to testing, you should regard that very seriously. He is trying to hide something which you have a right to know.

If you have a sexually transmissible disease, it is your responsibility to reveal it to him. It is a serious criminal offence to expose another person to a disease without warning them and gaining their consent. If you and he break up over it, that is too bad. Deal with it.

Unwanted Pregnancy

The standard method for a nasty man to exploit a woman is to have as many children with her as she can support by herself, then he leaves. That is why it is prudent for a woman to check that the man wants to have children. Children are a powerful way of keeping your man with you. Lots of men love their children deeply and want to keep the family together. Make it easy for him to feel that way.

No or Inferior Children

Naturally, you want the best male genes for the children you hope to have. You have to make a rational assessment, bearing in mind all his genetically-related good points and defects. Remember that much of human behaviour is genetically determined, so if you foolishly have children with a nasty man, they will inherit his nastiness. Do you really want nasty children? However, do not spend so much time making up your mind that you end up with no children. Having no children is the equivalent of being so unattractive that no man would have you at all. A woman's time to have her children is limited.

No Happiness

When you have no man your life runs at an inferior level. The only way for a woman to be truly happy is to love a man and have him love her back. That is the way our biology has made us. It is a grave mistake to be so concerned about the other dangers of having a man that you decline to have one at all and spend your life alone. Your social status will be poor. You will be unhappy, disappointed with yourself and permanently angry. Your hormonal balance will go bad because you are not receiving regular supplies of oxytocin [7] and testosterone. The

result will be that you will get old faster, get sick sooner and die younger. That is no way for a sensible woman to treat herself.

Feminism

First, some definitions: Feminism is the doctrine advocating that the social and political rights of women be equal to those possessed by men. A feminist is a man or woman who implements feminism. The noun is “feminist”; the adjective is “feministic”. A male feminist is not the same as an effeminate man. “Feminine man” or “female man” is a contradiction in terms. The term “feminist” should not be used as a contraction for “feministic woman”, such usage is insulting to feministic men who are thereby assumed not to exist. Feminist is a gender-neutral term, those who use it otherwise are engaged in sexism.

Feminism is never going to be a long-term successful doctrine while those who adopt it suffer disadvantage, particularly reproductive disadvantage. Feminists have to have at least as many children as non-feminists. Feministic women should positively discriminate in favour of feministic men. This business that the “new man” is not sexy needs to be fought against. Feministic women need to find out why there are women (even some female feminists) who think that feminism in a man is unattractive. The statement “Feminists are sexy!” needs to be regularly affirmed in word and deed. It should also be shown to apply to male as well as female feminists.

Adolescent girls and boys are dropping feminism on a large scale. The theory is that the battle is won, and they will simply continue to enjoy the benefits of feminism. This is false, the male-supremacists have not gone away and will gradually dismantle the laws placed on the books at the behest of feminists and pass new laws to repress women. Feminism has to be a continuing doctrine supported by large numbers of feminists willing to use their votes and their money to destroy the political future of any non-feminist. What happens at the ballot box determines the laws we all live under.

One of the reasons people are dropping feminism is the activities of some so-called “radical feminists”. Let us call them “radfems” so we don’t get confused. These are women who have apparently adopted a man-hating philosophy, they object to men and anything male. This is not feminism, it is female supremacy, a philosophy with no future because it is offensive to men. Men are not about to go away, or roll over and play dead, any attempt to even advocate female supremacy will be fiercely fought against. Men accept feminism because it is fair. Female supremacy is just as subject to abuses as male supremacy, all feminists should be against it.

The radfems are in serious trouble, intellectually and socially. Most of them are determined naysayers. Their reproductive success is very poor. A population which does not reproduce itself has no future, and is likely to face increasing difficulties in recruitment of new members. The worst thing which is facing the radfems is that they are not loved. A man cannot reasonably be expected to love a woman who hates men. They have lesbianism, of course, but that is a bad environment for raising children, even if they can arrange to get themselves pregnant. The lack of a father figure (and his love, guidance, work, help and money) disadvantages the children. A pregnant lesbian is giving the father of her child a free ride because he pays nothing for the upbringing of the child. That is being pretty nice to some man, a funny way to act for someone who hates men.

One of the favourite sayings of the radfems is, “A woman needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle.” Granted, fish don’t need bicycles. But a man is essential for a woman to reproduce herself. Men and women are the same species, quite unlike fish and bicycles. A woman is only successful as a woman if she has a man who loves her. This is the perception of the majority of society. Women who do not think this way must be reproductively unsuccessful because they do not enjoy the assistance of a man; biological, social and financial. The radfems will

continue to be a tiny fringe group with no power and no future. True feminists should stay well clear of them.

Who has Control of a Relationship

For two people to continue a relationship both must agree it is to continue. Either one may decide to end it. However, the woman nearly always has control of the relationship between a man and a woman, because the man hardly ever exercises his right to end a relationship. Men nearly always want the relationship to continue, because he knows how difficult it is to get another woman. Men are mostly bigger and stronger than women so she has more to fear from physical violence. So if things start to look nasty, then it is in her interest to get out fast. It is the woman who decides to end the relationship in almost all cases.

Maybe the reason the relationship was unsatisfactory was her fault, maybe not. The extreme difficulty in determining this point is why no-fault divorce was introduced.

As soon as she gets pregnant, she becomes vulnerable to exploitation by the standard nasty man technique of simply walking out. But she must get pregnant to reproduce herself. It is then that she finds out whether she has been careful enough in the selection of her man. She has the scarce reproductive capacity, so valuable to men. It takes her a full year to produce one baby (including lactation). The man's investment in his children really comes when he pays for their upbringing. If he can avoid that then he has effectively robbed the woman.

Marriage is the social and legal mechanism which is supposed to ensure faithfulness on both his and her part. It exists mainly for the protection of women and children. When a man says he loves her he is really saying "I am going to keep providing support. I'm safe".

If she has got a nice man, he wants to keep on being nice to her, he stays. If he and she can manage to keep on being reasonably nice to each other, they will have a happy life. The question of who has control scarcely arises because there is no likelihood of the relationship ending.

Sometimes a man is attractive enough to have two women interested in him at once, then he has control. He soon makes that apparent. The woman is trapped, she realises that he doesn't and probably never did love her. She is shocked and disappointed. She gets depressed.

It can be seen that a critical part of a woman retaining control until she is confident that it is safe to get pregnant, is the ability to control her own fertility. Denying her man sex is hardly the way to hang on to him, or to convince him that she loves him. But if she gets pregnant before he is ready, he is likely to desert her, leaving her exploited. Thus, feminists are in favour of adequate contraceptive and health advice and supplies being readily available to everybody, man or woman, married or not.

The availability of abortion on request by the woman is also critical to saving some women from exploitation as a result of a mistake or contraceptive failure. Nobody much likes abortion, but it is either that or some women get their lives wrecked.

Any person who is against sex education, adequate contraception or the availability of abortion on request, is striking directly at the ability of women to control their own lives. Such a person is no feminist.

How to be a Successful Feministic Woman

A woman's time to have her children is short compared to her whole life. Ages 20 to 35 is about it. That is only 16 years in a lifespan of typically over 80 years – less than 20 percent. If you are in that age range, be aware of your power. The nasty men will be trying hard to get you. Watch out. The nice men are harder to find, but they are out there. Work at it. Many women have tried and failed to have children at older ages. Do not leave it too late. Take it seriously. Be genuine.

Be normal. Get yourself a nice feministic man who is willing to love you. Love him back. Check that he loves you, reliably, consistently over the long term. You can't expect perfection, the best you can do is rationally maximise your happiness. Weigh all your options carefully. Be careful with your lover, you want him to last all your life, don't break him accidentally.

More Copies

The latest version of this document may be found at:

<http://www.netspeed.com.au/adglenn/Relationship.htm>

Please feel free to print out as many copies as you like and give them away. Feedback on this document is welcomed.

References

1. *The Selfish Gene*, by [Richard Dawkins](#), Oxford University Press, 1976.
This is the book that catapulted Richard Dawkins from obscure zoologist to world-famous scientist. Professor Dawkins is presently (2006) [Charles Simonyi](#) Professor of the Public Understanding of Science at the University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.
2. *The Female Eunuch*, by [Germaine Greer](#), 1970.
This is the book that made Dr Greer famous. Professor Greer (b. 1939) was Professor of English Literature at the [University of Warwick](#), UK, but she has now retired.
3. *Too late for Molly, but there must be answers*, Sydney Morning Herald, 2006 February 27, by Paola Totaro and Gwyn Topham.
<http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2006/02/26/1140888748091.html>
4. *What men and women really think*, Sydney Morning Herald, 2006 June 13, by Samantha Brett.
http://blogs.smh.com.au/samandthecity/archives/2006/06/what_men_and_wo.html
5. *Forget the statistics - meet my family*, Sydney Morning Herald, 2006 June 14, by Adele Horin.
<http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2006/06/13/1149964534949.html?page=fullpage#contentSwap1>
6. *Hormone of monogamy: the prairie vole and the biology of mating. (brain hormone vasopressin associated with monogamy)*, Highbeam Research, Science News; 1993 November 27; by Kathy A. Fackelmann.
<http://www.highbeam.com/library/docfree.asp?DOCID=1G1:14642472>
7. *Oxytocin: The Hormone of Love*, Oxytocin.org, 1999 July 14.
<http://www.oxytocin.org/oxytoc/index.html>
8. *Why We Love: The Nature and Chemistry of Romantic Love*, by Helen Fisher. Henry Holt and Company, New York.