

The Myth of the Middle Class Alpha Male, Part 1

Last summer I was in Jaco, Costa Rica. It was one hell of a poor and cutthroat place. It was very much a crime and vice-infested town with a Wild West, anything goes feel and where the cops were basically a joke, except when it comes to harassing drunk tourists. It was incredibly grimy and bleak. I spent most of the vacation sitting by a pool in our house getting twisted and barbecuing.

There was a lot of petty crime and vice going on in Jaco. Drugs and other vices were everywhere out in the open, in daylight and nighttime. Lots of hustlers and crumbsnatchers. It was touristy in some densely trafficked areas but there were a lot of isolated spots where you could get got if you weren't careful. But for the most part it wasn't dangerous if you had even a hint of street smarts.

Most of the criminals I saw were local [crash test dummies](#). Little dirt-poor young knucklehead locals who seemed influenced by too many gangsta rap images from America and too much reggaeton and ended up dressing and acting like bad parodies of a hip-hop stereotype. Punks trying to look hard and practice their ice grills, but as I said earlier nothing to worry about if you had even a hint of common sense or street smarts. But if you were careless and gave them an opening, they'd rob you blind.

At one nightclub we went to, I saw one girl who had to be the most beautiful creature I saw in my whole time down there. She was head and shoulders above every woman I had seen in the town. She had this style of dress that I can only describe as a modern haute couture/old world gypsy/bohemian/WWII European refugee chic/space age futuristic Paris runway mashup with lots of costume jewelry and gaudy accessories that she played straight yet managed to pull off without looking camp, kitschy, she somehow got all those disparate elements to blend together seamlessly and become more than the sum of their parts. For physical appearance picture Ava Gardner in Barefoot Contessa meets Shakira meets Dorothy Dandridge in Carmen Jones meets Jessica Alba...but with just a light sprinkling of light brown freckles on the olive skin of the bridge of her nose and upper cheeks, almost unnoticeable on first glance. The kind of appearance that's so subtly exotic that she could conceivably belong to every race on the planet. And finally, she had a very seductive but classy body language that worked to maximum effect but without looking at all try-hard or desperate for attention. Ultrasexual but not slutty. Restrained but not prudish or icy. Great poise, posture and movement. Yet the final coup de grace was that despite all of this...she looked friendly, interesting and approachable. She somehow managed not to be intimidating at all, and didn't put out the bitch shield unapproachable vibe that a comparatively hot women would if she were in America. My friend had a conversation with her and found her very pleasant and charming.

She wasn't just hot by the relative standards of the uninspiring local talent. She would turn heads in the trendiest bar in Hollywood filled with aspiring starlets and models. It was the combination of her physical assets, her unique and well-conceived fashion style and her demeanor that would make her stand out in any room in any country in the world.

She was on the balcony of the club standing next to me, and I thought to myself *In a third world shithole like this, who does this chick fuck with?* See, in a Vegas, Los Angeles or a New York, a chick with looks and game like this girl would be fucking with straight moguls. She could golddig with the best of them if she wanted, without much effort. I'm not talking the glorified groupie chicks who mistakenly call themselves goldiggers and waste their time being jumpoffs for athletes and rappers and B-list actors for occasional shopping spree money or a free bottle here and there in a nightclub. I'm talking the type of chick who skips all the bullshit athletes, rappers and actors and gets *wifed up* by the team owner, the record label owner or entertainment mogul. The kind of chick dudes would be courting not with expensive dinners, vacations and jewels but by buying her a home, a car or a business. She'd get a new promise to make her famous every day. I totally would know her story and her type in the type of urban metropolis I'm from. But here, in Jaco, Costa Rica, in this almost primal, dog-eat-dog grimy town that is dirt poor and virtually lawless, *who does an alpha female like this fuck with?*

I was about to find out.

The Myth of the Middle Class Alpha Male, Part 2

The nightclub we were at was on the second floor of the building, with different landings in multiple directions that allowed you to lean on a railing and look downward at people entering from the ground floor and heading upstairs. I was spending my time at the club people watching rather than actively socializing. As I saw one unremarkable person after another enter, my eyes began to glaze over with boredom. I was just counting down the hours, no minutes, before I'd be heading home.

Suddenly my vision sharpened. I saw a man enter that caught my attention. Let's call him CR Alpha. On the surface there was nothing really impressive about him. He wasn't remarkably fit. He wasn't remarkably unfit. He was slim but not muscular. He wasn't tall but wasn't particularly short either. He wasn't incredibly handsome although he wasn't ugly. He wasn't especially well dressed. He definitely wasn't [peacocking](#). He just had a basketball jersey, some track pants and some sneakers. He had a slight swagger but it was understated and not a godzilla-stomping-out-tokyo badass strut or anything like that; he had no chip on his shoulder or attitude that he was looking for trouble. He had some tattoos, but not the outrageous amount guys get when they're

blatantly overselling the bad boy image. But I could tell there was something about him. He exuded maximum confidence and control of his domain with a bare minimum of cocky displays or overt exertion.

As I described before, the streets of Jaco were filled with a lot of [crash test dummy criminal types](#). The kind of petty crooks who would try to sell you drugs or steal your stuff in a heartbeat if you left it unattended. They walked around trying to look as grimy and hard as possible all the time. I classified them immediately as opportunist punks, dangerous in that if they saw a moment of weakness, like you were drunk and outnumbered and a herb, they may try something, but if you were street smart and willing to show some heart they wouldn't consider you worth the trouble of bothering. But this guy was different. I immediately identified him as a different class of criminal: [a player](#).

I tapped my partner in crime Beethoven and pointed at the dude with my chin. "This fucking guy."

Beethoven took notice and immediately knew who I was talking about. "Yeah, I see him. He's all business. He *carries* it."

"Yeah. Yeah, I was thinking the same thing. Like if anything goes down, he'll have the last word. But he's not obnoxious about it. Like he'll never go looking for trouble or causing unnecessary shit. Like he's just chill as shit unless you come at him sideways. And then that's that. No extra talk, no prolonged "man dance" where you argue and puff your chest out for 45 minutes straight but no one makes a move. He just handles his shit."

Beethoven's eyes stuck with the guy. "Yeah, yeah that sounds about right."

The guy makes his way upstairs. We forget about him for a while. When I look at the beautiful girl from part 1 of this tale again, she is with him. Until he arrived, she was aloof and her expression was somewhat blank. She wasn't acting stuck up or standoffish anything, just not particularly emotional one way or the other. But now that he was here, she was smiling, gregarious and warmer. She and her friend were only talking to him. But more important was the body language between him, the girl and her friend, who was also female. He would smile approvingly whenever they addressed him, speak a few [words](#), but otherwise just lean back against the railing and stare at an undetermined spot in the room rather than at them. He wasn't hugged up on the girl and she wasn't attached at his hip. She and her friend would dance in his vicinity, almost for his benefit, but rarely directly in his line of sight. More like within his peripheral vision, so that he could keep his eye on them without having to look preoccupied with them. It was almost like there was an invisible semicircle area of personal space around him, a force field of unspoken protection, and they happily occupied the area within it, never going beyond the outer perimeter, held within his orbit by the invisible gravity of his quiet charisma much like a moon predictably orbits a planet and is content to never go beyond that orbit. He just leaned back, surveyed his domain and held these two girls in his sway with minimal maintenance.

Now you can always tell a winner mentality from a loser mentality by how they react to viewing situational winners. Losers see winners in a situation and try to visualize either how it should be the losers winning instead or try to think about how the winner doesn't really deserve to be winning and got his gains unfairly. A man with a winner mentality sees someone winning in a situation and thinks, "Why is he a winner right now, and what can I learn from this?" That was my attitude when seeing this guy. I couldn't hate, I had to congratulate. A lot of square guys, especially from developed Western nations, would have seen this dude and say "What does he have? Why is that chick with his third-world criminal thug ass and not a classy civilized nice guy like me? The world is unfair. After all, doesn't she realize I'm smart, have a high IQ, am from the West, have American dollars, would treat her like a queen the way she deserves instead of ignoring her like this alpha thug does? She must be brainwashed or low IQ trash to be content with a third-world badboy asshole like him instead of jumping through hoops for a good guy going places like me." Even worse is the guy who puts a chick like that on a pedestal and imagines how all she needs is his nice treatment and exposure to his worldly ways to see the errors of her dating choices. That's sucka mentality.

But there's a saying in the hood, "game recognizes game." Any guy with real game, I'm talking truly internalized game that comes from years in the game and not a bunch of barely tested scripts and gimmicks, would recognize that this guy deserved what he got, because he was giving her what she needed in that harsh environment. He was an alpha in the purest sense, and in an environment like that pure alphaness mattered more than anything else. He was alpha in the way a middle class man could never be, especially in the West. ***The more primal and dog-eat-dog the environment, the scarcer the available resources for both the average man and woman, the harder the everyday grind, the weaker the property rights, the weaker the governmental representation, the more corrupt and powerless the police force and most importantly the more powerless and more nonexistent the middle class population, then the more women in said environment will select for pure, true alphas.***

Here in the modernized West where there is a strong middle class and the average woman has more and more self-reliance thanks to feminism and doesn't need a man as much for survival, a woman doesn't need to select for pure alphas as much, and probably won't. She may still be primally drawn to such alphas due to her genetic hard-wiring, a holdover from the more primal Pleistocene era, but she has enough counterprogramming from Western culture to ultimately balance it out. What women in our modernized western societies are screening for, contrary to popular belief, are not the most purely alpha men but the *most relatively alpha men within reasonable limits*, or what I dub the [Renaissance Man](#) (credit for originally coining the term though goes to [Tariq Nasheed](#)).

To a chick surviving in the bleak, primal grind of a Jaco, Costa Rica, does she have time to seriously entertain this as an alpha male?

Is that really the pure essence of an alpha male in traditional evolutionary terms? Or this frat guy?

No offense to any of the guys up there (Mystery, Style, Tucker Max), but most middle class men that are successful with women aren't true alphas in the historical evolutionary sense. They're alphas in a relative sense, when compared to other middle-class men in their social circles. Not only are most middle-class men not alpha males in the pure sense, but it would be stupid for them to even aspire to true pure alphadom. Because true alphadom is a pointless goal for middle-class men in the West.

The successful middle-class alpha male is a mythical figure that can't exist for any significant amount of time. Our society is specifically built to put most alpha behavior in check. The only types of men who can pull off any semblance of true alpha behavior in the West are men at the extreme lower end of the socioeconomic scale because they feel they have nothing to lose and men at the extremely high end of the socioeconomic scale because despite having something to lose they have more resources with which to get away with alpha behavior. This is a society that keeps the peace and maintains the status quo by keeping alpha behavior in check through various disincentives and punishments.

Middle-class men in the West especially feel the pressure of these disincentives and punishments because on one hand they have enough resources and civility that they feel they have too much to lose by receiving these disincentives and punishment. They have enough property and status and career that it will hurt them to lose any of it. And if they end up in jail, they're so civilized and genteel that they aren't built for that setting the way a man from the lower end of the socioeconomic scale is. Yet on the flip side they don't have so much resources that they can shield themselves from the consequences of alpha behavior either, either buy themselves out of punishment or getting afforded a cushy punishment in the form of a country club prison stretch the way a man from the higher end of the socioeconomic scale can. For these reasons lower class and upper class men have much more freedom to push the envelope in pure alpha male behavior than middle class men do. And even for these groups in America there are limits to how alpha they can be, for various reasons. [I touched on limitations on the alpha status of the lower class already.](#) One of these days I'll do the Myth of the Upper-Class Alpha Male as well.

Western middle class women are willing to enjoy these middle-class Western men because they have grown up conditioned to aspire to self-sufficient career woman status and expect to have two-income households when they marry. So they don't have to select mates with enough extreme wealth that can support a family singlehandedly. Thanks to their own careers and middle-class status, they can still get a great quality of life from combining their own middle-class income with the income of a middle-class man, as opposed to the woman of the past with few big career opportunities who needed to rely totally on her prospective mate's income and resources to improve her socioeconomic status. Also, because of the higher expectations of monogamy in the modern West, even if a bunch of Western women *wanted* to effectively share a powerhouse alpha's resources, it would be logistically too hard to pull off. Rich men in America and the developed West are expected to be and actually are much more monogamous than rich men elsewhere in the world or throughout history because polygamy is very frowned upon here and the

financial consequences to the rich man for engaging in it if caught can be very high. Not to mention the social shaming (ask Tiger Woods).

Also, two more factors. Rich people have less leisure time than ever, which is an important part of philandering. They work more than ever nowadays, limiting the time they can spend on building and maintaining a harem. Second, the cost of a decent standard of living in urban environments and big cities, the places that offer the most opportunity for rising in socioeconomic class these days, becomes a natural obstacle in harem building as well. For a rich guy in a small town or the third world or a less expensive bygone era, maintaining a harem of extramarital women is a much less economically draining proposition than for a rich man in New York or Tokyo. That's why in America it takes a man of Tiger Woods's flexible schedule and exorbitant wealth to pull off a harem of 14 women (not all simultaneously) throughout the years while a successful businessman in some parts of the world can accomplish the same feat with ease.

So rich men in America get monopolized by one lucky wife and may have one or two long-term mistresses with assorted quickies and escorts here and there. The most access the average lower and middle-class woman can get to one of these high powered alpha men is the parting gift of occasional fling or quickie, and not the first prize of marriage or second prize of kept mistress status. Societies like ours that strongly enforce monogamy shrink the supply of powerful alpha men women can choose from since they aren't allowed to share these men amongst each other the way they could in a society that allows, explicitly or implicitly, long-term polygamous arrangements. But as I pointed out, this shortage of powerful rich men available for long-term pair bonding is irrelevant because Western women don't need such men for their survival like women in the past did.

In addition, thanks to a strong police force, strong property rights and strong paternalistic democratic government to offer physical protection and entitlement benefits if needed, thanks to feminism altering gender role expectations and giving women equal representational votes, thanks to a strong court system to provide retribution and justice if a man tries to violate them in any way, thanks to their own careers that allow them to be self-sufficient enough to provide their own sustenance and resources, thanks to birth control and abortions, thanks to the conveniences offered by appliance technology like washing machines, food processors, blenders and trash compactors, they are free to engage in sexual escapades and mating arrangements their female predecessors never dreamed of. Or as I like to call it, "sport fucking" or "fun fucking" whoever she wants, be it bad boy alphas, metrosexual artfag hipsters, starving artists, ad account executives, Starbucks employees, and all types of middle class and working class guys who would have normally died without reproducing in the old dog-eat-dog primal eras of the past. Choosing non-committing alpha males for flings or weak betas with little to moderate resources, while not the optimal choice of her genetic hard-wiring, doesn't have the same dire consequences her in the Western world that it had for humans in the primal environments of the Pleistocene era or in modern third world hellholes.

In the West, a powerful resource-rich alpha isn't a necessity thanks to the factors I described above, and in addition such an alpha isn't widely available thanks to strongly enforced monogamy (only one woman for each man) keeping the supply low. This is why middle-class men are able to thrive in Western society. They are a luxury only Western women can afford. And the ideal middle class man is alpha enough to be a prize, but due to his circumstances there are natural ceilings to how alpha he can be. A middle-class alpha who aims to have any longevity and reproductive success can't exercise pure alpha status. Sure he can work hard until he moves into a higher socioeconomic status and becomes rich, and at that point become more of a true, pure alpha, but so long as he remains in the middle-class status he won't be able to pull off true, pure alpha status. It's for these reasons I specifically called my self-improvement series [The Renaissance Man series](#) and not The Alpha Male series. The choice of terms was very deliberate and the two concepts are not interchangeable. Because I think telling the average middle class man that alphas are attainable or even desirable while remaining in middle class status is the biggest crock of shit going on today. ***The best thing for a middle-class man to be in today's society is not a true, pure alpha but a blend of the best aspects of an alpha male and the best aspects of a beta male, with the trappings of neither. A Renaissance Man.***

Back to the Costa Rican Alpha Female I described in Part 1. If you came up to her using some cheezy negs and magic tricks, she'd look at you like you were a joke. The first thing she'd think is, *if some crazy dude came up to me and tried to attack me or force me into prostitution or some drunk tourist tried to [rape](#) me, this dancing monkey couldn't do shit. Can he guarantee that I'll never have to resort to prostituting myself to get big bucks or slaving away at a shitty service or hospitality job for peanuts just to barely keep above grinding poverty level and stay at the same class level?* This middle-class guy with his check-to-check existence, his meager 401(k) plan, his Netflix queue that he updates religiously, his mirthless materialism that he uses to convince himself he has more status than he actually has and he works like a dog to maintain, his DVD box sets and encyclopedic knowledge of sports stats trivia, fantasy basketball league and collection of Bill Simmons Sports Guy columns, his 367 facebook friends, his witty repartee of popular movie quotes, his blog following, his X-Box 360 or whatever other middle-class trappings he has? He'd be utterly useless to her.

"Fun-fucking" men like that for sport the way Western women can is a luxury not afforded to women who don't come from the same environment. For these women, choosing the right man is a decision so critical that it means the difference between surviving and thriving or wasting away in poverty, shame and degradation. A woman like this may view such a middle class guy as a trick or a simp and use him for some short term material gain like some free drinks or quick cash, but that's it. She may maintain a correspondence with him in hopes he's a Captain Save-A-Ho type so that she can hit him up later with some sob story about her sick babies and get him to wire money to her if he's enough of a big-hearted sap to go for it. And if he's a that type of jackpot middle-class sucker who can be used for a *really* long-term benefit like getting immigration to the West then she may *really* entertain him seriously, usually by playing to his emasculated Western male ego in a way American women would never do. This type of treatment usually blows the middle class Western man's mind and he's immediately sprung and wrapped around her finger. But she'll never respect him fully due to the type of men she's grown up exposed to and once she immigrates and gets a foothold in her new country to the point where she no longer needs him anymore, she'll

leave him and get with the type of alpha male she's been conditioned to be turned on by. Oftentimes she'll even cheat with such an alpha behind her beta husband's back soon after arriving in her new country. Such stories are common.

Most of the time, what the average woman in a primal dog-eat-dog environment need in their immediate future is a lower-class guy who is so badass he can physically protect her from the dangers of the ghetto, or a guy uber-rich and uber-powerful enough to immediately lift her far away from the ghetto, so far in fact that she feels she is never in danger of going back. In the specific case of Costa Rican Alpha Female, she is so top notch, even by the standards of the world stage, she can get the best of both worlds in Jaco: the guy who is both badass and tough enough to offer physical protection *and* powerful and rich enough to lift her far away from her poor beginnings. A guy like CR Alpha.

So who exactly was CR Alpha?

The next day I discussed this with our guide for the trip. This guy knew was a street-smart American expat who now lived in Costa Rica and functioned as both our concierge and tour guide. He had been there for years and knew the ins and outs very well, from the seedy underbelly to the well-to-do parts. We described the guy to him to see what he could tell us. He immediately knew who we were talking about. "He's a lieutenant for the Colombians here." I can't remember the full details because I was pretty wasted, but he was a ranking member of a Colombian organization known as either the White Colombians or the Black Colombians, I forget which. He was their representative and highest ranking member in CR. He ranked pretty high in the gang's hierarchy, and of their members stationed in Costa Rica there was none higher. Our concierge also said things that echoed the speculations Beethoven and I made the night before. That he carried himself as a really cool guy and didn't walk around acting like he had something to prove, but if there was ever a problem (which there rarely was because few were willing to cross him), he handled it in a definitive, unambiguous fashion. He was no joke, and our concierge said over the years he even used him to handle some of his own "problems" that our concierge didn't have the clout or muscle to handle on his own (presumably for a fee or in exchange for a favor, I didn't ask for elaboration).

But that's true alpha. Not a fuzzy hat and black nail polish. Not a cubicle job or middle management office. Not blog stardom. None of this shit is true alpha. And that's fine. For reasons I'll explain in the next installment.

Next installment, how and why modern Western Society keeps alphadom in check and penalizes any excess of it. And the pros and cons of such a system.

The Myth of the Middle Class Alpha Male, Part 3

How and Why Modern Western Society Keeps Alphadom in Check and Penalizes Any Excess of It

I have to warn you, this will seem repetitive at times as I will cite overlapping points repeated by several sources, but I really, really want to make sure the logic behind my reasoning comes across clearly so bear with me.

Let's start off with a passage from the book *The Red Queen* by Matt Ridley:

In the ancient empire of the Incas, sex was a heavily regulated industry: The sun-king Atahualpa kept fifteen hundred women in each of many "houses of virgins" throughout his kingdom. They were selected for their beauty and were rarely chosen after the age of eight—to ensure their virginity. But they did not all remain virgins for long: They were the emperor's concubines: Beneath him, each rank of society afforded a harem of a particular legal size: Great lords had harems of more than seven hundred women. "Principal persons" were allowed fifty women; leaders of vassal nations, thirty; heads of provinces of 100,000 people, twenty; leaders of 1,000 people, fifteen; administrators of 500 people, twelve; governors of 100 people, eight; petty chiefs over 50 men, seven; chiefs of 10 men, five; chiefs of 5 men, three. That left precious few for the average male Indian whose enforced near-celibacy must have driven him to desperate acts, a fact attested to by the severity of the penalties that followed any cuckolding of his seniors. If a man violated one of Atahualpa's women, he, his wife, his children, his relatives, his servants, his fellow villagers, and all his lamas would be put to death, the village would be destroyed, and the site strewn with stones.

As a result, Atahualpa and his nobles had, shall we say, a majority holding in the paternity of the next generation. They systematically dispossessed less privileged men of their genetic share of posterity. Many of the Inca people were the children of powerful men.

In the kingdom of Dahomey in West Africa, all women were at the pleasure of the king. Thousands of them were kept in the royal harem for his use, and the remainder he suffered to "marry" the more favored of his subjects: The result was that Dahomean kings were very fecund, while ordinary Dahomean men were often celibate and barren: In the city of Abomey, according to one nineteenth-century visitor, "it would be difficult to find Dahomeans who were not descended from royalty."

The connection between sex and power is a long one.

There are several important lessons to derive from this passage. One lesson is that an unfettered, free-for-all competition for resources usually leads to incredible inequality

where only a few of the men control most of the resources, including access to women, while most men are forced to suffer in misery and celibacy. The second is that being a major alpha male in today's industrialized West is much, much less rewarding than it was at other moments in humankind's history. We've gone from legalized harems and rule with an iron fist as a reward for major alphas to societies where we expect monogamy and a degree of humility exercised by comparable alpha males today. For example we recently saw the fallout a billionaire of today like Tiger Woods faces when he cheats for banging 14 low class hoes, which is nothing in comparison to the sexual escapades of the alphas of era past described above

To get an idea of how powerful the vagina-hoarding effect of polygamy throughout history was, consider this: today's human population is descended from twice as many women as men. [Maybe 80 percent of women reproduced, whereas only 40 percent of men did.](#)

How did we go from there to here? From polygamous societies where high status alphas with all the resources hoarded all the women and the average man didn't get a chance to reproduce to a society where the most powerful alphas are expected to stay loyal to one wife and risk getting half their resources taken away from them if they don't? How did we get from the richest alphas running harems to being publicly shamed on every television network and punished for straying even once?

The Red Queen tackles this question also, emphasis added by me:

[T]he long interlude of human polygamy, which began in Babylon nearly four thousand years ago, has largely come to an end in the West: Official concubines became unofficial mistresses, and mistresses became secrets kept from wives: In 1988, political power, far from being a ticket to polygamy, was jeopardized by any suggestion of infidelity: Whereas the Chinese emperor Fei-ti once kept ten thousand women in his harem, Gary Hart, running for the presidency of the most powerful nation on earth, could not even get away with two.

What happened? Christianity? Hardly: It coexisted with polygamy for centuries, and its strictures were as cynically self-interested as any layman's: Women's rights? They came too late. A Victorian woman had as much and as little say in her husband's affairs as a medieval one: No historian can yet explain what changed, but guesses include the idea that kings came to need internal allies enough that they had to surrender despotic power. Democracy, of a sort, was born. ***Once monogamous men had a chance to vote against polygamists (and who does not want to tear down a competitor, however much he might also like to emulate him?), their fate was sealed.***

Despotic power, which came with civilization, has faded again: It looks increasingly like an aberration in the history of humanity...[M]en have been unable to accumulate the sort of power that enabled the most successful of them to be promiscuous despots. The best they could hope for in the Pleistocene period was one or two faithful wives and a few affairs if their hunting or political skills were especially great: The best they can

hope for now is a good-looking younger mistress and a devoted wife who is traded in every decade or so.

Democracy happened. Democracy empowered lower status men and gave them a voice. Individually lower status men may have much less power than individual high status alphas, but as a group since there are so many more lower-status men in a society than there are powerful alphas, a “one-man, one-vote” society allows lower status men to collectively exercise much more power against alpha males than any others. And what these lower-status men will use that power to do shape a society that will (1) give themselves more access to women while giving alphas less access to women and (2) place limits to the abuses an uber-alpha can get away with. So democracy leads to legal limits on polygamy which leads to increased monogamy which leads to less sexual spoils and unfettered power for alpha males and more sexual spoils and more political power for all other lower-status males in a society. ***This means limitations on the upper-levels of alphas are an essential part of a strong democracy.***

The character of Hopper in *A Bug's Life* understood the dangers of lower status people, who naturally outnumber higher status people, getting an equal voice quite well.

Robert Wright also [comes to a similar conclusion](#) about the relationship of democracy to both the lessening of alpha political and sexual power and the increase of the political and sexual power of lower-class men:

Polygamy. This is the natural state of our species. Then again, the natural state of our species is also a small hunter-gatherer society, with little wealth and thus, only mild inequalities of status and power among men. In this “ancestral environment,” large harems were rare; competition for women, though intense, was seldom epically intense. But then came agriculture and other sources of economic surplus. Suddenly some males could be way more powerful than others. The commensurately massive sexual rewards made men ill-inclined to play by Marquess of Queensberry rules. According to the Guinness Book of World Records, the most prolific genetic replicator in the history of our species was the last Sharifian emperor of Morocco, who had 888 offspring. He was known as Moulay Ismail the Bloodthirsty. Get the picture?

And, in polygamous societies, low-status males weren't exactly pacifists either. With scads of women monopolized by the well-to-do, less fortunate men could get mighty lonely and become very unhappy campers. This volatile discontent may be the reason that, as anthropologist Laura Betzig has shown, polygamy and authoritarianism have gone hand in hand. Back when the Zulu king was entitled to more than 100 women, coughing or spitting at his dinner table was punishable by death.

In this sense, monogamy meshes better than polygamy with the egalitarian values of a democracy. One-man-one-vote, one-man-one-wife.

So hoarding of women by powerful men in the form of polygamy and despotism go hand in hand, and more equitable distribution of women in the form of monogamy and democracy go hand in hand. A lot of men mistakenly believe polygamous society represents a paradise for men in general, but it doesn't. It represents a paradise for

one or a few men over all other men, who exist in a hell. Most men in highly polygamous societies are condemned to celibacy and their lives are less free and consist of extreme oppression by uber-alphas to boot.

Consider the following excerpts from [this article by Alan S. Miller and Satoshi Kanazawa](#):

The history of western civilization aside, humans are naturally polygamous. Polyandry (a marriage of one woman to many men) is very rare, but polygyny (the marriage of one man to many women) is widely practiced in human societies, even though Judeo-Christian traditions hold that monogamy is the only natural form of marriage...

In societies where rich men are much richer than poor men, women (and their children) are better off sharing the few wealthy men; one-half, one-quarter, or even one-tenth of a wealthy man is still better than an entire poor man. As George Bernard Shaw puts it, "The maternal instinct leads a woman to prefer a tenth share in a first-rate man to the exclusive possession of a third-rate one." Despite the fact that humans are naturally polygynous, most industrial societies are monogamous because men tend to be more or less equal in their resources compared with their ancestors in medieval times. (Inequality tends to increase as society advances in complexity from hunter-gatherer to advanced agrarian societies. Industrialization tends to decrease the level of inequality.)

Most women benefit from polygyny, while most men benefit from monogamy

When there is resource inequality among men—the case in every human society—most women benefit from polygyny: women can share a wealthy man. Under monogamy, they are stuck with marrying a poorer man.

The only exceptions are extremely desirable women. Under monogamy, they can monopolize the wealthiest men; under polygyny, they must share the men with other, less desirable women. However, the situation is exactly opposite for men. Monogamy guarantees that every man can find a wife. True, less desirable men can marry only less desirable women, but that's much better than not marrying anyone at all.

Men in monogamous societies imagine they would be better off under polygyny. What they don't realize is that, for most men who are not extremely desirable, polygyny means no wife at all, or, if they are lucky, a wife who is much less desirable than one they could get under monogamy...

For an example of the mindset such an environment creates in lower-status men, let's look at Muslim suicide bombers:

According to the Oxford University sociologist Diego Gambetta, editor of *Making Sense of Suicide Missions*, a comprehensive history of this troubling yet topical phenomenon, while suicide missions are not always religiously motivated, when religion is involved, it is always Muslim. Why is this? Why is Islam the only religion that motivates its followers to commit suicide missions?

The surprising answer from the evolutionary psychological perspective is that Muslim suicide bombing may have nothing to do with Islam or the Koran (except for two lines in it). It may have nothing to do with the religion, politics, the culture, the race, the

ethnicity, the language, or the region. As with everything else from this perspective, it may have a lot to do with sex, or, in this case, the absence of sex.

What distinguishes Islam from other major religions is that it tolerates polygyny. By allowing some men to monopolize all women and altogether excluding many men from reproductive opportunities, polygyny creates shortages of available women. If 50 percent of men have two wives each, then the other 50 percent don't get any wives at all.

So polygyny increases competitive pressure on men, especially young men of low status. It therefore increases the likelihood that young men resort to violent means to gain access to mates. By doing so, they have little to lose and much to gain compared with men who already have wives. Across all societies, polygyny makes men violent, increasing crimes such as murder and [rape](#), even after controlling for such obvious factors as economic development, economic inequality, population density, the level of democracy, and political factors in the region.

However, polygyny itself is not a sufficient cause of suicide bombing. Societies in sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean are much more polygynous than the Muslim nations in the Middle East and North Africa. And they do have very high levels of violence. Sub-Saharan Africa suffers from a long history of continuous civil wars—but not suicide bombings.

The other key ingredient is the promise of 72 virgins waiting in heaven for any martyr in Islam. The prospect of exclusive access to virgins may not be so appealing to anyone who has even one mate on earth, which strict monogamy virtually guarantees. However, the prospect is quite appealing to anyone who faces the bleak reality on earth of being a complete reproductive loser.

It is the combination of polygyny and the promise of a large harem of virgins in heaven that motivates many young Muslim men to commit suicide bombings. Consistent with this explanation, all studies of suicide bombers indicate that they are significantly younger than not only the Muslim population in general but other (nonsuicidal) members of their own extreme political organizations like Hamas and Hezbollah. And nearly all suicide bombers are single.

Modern democratic society is a tradeoff. A lower status man ostensibly obtains the same vote and therefore voice as a higher status man. Since lower status men outnumber higher status uberalphas, they can now create a system of laws, checks and balances called the State that contains innate limitations to just how powerful an alpha can become. Powerful men keep adapting to the new status quos and try to become more powerful regardless, and the State, which mostly represents the collective voice of the lower-status people, in turn keeps adapting to find new ways to put limitations on their alphas. It's an arms race between uberalphas who want to become as powerful as they can thanks to human nature, and the State, which is the tool lower status men collectively use throughout history to keep uberalphas in check by limiting their access to political power and the best vagina.

Yet because most men still harbor dreams of becoming more powerful and alpha themselves, these societies are still constructed with enough flexibility to allow for social mobility as well. Evolution has designed men to naturally seek out power, status, and as a consequence, access to better and more women, so no matter how much lower-status men desire to squash uber-alphas, they will never tolerate a society that *totally* crushes the ability of everyone to become more powerful. These tensions are what leads to our society that rewards people for being a mix of both alpha and beta as opposed to other societies that reward people strictly for being super-alpha, a society that crushes you for being too beta *and* for being too alpha, especially when you're sandwiched between both extremes in the middle class.

This is a big reason why I said in the last installment that middle-class men are the worst equipped to achieve pure unadulterated alpha status in our society. Upper class men have the resources to possibly buy the State or work it from the inside. Lower class men often have little to lose and are used to hardship so they are often more willing to just straight up refuse to abide by the rules of the State. Then you have men who embody both attitudes, a ton of resources to buy off the State or work it from the inside combined with a willingness to thumb their nose at the rules of the State and refuse to abide by them when necessary. The patron saint of this last category is Joseph Kennedy. Is it any wonder his family is considered *the* ultimate American dynasty?

But even among these groups, sooner or later they more often than not lose against the State, whether it's the IRS or divorce court for the rich or jail for the poor. So what chance does the middle-class man have to aim for pure alpha status in a society that by design is meant to curb any attempts to be alpha for the benefit of all men?

[The Myth of the Middle Class Alpha Male, Part 3.5](#)

A reader (I forgot to ask him if he wanted his name used) forwarded me this clip of an NPR show called [Radiolab](#), in particular a clip that he said speaks directly to my Myth of the Middle Class Alpha Male series.

Putting aside the annoyingly nebbish yuppie cadences of the presenters, it makes some great points that speak directly to things I was going to mention in Part 4 of the series. So consider this both an illustration of things described in parts 1-3 and a preview of part 4. I'll elaborate on the parallels in part 4.

Brian Hare tells us the story of Dmitri Belyaev, a geneticist and clandestine Darwinian who lived in Stalinist Russia and studied the domestication of the silver fox. Through generations of selectively breeding a captive population, Belyaev noticed not only increased docility, but also unexpected physical [changes](#). Why did these gentler foxes necessarily look different than their wild ancestors? Tecumseh Fitch has a hypothesis, something about trailblazing cells and embryonic development. And Richard Wrangham takes it a step further, suggesting us humans may have domesticated ourselves.

Middle Class Alpha Interlude

This weekend was a little hectic and I didn't get a chance to do part 4 of the Middle Class Alpha series. Which means I won't be able to do it until next Monday, although I may do some smaller unrelated posts in the meantime. But rather than leave you with nothing, I thought I'd take this chance to respond to some feedback to the series so far.

Over at Roissy's blog someone left [this comment](#):

Tbone at the Rawness wrote a piece on the Myth of The Middle Class Alpha Male that pretty much tore your whole frame up. Roissy as an office worker you can never be anything BUT a Beta Male. At this point the amount of pussy you get by exploiting psychology, or the amount you don't get because of bad genetics, poor conditioning and role models, etc, is irrelevant to the equation.

If you are a middle class, salary earning chump, you're a Beta. Period.

This guy misses it. My point in this series wasn't to say that everyone in the middle class is doomed to be nothing but beta. That buys into the idea that it's a totally binary scale where everyone either must be a total alpha or a total beta, and that everyone who doesn't squarely fall into the former category must automatically fall into the latter, a notion I disagree with. Just because I say a middle class person can't survive and prosper in the long run trying to behave like a pure alpha, that doesn't mean I think middle class men are therefore doomed to betadom as a result. I think of each individual person's character as a recipe, with a mix of alpha ingredients and beta ingredients. Very few people are purely made up of alpha ingredients or purely made up of beta ingredients. A middle class man's best option is to become as alpha as he can without becoming so alpha that he starts receiving the negative consequences that come in our society from being too alpha. On the flip side, if a man is super alpha and trying to work his way up the social ladder and navigate the politics of working for a living in the middle class or is trying to maintain a conventional long-term middle class marriage, he needs to learn to become more beta, but not so beta that he starts receiving the negative consequences that come with *that* state.

[RooshV's forum discussed the series](#), and poster Quasi said the following:

I think the article is mediocre..

I agree its context related and the word is really overly used to the degree of nonsense hip word, that is doesnt even constitute a meaning anymore. Its obvious that the original meaning of the word in the animal kingdom refers to the packleader and since human society is way more context related only gods like Brad Pitt etc, would be able

to pull of alpha status everywhere. Alpha isnt about being in prison, thats wrong in my book, that just being stupid.

Its a hype word more than its really usefull for anything... alpha, beta, gamma, delta and epsilon all depends on our contexts

its that kinda shit that hapends when you let happy, go lucky ignorant americans with alot of bullshit words and peacock bluff misuse words for personal gains. Evolution is also widely misunderstood and often seen in totally wrong context trying to validate BS humanistic crap teorries.

So get a pack of schoolkids and rule..be the alpha, shouldnt be too hard to get a few boosterboxes of pokemon cards and rule their world or even better get some dogs, your their alpha pretty easy.

This is where Quasi also misses the point. Yes on a micro level in any small group there will always be an alpha or a leader within that small group. But acknowledging that in no way debunks my theories about uberalphas, the men who are alphas on a macro level. These are the men who are major movers and shakers on a larger scale and on a more prominent stage. These men are humankinds closest equivalent to some of the animal kingdom's usual definitions of alpha. Quasi inadvertently makes my point at the exact time he's trying to claim it's mediocre. The point about context-based alphadom is what I was getting at when discussing middle-class men. Context-based alphadom in their groups is the best they can and should aspire to if they want to survive and prosper in the long run, at least while still in middle class status. Hence this point I made in part 2 of the series:

most middle class men that are successful with women aren't true alphas in the historical evolutionary sense. They're alphas in a relative sense, when compared to other middle-class men in their social circles.

This is the same point he's making in his example of the kids in the school yard with Pokemon cards, where on a micro level within that small group one kid is the most alpha. I already made that point.

When he says "human society is way more context related" he is making the mistake of taking what the norm is in industrialized, modern Western society and calling it the norm for society worldwide or throughout history. In more despotic places with a weak or nonexistent middle class, definitions of alpha are not really that nuanced at all.

My point in the series is the same point that the exact point that he claims I miss. That the comforts allowed by our modern, industrialized human societies with their strong middle-class and property rights and high standard of living allow us the comfort of

being satisfied and content with being alpha in much more nuanced, subtle, context-based ways. And for these reasons, we no longer need to believe we only have worth if we achieve uberalpha status on a macrolevel, or that any failure to achieve uberalpha status on a macrolevel necessarily means we must be sniveling, worthless betas by default.

Later in the forum College Game says the following:

He had me with the first two, well written, and part of the conclusion, be in part three the guy just sounds like a fascist.

And in the comments to one of the original posts, Gil says the following:

What a lame article! Advocating monogamy here really means one thing: pussy socialism. "I can't get a hawt women because I don't have the qualifications therefore every guy should be restricted to one woman so the pussy can be evenly spread around." Yeah right! There's plenty of fuglies who are not part of any Alpha's harem who'll quite happily settle down with a Beta loser however he wants the beautiful Alpha women during their prime years.

Both these guys assume I'm *prescribing* things, saying how society *should* be, when I'm actually just *describing* things, saying how I think things have been and currently are. I don't believe I advocated either monogamy and democracy or on the opposite end advocated fascism and polygamy. I just described how we moved from one state of affairs to another while describing the pros and cons of both systems.

What I find especially amusing is Gil's comment, and his assumption that because he presumably cleans up in the women department in this modern, industrialized era, he'd be one of the polygamous uberalpha overlords if he existed in the older eras I described. The social mobility we have today was virtually nonexistent then, especially for men, no matter how much personal ambition you may have personally had. You usually needed an accident of birth just to get your foot in the door, and then and only then did your personal attributes, self-discipline and determination matter. And the bigshots back then had way more power and control than bigshots do today. People in charge didn't have term limits, an IRS taxing them or checks and balances keeping them honest, government agencies penalizing them for accumulating too much power and forming monopolies, nothing like that. Knocking off the top dog in that environment and getting a shot at reproduction with a quality woman was a much bigger challenge in that environment than in today's. According to Matt Ridley's book *Red Queen*, even men who have the qualities to be very successful with women in our modern society would likely die childless or be forced to mate with uglies and fatties in the older despotic environments.

The Myth of the Middle Class Alpha Male, Part 4

[Warning: If you are one of the readers who thought the wordiness and repetitiveness of Part 3 or any of the previous installments outweighed the useful information contained in them, or worse believed they had no useful information at all, don't bother continuing this post. It's more of the same stuff you hate. The rest of you, dig in.]

One of the great works of Western philosophy is the book *Leviathan* by Thomas Hobbes. It is widely considered one of the earliest and most influential treatises on [social contract theory](#) ever written. Wikipedia defines social contract theory as “a broad class of theories that try to explain the ways in which people form states to maintain social order.” And Wikipedia, in describing *Leviathan*, states Hobbes wrote that chaos or civil war — situations identified with a state of nature and the famous motto *Bellum omnium contra omnes* (“the war of all against all”) — could only be averted by strong central government.

This strong central government is what Hobbes called the Leviathan, as described in this [Sparksnotes summary of the book](#) (pay particular part to the section I emphasize and bold below):

Hobbes's political state, the Leviathan, is a monster. The name “Leviathan” itself refers to the Biblical sea beast: “None is so fierce that dare stir him up . . . his teeth are terrible round about. His scales are his pride, shut up together as with a close seal. . . . His breath kindleth coals, and a flame goeth out of his mouth. . . . When he raiseth up himself, the mighty are afraid . . . Upon earth there is not his like, who is made without [fear](#)” (Job 41:10-33). Yet Hobbes takes this creature as the inspiration for his political state, because the Book of Job describes Leviathan as “King of all the children of pride.” Hobbes's political state has to be a Leviathan, the most terrifying of all monsters because it must subdue the pride inherent in its human constituents, and it must use fear to prevent a recurrence of the state of nature.

The horrors of the state of nature are always lurking behind the state of the Leviathan. Civil war within the Leviathan causes the artificial body to collapse and all the subjects to fall into the state of nature. Fear of the state of nature is one reason for avoiding civil war. Fear of the sovereign Leviathan is another. ***The Leviathan is constructed to combat the fear of the state of nature, but it is capable of doing so only by wielding fear as its own weapon. Thus, in Hobbes's view of things, fear never disappears from human existence. However, there is a security accompanying fear of the Leviathan, an assurance of peace and the preservation of life. In contrast, fear of the state of nature has no such assurance. Thus the fear experienced by people living within the Leviathan is infinitely preferable to the fear experienced by people living within the state of nature.***

Let that marinate in your skull for a bit. That's what modern society is, a Leviathan where we trade in fear of the chaos of nature where lower status men live in constantly

fear for their lives and have little hope of reproducing thanks to incredibly powerful high status men, for the infinitely preferable fear of the Leviathan, which at least promises the assurance of peace, better protection of their lives and better chances for the average man to reproduce with a quality woman. We agree to let the Leviathan be society's ultimate alpha because we know despite how flawed as the Leviathan is, it has a much better track record at not abusing ultimate alpha status than individual humans.

All this has already been laid out in the earlier installments of the series. I already described life for lower status men before the Leviathan existed. I already described how the Leviathan was collectively created by lower class men to protect their interests from uberalpha males who ruled their lives and hoarded their reproductive opportunities through despotism, polygamy and hoarding of reproductive opportunities. I already described how democracy, monogamy laws and property rights were the political mechanisms that allowed this leveling of the playing field between lower-status men and higher-status men.

This installment elaborates on the specific tools our modern Leviathan uses to maintain this status quo and keep things from returning to the state of nature Hobbes described, the short, brutish, chaotic existence where everyone fended for themselves and the strong had free reign to crush the weak and take their shit at will.

To make the idea of monogamy work, lower-status men had to make marriage to lower-status seem to be as good a deal as marriage to higher-status men. The problem was, how could they do this? Not only were women back in the day physically weaker than men (same as today), but also, unlike today, they had little rights and protections and few independent means of income. Choosing a strong, powerful alpha male was especially important for women back then for mere survival, not just bragging rights.

Lower-status men simply couldn't cut it. Say a pack of men want to [rape](#) her. Is he high enough in status or badass enough in combat to protect her? Because there's no reliable police force to do it for him. Or if some thugs do rape and violate her, is the lower-status man badass enough to storm up to the thugs stronghold, kick in the door and get revenge for her? Does he have strong alliances and coalitions that allow him to get things done? Even if he's able to accumulate decent resources, if someone comes along and tries to take his resources, his worldly possessions, run him off his land, burn his house down, kill his children, and/or steal his wife, what is he prepared to do? Once again, no police force to call. And no reliable court of law and property rights in existence to intervene and set things right if you were violated in such a way. No institutions dedicated to righting your wrongs and enforcing your rights for you.

In the olden days, you and you alone as a man are responsible for providing physical and financial security for all your resources and family yourself. There's no one else for the average lower-status man to assign these tasks to. In such an environment, how can a lower-status male compete? A woman back then relied on her man for everything when it came to her physical and financial

security. Think of the level of responsibility a woman, or even worse, a whole family was for a man back then.

This is where a concept I call **alpha proxying** comes into play. This is where lower-status men, in a democracy where they have a vote and the ability to change public policy, collectively create alpha proxy institutions to relieve less powerful men of their alpha responsibilities. And a major tool these alpha proxies use to is **renegade alpha suppression**. Some examples of alpha proxies and renegade alpha suppression, but far from an exhaustive list, can be seen below:

- **Police.** Protects and serves. Punishes those renegades who try to attain alphadom using routes not approved of by society. Gets retribution for victims against those who wronged them, saving them the burden of having to avenge themselves. You're wife gets raped, you get beat up or your kid gets robbed or killed? You can have the cops accomplish your alpha duty of retribution for you. Suppresses alphas of the violent and greedy variety.
- **Insurance companies.** One advantage of marrying an uberalpha back in the day for a woman is that she and her kids could get his resources when he died. A lesser-status man didn't have the same resources to leave, which was yet another way he couldn't compete. A life insurance policy accomplishes that. The way insurance works, lower-status men collectively pool their resources to accomplish what only a super powerful resource-rich alpha could do back in the day: leave a lot of money to his family.
- **Civil and criminal courts and strong property, torts and criminal laws.** It wasn't enough for a woman to get a man with resources back in the day. She had to find a man who was bad enough to hold on to his resources. If he was too weak to stand up for himself and hold on to his shit, then they were in a precarious position. And if her man lost his resources, she and her children were screwed because she had no way of making money on her own. If someone was violent against their family and he couldn't take care of business and offer retribution, they'd continue to get victimized. If someone stole from them, if he wasn't man enough to take it back, same thing. Courts and strong laws and rights relieve lesser-status men of these burdens as well.
- **Justice Department and Antitrust laws.** This alpha proxy works to keep rich uberalphas in check by punishing them if they are found guilty of running monopolies and crushing their competition. Forces them to spread the wealth and play fair.
- **The IRS.** Takes money from those successful at acquiring resources, and the more powerful the person and successful at accumulating resources, then the more this alpha proxy tries to take from the uberalpha. Then it works to redistribute this wealth among lesser status men. A legally sanctioned extortion and protection racket designed to control and suppress excessive alpha ambitions. Relieves lesser-status men of the alpha duties of trying to take down the big man, trying to get a crack at his resources and stopping him from getting too powerful and rich.
- **Capitalism, Division of Labor, Technology and the Service Industry.** Not handy around the house? Hire a contractor. Can't hunt and gather or grow food and run a farm? Create a society of convenience where you can just buy things at supermarkets. Don't have the skills to build a house for your family? You don't need to have them. Can't fight? Technology has created the gun and capitalism has created the means of getting it in your hands. In a capitalist society with division of labor, efficient allocation

of resources and a thriving service industry, many of the traditional manly skills an alpha male was expected to have can be outsourced to others.

- **Media, Public Opinion and Social Norms.** Hobbes envisioned the Leviathan as being composed primarily of a strong government. But the Leviathan we have is made up of more than just government, it also has a strong social component: collectively agreed on social norms and public opinions at play, and a pervasive media entity with which to disseminate these social norms and public opinions. You may wonder how this works for alpha suppression? Start examining the stories in the media and the recurring themes. If a billionaire alpha like Tiger Woods tries to build a harem, he's shamed into apologizing for his natural male urges. Bill Gates is demonized as evil incarnate for attempting to build a monopoly and become even more powerful. The media becomes more liberal and less and less sympathetic to powerful men unless they're willing to openly celebrate, praise and feed the Leviathan (which is why powerful liberal men like celebrities and Democrats fare better in the media than so-called "greedy" men like Wall Streeters and Republicans).
- **Military.** Channels young male aggression that could potentially turn renegade alpha into being used for the Leviathan's purposes as its enforcement arm. Teaches potential renegade alphas to play by the Leviathan's rules and become part of its international renegade alpha suppression force.
- **Jails.** If someone is stubborn about refusing to concede to the Leviathan's ultimate alpha status and insists on not playing ball and reaching for ultimate alpha status for themselves without playing by the Leviathan's rules? They end up fast-tracked to jail and set straight. Relieves lesser status men of having to find a way to punish ambitious renegade alphas in their midst themselves.
- **New Deal Entitlement Programs.** The Great Depression and the fallout from it among lesser-status men was a great illustration of the dangers to a woman if she married a lesser-status man. If you ever read a book describing life for the average man in this era, it was horrible and emasculating. Now if a man runs out of ways to support a family, he can get unemployment benefits to help him get by between jobs. And Social Security and Disability Insurance relieve him of the burden of having to figure out how to support his family after he can't work anymore.

As I said earlier, this is far from an exhaustive list. If you think about it, you can come up with a ton of other alpha proxies and methods the use to suppress renegade alphas in our society. The more alpha proxies a society has, the more attractive lesser-status men become as marriage material as a result. If you're a lesser-status man, you no longer have to be capable of singlehandedly doing all the traditional alpha duties in order to promise financial and physical security to a prospective mate. You have all of the Leviathan's alpha proxies to do that for you and keep renegade alphas from getting too much status and making your life hell! And as a result lesser-status provider males become a competitive marriage option against uberalpha males.

This also explains why many less developed countries can technically have democracies yet still have a dog-eat-dog environment with badass uberalphas like CR alpha from part 1 of this series ruling the roost: because despite the existence of democracy, these societies do not have good alpha proxies in place and therefore individual men are still ultimately responsible for their own alpha duties. For example our expat concierge in Costa Rica from part 2 in this series told us how pathetic and powerless the police were against truly dangerous criminals and how you had to "handle your own shit" there. But on the bright side, he proudly said, it was much more acceptable in Costa Rica to

kill someone in self-defense without any bleeding hearts ganging up on you for it like in America.

It's not just democracy's one-man, one-vote system that curbs abuses by uberalphas, it's democracy combined with institutionalized, well-funded alpha proxies. [See this article about Costa Rica for example:](#)

One such cultural characteristic of Costa Rica that is both deep rooted and unfortunately very public is a lack of respect for their own law enforcement ...

"Largate, largate" ... or 'beat it', 'go away' was yelled by many in the crowd at the recent San José Festival de la Luz celebration whenever Costa Rica police would walk by on the parade route.

Valid arguments to justify mistrust by the general Costarricense public of government police agencies include; lack of qualifications or education for recruits, poor initial training, little or no in-service training and corruption from top officials down to the street-level officer.

The mistrust of Costa Ricans does not end with the effectiveness of the police, but of the entire criminal justice system. Too often the few criminals that are actually apprehended by the frequently scarce and slow to respond police are not even prosecuted with 'lack of evidence' cited as the main reason.

This broken system leaves Costa Rica citizens' feeling the only real solution is to take matters into their own hands – especially when it comes to petty crime and repeat local offenders that plague a neighborhood, often referred to as "ladrones".

The United States found the solution to improving its own police problems was to professionalize law enforcement. Active and public pursuits of police corruption, expectations of more accountability, better training, higher standards for police recruits and improved salaries to attract better officers all resulted in a better social image and increased respect for police by the American public.

I also did some research and discovered Costa Rica had no standing military to channel renegade alpha aggression. It was abolished in 1949.

Now as you review the alpha proxy list I made above and come up with your own examples, notice something. Even though alpha proxies work to limit excessive alpha ambition across all socioeconomic levels, who do they disproportionately affect more? Middle class men! As I said in an earlier installment, upper-class men have the resources in the form of riches and connections and the best legal assistance to get away with going against the Leviathan more often, or to become an important part of the Leviathan and use it to their own advantage. Lower-class men have an advantage in that they have nothing to lose in terms of resources and reputation, aren't afraid of punishment and are conditioned for hardship and free-for-all dog-eat-dog conflict.

The middle-class man has the worst of both worlds: unlike the lower-class man he has just enough resources, respectable connections and reputation to be irreparably hurt if he loses any of them, plus he's not cut out for environments like jail or the ghetto, but unlike the upper-class man he doesn't have quite enough resources, respectable connections and reputation to buy off or successfully infiltrate the Leviathan either. ***Although the alpha proxies that make up the Leviathan use their power to punish renegade alpha's across the board, it's the middle class man who suffers the most from going renegade by trying to be too alpha. Hence the title of this series.***

An illustration of what I'm talking about with lower-class men. I was on the train once in Bedford-Stuyvesant, Brooklyn, where I lived. Two guys were talking about a third guy, a friend of theirs who was recently arrested. They were talking about how he got arrested and went to court for a crime and ended up copping a plea so that he could go free but end up with a very long probation period. I believe several years long (I was eavesdropping so I didn't catch every last detail). Guy #1 was dumbfounded and asked why he would agree to such a long probation period. Guy #2 said he had the option of doing "a bullet" (street slang for a year in jail) and possibly getting out in a little less time with good behavior, or taking the years-long probation instead.

Guy #1 said "What an idiot! Why not just do the bullet! It's just jail, we all done a bullet before." Guy #2 laughed and agreed that the guy they were talking about was an idiot for choosing probation over jail, but said in his defense that he just had a kid and wanted to be free to spend time with him. But even after that they both seemed unconvinced still that their friend did the right thing and continued shaking their heads and debating it. You and I may call these priorities fucked up, but that recklessness and personal disregard is exactly what makes lower-class men so hard for the Leviathan and its alpha proxies to control.

In parting, look at this scene from the wonderful television program *Jersey Shore*

Now look at the fallout from that alpha moment, as shown in the first 9 minutes or so in the clip below:

Notice how Ronnie went a little renegade, got his alpha on and began to puff his chest out and strut. Look at how all the Leviathan's alpha proxies like the police, the courts, jail and public opinion immediately swooped down and work together to put him in his place. And finally, look at the speech he gives in the second clip, remorseful, contrite, and ashamed for doing what was totally within his rights to do according to the laws of nature: punch a man who was following him home and threatening the safety of him and his woman. He'll think twice the next time. If he was rich, he'd have been able to buy his way out of this little scrap. If he was poor and blue collar/ghetto he'd have been undeterred by a stay in jail and wouldn't hesitate to do the exact same thing next time and go right back to jail. ***But Ronnie has neither option and as a result is still facing the charges even today as prosecutors build their case against him.***

All because he bought into the myth of the middle-class alpha male.

[Only two more parts to go: *Feminism: The Monkey Wrench* and *The Conclusion: How All This Translates Into Practical Advice for You To Use*. Hang in there.]

The Myth of the Middle Class Alpha, Part 5

So we've discussed the transitions from despotism and polygamy to democracy and monogamy, from a system with no checks and balances on alphas to one that has institutionalized alpha proxies dedicated to policing alphas, all of which came about thanks to the increased voice of the lower-status male.

But what about modern feminism? Where does that come into play?

To understand feminism how feminism came about, you have to understand two things: first, the difference between how females deal with high-status male versus how they deal with low-status males, and second, who feminism actually benefits.

Women are much better on average at nonviolent manipulation of men than vice versa. Although the word manipulation has negative connotations, I'm using the word in the least judgmental way possible. Nonviolent manipulation means to mold, control or influence through powers of persuasion without the threat of physical violence. Women had to develop this skill through eons of evolution because guys throughout history could kick their asses, kill them and rape them at will if they wanted. Nonviolent manipulation is a skill they needed to develop to compensate for other weaknesses.

Women developed survival strategies throughout history like manipulating men and testing men for strength in order to choose providers of either resources or good genes. Women manipulate and test high-status men differently than they do low-status men, though. For example, there have been times when I've met women and had them eating out of my hand. These same women would have some low-status guy without game in their life, often a boyfriend even, who they would treat like crap. Sometimes they'd call the guy right in front of me to punk him while I was in the background. Or we'd be out and some low-status guy would approach, and she'd treat him like crap then make him buy her a drink, which she'd promptly give to me.

This same exact chick who was flippant, emasculating and disrespectful when dealing with a low-status guy could turn around and become demure, ego-boosting and respectful when being romanced by me, who she perceived as high-status. This didn't mean she wasn't actively manipulating and testing me for strength too, but that she did it more subtly and in a passive way that satisfied my ego.

When dealing with a low-status weaker guy, a woman is going to try to openly compete to be the "head" of the relationship. Her testing and power plays will come in the form of open disrespect. Her manipulation will be blatant and emasculating. Much of this comes from perceived necessity though, because she instinctively distrusts the low-status man to provide and lead. Because he has more to prove, she's going to test and manipulate twice as hard. When dealing with a high-status stronger man however, the woman allows him to be the head and believe himself to be in charge, but she fight to become the "neck" that turns the head toward where she wants it to focus.

All of this applies on a macro-level also. Think of the evolution of society that I described throughout this series. In more primal, traditional societies where high-status men monopolized most of the mating options and made life miserable for low-status men, women as a whole predominately manipulated by acting demure, ego-boosting and respectful of men. However, because of the collective rise of monogamy and the creation of the Leviathan [I described in the last installment](#), western women today are forced on average to deal much more with lower-status men, and therefore as a group modern women manipulate by being more flippant, emasculating and disrespectful. Even today in societies that are democratic and monogamous, if there is not a good system of alpha proxies and renegade alpha suppression the women will still choose to manipulate in a more passive, traditional conservative way than an active, progressive liberal way.

So is it ultimately better for a woman to be active and progressive (the head) or passive and traditional (the neck)? In many ways the latter's a better strategy because it allows the man believes himself to be in charge, therefore he doesn't bother fighting back or changing anything because the poor chump thinks he's winning. In addition, he bears the full responsibility for all the finances and for all decisions and takes full blame if they don't work out. This system gives women a lot of power with much less responsibility. To be openly recognized as the head or equal partner of the relationship or household means having responsibilities and accountability, two things women utterly *hate*.

That's right, women *hate* accountability and bearing the brunt of responsibility. Women like to be recognized as being *capable* of doing anything a man can. They like to be recognized as having the ability to be just as skilled as a man and worthy of the same rights and perks as a man. What they don't like though is *being required* to share the same responsibilities and duties as a man, except when it's convenient (which is why they want to join the military but don't like the idea of, you know, going all commando on the front lines of combat).

For example, ladies out there tell the truth on this one: do you or do you not hate when a man, in response to the question "What do you want to do?" responds with "I don't know, what do *you* want to do?" Women, even if they are openly indecisive and wishy-washy about a topic, *hate* when the men they are dealing with act indecisive and wishy-washy about the very same topic within the very same conversation.

Why do they have a right to be indecisive on a topic but judge a man harshly for being indecisive about the exact same topic during the same conversation? It's because despite modern feminist dogma, they still instinctively resent men who put them in a position where they have to take responsibility and ultimate accountability for

decisionmaking. They want to be recognized as *capable* of making decisions for themselves and want to reserve the *right* to make decisions for themselves, but they don't want the *actual obligation of making decisions if they can avoid it*. If they can avoid the responsibility and accountability of such decisionmaking, they'll always take it. This is why women find leadership qualities to be such a turn-on in men and why watching a group of women try to agree on any decision can take so long that it's maddening.

So if women don't really like the responsibility and accountability that comes with being in charge and making decisions, why is modern feminism such a strong force in the developed West?

The key to understanding the answer is to reevaluate how you think of power. A popular tenet of modern feminism is that women were historically deprived of power before they fought for their rights through feminism. This isn't true. Women have always had power. Arguably they've even secretly had more power than men. It wasn't power women lacked before feminism, it was *authority*. Men are very simplistic and linear and often conflate power with authority. Although authority is a form of power, not all power is necessarily a form of authority, as Chinweizu points out in [Anatomy of Female Power](#):

In any case, even if no "strictly matriarchal society" ever existed, that would not imply that female power did not exist. Authority is only one of the many types of power; and the wielding of authority is not necessary for the exercise of many types of power. Power without authority is neither unknown nor rare, as is recognized when it is said that someone is "the power behind the throne"...

...If the essence of power is the ability to get what one wants, then women are far from powerless. Women do get, and always did get, what they want – be it riches, or thrones, or the head of John the Baptist, or routine exemption from hardships and risks which their men folk are obliged to endure. That women operate by methods which often differ from those available to men does not in any way mean that women are bereft of power.

If women are not powerless, are they, perhaps, less powerful than men? Some feminists find it in their interest to have the world believe this. And for proof they point to the public structures of political, economic and cultural power, and show that these are almost exclusively occupied by men. But does that prove what they aim to prove? Not at all! All it shows is that in the public structures, which form the domain of male power, women are not well represented. If this under-representation is to prove that women are less powerful than men, it would need to be also true that those public structures exhaust the modes and centers of power in society. Alas, for feminist claims, they do not; for there indeed are other modes and centres of power which women monopolize. Such are the subjects of this inquiry.

In those centres, women control scarce resources, commodities and opportunities; and they distribute them. They exercise power through education, propaganda, directives,

suggestions, rewards and punishments. They wield instruments of persuasion and coercion.

As this inquiry shall show, matriarchs (who wield female power) and matriarchy (an organized structure or institution for the exercise of female power) do exist, indeed have always existed. The power they wield is neither illusory nor a joke. Furthermore, in human society, it is not male power but female power which is supreme. Or rather, to change the imagery, however great male power may be, it is to female power what that one-seventh of an iceberg which is visible above water is to the six-sevenths which lies below the water line.

As we shall see, the male modes of power are actually tributary to the female modes, in as much as the fruits of male power are poured at the feet of women through the workings of female power. That men seek wealth, power, status and fame for the love of women is widely attested to by knowledgeable commentators. According to Esther Vilar: "Man's work is only done with woman in view"...

From his own experience, Aristotle Onassis, an ambitious and very successful businessman of this 20th century, confirms this when he declared: "If women didn't exist all the money in the world would have no meaning" ...

Moreover, male preoccupation with wealth, power, fame and status in order to win the love of women is quite natural, being rooted in the animal origins of humanity...

If the natural goal of male power is to pay tribute to women, then male power is naturally tributary to female power. If, however powerful a man may be, his power is used to serve the women in his life, that would make dubious the notion that men are masters over women. Because every man has as boss his wife, or his mother, or some other woman in his life, men may rule the world, but women rule the men who rule the world. Thus, contrary to appearances, woman is boss, the overall boss, of the world.

Chinweizu then goes further into breaking down the three phases and five pillars of female power, emphasis added by me:

Female power exists; it hangs over every man like a ubiquitous shadow. Indeed, the life cycle of man, from cradle to grave, may be divided into **three phases**, each of which is defined by the form of female power which dominates him: **mother power, bridepower, or wifepower**.

From birth to puberty, he is ruled by motherpower, as exercised over him by his one and only "mummy dearest". Then he passes into the territory of bridepower, as exercised over him by his bride-to-be, that cuddlesome and tender wench he feels he cannot live without. This phase lasts from puberty to that wedding day when the last of his potential brides finally makes herself his wife. He then passes into the domain of

-wifepower, as exercised over him by his own resident matriarch, alias his darling wife. This phase lasts till he is either divorced, widowed or dead.

In each phase, female power is established over him through his peculiar weakness in that stage of his life. Motherpower is established over him while he is a helpless infant. Bridepower holds sway over him through his great need for a womb in which to procreate; if he didn't feel this need, he wouldn't put himself into the power of any owner of a womb. Wifepower is established over him through his craving to appear as lord and master of some woman's nest; should he dispense with this vanity, not even the co-producer of his child could hold him in her nest and rule him.

There are five conditions which enable women to get what they want from men: women's control of the womb; women's control of the kitchen; women's control of the cradle; the psychological immaturity of man relative to woman; and man's tendency to be deranged by his own excited penis. These conditions are the five pillars of female power; they are decisive for its dominance over male power. Though each is recognized in popular jokes and sayings, their collective significance is rarely noted.

If traditional male power is can be summed up as ***authority*** and all it's forms (political, financial, physical, etc.), traditional female power – the three forms and five pillars Chinweizu describes above? – can be summed up by the term ***pussy power***. ***Pussy power trumps everything. Properly utilized, pussy power is the most powerful weapon on the planet.*** Even major uberalphas like Julius Caesar and Marc Antony, when all else failed to bring them down, fell to it when wielded by a master practitioner like Cleopatra. Iggy Pop even made a song in tribute to Pussy Power:
powered by Hipcast.com

Before modern feminism, low-status women were women who fell into two categories.

1. women who for some reason or another *couldn't* utilize the traditional weapons of female power. They were deficient in either mother power, bridepower and/or wifepower because they can't effectively use the the five pillars of female power. Examples are ugly women, fat women, socially immature awkward women, older women who were once attractive but were now past their prime beauty and reproductive years, old maids, widows, divorcees, etc.
2. women who *could but didn't want to* rely on the traditional weapons of female power. This included lesbians and other types of women who wanted to be men or at least be free to behave like them and women who resented men and were not willing to settle for the traditional female game of being holding the power secretly but letting men believe they were the ones actually holding the power. They weren't satisfied with the power that came from being the neck, they wanted the recognition and authority that came with being the head. They didn't want to carry on the charade of being subservient and inferior to men.

Thus modern feminism was not the quest for oppressed, powerless women as a whole to gain equality. Modern feminism was actually the quest of a specific

subset of low-status women to gain access to authority – the traditional mode of male power – because they couldn't or by choice wouldn't rely solely on traditional modes of female power – pussy power. The low-status women who were were unattractive, unmarried and/or not mothers wanted access to the male form of power – authority – to compensate for lacking pussy power. These are the types of feminists who bitch about women being objectified in the media, because they are too ugly or old to profit from showcasing themselves sexually. (You rarely see hot, young women bitch about objectification for example unless they've been indoctrinated by one of these old or ugly feminists at some point, usually at university. They're too busy using their looks to get what they want).

The women who were low-status by choice like open lesbians and women who disdained marriage also saw the benefit in gaining access to authority because they found using pussy power against men personally distasteful. Together these two types of women eventually recruited a third type of woman, the one who gave them the most leverage, **the high-status women who did have access to traditional modes of female power – pussy power – but were so bored and/or greedy they decided to get access to authority – the traditionally male form of power – as well.**

Chinweizu also builds on this:

To help us assess feminism, we ought to note that, in their attitudes to men, there are three basic types of women: the matriarchists, the tomboys and the termagants. A matriarchist is a woman who believes that a man's natural or god-ordained role in life is to serve some matriarch or married mother; and that the best way to get full service out of him is to make him think that he is his matriarch's boss. A tomboy is a woman who would rather be a man. A termagant is a woman, whether tomboy or quasi-matriarchist, who insists on showing her man that she, not he, is boss; she therefore takes sadistic pleasure in harassing and bossing men.

Most women, down through history, have been matriarchist. Tomboys there have always been, but most, at puberty, reconciled themselves to the matriarchist social arrangements which suited the overwhelming majority of women. Termagants, the man-hating, temperamental misfits in the matriarchist paradise, there have always been. Incensed by the facade of patriarchy, they would vent on the hapless men around them their resentment of the matriarchist requirement that women make believe that they are ruled by men.

Feminism is a movement of bored matriarchists, frustrated tomboys and natural termagants; each of these types has its reasons for being discontented in the matriarchist paradise that is woman's traditional world. Indeed, the career of post WWII feminism may be summarized as follows:

Bored matriarchists (like Betty Friedan) and frustrated tomboys (like Simone de Beauvoir) kicked it off;

Termagants (like Andrea Dworkin) made a public nuisance of it;

Satisfied matriarchists (like Phyllis Schlafly) oppose it;
Non-militant tomboys (the female yuppies) have quietly profited from it.

Friedanite feminism began by giving public voice to the craving by bored, wealthy, suburban American housewives for "something more than my husband and my children and my home." Much of feminism has been inspired by this desire for something better than the matriarchist paradise; however, feminists find it politically expedient to present their aggrandizing demands in the language of liberation from oppression. But it is hard, without standing the word "oppression" on its head, to fathom how their boredom, an affliction of the leisured and the idle rich, can be taken as a product of oppression. It takes Orwellian doublespeak to say that such a wife is oppressed by the husband whose income makes possible her leisured life. And if the idle rich are oppressed, then what are slaves, peons, and the like?

What Friedanite feminism proves is that what to most women is paradise, to some women is hell; that any paradise can bore some to rebellion...

Anyway, however dubious the "oppressed" status of Friedanite feminists was, once their banner was unfurled, tomboys and termagants were powerfully drawn to it. Under the banner of feminism, the militant tomboy, who would rather be a man, vents her frustration on men instead of appealing to god or the surgeon for a sex change. Under the banner of feminism, the non-militant tomboy goes on to become a yuppie, a business or political entrepreneur, glad for a social climate in which, when she plays male roles, she encounters less resistance than previous generations of tomboys did. She goes into previously all-male fields, and still uses to full advantage all the skills and weapons of female power.

The termagant (the shrew, scold and harridan of old) is a misandrous sadist whose greatest pleasures come from man-baiting and man-bashing. She resents the matriarchist code which would have her pretend that she is not boss to her man. Under the banner of feminism she can fully blossom. The termagant now carries on her man-harassing and man-bossing without restraint, battering a man's ears with blows from her tongue without fear of retaliation by blows from his fist. The termagant claims for herself a tyrant's absolute freedom of conduct and would punish any reaction, however natural, she provokes from men.

She is the type of woman who would wear a miniskirt without panties, a see-through blouse without bras, and swing her legs and wiggle her arse as she parades up and down the street, and yet insist that no man should get excited by her provocative sexual display. Any man who whistles at the sight is berated for male chauvinism. She would put out all male eyes with white-hot iron spits so they would not subject the naked female to "the male gaze". She is so outraged by male energy and exuberance that she would have all males between 15 and 35 put in prison, just to spare women their attentions. If she flirts and teases and leads an adolescent boy on, well beyond the limits of his self-control and he rapes her, she would demand that he be hanged. The only males she would have in the world are lobotomized robots and enervated poodles, all at her beck and call. Under the guise of "radical feminism", some termagants, in their utter misandry, have retreated into lesbian ghettos, and from there attack, as traitors to womankind, those other women who are heterosexual and who do

not totally refrain from social and sexual intercourse with men. Under the banner of feminism, all this is treated as legitimate human behaviour.

The matriarchist – as the nest-queen who happily trams, rules and enjoys the income of the male head of her house – is largely unpersuaded by feminist demands for an equality which would end her privileges. As the prime beneficiaries of the system which feminists would dismantle, the quiet army of satisfied matriarchists is the great immovable rock upon which the tidal wave of feminism spends its fury.

Though feminism parades itself as a revolt against the domination of women by men, it is in fact a revolt by some tomboys against some of women's privileges within the matriarchist paradise, and a revolt by termagants against the matriarchist restraints on their freedom to tyrannize males. However, despite basing their campaign on the principle of gender equality, only a few feminists, a rare few who recognize a need for consistency and fairness, go so far as to accept that the equality they demand must apply also in the trenches, battlefields, mines and other high risk and strenuous areas of life. For the rest, their egalitarian clamour is simply a ruse, and they scheme to head men off from insisting on its full scale implementation.

Most men did not see feminist egalitarianism as the ruse that it was. Of the few who did a mere handful glimpsed that feminism was not a revolt against oppression by men, but a clamour for additional privileges and opportunities for women. Such men began that men's liberation movement which drew the ire of feminists like Carol Hanisch. However, lacking an analysis of female power, the men's liberation movement did not get very far. Most men, being machos, were thoroughly indoctrinated in the view that men rule women, that human societies are strictly patriarchal: they did not, therefore, take seriously the idea that men needed liberating. At best, they saw men's liberation as a practical joke to annoy feminists.

Now here's the irony of all this.

Many lower status men, or beta males as some like to call them, complain about modern feminism, but they were the ones who made this possible. In societies of despotic, uberalphas, would women take such a feminist stand? In polygamous societies with no strong middle-class and no alpha proxies to suppress renegade alpha males, would women take such a feminist stand? No. In those societies women choose passive and discrete manipulation, prefer to be the neck rather than the head and rely mostly on pussy power (which can be broken down further into mother power, bride power and wife power). Only in a society where lower-status men and beta males have a strong voice would women take such a feminist stand, because women know such men are often needy, eager to provide and easy to dominate and openly and actively manipulate. Only in societies of empowered beta males can women as a whole make a play at being the head as well as the neck and in gaining authority power in addition to pussy power.

Lower-status or beta males, being clueless about female psychology, just gave and gave to women until it backfired on them. Before beta males reading this start pulling out their selfless martyr hat, this wasn't out of valor or noble altruism but because of selfishness. They thought it would get them laid more. But once women got more and more male forms of power, like authority in the forms of the political vote, they then used their political voice to alter the Leviathan accordingly so that they could make *all* men increasingly irrelevant. No longer was the Leviathan just a force for renegade alpha suppression and empowerment of lower-status men. Once women could vote the Leviathan was also a tool for female empowerment and freedom from dependence on men.

John Lott, Jr. [did an op-ed in the Washington Times](#) a few years ago describing how women's suffrage and increasing female voter rates from the 20s through the 60s caused the size of federal government to grow as well. Now the Leviathan works not just to suppress renegade alphas but also to empower women with authority – the male form of power – in addition to the pussy power they already had access to. Entitlements from the Great Society onward primarily benefit women and work to make men of all classes less necessary. The female vote altered the Leviathan to make sure that women retain the benefits of the pussy power, gain the benefits of traditional male power to boot, yet remain shielded from much of the responsibilities that come along with traditional male power at the same time. It's the best of all worlds, a masterstroke by women if you will.

And you know what? I can't blame them. If men are clueless enough to be so manipulated, women have to be fools not to go for it. I tip my hat and pop my collar to them. But for all these beta males who try to paint the modern world as some conspiracy by alpha males and women to keep them down, they have to realize much of this is their own plans backfiring. Much of the emasculation of men started with the creation of a society dominated by alpha proxies that low-status men created to protect their interests against uberalphas. And the rise of modern feminism can largely be attributed to the inability of these newly empowered needy and supplicating low-status men to understand female nature and resist their demands.

The Myth of the Middle Class Alpha, Part 6

Some of the myopic and vision-impaired among you have been complaining that they can't see the practical use of this series. This final installment will make it clearer for you.

Before we get started, let me get one thing out of the way that you should keep in mind throughout this article. Although I say being a pure alpha can be a bad thing in this society because modern society is so rigged against excessive alpha behavior, make no

mistake about it, ***if you have to be excessive it's definitely better to be too alpha than be too beta.***

Now that we got that out of the way, I want to introduce you to the **alpha fallacies**.

The Alpha Fallacies

1. Everything good a modern man can be must represent an alpha trait.
2. Everything that represents an alpha trait must represent something good for a modern man to be.
- 3.

These differences between these fallacies are subtle, but they aren't exactly the same. However both play a big role in much of the confusion men have when they debate idealized manhood.

The point of this whole series has been to point out why these two fallacies are actually fallacies, especially for middle-class men. For middle-class men in modern society, the best response to take in many scenarios is often the beta response. And for middle-class men in modern society, many alpha traits can also be extremely counterproductive and even self-destructive.

Alpha Dissonance

Modern developed, monogamous societies are set up so that a model man is one that is not excessively alpha, and such societies are set up to curb any excessively alpha displays by use of alpha proxies. (See part 4, linked above) Alpha proxies aren't limited to just governmental bodies but also social norms, etiquette, media messages, public opinion and modern customs. Our society has set us up to believe being alpha is the best thing for a modern man can be and that all things great about modern men are automatically alpha traits, yet at the same time our society discourages and punishes men the moment they engage in any excessively alpha behavior, whether it's growing a harem (look at Tiger's shaming), monopolizing resources (antitrust laws), engaging in fistfights (look at Ronnie's arrest on "Jersey Shore") or murders of romantic rivals along with other brutal, aggressive and domineering aspects of alpha male behavior. These conflicting messages society sends us where alphaness seems simultaneously celebrated and encouraged yet is punished and discouraged creates what I call **alpha dissonance**.

Here's an example of alpha dissonance. A reader named Alpha Male [left this comment](#) in response to part 4:

My definition of an alpha male is really parallel to that of a leader and any truly great leader is not a jackhole.

Here we see the alpha fallacy #1 in play. Modern men are discouraged from being assholes. In fact, being an asshole can be very counterproductive, especially if you are a middle-class man, because if you do it on the job the good employees under you will leave the company and the supervisors above you may view you as a liability because of the sexual harassment and employment discrimination suits they can get hit with (again, note the use of an alpha proxy at play to level the playing field, in this case the legal system and courts). Also, if you as a middle-class guy are an asshole in a social

situations, even if you're a leader among your peers, it can really backfire against you, because you're not so poor that you have nothing to lose and no [fear](#) of consequences, and you are not so powerful you can just thumb your nose at the rules and buy yourself an out.

Therefore if you get too assholeish the cops can beat you and lock you up, you can get hit with a criminal record that follows you around forever, you can get sued in a civil court and lose all your resources if the judge rules against you, you can lose your job and community social standing, you can win and court and still lose most of your resources through expensive legal fees and so on and so on.

So we learn from numerous examples and social conditioning that it pays nowadays for a man not to be an asshole even as a leader, especially if he's middle-class. Yet many of us also believe the alpha fallacy that everything good for a modern man is automatically an alpha trait. Therefore a man will reconcile this dissonance by declaring that part of being an alpha male leader must also mean not being an asshole.

This however is not true at all. Coming up with bad definitions like this is an example of what I call **alpha rationalization**.

Alpha Rationalization

This comes about when a man is faced with the alpha dissonance that comes from the alpha fallacies not matching up to reality.

Using the previous example: Not being an asshole has nothing to do with being alpha. If an alpha male feels like being an asshole, he'll be an asshole plain and simple. If he doesn't feel like being an asshole, he won't. **The only constant in the alpha male's behavior is dominating and feeling entitled and correct in doing whatever the fuck it is he wants to do at any given time.** You think Genghis Khan and Attila the Hun were worried about leading without being assholes? Or Napoleon? Or John Gotti? Or Bumpy Johnson? Or Julius Caesar? Or Pablo Escobar?

The freedom of a man to engage in truly unrestrained alpha behavior is directly related to how free he is to not cooperate with alpha proxies, either because they don't exist in his environment or he's found a way to exploit them. The rest of us in modern society, especially in the middle-class, are forced to strike a balance between being as alpha as we can while being beta enough to fly under the radar of the various alpha proxies around us. [In other words, being a Renaissance, or Evolved, Man.](#)

The commenter Alpha Male realizes that it's good for a modern man to be a leader yet not an asshole. But because he also believes the fallacy that everything good a modern man can be must automatically be called alpha, he has incorrectly rationalized that being a leader who is not an asshole is part of the definition of alpha male.

Many men giving advice out there, because of alpha fallacy #1, are polluting the minds of confused men with alpha rationalizations like the following:

- Alpha males are always valuable, upstanding citizens who always "give back"

- Alpha males always leave women better than they found them
- Alpha males always smile and create good feelings in everyone around them
- Alpha males are the most well-educated and intelligent
- Alpha males motivate through inspiration and positivity rather than fear and bullying
- Alpha males are morally superior
- Alpha males are great team players
- Alpha males sincerely love women (they may not have bitter sour grapes or judgmental, resentful attitude toward them that beta males do, but they don't necessarily have to love them either)

Even though an alpha male can *choose* to be any of these things if he wants, none of them are mandatory for being considered alpha. All that an alpha male needs to be considered alpha is to dominate and to be unafraid to do and say what he wants when he wants. Whether he is empathic or sociopathic or whether uses these traits for good or evil is irrelevant to whether or not he is alpha.

In addition, there are plenty of times in modern developed society where alpha fallacy #2 comes into play and we discover that the most alpha response is the worst response one can take in response to a problem, especially when going head to head with alpha proxies. Ask Rodney King or Ronnie from "Jersey Shore." Even though it's a fictional example, watch the movie *Scarface* to see alpha fallacy #2 in action as well. At almost every step in the game Tony Montana does the most alpha response possible. At first it carries him far, but eventually it backfires and leads to his undoing because he hits points where he needs to humble himself or choose his battles wisely and he is just too alpha to accept that.

Alpha Anxiety

Alpha anxiety is the state most modern men currently exist in thanks to a lack of understanding of what modern society is. Alpha anxiety comes when men are unfamiliar with concepts described in this Middle-Class Alpha Male series such as the Leviathan, alpha proxies, renegade alpha suppression and renaissance men. Alpha anxiety comes when men are exposed to media messages that celebrate being as alpha as fuck, [for example heroes in action movies](#), yet at the same time are given examples of the consequences of acting too alpha at any given time (for example jail, ruined reputation, or lawsuits). Alpha anxiety comes from having to constantly trying to create rationalizations for the dissonance that comes from reconciling the alpha fallacies with reality in modern developed, monogamous societies.

Alpha anxieties is why people are getting rich creating self-help products advising men on how to be men. Alpha anxiety is why men's insecurity buttons are easier to push than ever before. Alpha anxiety is why so many men are currently clueless about human nature and what women want and how to seduce them. Alpha anxiety is what creates this guilt or shame in men whenever they feel their response to a problem was inadequately alpha, even though logically they understand that in our society the most alpha response would have likely caused more harm than good.

And the point of this whole series Myth of the Middle-Class Alpha Male has to been both to explain to people how this current state of alpha anxiety came about and to make

men realize that they don't need to carry around this alpha anxiety anymore. To realize that the alpha fallacies are just that: fallacies. And that men not only shouldn't feel bound by them but also realize that they're often counterproductive and can impede their progress to becoming the ideal men for their modern era and middle-class environment. And also to put the renaissance/evolved man advice in a larger context and explain why it's not exactly the same as an alpha male.

For further reading, I recommend looking at a blog I recently found where the author Athol Kay actually shares my philosophy about how modern middle-class male life actually requires a blend of alphadom and betadom rather than being pure alpha, [especially this post](#).
[And this post](#).

Final Thoughts On Feminism

In part 5 of this series, I explained how feminism came about and how it related to the rise of the lower-status male. As usual, many people assumed that because I was describing something, I was actually passing judgment on it. In this case, a lot of guys thought I was joining in on the whole "feminism is evil and the world would be better for men if we abolished it" bandwagon.

I actually don't think like this. Feminism has its problems if you totally buy into it 100% because many of its fundamental tenets rely on delusions about human nature, but I think it actually can be helpful so long as you understand what it's really about, don't buy into it wholeheartedly, and retain a basic understanding of human behavior and sexual dynamics no matter what.

Assanova gives great insights in two blog posts about how feminism can be helpful to men once they get hip to the game:

[Why I Love Feminism](#)
[How Feminism Benefits You](#)

That's it, all done. And for those who haven't been enjoying this series, be happy because it's all done and we're moving on to lighter topics for a while.

Why I LOVE Feminism

Look around on the internet, and you'll notice quite a few websites that are against non-submissive women and feminism in general. Not to be one that just accepts things without looking into them myself, I have to say that I absolutely love feminism.

If you think about it, there are two types of men that feminism doesn't benefit: beta males because they have no checks in place to keep all of the women from fucking alpha males, and inexperienced men that get married without considering the repercussions of divorce and end up

getting financially screwed over.

I've said this before: I think marriage & suppressing women were meant to benefit beta men. They're a way to keep women financially dependent on them, a way for them to control women, and a way to keep women from going out and fucking who they really want to fuck whenever they want.

What I can't understand, is why would any attractive man be against feminism and the rights of women. If you really look at it, if you're an attractive guy, you only benefit from feminism. And below, you'll see a few of the ways in which you'll benefit if you're an alpha male that most women go for and want to fuck.

The first benefit is that women have higher wages than what they have had in years past. What this is due to? I don't know, but I will guess that it's due to more education and opportunities to move up the corporate ladder. What I've come to notice, is that a lot of the women I date have a lot of disposable income. More and more women are driving ME around, buying ME drinks, taking ME out to dinner, and buying ME gifts. In other words, feminism means that more women can afford to pamper attractive men.

The second benefit, is that since women have more power to do so, they're more willing to cheat on and/or leave their husbands at will. What does this mean? More opportunities for attractive men to have sex with women who might otherwise not have even risked cheating on and/or leaving their husbands.

This also means something else: more and more women feel free to delay marriage. How does this benefit men? I have no intention of getting into anything serious anytime soon. In the past, most women might have been locked up in marriage and been unavailable. Just think of what it would be like to be a single 30-something year old man pre-feminism. There would be relatively few single women to choose from.

Now, as I age, the women are choosing to stay unmarried longer, and what this means is a larger pool of single women to choose from over a longer period of time. Before, I'd imagine single men snatching up and choosing to marry before all of the decent women were taken. Now men can delay marriage longer without worry because the pool of older single women is now larger due to single women putting off marriage. Another product of what feminism has accomplished.

And finally, so many men love all of the crazy sexual things that women do now, but don't stop to think of how it got that way. What do you think happened pre-feminism when beta males ran things? Sexuality was strongly censored and women would be openly scolded and frowned upon for doing many of the crazy things they do now, so they most likely wouldn't have even risked it.

Now, thanks to feminism, women feel free to be open about their sexuality and to experiment without fear of serious repercussions. Without feminism, what would happen to women constantly flashing their tits, homey hopping, threesomes, blowjobs in the bathroom, spring break, public sex, and all of the other crazy shit that women are willing to do now? I guess one man's trash is another man's treasure, and in this case, all of the booty belongs to the alpha male.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 26, 2009

How Feminism Benefits You

As many of you already know, I love feminism. The only reason I can think of why any man would hate it, is because he's either been fed a one-sided view, or he is a complete loser. In a previous post, I wrote about how it benefits any man that considers himself attractive. And if you are one of those guys complaining about how men get screwed in marriage, then perhaps you should be smart enough to read about marriage law before you go signing a contract.

Now onto what this post is about, a continuance of how feminism benefits you. If you don't know this already, one of the benefits of feminism is that women are now able to earn higher salaries, advance into higher positions of authority, and work in areas that they may have been shut out of in the past. Have any of you actually thought about how this benefits you before running off crying and whining like sissies?

Let me put it in perspective for you. Are you a wealthy man? If not, then pre-feminism, you would have been screwed when it comes to dating, and keeping, a beautiful woman. Why, might you ask? In case you aren't aware of how things use to be, wealthy and powerful men swooped up all of those tens that all of you pick-up artists claim to be getting. A wealthy man eyes your girlfriend or wife? Say goodbye to her. You can read about this in any book about the harems and mistresses powerful men had, specifically, political men.

If you still don't get it, before women had any rights and little if any means to earn a good income, women were forced to put a huge emphasis on a man's earning potential. And if she happened to run across a man that earned a significant amount of money more than you, then there's a good chance that she'd either leave or cheat on you for a chance at his purse. Read any pre-feminism book about relationships, specifically in the monarchies, then you'd read about women packing up, openly cheating on or leaving their husband to be with a wealthy political figure, birthing his children, and expecting her husband to welcome her back home with a smile on his face when said wealthy political figure was done with her, IF she came back at all.

Now let's take a look at women today. Although poor women still choose men for their wealth, I've noticed that women who have a good income are openly turning down men that they might have otherwise cheated with or left their husbands for pre-feminism. I talk to women, and they're constantly telling me about their married managers, bosses, and other men that make a considerable amount of money trying to have sex with them.

Now what do you think these women would do before feminism? They'd probably cheat on you, perhaps leave you, and sleep with these men in order to keep their jobs or provide their children with resources. And this is usually what happens when you suppress women; they fuck their way up to success if you don't provide them any other means to better themselves and their situation with their children.

Not to mention that when women have their own income, if she chooses to get into a relationship with you, then you have the security of knowing that she's with you for you, and not because of how big your bank account is. She has her own money, so she has no need to date men that provide it for her. Not to say that money won't be a factor when choosing a mate, but it is less of a factor than it was fifty or so years ago. And this is exactly why you see a lot of beautiful women dating men that don't make a lot of money.

I know that I said that women are now free to choose men based on aesthetics because of feminism in the previous post, but this also benefits you. For instance, let's say that all women start choosing for buff

men, you know that with the right diet, and gym time, you can get buff. In other words, with dedication, it's very reachable. With political power and wealth, hard work is only part of the equation. Without the right connections, you are dead in your tracks. In other words, if aesthetics take the place of wealth, you have a much better, equal, chance of attaining it, and gaining access to the beautiful women that choose for it.

Feminism really isn't as bad as most PUA's make it out to be. If you just use common sense before signing a contract, you'll soon realize that it benefits you and places men on a much more level playing field with those that have amassed power and wealth and used that as a means to pick and choose any beautiful woman that they want, even if it happens to be your wife or girlfriend. Feminism allows your wife or girlfriend to stay with you and not place another man's financial resources before who she really loves and wants to be with. The sooner that women make more money and attain their own financial security, the better off men are as a whole.