

Vintologi

The fundamental beliefs in vintologi are:

- The fundamental laws of nature are universal.
- consciousness has no first beginning or final end.
- there is only one universe.
- free will \equiv quantum indeterminism (def).

There is no absolute morality, only personal preferences shaped by evolution. We can still get to prescriptive statements about what we ought to do since some things simply cannot be avoided.

By using might you can enforce subjective preferences upon other people changing the world to what you view as something better [0](#) [1](#) [2](#) this however doesn't allow you to arbitrary shape society to your preferences since certain decisions will result in you losing power or your society collapsing.

Unless you control the entire planet you will have to worry about competition from other societies. Policies that make your society more competitive may not actually be the policies you want once you have gained control over the entire planet.

Darwinian vintologi has the additional assumption that the probability of reincarnation decreases with genetic distance due to the continuation of your conscious experience being tied to brain-structure.

The type of lives you live will change as your specie (currently homo sapiens) and the world evolves.

What it means to live a great life

There are multiple factors to consider when it comes to which experiences that actually provide people with great lives.

Generally you want variation in terms of what you do and what you experience. Rather than doing the same thing every way you want to experience diversity in terms of experiences and also some degree of unpredictability.

While pain is often viewed as something we should just avoid it can actually provide people with new experiences and sensations making life more exciting and diverse in experiences. It's fairly obvious that a lot of people are masochists who actually enjoy having other people inflict pain upon them.

The case for brutal domination

Let's say only 1 male and 1 female exist. You are randomly going to either live as the male or live as the female (50% probability for each). For simplicity future consequences will be ignored here.

There are basically 4 ways in which the 2 can interact

0. Liberalism (they respect each other).
1. Male domination.
2. Female domination.
3. They fight each other.

But if they fight one party is very likely to lose the ability to inflict significant harm upon the other (such as getting knocked out and restrained) leading to 1 or 2 (or 0 if they make peace before that).

One advantage with having the male brutally dominate the female here is that then the male can have a lot of fun humiliating the female such as playing with her breasts and watching her react to that. Maybe experiment with different ways to finger her and see if you can make her orgasm. Maybe you can experiment with her anus stretching it.

But having the male brutally dominate the female might also provide a more fun experience for the female.

So rather than having the 2 respect each other having the male dominate the female (for example) might actually result in an overall better experience for the 2.

The act of brutal domination provides the one being dominated by unpredictability (not knowing what will be done to you) and potentially offers a diversity of sensations and experiences.

So for this scenario it might be better if the female start out tied up so the male can do how he pleases.

One interesting alternative is female domination but most females do not seem particularly interested in being dominant like that. Males are also generally stronger making it easier for them to be physically dominant (reducing the need for physical restraints).

Freedom to choose isn't always a good thing

Having a worse option made available for you is at best neutral but it can also be detrimental since then you might choose that worse option (due to limited intelligence).

If we look at videogames for example we see that games that force the player into taking a fixed route are often more fun since then the game developers can optimize for that particular way to play rather than trying to optimize the gameplay for many different routes (which is a lot harder and often lead to the game being mediocre).

A compromise is to have a more fixed path early on in life and later as you get older and learn more you get more freedoms given to you.

About hedonism and the brain

There is no shortage of people becoming miserable while merely chasing pleasure such as homeless drug addicts.

The brain has multiple mechanisms to regulate how good you feel. If you start using drugs the brain will adjust itself to that and long-term you will not benefit much from it in terms of pleasure (it's likely even negative due to side effects and other issues).

The brain adjusting itself to stimuli very likely extends to stimulation not caused by drugs such as pornography.

Overcoming hardships

It can be an amazing feeling to finally prevail beating a very difficult challenge.

If you have played videogames you will have noticed that games that are too easy are generally a lot less fun. Multiplayer games often benefit from rating-systems that match people based on how good they are. That keeps people engaged since even if they improve the game will still be hard because now they have to face harder opponents.

When it comes to challenges in life it ranges from completely pointless to life or death (potentially also including your children). If something real is at stake it will generally be more exciting and fulfilling to actually complete the challenge.

If you live in a primitive world your survival will to a large extent be in your own hands. You having to build shelter, fend off large predators, hunt, etc [3](#) [4](#)

It can be a lot harder to offer people the same meaning in a modern society where most people are safe and can survive easily. This is especially a problem in societies where the government enforces egalitarianism making it less worthwhile to work towards a better future for yourself.

Human goals and desires

Humans have evolved various preferences shaped by evolution. We like eating food, sex, raising a family, etc.

Evolution does over time push humans like other animals to behave in ways which is beneficial in terms of survival and reproduction. It's about which genes that cause themselves to replicate.

That does not however mean that evolution will push humans to behave optimally in terms of reproductive success. Genetic evolution is a very crude process.

Having genes enabling cultural evolution (which can take place much quicker) might be a better way to maximize reproductive success than direct genetic control over behaviour. Humans have the ability to use their brain to force themselves to do things that are painful/unpleasurable.

Decision making and consequences

Given a mental state you will make a given decision with a certain probability, this mental state in turn will have depended on environment, genetics, quantum indeterminism.

Your decisions always have consequences, these can sometimes be difficult to know. Making good decisions itself isn't free, when you spend time trying to figure out the rational endeavor you lose time that could have been used to benefit you in other ways. High intelligence makes it a lot easier to arrive at the correct conclusion during a given time and allows you to influence the future according to your preferences.

You will have to accept that you are wrong sometimes, eventually it will be cured with death or by changing your mind.

Karma

Your decision now will also affect future lives, not just your current life. The more likely you are to reincarnate as an individual human the more it matters to secure a good life for said human in terms of your own direct well-being. Thus you naturally want to create a future where humans and maybe other animals overall have fun lives. For example you may subject your citizens to fun punishments.

When you die your current preferences will die with you. You will instead begin a new life where what you will desire will be shaped by genetics and your environment. What matters here is the probability of reincarnation, not what preferences you had in your past life. Thus conclusions on what society we ought to create will be objective where the only difference between individuals in terms of upcoming lives will be potential differences in reincarnation probability.

If you reincarnate as a non-human animal what is a good life will then depend on the neurological traits of said animal, pigs don't like the same things humans like.

It's very likely that the probability of you experiencing life via some brain will depend on the neurological size of said brain, otherwise you would be much more likely to experience life as some highly numerous animal such as an ant or a small which which is not what you observe. Thus animal welfare is less of a concern.

According to darwinian vintologi your kind will be punished/rewarded in future lives, based on decisions you made. Evolution has shaped humans to naturally desire things like good sex and space colonization and this will naturally extend to future lives given the fact that you will reincarnate.

If you fail to stop communism/leftism you will suffer from it in future lives (we all suffer from that now). If you fail to stop christ insanity and the bad things that come from that you may end up living with a mutilated penis in the next life(luckily circumcision isn't common in Europe).

Being born with good genes can bless your life [5](#) [6](#) [7](#) [8](#)

The punishment of having bad genes can be really horrible; if you are an ugly male almost all females will reject you, ugly females can still get males but not the best. There are many truly horrible genetic disorders that we should try to eliminate completely. Some disorders such as OCD can be cured but it will be painful and difficult, left uncured they ruin many people's lives.

Being an ugly male is no fun [9](#) [10](#) luckily females will reject most of these males resulting in a more beautiful population in the future.

The quality of your life isn't just about the genes you happen to be born with, when you are young you will depend on your parents/government taking proper care of you [11](#) in addition you will have to deal with the consequences of political beliefs the majority hold and this can ruin your life [12](#)

When you reincarnate you go from a matured brain to a young brain that has limited capacity, thus you will most likely end up with a more powerful brain the next life if these brains are available. When you increase the amount of people with similar genetics you will increase your chance of ending up with a better brain next life.

If the amount of new children being born of your genetic type is low you will be unlikely to reincarnate into a better brain unless you reincarnate into a different genetic type. If you do reincarnate as a different race you are more likely to end up with an abnormal brain of said race.

The quality of your future life is also to a large part determined by actions and characteristics of other people. Traits such as high intelligence tend to also benefit other people and not just the individual with the trait, therefore you need to look at the impact on society as a whole and not just the individual when assessing what types of genetics are desirable.

Culture and politics of a country will however over time be a result of genetics, it does however take time before the fruit of eugenics can be enjoyed and thus people will generally not be in favor of eugenics policies even when it's clear they work thinking they will not actually benefit themselves from the improvement.

Creating a good society where people live good lives is obviously not enough to secure a good likelihood of a good life in the case you get reincarnated as a human. Unless the society is global you may still reincarnate outside said society and thus end up living a bad life. By increasing the population of your society you increase the chance of reincarnating as a member of said society.

Increasing the chance of your society eventually conquering the entire planet will however require sacrifices. Your population might end up having to work harder to finance all the military spending via taxes (or forced labor such as conscription) and millions of your own citizens is likely to die in all the wars of conquest you engage in.

Societal survival of the fittest

Weak societies will fall and be taken over by stronger societies.

Democratic societies tend to become weak and this cannot last forever, you can utilize weaknesses in democratic systems to slowly grab power, after that there will not be any more real democracy.

One key factor for societal success is the reproduction of their people since that will create the biological foundation for the future society. The by far biggest factor limiting the birthrate is females unwilling to have even close to the max number of children. There are several brutal methods (baby quotas, females as property) to maximize the fertility rate among desired females.

13 is a good age for a female to start breeding, if she is finished breeding early that will allow her to enter the economy and be productive to society early. It's also easier to force a young female to have children since it will be difficult for her to flee or fight back.

We also need to have a strong economy so we can support all the children we are raising as a society, this will also allow us to build a strong military. In order to build a strong society we need to be inclusive, not exclude people based on ethnicity, sexual orientation or gender expression. By attracting important individuals to our society we make it stronger.

As your population and resources grow you will become increasingly constrained by the amount of land you control as a society. In addition being constrained to a small space will make it easier for a hostile actor to target you since the area that needs to be nuked is a lot smaller. Controlling land is also very valuable in conventional warfare since that can be used as a buffer against potential invasions. It's a lot harder to invade when you have to make logistics work over a long distance.

Food production does require a lot of space and if the world population keep growing the value of agricultural land will also increase drastically since there will be harder and harder to make enough food in a given area, that potentially allow hostile nations to starve the population of a small area (relative to population size) since they lack the land required to produce the food themselves. In addition a nation with a lot of land may just decide to restrict exports due to high food prices in an attempt to please their citizens (resulting in others starving instead).

Rather than waiting until you become severely constrained by the amount of land you have you should expand your borders at the first good opportunity, you might not get a chance like that again.

The notion that the short-term catastrophe caused by nuclear war would prevent it from happening is very much false. What it does mean however is that countries looking to expand will prioritize targets who cannot defend themselves with nuclear weapons (such as Ukraine).

But once only nuclear powers remain in order to expand you will have to be willing to take nuclear hits. There are multiple ways to mitigate the damage that can be caused by other nuclear powers.

0. Spreading out your population and important material/infrastructure over a large area
1. Having people and important infrastructure hidden under ground safe or mostly safe from nuclear weapons.
2. interception of nuclear missiles
3. Have great food stockpiles (ideally lasting years).
4. Doing a first strike to severely damage the nuclear capability of the country you are invading.
5. Deterring a retaliation by having a lot of nukes yourself (so a leader might be afraid to hit back even if you nuke them) [13](#)

The correct strategy is to start a nuclear war at the moment you have a great enough chance to win. Otherwise if you wait you will give your opponents a chance to surpass you and you do not want that, win now when you can.

Some people have claimed that nuclear war would cause disastrous fallout but that ignores the fact that 2056 tests of nuclear bombs have already been done and most people are just fine, sure there were some issues with it (which led to testing being halted) but nothing like the apocalyptic disaster.

The total radioactivity of the fission products is extremely large at first, but it falls off at a fairly rapid rate as a result of radioactive decay. Seven hours after a nuclear explosion, residual radioactivity will have decreased to about 10 percent of its amount at 1 hour, and after another 48 hours it will have decreased to 1 percent. (The rule of thumb is that for every sevenfold increase in time after the explosion, the radiation dose rate decreases by a factor of 10.)

<https://www.britannica.com/technology/nuclear-weapon/Residual-radiation-and-fallout>

It's unclear how a nuclear war would affect the climate [14](#) [15](#) but if these affects are global it will not be effective deterrence against war since it would also cause problems for countries not directly involved.

The winners of the nuclear war would likely gain control over the entire planet and this would include control over food production. If the nuclear war disrupts food-production the surviving populations of the losing countries would likely be given very low priority potentially resulting in them facing mass-starvation and thus further casualties.

Economic interdependence doesn't prevent war

It is sometimes claimed that countries being economically dependent on each other would result in general peace since you would harm yourself by doing an invasion.

The first obvious issue with this is that for a lot of products alternative sourcing exists or you can just stockpile what you need until you are able to find replacement.

The second issue with this reasoning is the fact that countries could just resort to protectionism and economic nationalism to make sure they can produce all vital products themselves.

The third issue with this argument is that often when you invade you can spare a lot of their industries and just take them over, you do not necessarily have to just destroy everything. China would probably spare the TSMC factory if they invaded Taiwan. TSMC is currently building chip-factories in multiple countries which will result in the west no longer needing taiwan for computer chips.

There have been many cases of sanctions being attempted to harm a country without invading them but this has very rarely actually been effective in deterring invasion. If sanctions don't work to prevent war then clearly economic interdependence would also not work, it's all wishful thinking people engage in because they view war as this awful thing to avoid not realizing that it's not something you can avoid in the first place without having a strong and stable world-government.

Military alliances and international relations

Unless you are militarily stronger than all other countries on earth combined it's very important to build strong alliances to ensure you will come out victorious in the case of a world war. By winning the world war we will be able to drastically expand our borders and eventually rule over the entire planet.

Rather than going up against some other strong country it's better to first just conquer weak nations that cannot defend themselves well first allowing you to grow even stronger before you eventually have to face a strong adversary [16](#)

Weaker powers will be dependent on alliances with other countries for security and thus small countries can never truly be independent. Smaller countries will be forced to join into a federation or become a semi-colony of some major power. Relying on alliances like NATO is not a great idea long-term since that depends on other members of the alliance not acting in their self-interest, it's often not worth it to enter into a war just to protect some ally, you shouldn't do that without very significant compensation.

Short-term just using military might alone will be enough to expand your border but then if the population isn't on board with the system there will be constant friction.

You will have to take action to align the public more with your new government and this may include actions that aim directly at genetics rather than attempts at changing culture.

A strong nation can potentially get beaten by making too many enemies even if all individual enemies are weaker.

If an individual state becomes stronger than all other states combined then said state can just keep expanding to eventually conquer the entire planet, this is good if you are in control in that state but you do not want someone else to be able to do that. If there are only 3 countries left on the planet having one of the final 3 eliminated is probably not in your best interest if you then cannot win the final war.

As the number of countries becomes fewer it becomes increasingly valuable to prevent an individual country from becoming too strong. Therefore if a country attempts to expand you may want to attempt halting that by aiding the nation they are invading preventing them from gaining ground too cheaply.

You have to be careful with military aid though since it could end up in the wrong hand or the former ally may turn against you. You might want to demand concessions in exchange for supporting some country such as demanding that you gain some control over their government or demand that they pay for the weapons you provide them.

Since becoming too visibly strong will put a target on your back you may want to keep a lot of your military might a secret, otherwise weaker nations may just gang up on you.

You also do not want to appear too weak since that might also invite attacks.

Of course no matter what you do there will always be a risk of some country suiciding into you which can hurt you badly even if you manage to eventually win over them.

You should probably try influence other countries into not attacking you. Instead you want them to waste and lives attacking your enemies while you sit back and grow your military might.

When there are only 3 countries left

It would probably not be in the interest of a country to maintain an alliance with a significantly stronger country since if the third country was eliminated they would be the next power to be crushed.

There are multiple ways in which this could end. Peaceful unification is a bit tricky but could work out.

If both countries believe they have a great chance of winning the final 1v1 war they might maintain an alliance against the third party. The third party could try attacking just one to create an imbalance but then the country not being attacked could just provide aid to the attacked partner in order to maintain the alliance.

Because a stronger country always has the option to give away military might to a weaker alliance partner there would be no downside to being strong when there is only 3 countries left.

Politics will very likely be the biggest factor in determining which 2 countries that would ally themselves to crush the third country. The ideology of your temporary alliance partner would be very relevant since they might win against you in the final fight, you want to eliminate the worst option.

Having a vision for society people can get behind will also make it easier to attract important individuals to your country. Engineers might emigrate to you to help with weapon development. People might move to your country to start a new business. This will help you become the dominant power.

Immigration and inclusivity

Societies that are inclusive and allow valuable individuals to enter will have an advantage over societies that try to exclude people based on factors that don't matter [17](#) [18](#) [19](#)

It's very important that you as a country put effort into attracting high-quality people to your society so it becomes stronger instead of some other country benefiting from them. By attracting important individuals from other countries you make your own society stronger and other societies weaker.

Unfortunately today borders are relatively fixed and if you take in immigrants that may result in less land and living space for your existing population unless you are later able to expand your borders and attain more resources for everyone.

If you have too many people in your country then you will have to import food to feed your population, this may come with some risks but there are strategies to manage that

0. keep food and other important items stockpiled so you will be able to survive for years if you are no longer able to import food.

1. have a strong military and make good geopolitical decisions securing trade of important goods.

2. eventually gain control over new areas allowing your citizens to spread out again.

Having a lot of people concentrated in the same area (such as a big city) does come with some military risk, you can try to mitigate this by having advanced defense systems but it may not actually be effective. Thus if you allow more people in the same area you might invite attacks by weapons of mass-destruction making everyone less safe. This is not however an issue of migration and it will actually be less bad in terms of inclusive fitness if the people who migrate to the city are genetically distant.

It's not just about being accepting with regard to ethnicity, it's also about being accepting with regard to culture, sexual orientation, gender expression and sex-characteristics.

Laws and culture

The ideal set of laws does not depend much on culture or ethnicity of your population. Sometimes it's necessary to implement a bad law to appease the population (mob) of your country but in these cases the judiciary and executive branch will be able to limit the damage by not enforcing the law or only enforcing it when there are other reasons for wanting to punish these individuals.

Laws that don't promote the continuation/expansion of the society will be not sustainable and thus suicidal in terms of societal survival of the fittest.

There is hardly any need for having localized laws, things like environmental regulations do need to be different at different places but this does not depend much on culture unless you are going to let some culture destroy the environment for the sake of tradition.

The school system might also have to be localized to a degree, some people might also want to learn their own language in addition to the language of the country they live in.

People have different preferences regarding how laws should be but this already create a lot of conflicts within countries that have a mostly homogeneous culture. Two people with wildly different cultures can also have similar views on how society should be structured. Rightwingers today in Unites States like Augusto Pinochet far more than most Chileans.

In order to evaluate how good a law is you need to look at how it affects the gene-pool of your population, if it will make your population more fit over time then your society will be able to grow stronger and out-compete other societies that did not have as good policy with regard to eugenics.

Cultural survival of the fittest

Some cultures will naturally spread while other cultures will become increasingly less common. A culture can grow by reaching new people or by being transferred to children being born to said culture.

Cultures that promote fertility will spread naturally by causing higher birthrates among individuals that believe in said culture, furthermore people that are neurologically susceptible for said culture will end up reproducing more and thus keep spreading the culture even if it's unpopular among most people.

How easy it is for a particular culture to spread will depend on society and neurological factors. Some cultures will naturally appeal to people and gain popularity even though it's bad in terms of survival and reproduction, these will however die out over time.

The origin of morality

Animals that act in a way not ideal for survival and reproduction may end up being replaced by animals that make better decisions in terms of survival and reproduction. Thus over time evolution enforces a darwinian morality meaning people are forced to adapt to the environment. People that break laws may end up jailed or even killed and this will create evolutionary pressure not to break these laws.

Humans often try to push morality upon others that is not beneficial in terms of their reproductive success. Often morality is pushed with the intention of benefiting some group rather than doing what's best for society or trying to pursue reproductive success. You want your enemies to follow moral systems that make them weak such as believing that it's always wrong to kill people.

Thus there is a very significant moral tension where different groups pushes different notions of morality and where it's in the reproductive interests of people to ignore the morality the government and special interest groups is trying to push. Parents do have an interest to push morality that is actually beneficial in terms of the reproductive success of their children but other people do not.

Humans are currently in control over the environment and thus the morality will to a very large extent come down to decisions made by humans, by changing the environment we can change the direction of human evolution.

Genetic preferences

Humans will generally favor their own genetics, this is enforced over time by evolution so it's probably never going away, if anything it will become more prominent in the future. Most people prefer having their own children over adopting. There is however other factors to consider when evaluating genetics

Factor1: does the gene provide a survival & reproduction advantage?

Factor2: does the gene benefit the survival and expansion of your society?

Factor3: do other people being born with said gene lead to you living better lives?

Factor4: does your quality of life benefit from having said gene in upcoming lives?

Factor5: does the survival and reproduction of your culture?

Here we see a potential conflict between future pleasure, genetic reproductive success, cultural reproductive success, societal success. It is worth noting that people pursuing pleasure over reproductive success will be selected against so it might be a futile dead-end approach to life.

All these factors are heavily dependent on environment and our environment comes down to decisions made by humans, the actions you take now will affect the future of humanity.


You do not want to pass on individual genes that are massively detrimental for reproductive success since then your overall reproduction will go down. You might instead benefit from genetic modification in terms of reproductive success since the changed/added genes help your other genes to spread.

Eugenics

Evolution by natural selection is a brutal and ineffective process. Therefore it can be tempting to take shortcuts when it comes to breeding a more fit population, this however will often end very badly, often worse than no selection at all [20](#)

This however does not mean eugenics cannot work, it just means we need to be patient and give it the time it needs. Rather than trying to micro-manage breeding like we tried with dogs (and generally failed) we need to give evolution the time it needs to naturally adapt humans making the society stronger. Slow gradual evolution has worked in the past and it can work again.

Societies that neglect their gene-pool will gradually weaken to the point where they fall and be conquered by societies that have a working eugenics policy, you making humanitarian excuses will not prevent your society from falling or your population to go extinct.



The reason humanity as a whole needs eugenics is that we cannot survive on earth forever, eventually the sun will become so hot it will fry earth and all life on earth will die, moving to mars (assuming that would even be sustainable at all) would just buy us time, we need to move to other star systems in order to continue our lineage and civilization.

There is of course a lot of different methods that can be used for eugenics, it does not have to be a policy that is officially justified with eugenics. One example of this is baby quotas supposedly implemented for raising the fertility rate but then it's individualized to specifically target privileged individuals (forcing them to have and raise more children). We can justify this by saying "privileged people need to do their fair share in increasing the fertility rate" and also "we shouldn't force poor people to have children" and also make exceptions for people with genetic disabilities.

If eugenics is generally viewed as something bad then governments will have to figure out ways to do eugenics without the masses realizing the real purpose is eugenics. A policy can officially have some other purpose such as "supporting parents" or "keep people safe from dangerous people".

Eugenics and diversity

Rather than aiming for a single goal the goal with eugenics should be to improve humanity in general while still maintaining a high level of diversity. A high level of diversity can be maintained by decentralizing eugenics and letting people with different preferences make different decisions.

Applying any evolutionary pressure will short term reduce diversity in weeding out the unfit, in nature this is counteracted by random mutations that introduce new diversity that can be selected upon. Reducing diversity had both advantages and disadvantages but it's possible to preserve a great deal of diversity while maintaining eugenic pressure.

Even if just 1% of the male population reproduce that's still 35 million, significantly larger than the typical populations of large mammals.

We do not however need to rely on random mutations to introduce new diversity to the gene pool; genetic engineering allows us to introduce new diversity to the gene pool that we can select upon via eugenics, this will allow for diversity that is actually useful when it comes to advancing humanity. We don't need to know exactly what will happen with the genes we try to introduce.


Sexual selection

Female Sexual selection will provide a great deal of diversity since different females have different preferences for sexual partner.

The current sexual selection is based on largely genetic factors such as looks [21](#) [22](#) [23](#) this is due to several key factors, females no longer need male resources due to the welfare state and females entering the labour force. The sexual liberation has resulted in females having a lot more options while males have fewer options [24](#)

There is conflicting data whether or not intelligent males would reproduce more but dysgenic reproduction among females is to be expected [25](#) [26](#) good-looking people tend to be more intelligent [27](#) [28](#) and thus female selection based on appearance is likely to favor intelligence.

Other selection criteria such as money and status also depend on intelligence [29](#) If you are mentally fit for society you will have an easier time gaining social status and resources and this will allow you to have more success attracting females to impregnate [30](#)



As the bodies of males become more attractive due to female sexual selection the male body will become less and less important when it comes to female sexual selection and other factors such as intelligence and social status will become increasingly important. Different individuals select their partners differently but we can still see some general patterns such as females loving good-looking male psychopaths.

Female sexual selection is likely to favor males who are physically strong [31](#)

It is very unlikely a female will be monogamous with an unattractive male, some guys might be lucky enough to find a female willing to waste herself on a loser but for the most part unattractive males will remain single or in very short relationships. Being rich might attract certain types of females even if you are ugly but these females will quickly 'fall out of love' if you stop being successful. Females in general prefer white males [32](#)

Forced breeding

You can force people to breed and still allow them to select their partner(s). It is also possible to do forced breeding where females are given the final selection among the candidates in deciding who is going to make her pregnant.

Generally the females who have the highest fertility rate are not the most suited for breeding in terms of building a strong society [33](#) [34](#) [35](#)

Since there is naturally a big male surplus there is little to no benefit in applying forced breeding to men, females are the reproductive bottleneck and thus the ones suited for forced impregnation, pregnancy, childbirth. Males will however be expected to support the extra children females are forced to have and this will include males that do not have any children of their own (such as due to being rejected by all females). Males without children will be subjected to higher taxes.

One method is to simply legally obligate females to have a certain number of children and this will be individualized such that capable and successful females are being given big quotas while females that struggle in life (such as due to low IQ) are not given any quota to meet. This will naturally make a lot of people pissed off and it would also be difficult to enforce, this is probably not the best approach.

Another approach is to give privileges to people who breed and implement it in a such way that the fertility rate increases more in females that have traits valuable for the future society.

A more aggressive approach is to outright reduce females to property and then have her be raped and impregnated over and over again, this can continue until she has given birth 20 times. She will get physically punished and restrained if she tries to resist.

This makes it less likely people with bad genetics will rebel against the system since they are not really impacted by these aggressive breeding methods. People that used to be genetically privileged will now be subjugated and raped (sometimes over 1000 times) being humiliated as people with worse genetics can live normal lives.

Children females are forced to give birth to against their will does not have to be raised by said mother, they can also be raised by the father or the state. Having a mother less interested in child-rearing makes it easier for the government to gain power over the children and thus raise them to support the state and give them the skills needed to be good enforces of the system.

Rape and forced marriages

By using might you can force a female to have sex and get pregnant by a different male of your choice (such as yourself) instead of letting her make the decision, whether or not it's dysgenic will depend on the decision you make and what genes that are good for society as a whole.

Rape is dysgenic when it allows males with undesirable genetics to make females pregnant, if a male has top-tier genes he will not have to rape females in the first place.

It does however take effort to reduce the occurrence of sexual rape in a country, thus we need to ask ourselves whether or not this effort can be put into achieving something more important, there is an equilibrium point where it's no longer beneficial to try to reduce the amount of sexual rape.

The main reason males get away with raping females is the difficulty in proving she did not consent to the sexual activity. In the privacy of someone's home it's not really possible to figure out what actually happens between 2 individuals. If you as a female get alone with a male with nobody watching you are in essence inviting him to engage in sexual activities with you even if you do not want to, you can try to fight back but he is very likely to be stronger than you and thus win.

There are multiple strategies you as a society can utilize to prevent males with undesirable genetics to reproduce via rape

0. Separating people based on gender. the issue with that is that it will make society generally less efficient while still failing to effectively reduce to occurrence of rape and sexual assault. Therefore we ought to find a way have females and males work closely together.

1. By using surveillance. By monitoring what happens between two individuals we do not run into situations where the 2 individuals have 2 different testimonials with no way of figuring out who is lying. Most people however do not want to be recorded during sex.

2. Requiring recorded consent. That way if a female is raped badly enough such that she will risk pregnancy there will be technical evidence of the sex occurring being stored inside her and since there was no recorded consent he will be very unlikely to get away with it.

3. Look at whether or not the male accused of rape is suitable for biological reproduction, this does however require that the legal system is able to properly determine these things which isn't the case for any current legal system. We can also look at whether or not the male is an important member of society.

For society important males can also be given female sex and breeding slaves to have fun with (similar to [conservatorship](#)) another option is forced breeding except the female will otherwise be free.

If a female is reduced to property of a male who already has success with free females the likely result is instead more sexual inequality; potentially resulting in stronger eugenic effect due to human selections. You can have a lot of fun with a female that you own as property since you do not have to consider her preferences when it comes to sexual activities.

Assume we have two tribes, one with strong(genetically superior) males and another with weak(inferior) males. If the tribe with strong males kills the weak males in the other tribe and rape the women the following will happen:

0. The weak men from the other tribe will die and reincarnate.
1. The females will experience being raped and humiliated.
2. The children born will be genetically better.
3. In the upcoming lives everyone will benefit by having better genes.

Some females develop Stockholm Syndrome after rape or general brutal domination. Some females even **state** that they enjoyed being raped, other females describe it as something horrible and end up with mental issues because of it.

Today females are protected by the might of governments that need to be crushed before they can be raped on a major scale, rape is a useful tool during war but it's not a viable option to spread your genes in a modern civilized society. Abortion is now an option in the case of a pregnancy.

Females will avoid undesirable males. Most rape in the legal sense consists of a male she has already approved of forcing her into a sexual activity she does not want to do at the time, this will make the relationship more exciting.

Females often want to exchange **sex for resources**, in order to provide for the children, if a man rapes a woman she might get good genes but the man will not have to provide any resources. If a female is married against her will (sex slave) the man will still provide for her.

Restoring male authority

The people with the abilities required to properly rule our planet are mostly male, elite females are at a general disadvantage compared to elite males.

As we gain political power we can achieve our goals:


0. Lower the age of consent to 13 for sexual activities
1. reducing some males to property (D4 to D5) of C0 to A.
2. Reducing some females to our property (D0 to D5).
3. Child support shall only be based on which male she is married to or marries first after conceiving the child, it shall not be based on biological fatherhood.
4. In rape cases the attractiveness and importance of the male shall be taken into account.
5. We may want to force females with good genes to have children(donating eggs is an alternative).
6. It should be legal to directly buy or sell sex.

Goal 3 can partly be implemented by limiting the access to paternity tests or even outright banning them. Another option is to abolish child-support completely and instead support active parents via tax-money.

A soft patriarchy is simply a minority of wealthy males controlling the society and having power over the females via money or by being very attractive in other ways.

Males will have to compete against males for females and it will be a lot more difficult for males to procreate, only the best among males will be given much freedom when it comes to partner selection.

A hard patriarchy is a society where most/all females are reduced to property of males allowing males to have fun dominate them physically and sexually, forcefully impregnate them, etc.



When males are in total control the only sexual selection will be against females resulting in unattractive females being discarded while unattractive males will be able to spread their genes simply by just buying females.

Currently most males including most current fathers are ill-suited for controlling females as their property, we cannot trust fathers or brothers to make good decisions for their daughters or sisters. This leaves us with having the government control females but a single government cannot properly do that.


Due to gynocentrism, humanism and wish for semblance of fairness most males are naturally against brutal patriarchy making it unviable on a larger scale, even brutal patriarchy at smaller scale will be problematic since most of the world is very much against that, the ISIS caliphate got destroyed.

The only reason females stayed with unattractive males before was because of cultural expectations [36](#) and lack of government support for single mothers, now there is no turning back and we do not even want to try going back to a traditionalist society.

Polygamy

Without enforced monogamy the most successful/attractive males will have multiple wives which will allow for families to be lead by males that are capable individuals. Most males are ill-suited for having authority over women/children.

Social and sexual polygamy allows a single male to become a father both biologically and socially with several females at the same time, this will allow the children to both get good genetics, good genetics and a biological link to their father figure.



Most males are simply not suited to be fathers and because of that we need to promote policies and cultural change that results in less males reproducing. Thus the elite males will have to take on a bigger responsibility to compensate for the fact that most of the male population is worse than useless. Being a father is hard work, especially when you have several wives, it's not for everyone.

With shortage of females the men will be forced to take larger risks and the stupid cowards will be eliminated from the gene pool. Polygamy allows most males to leave the society while maintaining population growth.

This will also incentivize males to work harder since they will gain more from it in terms of sexual and reproductive success, it can be utilized to destabilize dysfunctional governments and to improve the future generations of humanity. It will also incentivize males to take on bigger risks such as being a soldier in a dangerous war since the reward from gaining social status/wealth will be far higher.

Males being willing to take bigger risks will also be useful in terms of bringing down a dysfunctional society and replacing it with something better.

Males living in a polygamous society will often have to leave the society in order to find even one partner, the result will be a gene-flow away from the polygamous society into other societies. The less monogamous a society is the greater the gene-flow will be to other societies that willingly or unwillingly (war and rape) end up with some of the male surplus created.

Without polygamy, it will only be possible for a man to impregnate a female once a year which isn't desirable. The best example of polygamy is Charles Lindbergh. Polygamy will also make it possible for a female to begin a relationship with a more attractive male (all females will benefit from it due to less competition for good males).

Supporting polygamy is a sensible thing to do because men already like having many partners, it enhances personal freedom, helps to prevent or minimize adultery, is an integral part of some cultures, was practiced by great men of christianity and islam and other religions, helps to decrease the number of single women in society, helps men with leadership ability, it indicates that men are humanitarian, and it is a normal human practice.

Women prefer men who are successful with other women. A man who has the opportunity to spread his genes to many women will probably produce sons with the same opportunity, thereby also spreading the mother's genes. This would indicate that women would actually prefer to marry men who can have sex with other women.

A good male will by definition not accept the current horrible marriage deal where the female gets all the power and the male will be punished hard during a breakup, often marriages are sexless and only a way for females to get economic security, these psychopath females are suitable for mating. There is nothing wrong with cuckolding pathetic males [5](#)

Fatherhood

The most important aspect of being a father is providing your children with good genetics, that cannot be fixed later if it goes wrong. In addition you can have a special bond with your biological children due to genetic links and biological similarities.

Your role as a father besides giving your children good genetics is mostly to provide resources to them and also support them in critical moments.

The legal father of the child will be given a lot of authority via custody, most males are ill-suited for that responsibility. You are supposed to be a great role model for your children and lead by example, they are supposed to look up to you and learn from you.

As the number of children you have increases; there will be less available time and resources for each child, thus you will be forced to be effective and not waste time doing mundane things with your children [37](#) [38](#)

Cuckoldry

One clever strategy to use if the male who made you pregnant is unable/unwilling to raise the kid is simply to find a replacement. Some males who are genetically ill-suited for reproduction or infertile will still be able to take on the father role and do a good enough job in raising the kid.

Social monogamy combined with sexual polygamy results in the child both having good genes and a father figure who has a lot of time to spend with children he foolishly thinks are his, most males can be shamed into not demanding any paternity test.

Unfortunately fooling a male into thinking it's his child is a difficult and messy process, you typically have to actually have sex with him hiding the fact that you have sex with other men, in addition he might get suspicious if the child looks too different from either parent.

There are however many males willing to knowingly raise a child that isn't theirs partly due to societal conditioning, this is highly useful.

Instead of relying on individual males the government can simply force all males to pay via taxes. It's especially important to support young parents financially since they often have had no real chance of getting their career going.

Motherhood

You are able to be truly intimate with your children as a mother, in addition to first carrying them inside you breastfeeding will allow you to bond with your children even more. Your role as a mother will be to take care of your children and spending a lot of time with them while their father is busy with other things such as fucking other women or making money.

Motherhood is something you want to experience early in life when you don't have any important career that is difficult to combine with motherhood.



Serial monogamy

Once the male has impregnated her children she wanted he simply moves on to a new female and makes her pregnant too, this is already taking place resulting in a big portion of the male population being forced into childlessness [39](#) This allows for the preservation of both sexual and social monogamy while weeding out undesirable males from the gene pool.

Why you should try to reproduce

Most people are biologically driven to actually reproduce, not just to have sex. This is one of the reasons why incels are so unwilling to go trans even though sperm can be banked prior to HRT.

You need to have goals in life you have a decent shot to achieve to be happy, maximizing your reproductive success will fall in line with your biological imperative. In addition to finding females willing to have children with you why not try to support your children to maximize their reproductive success too?

Dying childless is ultimate failure and deep down you know that.

Most people who shouldn't reproduce lack the mental abilities to properly assess their own genetics, thus we cannot rely on voluntary negative eugenics. You need a lot of intelligence and self-awareness to properly evaluate yourself genetically and if you can do that you reproducing is probably a good idea, you may however want to look into whether you can make any enhancements with technology (embryo selection, crispr, etc).

How big families benefit children

Some parents convince themselves that overparenting a few kids is better than having a lot of children whom they do not care too much about, the reality is of course the opposite. You may want your children to accomplish stuff you did not accomplish but if you only have 1 or 2 kids that will be problematic, they may not want to do what you have planned for them and this is a source of conflict.

If you have many children they will be free to do what suits them and it will still be likely that some of them will follow your plan. You may want one of your children to take a higher education but not everyone is suited for that(i would recommend taking a short stem degree if it's free or low cost).

Parenting and schooling in general are simply indoctrination and control, it often involves punishing children despite their not hurting anyone. Fortunately children are more influenced by their genes and general environment than their parents, as a parent you are simply at the mercy of the genetics of your child.

If a child has many siblings he/she will have a bigger support network in life, blood relatives are a lot more reliable than your 'friends', this network will be far more valuable than additional time with parents even if the parenting is ideal.


How we should view children

Children are the future of humanity. By taking care of children we take care of the future, by taking care of your own children you secure a future for your genetic lineage.

Children do have smaller brains and less knowledge(in general) than adults.

Their souls are also a lot more pure, they have become less corrupted by society.

One current view is that children need to be looked after and controlled by their parents until they are 18 or even longer. When young people are not allowed to make mistakes they will not learn the hard way and this will prevent their brains (especially executive functions) from developing properly.



Young people may seem to be rebellious sometimes but often they are only taking the values we taught them and applying them in a more radical manner. Young people are not yet indoctrinated into a particular belief system and thus they are a suitable target if you have a particular agenda, you just have to wait until they are able to vote before you see results (when they are finally able to vote).

The father is not really needed [37](#) [38](#) having good genes is a lot more important.

While adults generally have better cognitive abilities than children the difference is much smaller than what most adults believe, there is no shortage of kids that are a lot smarter than 99% of the adults. From the chart above we see that male children at age 8 have larger brains than adult females, females in general should be viewed as brain-polluted children.

Early sex and pair-bonding

It is natural for females to have sex after puberty, delaying sex and pregnancy can result in mental issues.

When males are legally banned from having sex with young girls it will be more difficult for young girls to have sex and get pregnant with a high-quality male early.



Females have much shorter biological window for sex than males and the earlier a females start to have sex without contraceptives the more children she will be able to have.

Females are generally mentally capable of sexual selection from very early age [40](#)

Teen pregnancies

One prominent feminist goal is to reduce teen pregnancies as if that would be a good thing. The current dogma is to put females in schools (where they do not learn much if anything of value) instead of being able to become mothers early and finding a way to combine that with an education that's actually useful for society. Young teens are indoctrinated into thinking it's somehow bad to be a teen parent.

Teen parents who are happy with being parents still often recommend against becoming a teen parent for other people [41](#) this can be due to virtue signaling or thinking they are some special exceptions. In reality however despite societal support for teen parents generally not being even close to what it should be teen parenthood generally improves quality of life and is clearly beneficial for society.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5896788/>



Motherhood can be a positive experience that makes sense in the lives of young women from disadvantaged backgrounds. To be effective, policy must recognize the valued social role motherhood provides for these young women. The negative long-term outcomes observed may largely be a result of their disadvantaged position within society and this should be the focus of interventions.

Girls from a young age often want to become mothers, taking care of babies. By supporting them we can make that dream a reality. Instead of dolls they will now take care of their own baby after carrying and giving birth. Having children early will allow for better bond between parent and child since the difference in age will be smaller, it will be more like a friendship relationship and better for everyone.

Early pregnancy reduces breast-cancer risk <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6199327/>



By becoming pregnant and having children early in life you will be able to focus on your career later, wasting your most fertile years as a female just studying things at school you will rarely/never use besides to pass tests is insanity.

Most females are fertile already at 13 [42](#) by delaying breeding you miss out on a windows where females have the highest fertility which makes it harder to maintain fertility above replacement.



In most regions, the age distribution of maternal mortality follows a J-shaped curve, with a slightly increased risk of death in adolescents as compared to women between 20 and 24 years old [43](#)

In contrast to the overall results, the maternal mortality rate in southeast asia and columbia was actually lower than in the 15 to 19 range than the 20 to 24 range, this is before adjusting for any confounding factors that will skew these results in favor of older females. In the [supplementary appendix](#) we see that the mortality was lowest in the 15 to 19 range for multiple countries such as Namibia.



Maternal Mortality in Miami-Dade County, 1994-2003 [44](#) and United States, 1991--1999 [45](#)

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5448726/>

When no other factors are taken into account, children of teenage mothers have significantly higher odds of placement in certain special education classes and significantly higher occurrence of milder education problems, but when maternal education, marital status, poverty level, and race are controlled, the detrimental effects disappear and even some protective effects are observed.

Hence, the increased risk for educational problems and disabilities among children of teenage mothers is attributed not to the effect of young age but to the confounding influences of associated sociodemographic factors. In contrast to teen age, older maternal age has an adverse effect on a child's educational outcome regardless of whether other factors are controlled for or not.


<https://academic.oup.com/aje/article/154/3/212/125794>

After adjustment for confounding factors, RRs (95% confidence interval) of fetal death and anaemia were respectively 1.37 (1.09-1.70) and 1.27 (1.15-1.40) for a 16-year-old compared to a 20-year-old mother. Younger mothers had significantly decreased risks of obstetric complications (preeclampsia, caesarean section, operative vaginal delivery and post-partum haemorrhage). Higher prevalence of prematurity and low birth weight in infants born to teenagers were not attributable to young maternal age after adjustment for confounding factors [46](#)

In a study conducted in Mexico by [47](#) complications during pregnancy were estimated to be at 26 percent (%) in adult women and 10 percent (%) in adolescents (p = 0.04). However, the gestational age and birth-weight were similar in both groups. The study further revealed that birth by cesarean section was more frequent among the offspring of adult women (65% compared to 48%, p = 0.015) than in adolescents [48](#)

In a study done at a french university hospital it was found that teen mothers had lower risk of various birth complications [49](#) After adjustment for confounding factors, RRs (95% confidence interval) of fetal death and anaemia were respectively 1.37 (1.09-1.70) and 1.27 (1.15-1.40) for a 16-year-old compared to a 20-year-old mother. Younger mothers had significantly decreased risks of obstetric complications (preeclampsia, caesarean section, operative vaginal delivery and post-partum haemorrhage). Higher prevalence of prematurity and low birth weight in infants born to teenagers were not attributable to young maternal age after adjustment for confounding factors.

Having children early can also be good for the careers of these females since by having children early you will be able to have your career later without interruption to have children.



Maternal mortality rate in South Africa [50](#)

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK219229/>

The research suggests that the age at which childbearing begins is not as important as the length of time since the (most recent) birth in influencing whether or not a woman works. Having a young child consistently lowers labor force participation, whereas an early birth does not.

Of the three studies that have specifically addressed this issue, one (Koo and Bilborrow, 1980) finds no effect of early childbearing while two studies find a weak positive effect of early childbearing on labor force participation (Hofferth et al., 1978; Card, 1979). In these studies early childbearers (female) appear to be somewhat more likely to be in the labor force 10 years after high school than later childbearers. This is probably due to several factors:

0. Since early childbearers start their families early, at 1 and 5 years after high school fewer early than later childbearers are working (Card, 1977). Ten years after high school, however, their children are older while later childbearers have just begun their families and have young children in the home. Thus the early childbearers were more likely to be working 10 years after high school in the Card study and at age 24 in the Hofferth et al. study.

1. Early childbearers may have a greater economic need to work. Never married mothers who had an early birth have a high likelihood of being employed (Haggstrom et al., 1981). In a related study Trussell and Abowd (1979) also found that among whites increasing age at first birth lowers the propensity to work by raising the wage required to attract them into the work-force.

There are sex differences in the association between early childbearing and employment. At 1 and 5 years out of high school more males in the adolescent childbearer group were working, compared to their classmates (Card, 1977). Thus for males, each parenthood leads to entrance into the labor force. However, by 11 years out, these differences had disappeared. By 11 years after high-school most non-parenting males had also completed their schooling and entered the work force so the difference disappears.

Females, in contrast, work less while they have young children in the home, but as their children mature, they return to work. Thus the timing of the birth affects when that hiatus will occur. By the mid twenties, the later childbearers are beginning their families and dropping out of the work-force while the early childbearers are reentering.

Government spending

We need to spend money on things that actually advance our society and humanity as a whole (long term). We shouldn't waste tax-money keeping useless people alive. Good things to spend money on are:

0. Military (nuclear weapons, fighter jets, etc).
1. Public education (government media, free online education, scholarships to talented individuals, free elementary education).
2. Gain control over social media by investing into these companies and creating new platforms, etc.
3. Police.
4. Research on biotechnology such as genetic engineering.
5. Support teen parents (19 or younger).
6. Infrastructure.
7. Support for adult parents (20+).
8. Eradication of STDs and other infectious diseases.
9. Buying up patents and letting everyone in our country use these for free.
10. Space missions.
11. Fund support people who will monitor and take care of people who seem to be a great danger to themselves or others.
12. Support females below 30 directly financially, you don't need to be born female to qualify for this, you can also change your sex medically with hormone replacement therapy [51](#)
13. Giving universal basic income and legal protections to important citizens.

Government funding

The main source of income to a government tends to be taxes paid by its own citizens, people are essentially being extorted into supporting the system. Other ways to fund the government are via some [inflationary monetary policy](#) or by extracting natural resources.

The issue with funding the government via taxes is that people will naturally avoid paying these taxes, it will create an incentive against doing the things that will result in having to pay taxes, this is a good thing if we tax stuff such as carbon emissions but it's problematic when we end up having to tax work.

Instead we want to levy taxes on people outside our country potentially destroying their economies [52](#)

It's theoretically possible to fund a government by extorting other nations and sending nukes to them if they refuse to pay, you can also invade other countries and later force them to pay war fines for resisting your invasion. We can force other countries to implement carbon taxes and give all the money to us, they will also have to pay fines if they ruin our environment in other ways.

Pure elite rule

Having a stable government that makes the correct decisions in a timely manner is very important for continued expansion. Just one bad government can be enough to destroy the future of your society sending your country into disarray.

Since governments are in constant competition against each other for power slow/dysfunctional systems of government will all be crushed and be replaced by more efficient systems of government. Thus over time smaller and smaller portions of the world population will be governed by a system other than **pure elite rule** and eventually a single government will govern the entire planet.

There isn't actually any good reason to think the right people would actually be likely to grab power to establish pure elite rule, instead in most cases the people grabbing power would not be very suited for it but then over time these people would see themselves out-competed and crushed to the point where only competent governments remain.

Because societies are in a constant competition between each other until they have crushed all competition the ruling elite would be very limited in their ability to actually implement their vision for society since unless they actually win the war their impact would be very limited.

It's in the interest of society that a good government remains firmly in power since otherwise you will risk losing power to some other actors and that comes with a significant risk. It's better to let the ones who are already governing well figure out the succession themselves. If the leaders are highly competent they should be able to also select good successors to themselves (such as everyone selecting their most competent son out of 50 to 200).

Once you have finally established yourself as the unquestionable world authority you would finally be able to stark shaping the world to your liking securing not only a good life for yourself now but also good lives for your children and if you reincarnate as a human you would experience the fruits of your labor first hand, you are thus incentivized to shape society in a such away that on average your life after reincarnating would be great, you can still have some people who are brutally abused if that creates more value for others than how much they suffer from said abuse.

An elite taking control over a country will be able to enjoy abusing their powers in many ways. If the elite takes power ruthlessly they are also likely to rule ruthlessly. The ruling elite will divide the world population into the following classes:

- A** The ruling elite (5 to 999 senators).
- B** Selected by the ruling elite.
- C** Ordinary citizens or tourists/guest-workers.
- D** Human property of a citizen or group of citizens.
- E** Less/no rights, not property of a citizen or group of citizens.
- F** Military targets.

All senators must be reachable at all hours of the day, if a majority of all senators cannot instantly agree to a decision senators asleep may have to be woken up. The full senate will have the highest judicial, legislative and executive power.

Each senator will select up to 1154 successors/advisors, if the successor already sits in the senate when being allowed to take over he has to give one of the seats away to someone else.

The senators can vote to make any decision including change to how the country is governed via simple majority, thus the senate can quickly change the government structure as needed.

In addition to voting "Yes" and "No" senators also have the option to cast an "Abstain" vote. 2 senators voting "Abstain" will reduce the number of votes required for a conclusive outcome by one. If a vote ends in a draw (such as 4 yes, 4 no, 1 Abstain, 0 didn't vote) the A0 senator will have their vote decide the outcome if he/she voted, if he/she voted "Abstain" the A1 senator will instead have its vote decide the outcome, and so on.

The strength of laws will depend on how many senators who support these laws. If only 10 of 15 currently approve of a new legislation you would need 8 of 10 to think that the one charge is guilty if all the 5 who disagree with the law are against convicting the individual (which might not actually happen). This will also apply to lower courts if each senator appoints a representative to said court.

A senator has the option to vote with a set execution time, once a majority has voted Yes or No with that execution time or less the time will start ticking down. By having some execution time a mistake can be reversed before it's too late.

Since the senate is the highest power you as a senator going against the majority will not actually do much good unless it's a decision that at some time can be reversed, at least in part. For that reason when senators are voting it might not make sense to continue having the vote once a majority decision has been reached (such as 3 yes including senator A0, 3 Abstain, 1 no, 2 not voted yet).

A senator will work at least 14 to 16 hours per day, each senator will have a personal staff (B citizens) that helps him with research and to avoid harmful group-think among senators.

It's very important that the ruling elite is actually able to implement the policies they think are right instead of having to constantly compromise to remain in power. For that reason you want the senators to establish themselves as something like gods such that very few people actually question their decisions. The senate shall control media and education in addition directly to ensure social harmony.

We can expect the ruling elite to prioritize the well-being of their own over the well-being of other citizens and this is not a bad thing. The elite are the for society most important individuals so of course we want them to make sure they are doing well. The elite will of course also have a great incentive to look out for the country as a whole since they depend on said country for their well-being and power.

It's very important that the senators put a lot of effort into creating successors that are even better at governing than they are since otherwise you might find your society out-competed by another society that managed to appoint a more competent ruling body.

One very simple method of creating suitable successors is for the senators to simply have a lot of children and then select the most suitable child from each senator, the more children they have the better the successors will be if the senators do a better than random job at appointing the most suitable children of them as their successors.

The senators can further increase the chance of having good offspring by selectively breeding with the partners where they are more likely to create suitable offspring. They can also use technology such as genetic engineering to make sure the ones eventually replacing them are more capable than the competition in other countries or competition that managed to remain in hiding within your country.

The male senators are supposed to have sex daily to impregnate a lot of females, this will result in each senator having many children to choose from when it comes to appointing a successor. A senator may also select a successor who isn't a biological child of his/her. Female senators will get impregnated on a regular basis and keep working while pregnant or donate eggs.

Senators can freely select who to breed with, a female citizen selected for that do have the option to just offer her eggs if she has already given birth enough or is already being bred. A female citizen can never be forced into surrogacy. A male citizen does not have the right to deny sex with a female senator.

If the number of senators is 15 we get

A0: senator of rank 0

A1: senator of rank 1

A2: senator of rank 2

A3: senator of rank 3

A4: senator of rank 4

A5: senator of rank 5

A6: senator of rank 6

A7: senator of rank 7

A8: senator of rank 8

A9: senator of rank 9

A10: senator of rank 10

A11: senator of rank 11

A12: senator of rank 12

A13: senator of rank 13

A14: senator of rank 14

B0: first successor to the senator of rank 0

B1: first successor to the senator of rank 1

⋮

B14: first successor the senator of rank 14

B15: second successor the senator of rank 0

⋮

B100: successor 7 to the senator of rank 10

⋮

B17309: successor 1154 to the senator of rank 14

C0: approved by the senate for high-level service. Can have sex without recorded consent.

C1: citizens allowed to carry light weapons.

C2: full citizenship.

C3: permanent residence.

C4: temporary residence (can be extended by paying fee).

D0: very high-value individuals under guardianship/custody (owned by senator or B-citizen).

D1: high-value slaves/children (owned by C1 or higher).

D2: slaves/children you are not allowed to injure (minor punishments allowed).

D3: slaves not allowed to be killed or seriously injure (loss of limb, brain-damage, sterilized, etc).

D4: slaves you are not allowed to kill or give serious brain-damage.


D5: slaves with no rights.

E0: very limited legal protections. Not the property of a citizen or group of citizens.


E1: no legal protections. Not property of a citizen or group of citizens.

F_n: military targets of value {F0 value}*10^{n/10}

Even with the help of staff the senators may not be able to properly rule on all important matters forcing them to divide themselves into smaller groups (such as 35*9). The decision of the senate can be with regard to geography or to set up specialized boards such as "executive council" or "confidential research board".



x = probability of a senator making a decision
y = probability of the senator making said decision



As we see from the pictures above increasing the size of the ruling elite can increase the accuracy in which the ruling elite makes decisions. That however assumes a constant error probability for all senators which will not be the case in reality.

Holding senate votes where the outcome is obvious is nearly pointless, this issue can be resolved by having a lower board or a sub-group among the senators make the initial decision, full senate votes/trials will mostly/only be held when the initial vote got close. This is especially a problem when the number of senators is large (such as 315) making it very unlikely an individual vote will change the outcome.

Another issue with having too many senators is that in order for the senators to be able to properly make decisions they will have to be provided with classified information, adding more senators will increase the risk for leakage of classified info (doesn't have to be intentional). The more freedom and privacy that are given to an individual senator the greater the risk is that he/she is going to leak classified information without someone finding out, of course even if he/she is found out the damage will have already have been done. Not giving senators freedom & privacy however will make it more difficult to recruit suitable people to the senate, especially if each senator only has very limited power.

Each senator can personally appoint one member of said board or court to make it representative of the senate if the number of senators is 19 or less. Thus these lower boards will be similar in structure to the actual senate since all jury-members or board-members will be there to represent an individual senator.

A case will first be tried by 7 to 19 B-citizens that are selected by the senate, most trials will come to an end here, especially when the verdict is without dissent. The jury can request to question the defendant when alone and the defendant will not be allowed to just remain silent.

The defendant/prosecutor can ask jury member(s) to appeal the verdict, if they do the A-citizens or higher ranked B-citizens can decide to look into the case potentially resulting in a new trial (more likely if more than one jury member made an appeal). The senate may also decide to overrule the lower decision via a quick vote instead of or before holding a full senate trial.

All senators will carry a secure phone with them when they are not working, the secure phones will allow them to quickly make a decision in the case of an emergency such as a nuclear war scenario. The first successors can be allowed to vote in the place of senators with a minimum execution delay of 3 minutes (enough for the senator to be woken up & vote) to 12 hours.

In order to become a C1 citizen you need to pass some basic tests including understanding the laws.

Once you have received your C1 citizenship you can be approved as C0 citizen via a vote among the A-citizens, B-citizens will prepare lists with candidates for the A-citizens to approve.

Selecting a less qualified female over a male might be worth it for the sake of diversity and thus getting more public support, if this is done its important that you do not tell people she is selected due to being female, instead you tell people she got selected by merit even though there were more qualified males for the position.

A purely meritocratic system will have some diversity but it will be very heavily **dominated by males**, a less meritocratic system such as having each senator freely select their favorite as successor will increase diversity at the expense of quality of the governance.

Each senator will be provided a large amount of money on a daily basis that he/she will be allowed to freely spend. A senator can also automatically redirect portions of these payments to other things such as salaries for personal advisors/children/wives.

Your citizen-class will determine which weapons you are allowed to possess and carry, non-citizens are not allowed to carry any weapons, C0 and higher will be allowed to carry very heavy weapons, since they have already been approved by the senate there will be no need for further background checks.

It's very important that the ruling elite and their supporters are in control over the military and powerful weapons in general in the case there is an attempted uprising. You also want problematic individuals to be armed as little as possible so they will be unable to fight back if you target them. Thus you will be able to keep your power or regain control even if most of the public starts opposing you.

Televised elimination games

Regular televised elimination games will be held for selecting a new member of the senate or some important position set up within the senate. Having a public selection process will be valuable in suring up support for the system, people will see with their own eyes how difficult it is to become a senator.

The contenders will be subjected to various hard tests to demonstrate they are capable enough for the position in question. The tests will be similar to the astronaut selection process.

Referendums

Even with significant control over global and local media the ability for the ruling elite to shape the opinions of the populous will be limited, therefore the ruling elite will have to shape policies based on referendums and the opinions of randomly selected citizens.

Ideally referendums should be of the nature that the outcome of them isn't important, if the outcome is important then you will have to go against the result of the referendum if the populous don't vote correctly or even worse end up having to implement bad policies to please the masses [53](#) [54](#) [55](#)

Having a public vote can be an effective way to push through a controversial policy since people will be more willing to accept it if a majority voted for it, if the proposal doesn't get majority support then the proposal is modified and then people will have to vote again, if getting majority support isn't possible you might have to skip the referendum completely and push it through against the will of the people. Referendums can be limited to only some citizen-classes such as C0 or higher.

You do however run into issues when there are more than 2 options to choose from and there isn't any clear good way to resolve this via one (or multiple) elections [56](#) the obvious solution is to first have the senate select 2 options that are both good for the country and then have the public pick the winner.

Elections

One issue with most elections is that multiple people are elected at once which makes it difficult for the public to actually choose the best candidates for all these elections, in addition the people voting are generally incompetent when it comes to government policy so we cannot expect them to figure out who is actually the best candidate. Often people just resort to voting for parties paying little attention to the individual candidates for these parties.

A general issue with parliamentary democracy is that people are expected to vote based on their party/coalition rather than what they actually think is the correct decision. Since people are up for re-election they will have to please the voters or party since otherwise they will not be able to keep their seats, thus people who act independently will over time be replaced with mindless button pressers who also happen to be good public speakers. In many countries people do not even vote for individuals in the first place, instead they vote for parties that get a number of seats based on their election result.

Generally in representative democracies parties are expected to form a coalition government and vote as a block to form a government, the system is not even set up well for the scenario where a majority is not able to consistently vote for a block (making the other members of parliament redundant since their votes don't matter at all). With pure elite rule all senators can vote as they please every time.

Since a small difference in how people vote can make a very big difference in what the resulting government becomes the system of fully democratic elections will be unstable and susceptible to malicious influence. People in control over significant resources will get a disproportionate amount of power since they will be able to leverage these to support the side that benefit them the most [57](#)

When people vote for individuals it's often limited to various areas meaning who you vote for will depend where you live, this of course opens up the door for gerrymandering if these districts are drawn, if they are not drawn (like for the US senate) we end up significantly more people in some voting districts than others making the system undemocratic even though the point of voting was to make it democratic.

The clear solution is to only have a single national election every 1 to 5 years where only some (such as 1 of 9) are replaced each election and there is only a single winner. A single individual can be a candidate for multiple lists if more than one person is elected at once.

You can have the current ruling elite select the final 2 candidates or you use something like <https://star.vote/> to pick a single winner out of many.

Letting for society important citizens elect a leader can be a valuable tool in increasing the support for the government but then you have to make sure a suitable candidate actually gets elected.

You do not need to get 80% of the votes to win a democratic election, you just have to get slightly more than 50% and then you will get to rule even if large portions of the population including valuable citizens oppose you.

Furthermore elections can also be a source of a lot of contention, people are likely to divide themselves into camps that go increasingly far to secure power for their own side. In addition by having elections to important positions of power you legitimize democracy which is not something you want to do.

In a democracy all aspects of your life are subject to majority rule including your sex life and what medical treatments you get. This creates an environment where groups constantly have to fight for their rights and often it takes decades to secure basic rights if these rights are secured at all. Increasingly groups will be pushed to become increasingly aggressive in securing benefits including political power for themselves, more and more resources will be poured into politics which isn't productive for society [58](#)

Rather than unifying a country behind a government periodic elections can tear a country apart.

Generally with democracy people can only vote freely when/if the ones already in power allow that, the system depends on the ones elected not acting in their own self-interest.

Of course if people are very much in favor of democracy they will be unwilling to vote for people who are clearly against democracy but many politicians who oppose democracy will not be open about it. Furthermore people may care about their side winning more than the dysfunctional democratic system.

Since the voting citizens cannot instantly force a new election it might be too late once they are finally allowed to vote again. Each time you let people freely elect candidates you subject your country to great risk since these people are very likely to elect the wrong candidate which can end very badly.

Since people cannot instantly remove the ones they elected from power the ones voting will naturally be afraid to take risks with new parties, people are righteously afraid that they are going to unintentionally elect the next [hitler to power](#).

Allowing people to instantly remove the elected representatives (such as by switching party) does however create other problems, then it only takes one temporary mass-psychosis at any moment for the system to fail, it does depend on the ones allowed to vote to act in a responsible and intelligent manner.

The damage done by a bad government is generally irreversible [59 60](#)

Therefore for stability and sustained progress you need to have at least one of the following

0. Limit the impact of each election such as by only having some of the important positions of power be subject to elections.

1. Having strong election regulations to ensure a for society good outcome of each election.

2. Have people elected to a single long and fixed term.

One additional benefit with option 0 is that then a party or coalition can no longer grab power by barely getting a majority of the seats subjecting to democratic election, since many citizens refrain from voting you could otherwise get elected into power despite a majority being against you.

Option 1 can include severe limitations in who is allowed to vote (such as limiting it to C1 or higher).

It's unclear if option 2 would be enough to make the system functional but it would at least encourage the ones elected to vote as they please rather than trying to please their voters or their party. Senators will be able to cooperate with controversial senators without having to fear backlash from voters.

Senators acting independently can also be encouraged by limiting the number of senators to at most 19. This will also make it easier for senators to cooperate such as working together to create a plan to invade another country, it's easier for a smaller group of people to effectively work together.

Stealth elite rule

Since the opposition to clear elite rule can be very strong the elite may have to implement a degree of fake democracy such as having a democratic parliament that will be overruled by the supreme court.

One option for fake democracy is a 2-party system where both parties are controlled by an elite that cannot be democratically removed and where no other party is permitted. That however might not be a stable solution since each individual party will be incentivized to offer a populist candidate to win.

Ruling behind the shadows may seem like a viable strategy and while it can work for a while it cannot be a stable system and your power will be more limited. Due to your limited power things will go wrong and then you will be blamed for it even though you were not the ones causing it in the first place, people like to blame elites when things go wrong due to the masses getting what they wanted.

In order to govern you need to interact with other people and this requires that you are visible. If you just reach out to politicians they might end up ignoring you even if you offer bribes since taking your bribe to implement an unpopular policy will hurt their chances of getting re-elected, furthermore giving direct bribes itself often come with legal or political dangers and it may not be worth the risk.

You want to help people who share your political goals to gain and hold power, this will also make them more willing to support you via their power since they like someone helping them get elected.

In democracy it's very important to have control over media, especially modern media such as facebook and youtube, thus you will be able to increasingly control the opinions of the citizens.

If you have a fake democracy you send the message that the country ought to be democratic which isn't the message you want to send, you want to send the message that the undemocratic structure is a good thing. You should not call it a democracy, call it something else such as "constitutional republic" and promote the "independent supreme court" that has more power than the parliament.

You need to use the limited power you have to quickly grow your power to the point where it's no longer possible for your opponents to effectively take power away from you. If you manage to gain control over the highest court then you might have to use that power to rig the next election to prevent future impeachment if the parliament can impeach supreme court justices.

If you fail to grab proper power in time then other people will take the indirect and direct power you had from you and you will end up with near nothing or even worse victim of the new rulers.

The former rulers of taiwan thought they could remain in power via institutional advantage and knowing the system in the new democratic system but of course that didn't work out too well for them, they won the first election but now they are out of power and they might never be able to get that power back again [61](#)

Individuals vs the state

What's good for the state is often bad for individual citizens. The interests of the state do not align with the interests of individual citizens or even most citizens. Since societies are in a constant competition with each other they will be pushed to implement increasingly anti-human policies or be obliterated.

The state may benefit from having the citizens raise children genetically engineered by the state but that will go against individual survival of the fittest for most if not all individual citizens and most people would also oppose involuntary genetic engineering or being forced to adopt on an emotional level, most males with for society unwanted genetics will still be biologically driven to reproduce [62](#)

What's good for society can be very bad for individuals of the society.

The society/state may benefit from sending males to die childless in wars but that will not be good for the individual males being subjected to that. The state may benefit from wedging a nuclear war where many major cities are obliterated and millions of their own citizens die.

Because all state does depend on public support to a degree the state is limited in how far they can go. If the state goes to far in pushing their own population (such as for winning a war) they will risk backlash and the war may get lost because the state failed to properly mobilize the public in defending the society, this is how the western last western roman emperor got disposed [63](#) [64](#)

It's about pushing people as far as possible while still maintaining popular support, by being skilled at brainwashing your own population you can convince people to act in the interests of the state. The only way to prevent societies from becoming increasingly hostile towards humans is to form a single strong world-government that takes care of the planet and makes sure humans get treated well in general.

People have different preferences and we will never be able to make everybody happy. We can however make most people satisfied via the free market and a free society in general, there will still be failure and suffering but that is short-term.

The market mechanism is very valuable when it comes to allocating resources [65](#) [66](#) the ones who need something more will generally be willing to pay more for it (if they are not poor losers). Without a market mechanism the true cost of a policy is hidden (such as in the case of conscription).

The vintologi legislature law

The scope of legislation will increase exponentially to the point where laws no longer place any limit on who can be punished and for how long [67](#) Since the rule of law limit the government there will be constant pressure to expand the scope of legislation in order to make the government more powerful.

Since direct rule is more efficient than "rule by law" a system formally starting out as indirect rule via laws will naturally change into the more efficient "direct rule" system.

Eventually not breaking the law will be impossible and the punishments that can legally be given to you will increase exponentially with time, thus the only limiting factor is that you will die eventually and therefore they will have to resort to cruel and unusual punishment such as [psychiatry](#) to maximize the possible exercise of social control. At some point we will have to give up on any notion of judicial fairness and embrace direct rule by force.

The source of state power

By being the dominant actor when it comes to potential of violence you will be able to keep everyone else down since if they decide to oppose you they will get crushed. It's not just about having potential for violence, you also need to be willing to use it to maintain control. Ultimately it's military might that decides, not elections or what's actually the correct policy [0](#) [1](#) [2](#)

The more military power you have the better you will be able to maintain control of your current area and expand control to other areas (such as russia annexing crimea).

Consequences of successfully limiting government power

When the government becomes too weak to maintain control over an area other actors will be able to grow at the former government's expense.

Freedom allows people to live more according to their own preferences, this however will not last.

By promoting libertarian values you will be able to weaken the ability of a government to exercise social control and this will make it easier for you to yourself gain control, you do however run the risk of the current rulers losing power to people even more problematic instead of you gaining control.

The vintologi power law

The amount of totalitarianism in a society has an equilibrium point. If you restrict the power of the government you end up with lower-level totalitarian control instead [68](#) [69](#) [70](#)

By weakening the central government you may end up with organized crime, parents having totalitarian control over their kids, sects, [psychiatry](#), etc.

Ordinary "checks and balances" only change who has the power, by making the supreme court more powerful you make other branches of the government less powerful. By making it easier to impeach the president you simply empower congress at the expense of the president.

If we allow citizens to instantly remove the rulers from power via a vote we just end up with more mob rule, technical solutions for this are to allow the citizens to call snap elections or by allowing citizens to change their vote at any time and not having periodic elections.

If we go too far when it comes to controlling people (such as sending 50% of the population to jail) it will hurt the economy and make the government less popular. Weaker economy and less technological advancement means it will become more difficult for the government to effectively control people.

Cruel and unusual punishments

By subjecting your citizens to cruel and unusual punishments you will be able to more efficiently control them and thus there will no longer be any need for expensive jails, few if any people will have to be locked up in institutions.

Locking up criminals in jails costs a lot of money and will cause a lot of suffering for the ones locked up. Instead most people committing crimes should be fined but if the individual can't pay or if the crime was serious a more brutal punishment will be given.

Some lawbreakers will be caned in public (up to 1000 times), this can be divided into multiple sessions if the individual cannot take it in one instance.

By having more tools at your disposal as a judge you will better be able to make an individual become a functional member of society, this may include [forced feminization](#) in order to drastically reduce their testosterone and allow them to live a better life as a female.

Creative and unusual punishment thus allows people to live better lives and less punishments will be needed to maintain social order.

Giving out these unusual punishments will provide value in the form of entertainment for everyone else, the purpose is humiliation for public amusement and deterrent.

Punishing problematic people

The punishment given will depend on several factors such as gender and physical attractiveness where attractive females and important males are given much more lenient punishment while unattractive males get very brutal punishments.

The harshest punishment a fertile female of high quality can face shall be being reduced to a D3 citizen. Females should in general be given a much more lenient sentence for the same crime.

Subhumans causing problems can end up facing very brutal punishments such as being killed for meat/organs or having to enter into a gladiator tournament where only 1 of 16 can survive (the winner).

We may also want to use some individuals for medical experiments.

People can at first be given a fine (which can be very large) to pay, what they cannot pay will become debt to the government which they are obligated to gradually pay off. If they cannot pay off their debt they will be reduced to property of the government and then the government will try to extract value from them in ways they view as suitable, the government can also decide to just donate people reduced to property to important citizens as a reward for their contributions to society or sell them to make money.

People with problematic views can be sent to re-education camps or by reducing them to the property of others (D0 to D5). By changing their environment we can hopefully help them purify their souls and become functional members of our new superior society.

Humans as property

Owning someone as property can provide you with a lot of entertainment value since then you can have fun doing whatever you want to him/her (in the case of D5 property).

If you permanently own someone as property you will however be incentivized to take some care of him/her since you do not want to just destroy something that provides you with value. For example if one of your slaves try to commit suicide due to all the abuse it's in your interest to prevent it since then you would lose a lot of value.

There are many potential advantages by reducing a fertile female as property:

0. Reducing females to property is very effective for breeding females who have for society desired genetics, this form of eugenics would have a very significant impact while only affecting a small minority of the population.
1. Provide the ruling elite with free hands when it comes to creating their successors, female senators would also be able to freely select which male(s) that would impregnate them/her and nobody within the borders would be allowed to refuse that.
2. Prevent females from being able to take care of their own children allowing the government to raise them to be loyal to the system instead.
3. increase the population allowing bigger economy and stronger military.
4. There would no longer be a need to push the general female population (95%+) to have more kids.
5. It would allow important males to reproduce a lot which can be used to reward males who contribute significantly to society or who are valuable to have as allies.
6. It would provide a lot of males with sexual entertainment.
7. Many females would probably enjoy it judging by [r/rakekink](#)
8. It could be used to gain control over females who are problematic for the government without actually breaking any law, maybe they figured out that the government was up to something most people view as bad and them being smart like that makes them into great candidates for breeding.
9. By forcing people females to get pregnant you do not create an evolutionary pressure for them to have more children which could be useful if in the future you no longer want a high birth-rate.

There is also many instances where people simply cannot make decisions for themselves and then we have to let other people make decisions for them, this is not just young children but also people of all ages that for one reason or another becomes unable to make their own decisions in an acceptable manner.

When other people make decisions for you it's generally better for you if the people who make these decisions are genetically close to you such as a parent or your brother/sister.

For example someone might make the very bad decision to go against our government and then he/she demonstrates very clearly that his/her brain isn't working very well, no sane human would do something like that, obviously he/she needs to be reduced to property of someone more capable allowing the individual reduced to property to be forced into a more healthy life-path.

Infertile females can still be useful as sex-slaves by providing sexual entertainment, these females are less important to protect since they cannot produce any children anyway, they can be used to satisfy males ill-suited for biological reproduction. People born male can also be used for this since if treatment is started early enough (before bones become too masculine) they can become attractive females instead and then a lot of people can have fun humiliating them.

Males slaves can also be used to sexually satisfy gay males or just having fun humiliating them.

Older males will have to provide value in other ways, most likely they can not become particularly useful as ordinary labor slaves since slave-labor tends to be ineffective, instead we can just send them to challenges likely to cause their death and then if they die there are less problems to be concerned about.

Gladiator games

People we dislike can provide entertainment value in the form of gladiator games. We watching in delight as they fight for their lives, the crowd cheering as another human is beaten to death.

The combatants will be paired up with other individuals that need the same numbers of wins (up to 4). You may simply give up and let the other contestant kill you but if both are unwilling to kill they will both get executed. They either die and reincarnate or they survive a fun adventure.

We do not want to kill too many people in these gladiator arenas since often people can be more useful in other ways. Gladiator fights to the death could work as a form of eugenics where the fit will be able to survive in the gladiator arena while the weaklings die(in general, you may be lucky or unlucky).

People will be given a fair chance to survive and be free. Jails will only be used to hold the contestants before/between the fights. We can of course also have duels to the death in an anarchy but they will not be very common without a ruling elite forcing people to kill each other.

In many countries executions are common where the survival chance is almost zero. Here you at least get a fair chance to survive (25% in the case of 2 rounds).

You can construct elimination games in many ways, it does not have to be physical combat, can be board games(such as Fischer random) or letting people of the opposite sex choose after they have stripped naked. You may give people several chances to survive and reserve the death matches to the losers. You can give both contestants a sniper rifle and then have them trying to shoot each other.

Soul purification

When your body dies you will lose most if not all memories and this is a good thing. When you live your soul becomes polluted by false beliefs and death is often the only cure. When you reincarnate your soul gets pure again and will be able to live a new amazing life.

Children with past-life memories generally become a lot happier when they forget these memories and can move on with their current life.

If you do reach important conclusions in one life you can easily make them generally available and you might get a good use for that the upcoming lives. If you write a good book you might read it an upcoming life and liking it, not knowing you wrote it yourself.

Most stuff you learn in your life is unfortunately useless or more than useless, you might believe it is important information when it isn't. When you are reborn you are able to experience childhood again and grow up with new friends, starting a new life instead of being old and miserable.

Victims of indoctrination will generally discard things that contradict their worldview as false and thus discard any information that is in conflict with their current views.

It is very difficult to help victims of severe brainwashing before they die and reincarnate, most people are not willing to accept that they have been fooled and will not accept help even if it is offered for free. Realizing you have been fooled and moving on to a better understanding of reality requires both intelligence and willpower.

As people get indoctrinated their media consumption itself will change towards outlet that feed them information that supports their new false beliefs, this results in a dangerous feedback loop where often death is the only likely escape. Without an intervention (such as preventing them from accessing the propaganda media they are consuming, re-education, etc) these victims will likely die still believing in the lies people fed them.

Mental disorders such as catholic/protestant christianity, nazism, homophobia, transphobia are all cured by death. If you have received brain-damage often that will never heal and you will suffer from it until you die.

It might be hard to accept for born cowards but death is the solution for all personal problems. Until you finally die your body will deteriorate over time via an unpleasant aging process. In addition you may acquire disabilities such as blindness over time that will never go away until you die.

The value of human life

When valuing individual lives you have to look at the particular individual and the society as a whole.

Death always leads to reincarnation and a new life, the new life can be better or worse, it is better to die with honor than to end up having a miserable life. In general human life is of little value, the current overestimation of the value of human life has lead to a very bad situation in our society.

One measure of someone's contribution to society is income but this does not cover all contributions since a lot of individuals offer a lot of value to other people (such as writing high-quality open-source software) without getting much in return, we also have a lot of individuals getting paid by governments to do things that are bad for our society.

What is important for each individual is the quality of their lives, not how long the individual lives. Taking actions that are likely to result in your death is often perfectly rational.

A particular human can be both beneficial and harmful towards other humans. We need enough people having children to maintain the population, which makes sure most humans will reincarnate as humans and not something else. An individual with valuable genes will be able to improve the upcoming generations by spreading their genes and should be considered as valuable.

Mass murderers and humans that torture only inflict short suffering, an individual that makes the gene pool worse will inflict suffering for many generations. The opposite can be said for improving the quality of the gene pool.

An increase in intelligence will result in a better society for many upcoming generations, how functional a society is will depend on the mental abilities of the people voting in the elections.

Abortions and infanticide

It is currently unknown when consciousness is developed in a child/fetus and it does not matter, if consciousness is developed in the fetus it will simply reincarnate after the abortion.

In the past infanticide was most likely a common method to avoid starvation, some children were also abandoned because of laziness or lack of time/resources.

It takes a lot of time and resources to raise children so it does make sense to focus on children who show promise rather than pouring resources on children who will never contribute anything to society, in the case of some disabilities reproduction isn't even possible so killing them early would also be beneficial in terms of individual survival of the fittest.

Even a child with average genes however might turn out to be valuable, thus forcing a female to give birth against her will can be useful for society.

Aborting your own child is often genetic suicide but if a female aborts her child it will also result in her husband spreading his genes less, thus it's often in the interests of the husband to prevent her from having an abortion. Of course the genetic interest argument could be continued indefinitely, what if your sister or identical twin is planning to do an abortion/infanticide?

The issue with trying to have the government decide when abortion is going to be allowed is that there are a lot of these cases to decide which demand a lot of effort of the government in order to properly make these decisions. For that reason we want general simple rules to follow. Example of a simple system is to allow abortion in the following cases

- 0.** Nobody wants to raise the child.
- 1.** There is a medical issue with the child making it unworthwhile to continue the pregnancy.
- 2.** Abortion will significantly increase the chance of the mother surviving.

That means that if there is no proper medical justification for abortion females can be forced to give birth if someone else (such as the father or the government) is willing to raise the child. If someone else (not father) is willing to raise the child he/she will have to have the resources needed to actually raise the child or make a deposit on a government-controlled account. The mother will not be obligated to support the child financially in these cases of forced births.

If more than one individual wants to raise the child then people genetically close to the child will be prioritized (such as a brother or grand-parent).

When a child is aborted a specific genetic configuration is eliminated before we know much about how good that particular combination is, this is only a good form of eugenics for obvious defects but it is not ideal if we want to improve average iq. In the case of down's syndrome the child would not be able to reproduce anyway and thus aborting them will have no direct eugenic impact.

Females suspected of wanting to do an abortion can be monitored to ensure that they do not harm the baby. If a female attempts to do an illegal abortion she will be restrained until she has completed the pregnancy. If a female successfully does an illegal abortion she will be impregnated again forcefully.


The notion that abortion restrictions wouldn't reduce the total number of abortions (including illegal abortions) isn't supported by science. When something is illegal (especially when punishments are severe) people will be unlikely to do it.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1508542/>

Fertility rates were compared over time between states that varied in the timing of abortion legalization. RESULTS: States legalizing abortion experienced a 4% decline in fertility relative to states where the legal status of abortion was unchanged. The relative reductions in births to teens, women more than 35 years of age, non-White women, and unmarried women were considerably larger. If women did not travel between states to obtain an abortion, the estimated impact of abortion legalization on birth rates would be about 11%.

Females who earn a lot of money are the ones most likely to seek abortion showing that abortion is not really something people just resort to out of poverty/desperation, it's out of convenience or for the sake of the career [71](#) almost all abortions are elective [72](#)

Late terms abortions are also largely elective and often the reason cited for it is very much not a valid reason for having an abortion [73](#) [74](#)



Turns out people who end up having to give birth instead are doing just fine

<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapsychiatry/fullarticle/2592320>

Women who were denied an abortion, in particular those who later miscarried or had an abortion elsewhere (turnaway no-birth group), had the most elevated levels of anxiety and lowest self-esteem and life satisfaction 1 week after being denied an abortion, which quickly improved and approached levels similar to those in the other groups by 6 to 12 months.

This study is actually cited often by people pushing for abortion access but as we see abortion is not a medical treatment women actually need (except for rare medical exception).

So while there is some temporary hardships from being denied abortion this is something women can get through just fine and it's very often worth it to save a human life. People who we save from abortions can become valuable members of our society.

Most women end up raising the child themselves rather than giving it up for adoption.

[https://www.whijournal.com/article/S1049-3867\(16\)30348-6/fulltext](https://www.whijournal.com/article/S1049-3867(16)30348-6/fulltext)

A minority of women denied abortions (n = 231; 14%) were considering adoption at 1 week after denial. Of participants who gave birth (n = 161), most (91%) chose parenting.

<https://thelifeinstitute.net/blog/2021/study-96-of-women-who-couldnt-access-abortion-dont-regret-that-after-5-years>

This shouldn't come as a surprise. Of course women are perfectly capable of giving birth and raising children, otherwise humanity would have died out a long time ago.

The government should have the right to ban harmful medical treatments, especially when these treatments harm society as a whole and not just the individual subjected to the treatment. We want a society where we take care of each other including vulnerable and valuable members of our society. Without children we don't have a future and relying on immigration clearly isn't sustainable.

Authoritarianism

Females have demonstrated very clearly that they are not capable of making decisions for themselves when it comes to having an abortion or just as bad not getting pregnant in the first place. Having a nation without true leadership is a recipe for disaster.

Authoritarianism people will worship their leaders as gods and follow them as they lead their nation to true greatness. People will be part of something greater than themselves,

With authoritarianism the people are accountable to the gods but gods and gods in turn are responsible to the higher process of [societal survival of the fittest](#).

The authority of the leaders will be absolute, they leaders will have the ultimate ownership over the ever expanding territory that will eventually eclipse the entire planet.


The leaders will ensure to carry out brutal punishments against the heretics that defile their godhood. People will all learn how great the leaders are from the schools and media controlled by the government.

The vast power of the ruling elite or autocrat will shape the entire society and eventually the entire world. Eventually only true gods will remain as false gods as brutally weeded out in conventional and nuclear wars.

Males will gladly go to war and often die to serve their gods. As they are fighting they know that what they are doing is serving humanity and eventually with total control over the planet wars will all end.

About checks and balances to power

Many people mistakenly think that constitutional rights somehow ensured their rights but the reality is very different from that. Beautiful words on a piece of paper are just that, words on a paper, you holding up an old constitution will not stop the bullets coming your way, [kevlar](#) is better for that.



Some countries have powerful courts expected to uphold the constitution but there isn't actually any good reason for them to take that nonsense seriously, instead it's in their interest to 'interpret' the constitutions and laws in a way that just happens to align with their personal beliefs while they claim to be defenders of the constitution and people will support them for it.

Rather than limiting the power of government all you do by creating a strong court to empower that court to rule the country as they please while other branches of the government become weaker. All you can do is move the power around.

If the government isn't able to control media that control will instead land on private actors and these corporations will have their own special interests that does not align with the interests of the wider society.

Having different branches of government with different specializations will create multiple points of failure since then one branch stepping out of line could wreck the entire system if the branches have too much independence from each other.

Having uncertainty when it comes to who actually has the authority is also very bad when it comes to creating a functional government since then it's not clear who should make the decision. The president might make one decision viewing it as constitutional only to be blocked by courts 1 year later.

You want it to be clear to everyone who has the highest authority so everyone knows what they should actually follow and listen to.

Having different competing government factions can result in the total amount of control exercised exceeding the equilibrium resulting in a less effective and unstable society since every entity will naturally try to maximize their own power even if it comes at the expense of society at large.

The power of an entity can be limited by hard limit or by deterrence. For a hard limit to work when it comes to government decisions the time it takes for other individuals to intervene cannot be too long, only a few minutes in the case of nuclear war. You might have to be wakened up at night to make a difficult decision because the people awake didn't get to a majority.

Deterrents can often be evaded; there are many ways to cheat in elections, in wars you may be able to limit the damage that can be delivered in return if you decide to push the nuclear button, you can prevent citizens from effectively rebelling by gradually disarming them 'to keep them safe'.

If someone does a crime it will often be too late once the police show up and many people are willing to break the law to achieve a political goal. Brenton Tarrant killed 51 muslims knowing he would go to jail for it, Breivik killed 77 individuals and didn't even expect to survive.


If it's hard to convict people (such as requiring the jury to be unanimous for conviction) then the police and others will get away with a lot of unlawful execution since it only takes one jury member to retroactively approve the killing.

Hard limits to the power of certain leaders only change the power distribution, it doesn't limit the total power of the government. Allowing supreme court justices to be replaced/added by congress means congress has more power while the supreme court ends up with less power, the total power of the entities remains the same.

Let's say you have 2 individuals, one president and one vice president, the president makes the correct decision 80% of the time while the vice president makes the correct decision 70% of the time, in that case it's questionable if allowing the vice president to over-rule the president would even be a good thing at all. The opposite is true if the probabilities are exchanged, in that case the more the vice president is able to overrule the president the better.

It's more complicated when you have different groups, in that case if one group is unanimous in their decision while the other group made their decision with a margin of just one vote it's very likely that the unanimous group is in the right.

There is no need for complex system for overruling an entity. If you want less power concentration you can just increase the number of A-citizens. If the number of A-citizens is increased then each individual A-citizen can vote incorrectly more often without an incorrect decision being taken.



You want the most accurate decision-making body to have a very dominant role so society can take full advantage of its superior decision-making ability.

Having a weak and unstable government might be a good thing if a good government (such as yourself) will take charge instead but that will very often not be the case, often the next is even worse (such as Joe Biden).

Unfortunately the ones with the ultimate power will be time-limited and thus they will end up having to rely on other people making good decisions for them. Thus even if the highest court always makes the correct decision we might still end up with a lot of bad results due to the highest court not having time to review all decisions made by lower courts.

Separations of power allow for more specialization but it also adds more points of failure, this will only be stable if all branches of government are accountable to the same entity with ultimate power, this specialization can also be achieved by relying on parties outside the official government.

Mental fitness

Given an environment there will be some brains that function better than others in terms of survival and reproduction, thus from a darwinian perspective mental fitness is simply about how well someone is mentally adapted for the environment, this is typically not the same as what's good for the society long term.

By implementing eugenics we can change the selection mechanism to be more in line in what's actually good for society long term, this could allow society to be highly functional even with a more democratic system of government.

All humans suffer from the limitations/flaws of our human brains and some people have very severe brain disorders. You might think you can tell whether or not someone is mentally ill but in reality you can't.

Mental fitness is a continuum, there are several aspects of mental fitness such as logical intelligence, spatial intelligence, executive functions, memory, etc. Mental capabilities all correlate and in typical mental tasks since many different mental faculties are used, it is thus a lot more practical to focus on the general intelligence *g* instead of the specific capabilities.

Most people are incapable of making rational independent decisions even when they have a huge incentive to make the correct decision. Unfortunately realizing your own limitation also requires intelligence and thus incompetent people generally think they are capable [75](#)

Mass-voting doesn't work

The incentive to make the correct decision will decrease when the probability of your vote changing the outcome is low, considering the low intelligence or the average voter democracy will never result in an outcome the voters actually want and thus the entire thing is somewhat pointless.

At best you end up with other actors such as private media and media controlled by other states gaining power instead. While this is in some ways meritocratic in how it benefits people able to gain control over media it is also a fragile system that allows for bad actors to influence voters negatively.

When democracy fails

When a technically democratic system fails people will point fingers and try to blame a small minority such as Jews or wealthy people in general. In any democracy the battle will be to win over masses and this will create a propaganda arms-race where a lot of actors have a lot to gain from spreading misinformation to the public. Strong outside governments will be incentivized to meddle in elections and this may result in a bad candidate winning due to outside influence.

Often the actual bad outcomes of democracies are not even viewed as bad by most citizens. Bad outcomes are to be expected when a democratic system is implemented, this can be predicted from theory, the nature of the bad outcome will however depend on circumstances.

<https://gking.harvard.edu/files/gking/files/inc.pdf>

Democracy is more like a constant civil war, where one side gets stuff from the other. The arms-race is always there, you use misinformation and propaganda to get more stuff from the other group. The only times where those differences CAN be bridged are during war or a global pandemic. People will blame those who gamed the system, that they all played, to the highest degree and just from a game theory point of view; it will be a group that persuades other groups to be open-minded and egalitarian, while being nepotists to their own.

All current democracies have plenty of undemocratic elements. Politicians will engage in bait and switch (what we call virtue signaling) and often once they are elected they will do something else. The undemocratic aspects of democratic societies are required to keep the system stable and efficient.

Fixes

The damage can be limited by reducing the importance of elections, you can let people vote on things that are unimportant, it can be symbolic positions similar to most monarchs in democratic countries or the system can be technically constructed in such a way that the real power is in institutions that are undemocratic.

Having stricter voter requirement is generally better, even random selection would be beneficial since that would make the few who got selected more motivated to vote correctly.

Selecting people for elections/sortition

There are several ways to select people based on some seemingly objective criteria

0. Amount of tax paid.

1. The time since you had your last biological child with a citizen as a male.

2. Passing a knowledge/intelligence test.

3. Wealth possessions (land, money, etc).

These methods can also be used to select people randomly "sortition" or determine how many districts someone is permitted to vote in (the parliament can be spread out over the country).

For example we might want to spread out the parliaments via 15 local buildings that each host 15 members of parliament where a candidate can run for any of these local parliaments via a list (they can have themselves first), seats will be distributed via the [D'Hondt method](#).

An alternative to dividing the population into people allowed to vote and people not allowed to vote is to use a tax-credit system where the taxes paid will get credited to you and then have each vote cost a certain amount of tax-credit, that would allow people to cast up to 15 votes for the example above. Unused tax-credit will be saved for upcoming elections but it will not pass to anyone in the case of deaths, people will also not be able to give away or sell their tax-credits.

People would be more motivated to put effort into voting if it was a privilege they had to earn rather than something that is given to them for surviving until the first election when they are 18 or older. One big advantage with the tax-credit system is that it would motivate a lot of people to work hard to pay taxes since that would allow them to get a say in how the government is run (which many people value highly).

Voting rights reserved to the people paying taxes voting rights would align better with how important people are for society than the 18+ system that gives too much power to useless old people who contribute nearly nothing to society. The issue of children not getting direct priority by politicians would however remain since most young people wouldn't pay much in taxes. Another issue is that someone can be important for society without being competent enough to vote.

If you would base voting-power on the amount of tax paid by each individual you could as a government just give the people you want to vote very high salaries and then these people would be able to vote in the next election. Not counting salaries directly from the government does not solve this 'problem' since then you could just have the ones you want to vote be employed by a 'private' company and then outlaw all their competition, it would also result in professional soldiers employed by the government not having taxes from their government salaries counted which is the opposite of what you want. People who work for your government should obviously be given more power, not less.

Method 1 would prevent incels from voting since it's difficult to make a female pregnant if they all reject you. Female citizens would select the voters while males citizens would be the ones able to directly vote in elections.

Method 2 can be used for selecting jury members to a court thus opening up the judiciary to the public.

All these 'objective' criteria are still subject to human judgment, the income people make and their resources will depend on government decisions, who does well on a test will depend upon the nature of the test and how difficult it is to cheat.

While many of these systems are very likely superior to democracy none of these systems are a great replacement for pure elite rule at the highest level.

Even just sortition (random selection) based on easy to get citizenship is very likely to perform better than democracy since then the ones selected would at least feel motivation to put effort into actually governing the country instead of just being passive voters largely manipulated by the media.

When it comes to the actual ideal selection when it comes to letting people vote or potentially getting randomly selected what you really want to focus on as a government is the potential for violence. A system where the potential for violence aligns well with the actual power-distribution when it comes to government decisions will generally be more stable since otherwise you might end up with a situation where the ones who would win a civil war are not the same people who actually govern the country. To ensure the formal ruling elite is actually in charge they should of course make sure to largely arm people who support their government while they disarm people hostile to the government.

Autocracy

It's a mathematical reality "arrow's theorem" that the only voting system where irrelevant alternatives don't matter and follow unanimous consent is dictatorship, all other voting systems are plagued with voting paradoxes and force people to vote tactically. When you rule as a dictator there isn't any legal way for other people to remove you from your post and you will be able to shape the country according to your personal preferences.

Being a dictator is a lot of fun, you will be able to freely abuse other people without them having any legal way to oppose it. You will be the closest a human can get to an omnipotent god. Long after you are dead people will look up to you as a hero no matter how tyrannical you were.

When you have absolute power you always have the option of implementing any other system of governance such as elite rule or constitutional democracy.

Vintologi Churches

Most vintologi churches shall be lead by a single individual "church emperor" who has full legal control over the church, members are still free to join and become a member of some other vintologi church. This will result in significant competition between churches where the most functional will end up completely dominating to the point where one individual becomes emperor for the society as a whole and not just a church.



Each church will have its own rituals and beliefs, with time some rituals and beliefs will be common for all churches and become a part of the vintologi religion. A vintologi church should offer wedding ceremonies, these weddings cannot always be legally binding.

There is no need for any big vintologi organisation controlling everything. relying too much on a single organization is especially a bad idea when we live under governments that don't support our churches.

Vintologi churches shall help their members to find sexual partners that meet their high standards, this may include screening males to see which of them that meet the high standards of the holy women of our church, a holy woman may decide to be naked in our church if she isn't taken.

A vintologi church should have good sex rooms in the case some church members want to make love in the church. These rooms will allow for bondage and family building.

There is currently no shortage of empty christian churches that can be converted to vintologi churches, when a church is converted everything christian about it should be removed and burned.

A vintologi church shall have a real organ that can be used to play music.

It's unfortunately very difficult to find good role models to follow in our modern society. Victor Blom may be a very talented poker player but he has other character flaws that have ended up costing him very large amounts of money. Anders Behring Breivik was brave but he was also delusional and did not have any children. Albert Einstein developed general relativity but he was wrong about quantum mechanics and failed to come up with a complete theory of physics (many humans have since tried that and failed).

Instead we have to look at the past and get inspired by great leaders such as [Augustus](#) and [Trajan](#).


Building Vintologi Communities

Everyone will be welcome to our vintologi communities, you do not need a full understanding of vintologi or have particularly good genes to join. You do not need to be anywhere close to being an elite human being to understand vintologi, the issue is more about age, as you get older you are more invested in your beliefs often to the point where death is the only cure.

To officially join a vintologi group you simply need to be invited by the leader of the community or pass a simple test that demonstrates that you have at least a basic understanding of vintologi, you will then select a membership name. You don't need to disclose your real identity to the leader to join.

Online communities have the advantage of allowing some people to be completely anonymous while real-world communities allow for closer human to human interaction. Online communities also allow us to remain in contact with each other without being in the same physical location.

Humans are social animals and thus in order to maintain your correct beliefs you need to interact with people who share the same correct beliefs. You will also need humans you are able to talk to honestly without fearing backlash due to you being too honest about your views.



If you believe in a more radical version of vintologi you may want to keep these beliefs for yourself unless you are fully anonymous. The social cost that comes with having unpopular views can be very high including but not limited to rejection by the opposite sex and issues with employment. As our numbers grow we will be increasingly able to support each other and we will be less dependent on the general society.

Living as a minority

When we are small in numbers we will be forced to blend in the society and not be perceived as a hostile group. When our numbers are small the proper thing to do is to reproduce in massive numbers.

Sacrificing ourselves like Breivik did simply isn't worth it in the early stages since that will reduce our number including future generations, it's difficult to reproduce when you are in jail. We should not fall into the trap of doing dangerous and idiotic things just for the sake of attention/publicity.

We shall contribute economically to society since people will like us better than [76](#) we can also do other things viewed as good by the general society in order to be viewed as something positive.

Having a local vintologi community has upsides but there is also a lot of risk to it and it gives enemies of vintologi an easy target to go after. By being open and supporting each other we would be able to survive and thrive assuming we do not get the government against us but if the government does turn against us having an open community will result in a lot of casualties for us.

You cannot fully follow vintologi and also follow the laws and norms of your country, this will force us to compromise a lot due to lack of political power, there is no really great country to flee to.

When we are small in numbers running and hiding will be the proper thing to do, defeating the military and maintaining control over the country will be very difficult unless at least 10% of the population support you. Time spent trying to achieve political success is time that could have been spent achieving real-world results instead of at best getting a few seats in parliament.

Generally we want to be armed as much as possible compared to our enemies, the issue with the second amendment is that it allows everyone including our enemies to easily get guns, thus it may actually be better if it's more difficult to get armed. We don't want our enemies to be able to defend themselves when we target them, we can target them efficiently once we have taken control of the government. Just simple legal weapons may not actually be that useful, we need to eventually get control over advanced weapons such as fighter jets, drones and weapons of mass destruction. This can be achieved by infiltrating the government and taking it over slowly from within.

The more accepting society as a whole is of us the better, living as a hated minority can be very difficult. Currently we can rely on the fact that people are tolerant of religious communities but that may not last forever. Even in democratic societies we still run into the risk of being harassed by the authorities such as child protective services (taking our children if we don't comply).

There are simply too many ways in which society can harass/punish us if we are disliked.

Gaining political power

When our numbers grow we will be able to take more and more control over the countries we live in and make the conditions for vintologi better. When people finally realize we are taking over the country it will already be too late, they underestimated us and thought we just were some crazy lunatics.

As our numbers grow so will the power of our voting block, this will increasingly incentivize politicians to cater to us, this is about attracting a big mass of people that will be able to vote.

Examples of political goals are lowered age of consent, better marriage laws(polygamous), abolish the system of child support being tied to who is the biological father, freedom of speech for us, freedom of religion for us, eugenics instead of dysgenics.

In some countries we will be able to directly have an influence via jury nullification [77](#) [78](#)

Just reaching out to a few percent of the US citizens will be highly valuable, just shut up about your beliefs and pretend to be a normie, otherwise you might get removed from the jury [79](#)

In general by having believers blending in with the general society not being open about their beliefs in vintologi we will be able to infiltrate institutions (courts, military, seats in parliament, etc).

By controlling media we will be able to change the opinions of non-believers too and thus over time change the society we live in for the better even as a tiny minority.

We need to make sure members do not become victims of psychiatry or other forms of coercion that do not require formal conviction of a crime. We having a violent ideology and being willing to act crazy will be an effective deterrent when our numbers are sufficiently big.

Tribalism

Being part of a strong extended family is very important when the society you live in is dysfunctional, a lot of bad things can happen to you and then having reliable blood relatives is very valuable.

Helping random strangers does not make evolutionary sense and because of this reason ethno-nationalism isn't natural. Tribalism is natural, a tribe is a group of genetically very related humans and this allows for the group as a whole to preserve its genetics.

Preserving your genetics by yourself is only possible with cloning and it has not yet been done with humans and if you just have children with random females your genes will be dissolved into the shitty general population and most likely it won't result in any good outcome.

Blood relatives are a lot more important than your so-called friends, they tend to be more supportive and thus valuable despite their intellectual shortcomings. Having blood relatives you trust will decrease the probability of you getting used by people who do not care about your well-being. Having Good blood relatives will result in you not having to rely upon the government or private organisations in the case you need help, thus tribalism is a threat to statism and also organized religion in general.

You do not need to have any friendships with people you are not genetically related to, it's rare that you can trust and rely upon an individual you are not genetically related to. Some people seek ideological communities or communities based upon a common interest but in most cases that end in disaster, they will abandon you very easily and it does not matter how much you have helped them.

You can be genetically close to someone without having a known common ancestor, generally if you look similar to someone you are genetically close to that human. One issue with internet accounts is that you may not know how someone looks and thus end up trusting a genetic enemy(most people are garbage).

Inbreeding

When you reproduce with someone genetically close it increases the probability of recessive traits being expressed so they will be selected upon. Often this will result in failure but it can also result in desirable recessive traits being expressed making the tribe strong. Thus inbreeding can allow us to accelerate evolution and facilitate the creation of homo sapiens superior.

You cannot just ignore bad genetics

You breeding with someone genetically distant will not eliminate bad recessive genes, it only kicks the can down the road but eventually these genes will cause problems because humans acquire more and more mutations over time.

As the genetics of humans deteriorate so will the conditions of societies, when problems are ignored they tend to get worse until avoiding the issue become impossible.

You cannot just run from societal problems

In some cases you might be able to just go around societal problems and escape the consequences of bad political decisions but that is not a viable long-term strategy [80](#) There isn't any good way to circumvent Age of Consent laws. No amount of privilege will fully protect you against psychiatry, John Nash experienced that first-hand getting tortured by these quacks. Homeschooling is outright banned in many countries so you cannot escape a dysfunctional school system.

In the short-term you can stay mostly safe from psychiatrists by not going to them but if too many people start doing that they will just treat more people against their will instead destroying their brains in the process [81](#) [82](#) thus you don't only need to worry about being convicted after breaking some unjust law, you may also be locked up "for your own good" when in reality your brain is being destroyed by the treatment supposed to help you.

Increasingly people are consuming entertainment media where they can flee to some alternate reality, for a while this will work but no matter how immersive the gaming experience is you will eventually have to return to your now even more miserable reality.

Of course societal issues will also over time affect things like entertainment media as well, you will see your shows and games being censored to appease the public and politicians.

A bad law you are able to get around now might be changed so you will no longer be able to evade it.

If societal issues are not fixed they will likely continue getting worse and you are likely to end up suffering from it the next life even you are able to escape the consequences this life. Thus some people will have to put effort into improving the situation, maybe you will be one of these heroes?

We need to eventually face the problem and this will require strength, we shouldn't take things off the table because they are viewed as "immoral" or "too extreme", what matters is that we fix the problem.

Hate & love

In order to truly love something you also need hate.

With hate we will be motivated to take the strong action required to actually solve a problem, without hate people will often resort to ineffective strategies because they believe a more effective & brutal strategy is immoral or because they are scared of the consequences employing said effective & brutal strategy would have.

Hate allows us to see through lies and pretense, it helps us concentrate on the essential. Hate is democratic; the rich and powerful cannot hate more than their slaves/subjects and soon hate might be all that we have left.

There is a lot of talk about hate-crimes, there is a body of laws against hate-crimes, everybody seems to be worried about hate. Hate appears to be the gravest problem of our time but hate is good, hate gives structure to our lives, it gives us a reason to exist, a focus, something to strive for, an identity.

Hate emancipates, without hate for slavery you cannot break your shackles, without hate for injustice there can be no justice. The greatest achievements of humans have grown from hate and the ability to control hate. Hate separates the humans from other animals, animals do not hate but humans do.

Humans can hate for decades, sometimes for an entire life, we can even pass on hate to our children and grandchildren and keep hate alive for centuries. Hate is a sign of abstract intellect; only humans can hate people they have never seen or met, only humans can hate concepts and processes.

How can we know what love is if we refuse to recognize and understand hate? love and hate are the two opposite sides of the same coin. In order to be complete we need hate. Hate separates us from the weak and docile masses. People in power fear hate since it's capable of destroying and creating empires.

Do not fear hate, do not deny or reject hate, accept hate and embrace hate, learn to know it and learn to use it. Hate is your most powerful weapon, a hidden source of your strength, do not deny it for you.

War morality

By going to war you can [expand your borders](#) and build a global empire eclipsing the entire earth.

Strong men will be able to rape females and the strong men will be able to advance in the crushed society. For the unfortunate few, who survived, a life in slavery [83](#)

Peaceful societies tend to be dysgenic while war-societies allow for the strong males to impregnate a lot of females. This will reward heroism and create plenty of children that can be used as soldier later.

By using force you can gain control over areas that otherwise would have never fallen under your control. This allows you to gain control over resources including humans that can be very useful for your goal. The more territory you control the harder it will be for others to invade you.

War often requires mobilizing a big portion of your population for the sake of the war-effort and then actually having these people believe in said war can be very valuable. It's a lot easier to conduct a war when your own population are willing to risk dying or even face certain death for the war-effort.

Of course it's not really in your best interest to die in the war but it's often very much in the interest of the state to make you think you risking your life is the right thing to do.

One way to motivate the population to fight is to capitalize in already existing racial/religious hate within the population. Someone who hate white people can be sent to fight against said white people, the ones of your population who hate black people can instead be sent to fight them somewhere else. That way racist idiots can be useful for you dying fighting a war that overall doesn't really align with their racist views.

A perhaps more powerful tool for motivation is ideology. You really want people to believe in the vision you claim to have for the world. You want them to believe that once you control the world you will create a new amazing society that will last as long as the earth itself remain habitable for humans and maybe even longer. Ideology has the advantage of potentially including people of all races and all genders.

You want your population to be very much against what they are risking their lives fighting against and by controlling media including the larger online sites you will be able to make your public outright hate the society you are invading and the people living there.

During war just like in peace some people are far more important than others and often in order to win you will have to let many people die and this is likely to include civilians of your own country, having some of the civilians be killed can actually be beneficial in growing the public hate for the other side, otherwise you will have to find other ways to turn the public against the enemy such as via government propaganda.

One strategy to protect key individuals is to instead of having them in some bunker deep in the ground you have them be constantly transported via an air-plane such as [fighter-jets](#) or something similar to [Air-force-one](#) that however a very expensive solution that has to be reserved for top among the elite.

Many of the losing population will be reduced to property of the winners (D0 to D5) while others will be rewarded by citizenship for their heroic contributions for crushing the old government.

By having the females of the losing population be impregnated by the winners a new population is created that will have ancestors from both sides, this will be very important for the future when these people are going to fight along you to expand your borders yet again.

The females of the losing population will experience amazing sexual excitement as they are restrained to be bred by the alpha males who conquered the territory. Surviving males can be injected by female hormones and send to a segregated area where they can have sex with other human losers who were also forcefully feminized by the winning government as their former wives are impregnated.

It's very important to brainwash the population you are subjugating making them think you are there to help them, this will very rarely if ever require you to spread any false information, generally there are plenty of things governments do that most people would/should view as very bad.

If the population in the area you are conquering isn't of significant value then there is no reason for you not to go for outright extermination. That way you will not have to deal with millions of bitter people angry about you killing males and raping females at a massive scale. You will not have to face millions of people upset that their homes got destroyed in your bombing raids.

Even when genocidal warfare isn't ideal you might still have to resort to in order to avoid losing the war itself. Societies unwilling to go brutal enough to win will find themselves destroyed and replaced by more brutal societies via societal survival of the fittest.

If one hydrogen-bomb isn't enough to win you the war why not send 10 more? Why not 100 more?

You do not actually have to engage in any "nation building" after the war. You can just send nukes to badly damage the enemy country and then leave them trying to regain some order afterwards.

Winning a war requires you to be brutal, the laws of war only apply to the losers and can be used to further humiliate the losers. Only losers of war will have to face war-crime trials while the winners will be the judges. By using weapons of mass destruction and committing war 'crimes' you will be able to win easier and you will save the lives of your own soldiers while the any former leaders of the now crushed state will face utter humiliation in court.

Winning the war may also require you to take drastic actions in other ways, you might have to confine everyone who holds some sensitive classified information to prevent it from leaking and this can include A-citizens and their first successors, this is especially the case if the ruling elite is numerous.

While you can attempt to reduce the 'negative' impacts of war with various international conventions there isn't really any reliable way to enforce these things. Often one type of weapon/strategy will benefit one party more than the other and then the side that benefits the most from using said strategy will benefit from breaking the deal signed since even if the opposing side also starts using said dirty strategy/weapon you will still benefit from it.

The situation is a bit more complicated when there are multiple countries hostile to each other where there isn't just 2 stable alliances. In that case countries can potentially gang up on some country for the purpose of punishing them for breaking international conventions that were agreed upon but often doing so is not actually in the interest of these countries doing so. Why alienate an important ally because they weren't following some dumb human right convention, that will only push allies away into the harms of hostile powers weakening your position at the international stage.

What's instead likely to happen is that if you comply with demands of other countries to disarm (such as giving up your nuclear weapons) that will likely invite an invasion since then invading you will become far less costly and many dumb leaders learned that the hard way.

Ukraine gave up their nuclear weapons to Soviet Union for a promise of peace only to later find themselves in a lengthy conflict with russia culminating into a for them very costly and bloody war. Had they instead done the rational thing which was to keep their nuclear weapons they would have never needed to rely on a promise in the first place since it would very badly for any country attacking them. Moammar Kadhaffi got raped by a bayonet after destroying his chemical weapons.

Trump tried scaring North Korea into giving up their nuclear weapons by threatening "fire and fury" but when Kim Jung Un refused to actually do anything to stop their program Trump never actually did anything against him and instead Trump still wanted to be his friend even though he got snubbed.




Due to the difficulty in only targeting individual humans you will have to judge people as a group, you add up all the damage and make a quick estimate on whether or not it was overall beneficial.

Human races?

While there are differences between human populations [84](#) there isn't any clear way to divide humans into races [85](#) any such division will be very arbitrary.

If the population of a race increases the probability to reincarnate into the race will become larger and the probability to reincarnate from the race to another one will become smaller.

Northern Europeans do not have the highest average iq but we typically have very attractive bodies and are thus sought after by humans all over the planet.



Southeast Asians instead have bigger brains and slightly higher average iq than the average for white countries [86](#)

In general population of higher intelligence have more wealth [87](#) while their fertility is lower resulting in a global decline of mental abilities despite better environments [88](#) reversing the flynn effect.

Your soul has no gender or race but something similar to your old body & brain will be a more natural continuum and thus the probability of reincarnation decreases with genetic distance. If a race becomes extinct the souls will most likely reincarnate into different human races.

About racemixing

Egalitarians have argued that people of mixed race are in some ways superior to people of unmixed race, and therefore race-mixing is desirable. This seems inconsistent with their position that there are no significant genetic differences between races and also goes against the notion of egalitarianism that would imply inbred people are just as good, egalitarians are not strongly committed to consistency.

Due to mutation and selection, the longer a population has been isolated from other populations, the more likely it is to have acquired alleles by mutation that other populations don't have. Inbreeding passes those alleles around within the population so that people within that population are more likely to share alleles than are people from different populations, i.e., that population is more homozygous than is a population formed by combining that population with another population.

Now, when two populations interbreed to form a hybrid population, each parent population has accumulated, over tens or hundreds of thousands of years, a unique set of alleles that is close to the optimum for the particular environment it has been in, and that environment includes the environment its own members have created, e.g., their history, culture, and accumulated knowledge.

Inevitably, the two parent populations have lived in different environments, and the hybrid population will live in the environment of one or both of the parent populations. Thus, the hybrid population will not have the collection of alleles that are most advantageous for either of those environments, a substantial loss of fitness, i.e., their likelihood of successfully reproducing is lessened.

When man makes a plant or animal hybrid, he carefully selects which offspring he will let survive and reproduce. Nature, too, selects ruthlessly and destroys thousands of crosses from different populations, leaving few, if any, hybrid survivors. (Patterson, 1999, p. 95). When the Caucasians arose, for example, there was no government aid to the less capable, and those who did not possess the most advantageous traits of both the Cro-Magnons and the Neanderthals simply died without issue. The very existence of the Caucasians in Europe proves that they, the hybrids, were more fit in Europe than either the Cro-Magnons or the Neanderthals who begot them.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4478293/>

[https://www.cell.com/cell/fulltext/S0092-8674\(18\)31095-X](https://www.cell.com/cell/fulltext/S0092-8674(18)31095-X)

With miscegenation today, however, few of the hybrids fail to survive and reproduce because food, shelter, medical and dental treatment, and social services are provided for them, whether or not they are sufficiently productive to pay for them. Instead of letting natural selection take its course, as it did when the Caucasian hybrids were born, the state requires the more fit to reduce their own chances of surviving and reproducing in order to enhance the chances of the less fit surviving and reproducing. Any farmer with an ounce of sense knows that all his plants and livestock are not all genetically equal, and so he selects his seed for his next year's crop from only the best of his plants and animals; only egalitarians tell every seed that with a little manure it can be the equal of any other seed, however unfit it is.

Genetic engineering

The probability of achieving a hybrid vigor will increase with the use of genetic engineering. Genetic engineering allows us to combine the best traits from several groups/individuals in addition to adding new traits that no current human has.

Contrary to popular belief GMO is perfectly safe when done right and it has incredible potential [89](#) in humans this can create a market for services allowing parents to design their own children instead of just relying on luck, that demand will fuel competition and thus innovation, technology will improve.

Biotechnology allows people with genetic defects to reproduce without ruining future generations, you might be able to overcome the genetic disabilities you were cursed with but unless you use technology to improve the genetics of your children the result of your success may just be generations of suffering.

Beneficial mutation sometimes occurs 'naturally' but it is rare and it takes a long time for it to spread, thousands of years in the case of blue eyes. A beneficial genetic change may require many basepairs to change possibly making the improvement irreducibly complex and thus unachievable via natural selection.

You only need to introduce a new superior gene once, after that it can be passed on naturally via sex. You may choose to have children naturally probably resulting in less fit children but then your children may have to fix the fitness issue via technology instead, even people with much better genes than typical will have some bad genetics too.

Initially ordinary humans reproducing without genetic engineering will be left behind, they will live miserable lives desperately searching for meaning when there isn't any. With time it will be harder and harder for unmodified humans to survive and eventually there won't be many if any old humans left and the world will be a very different place.

The progress will initially be held back by the desire to create humans able to breed with old humans, eventually new incompatible species will be created and some will be many times (if not hundreds of times) more intelligent than the old humans.

Genetic engineering when done in a proper manner will not lead to peace, instead it will accelerate evolution and create new conflicts. An intelligent enough organism will conclude that there are far too many useless humans and decide to exterminate a large number of them if possible, eventually rationality will win and a lot of humans will die.

You are unlikely to benefit from the creation of a new genetically engineered species the next life since the probability for reincarnation decreases with genetic distance, it may even be detrimental since it may result in less bodies of your own genetic type.

Examples of unnatural selection are forced sterilization, the welfare state, executions, selection of sperm or egg when the parents aren't biological. Technology also allows for genetic engineering and selecting the best outcome from several fertilized eggs to avoid genetic disease and disability such as Cystic fibrosis.

Genetic manipulation of humans is very controversial but there are very good reasons for making the population more intelligent by natural or unnatural selection. The goal should not be to make all perfect with iq 160 but to increase the genetic material of humans in general, we still want great genetic variation between individuals and races.

With Genetic Engineering it will be possible to drastically reduce sickness, if implemented properly there will no longer be a lot of people who suffer from cancer, cystic fibrosis, bad vision and other conditions where genetics are important.

Survival of the fittest

Making huge genetic modifications to your children does not make sense from an evolutionary perspective since it would be a big difference between you and your 'offspring', without natural selection the people that refuse to alter their genetics will replicate themselves and become more and more numerous despite being very unfit.

Parents without good genes who haven't spent the money needed to create design-babies will see their children left behind without any true purpose in life, this is already the case for many individuals resulting in them desperately trying to find a meaning, they will never find a true meaning since there isn't any.


When the genetic engineering is done in a decentralized manner the result will be more and more powerful and independent-thinking humans being created, this combined with artificial intelligence will result in a very unpredictable situation that may cause anarchy or large-scale war. Humans that are able to build a majority of force coalition will be able to take control over the entire planet, enhanced humans will be better able to reproduce and gain control over powerful weapons allowing them to eventually gain control over the entire planet.

It isn't just about high intelligence or being physically strong, it's also about acting in a more darwinian manner than typical humans today.

Genes that lead to suicidal behavior will not last and thus with time in a certain environment suicidal behaviors such as using contraceptives will become less and less common. You should of course never ever use a condom or even worse take pills that ruin your sex-drive, prevents you from getting pregnant now and also has severe risks including death, that is suicidal.

Thus over time natural selection forced us to become increasingly darwinian in our thinking.

Humans have already tried managing breeding with dogs and it has been a total disaster where the easiest solution is to start over again from wolves and kill existing dogs for food. Most humans simply lack the intelligence needed to make good choices when it comes to human genetic engineering and breeding in general. Civilization in general has lead to a lot of degeneration among humans similar to what we see with dogs(less intelligence and aggression).



The need for the intelligence of the wolf was not a prerequisite for our domestication of them, we did not need it, and the early portion of the formation of the dog was in a change of eating patterns by pack rejects that started following human settlements and surviving on our refuse.



Diminishing their hunting intellect, by which we further exacerbated by obstructing the natural selection within their species by altering their breeding environment to meet our needs. Dogs no longer died from stupid mistakes because they had humans to aid them, hunting intelligence was diminished because of food dependence upon humans etc etc. These were all unconscious decisions that led to the regression of the dogs' cognitive capacity relative to the natural wolf.

Harsh competition for survival results in bad genes being weeded out of the gene pool and thus a more healthy population. You may realize that you yourself do not have very good genes we still in general benefit from doing our best to survive and multiply, your children might be lucky and end up having better genes than you.

By having a lot of children with individuals that also have good genes you improve the chances of also having good genes in future lives. You have an interest in people with high genetic quality spreading their genes a lot even if you are not closely related genetically, reincarnation to an individual of a different race is possible even though the probability is much smaller.

Medical quackery

A lot of people have been weeded out from the gene pool using so-called “alternative medicine” which is ‘medicine’ that currently isn't evidence-based. Effective medicine often has side effects that are harmful while useless medicine often lacks bad side effects since it doesn't really do anything.

You can use resources such as <https://www.cochrane.org/> and <http://cepuk.org/> to protect yourself against charlatans and other people trying to sell you bad ‘treatments’. Quacks can be very manipulative and thus you need to be very critical about any medical claims made by someone.

There are a lot of individuals giving bad medical advice on platforms such as youtube.

The opinions of individual medical professionals and their recommendations cannot be relied upon [90](#) doctor ≠ researcher. If they screw up you will be the one suffering from it. Get at least a second opinion.

You need to look at actual scientific studies yourself to protect yourself from incompetent and outright evil people that otherwise can cause you significant harm or even death.

About psychiatry

Most people suffer from mental issues, how severe it is varies between humans. Psychiatry pretends to help people suffering from mental illness but it's all a fraud.

0. They cannot accurately diagnose people [91](#)
1. The medication they offer is addictive or will create dependence.
2. They may start treating you against your will "for your own good" [92](#)
3. Their non-pharmaceutical alternatives fail to beat placebo [93](#) [94](#) [95](#) [96](#)

None of the treatments they offer have good long term outcomes [97](#) [98](#) [99](#) [100](#) [101](#) [102](#)

There is no denying that the drugs they offer can feel good and a lot of people want to get their hands on the addictive drugs they are offering, people on drug will often think they are being helped by the drug when in reality they are just spiraling into an addiction [103](#) [104](#)

Many people have religious faith in psychiatrists and therapists and expect them to magically solve their problems, in reality these people are just humans and you might get more out of chatting with people online about your specific issue. The only treatment for gender dysphoria that actually works is to allow people to transition, just trying to treat the brain simply does not work.

What psychiatrist do is to ‘correct’ what they view as abnormalities and for that they use brain-damaging drugs, they don't care about the long term effect or ruined sex-lives [105](#) [106](#)

It's natural to be depressed when your life is bad and the solution is to take action to improve your life, psychiatry will instead give people drugs and [electroshock](#) to achieve short-term improvement at any cost, as if grand mal seizures would be good for you. They simply turn what could have been a temporary issue (psychosis, depression, etc) into a chronic problem via extended usage of psychiatric drugs and other brain-damaging treatments [107](#) [108](#) [109](#)

It's unclear if there are any situations where you benefit from drugging yourself unless you await a certain death that will come to you soon, in that case the long-term consequences don't matter and you may as well numb yourself so you will feel less bad about your horrible situation assuming there is nothing to be done about it. Side effects from psychiatric drugs can be very bad [110](#) [111](#)

With few exceptions studies showing drugs to be beneficial are short-term studies based on subjective rating rather than hard data such as suicide attempt rate, suicide mortality, total mortality, income, etc.

Studies on how stimulant drugs affect academic performance for people with ADHD symptoms are mixed and overall inconclusive [112](#) [113](#) [114](#)

Escitalopram (ssri) did marginally better than placebo (for quality of life) in a trial that lasted 8 weeks [115](#) due to the side effects it's likely many participants figured out whether or not they got active ingredient or placebo, this is a general problem with medical trials not specific to psychiatry.

Mental illness can be due to biological factors such as diet [116](#) [117](#) psychiatry will not fix that, nor will they be able to fix any issues with your genetics. Since they cannot do anything to help you and while being very likely to harm you the clear strategy is to avoid it as much as possible.

If you end up in a psychiatric ward it's recommended that you pretend to take the medications they prescribe [118](#) make them think the pill got you better, only take it to court as a last resort since there isn't any actual due process anyway (expect to lose).

Psychiatry is very useful if you want to control a population, label people opposing the system as mentally ill, when they are diagnosed as mentally ill they can be locked up at institutions "for their own good" and they might never get out.

Since psychiatrists are in a position of power over their patients (victims) people with antisocial personality traits including outright sadists will be very motivated to pursue these positions getting a sick pleasure out of seriously harming people. The more they manage to harm your brain and give you psychological trauma the more likely you are to end up in their hands again.

Due to the risk of being treated by these quacks against your will you should not talk about mental health issues such as suicidal thoughts or hallucinations with anyone who can find out your real identity, do not even talk to a psychiatrist and by avoiding them you will be mostly safe. If you need to vent about something use tor or safer to hide your ip address and you will be freer to talk about hearing voices or whatever mental health issue you struggle with.

Psychiatry is simply a quackery cult that has been able to successfully merge with government to create a nightmarish situation [119](#) they call their brain-washing therapy [120](#) while they do everything in their power to destroy the mental health of individuals who are unlucky enough to find themselves in their claws [121](#) when they destroy the lives of people they call it help and if you try to say they will typically resort to coercion (direct or indirect) to force compliance with their quack treatments.

<https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0137864>

Medical autonomy

Medical autonomy can be divided into 2 categories

A: Freedom to undergo a medical intervention such as taking fentanyl.

B: Freedom to reject a medical intervention.

These are not equivalent, without freedom B authorities will be able to torture you easily, they could easily kill you too but don't get your hopes up for that.

Currently we enjoy freedom B except when you are viewed as incapable (too young, viewed as mentally ill, etc). An infant cannot say no and this allows for very harmful practices such as genital mutilations.

[59](#) [122](#) [123](#)

Usually with medical interventions it first has to be approved by FDA, then you need to get approved for it by a gatekeeping doctor and lastly you need to approve it yourself. You do however have the option to move to another place or breaking the law to get access to the medical treatment you need, a lot of trans individuals just resort to buying hormones online due to gatekeeping and waiting times.

About individual rights

When your government is incompetent as all democratic governments are having basic rights meaning limitations of government power do limit the damage an incompetent government can do. For this to work the rights has to be clearly defined and also respected. If you live in a democracy you should put effort into promoting certain freedoms to limit the impact of public stupidity.

Individual rights you have on paper are not a good protection if the government actually wants to harm you, if this is the case they can always find some way to hurt you or lock you up, the system can easily be rigged against you such that winning becomes practically impossible.

If you belong to the ruling class controlling a country trying to protect people from their own stupidity shouldn't be your priority and thus you want to grant people citizen rights they will have at least on paper. These rights will not really apply universally, there will be many exceptions to them and thus they only offer the people you are ruling over a false sense of security.

Circumventing individual rights

0. downgrade citizen status to one that has fewer rights or no rights at all.

1. find some crime to pin on the individual.

2. declare the individual mentally ill and thus incapable of making their own decisions [124](#) [125](#) [126](#) [127](#)

3. government custody of young people due to socially destructive behavior (up to age 21 in Sweden).

4. take into custody just for being suspected of crime, the individual will suffer a lot even if he or she is not convicted.

5. take children away from the individual into government custody as psychological torture.

6. let non-government actors harm the individual without consequences.

7. selectively drafting people to dangerous wars.

A lot of government power is indirect, the government can use the mere threat of 0 to 7 to make people comply.

Due process

What due process means is that you are not supposed to be punished unless you meet a criteria for that decided by the government. A lot of countries claim you have that but it's just a facade, you don't need to be convicted of a crime to be locked up, a lot of people are locked up just because they are suspected of a crime while waiting for a trial, they end up suffering even if they are eventually acquitted, they will also have to go through the trauma and stress that come with having to go to court.

In the US a lot of people end up taking plea bargain even when innocent of what they are accused of since the consequences of being convicted of a single crime can be very bad [128](#)

It's the norm that the law is written in a such way that authorities can lock up anyone up if they really want to, there are just too many laws and often they are vague so you can always find a crime to pin on the individuals, otherwise there is always **psychiatry** where a different standard is used "danger to yourself or others".

Courts are often claimed to be independent even though they are really not, members of the US supreme court are appointed by the president and approved by the senate, it is political appointments where people are vetted before to make sure they will vote in a way people with power like. In addition congress have the power to impeach and convict members of the supreme court (removal from office) or to pack the supreme court with more members just by passing a law.

About conscription

Instead having a professional army incompetent government often directly force males to work for the so-called defense of the country. In return people tend to demand right to vote which is often granted.

Conscription may seem to be cheaper but in reality the true cost of it is just hidden.

<https://mises.org/library/conscription-and-other-draconian-taxes>

It's far more efficient to pay professional soldiers, this also makes war less costly politically and it rewards capable fighters financially. What actually wins the war is having good weaponry and also being able to use powerful weapons such as nukes, you need professional soldiers to properly manage these highly advanced systems (fighter jets, surface to air missiles, etc).

Conscription does however allow the government to punish or even kill people viewed as undesirable, they can simply be sent to die in a war somewhere and thus we get rid of these individuals, this works even if they are worse than useless in said war. It can also be used as a punishment (dangerous forced labor) to deter undesirable behavior.

The right to vote

While you want to have the right to vote yourself there are plenty of individuals that you do not want voting in the election. More people being allowed to vote dilutes the value of your vote and thus the probability of your vote actually changing anything will be even smaller.

You being allowed to vote will incentivize politicians from trying to get your vote but you are only one of maybe 8 million people who can vote in national elections. You only need to win a majority (such as 175 of 349 seats) to take power, the only reason politicians cannot ignore large parts of the population is because other people care about them, when that changes you will see that you never had any real rights.

The American government does put effort into taking care of their non-voting territories such as Guam, the fact that people there cannot vote in federal elections hasn't resulted in them losing any individual right relative to voting states, the impact has been mostly economical and even that is rather limited.

The right to bear arms

While you want this right for yourself you do not want the same for a lot of other individuals, you do not want people who want to harm you to be armed. You having a gun yourself will not prevent anyone from killing you with a sniper rifle from a distance, a "good guy with a gun" (whatever that is) will very often die to a 'bad guy' with a gun. Having a gun does allow you to easily kill yourself or fight to the death, this makes it more difficult for the government to torture you.

It is sometimes claimed that armed citizens are a safeguard against tyranny but that has already been tried in the united states and it didn't work at all, it makes vigilante 'justice' easier which is one of the worst forms of mob rule. For this to work you need to have enough total firepower to cause significant damage to other people, in addition you will probably have to demonstrate that you are actually crazy enough to do acts of terrorism, this is a dangerous strategy that is likely to backfire against your group.

The fair solution is to implement a licensing system where you need to pass a test to be allowed to use a gun, this test should be difficult enough to prevent the typical idiot from obtaining a gun. The unfair solution is to just give out powerful guns to people you like and disarm everyone else.

Inclusion criteria for individual rights

Individual freedoms cannot apply to everyone. At the start of your life you will be in a state of helplessness and you will depend completely on people around you, they have to make good decisions for you, in addition you may become incapable of proper decision-making at some point in your life.

More clear criteria for getting certain rights will make it more difficult for authorities to take freedoms away from people they view as problematic. Mental health criteria are ideal for arbitrarily depriving people of rights, if the individual disagrees with his/her diagnosis that is a sign he/she lacks insight in his/her illness and this can justify involuntary [psychiatric](#) treatments. Things such as iq-tests are more scientific and less subjective and thus less appealing to rulers.

Inclusion criteria don't have to favor the more capable. If people are conscripted to war the government may specifically choose more capable (useful) males while ignoring the weaker ones and also ignoring females. If baby quotas are implemented to increase the fertility rate it will impact individuals who are actually capable of giving birth. In the case of punishments more capable individuals are sometimes punished harder since they are expected to be able to follow the law. "human rights" are supposed to apply to all humans but it's not clear exactly what counts as a human and these things will not actually be respected by governments.

Free speech

It's a right you want for yourself and it's also a right you want to have for other people, at least to the degree that allows them to spread important information to you and to allow the spread of important information to voters as a whole.

But it's also in your interest to limit the spread of harmful information, if a competent and good judicial system is in place we do want people prosecuted for spreading false information, otherwise people will be allowed to do a lot of harm. Truth does not typically win over falsehood in the so called "free market of ideas" instead what tends to win are things that appeal to the emotions of people even if it's wrong.

No country on earth has absolute free speech but a lot of countries still have something close to free speech since governments are unwilling to prosecute people over speech. You also have the option of simply hiding your identity online and there are services such as tor that can be used for this. Most censorship by far in western countries is due to private platforms such as reddit censoring people.

Privacy

One significant limit to government power is difficulties monitoring citizens, technology is a significant factor in this.

Banning/restricting the government from collecting data may not help in practice if private companies can do the same, with internet it's easy to spread any information even if the government tries to ban it, efforts to stop piracy hasn't been very successful so far, what actually worked was providing easy and affordable legal alternatives such as netflix.

It's likely that it will be possible to also directly look into people's thoughts in the future making it thoughtcrime laws enforce bile. This may lead to increased [psychiatric abuse](#) since you would no longer be able to pretend not to hear voices or not think the government is targeting you.

About paranoia

Being paranoid is a natural and healthy reaction to the fact that there are plenty of people that will destroy your life given the opportunity. A lot of people think they know better than you and want to force you to do what they want "for your own good" other people are outright sadistic and only want to torture you to get a sick sense of pleasure. A lot of people simply want to get ahead in their life at your expense and they might not even dislike you as a person.

Most people are too naive and are thus likely to be seriously harmed by other people, a lot of people have to learn this the hard way and when they finally get it it might already be too late. Most people being physically and chemically tortured inside psychiatric wards are there because they were too trusting and too open with other people, maybe they were suicidal and sought 'help' as they were told. You being uncomfortable talking too openly with other people is a healthy defense mechanism to keep you safe, you need to take this uneasiness seriously.

Irrational paranoia can sometimes harm you but generally it's far better to stay safe and take unnecessary steps to protect yourself from people out to harm you than once being careless and thus being seriously harmed as a result.

People will go after you even more if you are politically active and a solid intellectual. People get very upset if someone explains to them how they are wrong and they may even want to torture you to death simply due to the fact that their ego couldn't handle it.

Critical thinking

Differentiating true from false is mostly about intelligence and motivation today, in most cases you have all the information to draw the correct conclusion available but often you fail due to lack of intelligence or research. Most people lack the intelligence to detect logical flaws in lies but if you do have that ability it will be much easier to know if something is true and not.

There are many individuals who are trying to manipulate you for personal/political gain, for this reason you need to be very critical about information that is provided to you. In many cases the propaganda will not be obvious, it can be hidden in entertainment you consume or be subtle social conditioning.

In life, you will have to make a very difficult decision, remain a part of the masses or cut all ties to the typical people. In order to become truly successful you have to cut all ties with ordinary people and be very selective with your friends, maybe you will have to live your life knowing you have no real friends and no-one that you can truly rely on in difficult situations.

About being open-minded

A lot of people will try to deceive you in various ways, if you are too willing to listen to other people you will end up being taken advantage of, if you instead are unfairly critical of new things you will generally not end up missing much, your life will still be fine.

It takes a lot in terms of time and mental abilities to properly research a subject and thus you need to be selective when it comes to even giving it a fair chance. You also run the risk of deluding yourself when looking into something and thus you may be better off just ignoring it.

About the burden of proof

There are many cases where you as a society need to take claims currently not supported by evidence seriously. If someone threatens to shoot up a school you will have to take that claim very seriously or people might die, the fact that the individual claiming that is very likely to be bullshitting doesn't change the fact that you cannot always discard a claim given without proper evidence.

If we are going to criminalize false speech the burden of proof will be on the prosecutor to prove someone was lying to the detriment of society, thus the burden of proof will be on the one disputing a claim, not the one making the claim.

About the free market of ideas

Modern technology has given a lot of people a platform that shouldn't have a platform, this has resulted in a lot of bad ideas spreading like cancer. Good ideas will often fail to take hold since most people lack the mental capabilities to recognize these ideas as good.

Since some ideas are socially unacceptable there will be a strong incentive to not accept certain things as true even if they clearly are, thinking too much for yourself can have bad consequences.

The advice you get when asking people online will rarely be good, often not a single individual will give a proper answer, they might be convincing but if they are wrong they are wrong.

In many cases such as poker you have an incentive to misinform people and not to give proper information, if you have information that would give you an advantage over other people you will often benefit from keeping it to yourself.

What we see is the blind leading the blind

0. people recommending psychotherapy even though it's no better than placebo [129](#) [130](#)
1. people with poor medical knowledge spreading misinformation thinking they know better than professionals.
2. various retarded conspiracy theories spreading like cancer even after being debunked.

People with an ideology will usually spread misinformation for ideological reasons, they might not know it's misinformation themselves. Neonazis typically deny the holocaust and blame Jews for 9/11, vegans claim their diet is healthy and that meat is bad for you, you can save time just ignoring these people and assume they lie or are mentally retarded.

The overspecialization problem

Our current society is supposed to function by having people specialize in different fields and then we are supposed to be able to trust the experts in said fields. The theoretical issue with that is that then there will be many points where society can fail since people will not actually be able to do proper oversight since how are you as a non-expert supposed to examine these things?

What ended up happening is that various fraudulent fields like psychiatry and philosophy, [psychiatry](#) was liked by establishment since it could be weaponized by authority figures and philosophy was tolerated since it doesn't actually say anything and therefore it's not in any way a real threat to any political ideology.

So instead of having separate specialist groups work together for the good of society they start pursuing their own special interest to the detriment of society as a whole. This is why having any separation of power at a governmental level is dangerous and very questionable, it creates additional points of failure in the system.

The obvious solution to these issues is to make sure society at least on the highest level is governed by people who are generally skilled instead of just being specialized in one field.

In order to make a good decision as a leader you need to have a good general understanding about a lot of fields, you cannot just rely on advisors for that.

While specialized may have more knowledge about their particular subject than a generalist these Special-interest groups are prone to abuse the trust people have in them to benefit themselves and the expense of society at large similar to how a cancer cells stop acting to support the body and instead becomes parasitic eventually killing their host unless it's aggressively rooted out of the body.

Similar to actual cancer people suffer from societal cancer tends to just grow increasingly bad until a radical treatment plan is started and this treatment itself is likely to also kill healthy parts of the body/society.

The educational industry

The educational system after high-school more or less forces you to specialize in one field, you are not really able to get a more general education about various things. The educational system has become a parasitic industry where young people are expected to spend years of their lives going into debt just to get an official degree [131](#) This may fully explain why intelligent females reproduce less on average [132](#)

One option to get a general education your best bet is math & physics combined with education you do on your own but that's far from ideal in terms of actually getting a good job [133](#) [134](#) [135](#)

In a lot of cases what you learn in schools are things you could have learned on your own for lower cost and at your own pace. If you just know what you are doing you can learn a lot on your own and then you will be free to actually spend time learning what you are interested in instead of being forced to follow some curriculum.

Another issue with institutional education is the fact that it will be subjected to government control. this may be beneficial for people already in power but it does expose you to the risk of you being taught propaganda as fact and as a student you might not actually be able to realize that if you are just blindly following through with the courses without questioning anything.

Unfortunately there are a lot of professions where you need a degree to have a career in them, it's not actually about having knowledge/skills. It's about having a piece of paper [136](#)

Legitimate vs false authority

A majority of the true elite will make the correct conclusion more often than any individual human, thus you might benefit from blindly trusting the true elite over thinking for yourself.

The challenge is knowing who are the actual elite, you can employ the following strategies for this:

0. Put a lot of effort into correctly analyzing a given situation, then you compare your correct conclusion to that of so-called authorities and see if they also arrived at the same correct conclusion.
1. Look at what members of these authorities have accomplished in life, have they demonstrated that they have the proper skills?
2. If the authority is elected democratically directly or indirectly they cannot be trusted.
3. The ideal size of the elite is 7 to 315 [137](#)
4. The members of the elite shall make the decision independently of each other.
5. If they are media they cannot be trusted since they might have an agenda or cater to certain individuals (such as lefties). Even if they have a good agenda they may still have to lie to make sure said agenda gets implemented. Therefore even elite humans tend to be unreliable when it comes to telling the truth, in order to remain as the elite they will have to lie and mislead to a degree.
6. If they are interested in getting money from you they cannot be trusted.

Method 0 is a dangerous strategy in itself since you may end up fooling yourself when doing research of your own [138](#)

Many people rely primarily on platforms like youtube for this information. People tend to prefer watching some propaganda documentary over actually reading scientific articles.

The problem with youtube as an information source is that it's not actually based on providing the correct information, instead you get views from sensational videos and doing things youtube/google as a company likes. The process which determines which videos that get popular is not actually based on who has the best understanding of the subject.

Still there are some good youtube channels not yet banned [139](#) [140](#) [141](#) [142](#) [143](#) [144](#) [145](#) [146](#) [147](#) [148](#) [149](#) [150](#)

An example of 0 is the quantum eraser experiment [151](#) which a lot of otherwise rather reliable science youtube channels got wrong [152](#) [153](#) while most other good science channels just didn't cover it.

There is a lot of misinformation regarding physics being spread by media and even the education system, for example a lot of people are being taught the bohr model without being properly told that the model doesn't actually represent reality and it is not even a particularly useful model for science. Many people are being told that the wavefunction (quantum mechanics) will collapse when it's measured which isn't the case for small-scale measurements [154](#)

In general when science is being communicated to the masses it is very frequently dumbed-down and sensationalized, scientific accuracy is not really a priority, political priorities will have far bigger weight than scientific accuracy. In the early stages of the covid-19 pandemic people were told not to wear masks in an attempt to prevent a shortage of them in hospitals, later people were told to use [worthless cloth masks](#) instead of [FFP3](#).

Why you cannot trust doctors in general

Regulators are there to please politicians and lobbyists, it's not actually in their own best interest to follow enforce actual evidence-based medicine. Politicians are mostly interested in pleasing their voters and donors and can absolutely not be trusted with any medical decision whatsoever.

If someone is democratically elected or appointed by people that are then clearly they cannot be trusted any more than you can trust your neighbor with medical advice, why should a politician go against the ignorant masses and special interests? People who are not democratically elected instead have their own special interests which will conflict with your interests as a potential patient.

The interests of doctors do not align with the interests of their potential patients, a doctor does not actually make money from people being healthy, they make money when people are sick. They have a vested interest in people pursuing their treatment even if these treatments are harmful to their patients.

Most medical treatments are not based on good evidence <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27032875/>

Harmful puberty blockers were given to children for decades but didn't come under scrutiny until they started being used widely for trans children (who don't need them and don't benefit from them).

<https://vintologi.com/threads/why-puberty-blockers-is-a-bad-idea.975>

Instead of criticizing these harmful drugs most people who at least claim to be there to support trans people defended the usage of these drugs that harm trans children while providing zero real benefits for them (in addition to all the damage done to cis children).

In most countries you are not the one paying for the treatment so you are not even the customer, therefore there isn't any real incentive for the doctor to actually do what's best for you, instead doctors will be incentives to please regulators and politicians.

Even if you pay for it them pleasing regulators will still be more important since they have far more power than you have with your money. Furthermore since a lot of people blindly trust doctors there will not actually be a particularly strong incentive for them to do a good job since they will get a lot of patients anyway.

A lot of people spend money going to chiropractors even though it's very likely to do more harm than good [155](#) this is far from the only example of quacks having no difficulty getting patients [156](#)

How to do your own research

In order to do research properly you need to look up the actual original data instead of trusting other people to interpret it correctly for you. The more steps there are between the data and what you hear the more opportunity there is for other people to manipulate information for the sake of some agenda.

When it comes to medical topics you need to look at the actual full text, especially their actual results, not their way to interpret the results which often does not actually agree with the data.

You can use <https://sci-hub.hkvisa.net/> or sci-hub.mkksa.top to gain access to the full text, use [tor/proxy](#) if it doesn't load. In some cases <https://openaccessbutton.org/> will work to bypass the paywall.

You need to be very critical when [appraising studies](#), you cannot just rely on [peer review](#).

If the study is a [meta-analysis](#) you need to find the full text of all individual studies and also read that, otherwise you will have to trust both the individual studies as a whole and that the authors of the meta-analysis actually did the analysis correctly which they often have an economic incentive not to.

Ignorance and the lemming mentality

Most people are lemmings, they do not spend time to research important topics, instead they trust some authority and this is of course a lot more convenient. It takes a lot in terms of time and mental abilities to properly research the difficult topics you have to face in life.

When a 'correct' decision isn't rewarded it will not make economic sense to spend the resources needed for the decision-making, some people may still do it but most won't. You cannot expect normal individuals to spend time researching [austrian economics](#) or biological differences between 'races'.

There is no shortage of examples of humans acting like lemmings, most people believe in a religion proven wrong by science, a lot of people deny the science of biological gender inequality [157](#) [158](#)

Science vs religion

While religions and science may at first seem like completely different things in reality there isn't any clear line between religion and science. Plenty of beliefs falls somewhere in between and should be called "reliscience". There is no shortage of beliefs that seem to be false and has no evidence in favor of them yet there isn't any way to falsify these beliefs either.

While most traditional religious beliefs are obviously false and easy to refute it's fairly easy to invent some new religion which we cannot falsify with our current scientific understanding.

As science progresses it becomes harder to construct a religion that is fully compatible with the known knowledge and the need for religion to give an (often nonsensical) explanation will decrease.

Darwinian evolution explains how species evolved without the need for a god. Gravity explains how planets orbit the sun without the need for anything supernatural.

Examples beliefs compatible with science are reincarnation, life on other planets and the beliefs that our universe is one of many.

Why you cannot just rely on hard logic and evidence

The real world we live in is too complex for simple logical reasoning to be enough. When it comes to real decision-making there are often plenty of things to consider and there isn't any clear way to actually figure out what the correct decision is since the problem is too complex for a logical solution.

What people call "intuition" is very likely just an unreliable output of the neural networks of the brain. In addition to neural networks being unreliable it's also unclear what the actual real reasoning is. Sure you can try to come up with some rationalization for the output of a neural network but these rationalizations will be superficial and different from the actual cognition used to arrive at said decision.

Still despite the issues neural networks is often the most accurate way to make decision in various situations. It wasn't until neural networks were created in via computers that humans started losing against said computers in many games like go. Of course actually solving the game go via brute-force computations would be far more reliable but no human or computer will ever come close to doing that.

vintologi vs christianity vs nazism

Overlaps with any ideology/religion are to be expected. While national socialism was originally sold to the people as an ideology it was basically a cult with Hitler as their cult-leader.

	Vitnologi (darwinian)	"Creativity" (nazism)	Christianity
Favored sex			males
Absolute morality		race based	suicidal rules and dogma
Afterlife	Reincarnation		heaven/hell
Target demographics	Young people	White people	all humans
Appealing to	Teens	nazis	the weak
Preferred economic system	Similar to the Nordic model	socialism	
Promotes Sex for pleasure	Strongly	partly	no
Eugenics	Baby quotas, genetic engineering, sexual selection	by government	opposes all forms of it
Dysgenics	Opposes it strongly	via collectivism	promotes it strongly
Abortion, infanticide	Can be justified		opposes it strongly
Contraceptives	Mostly banned for members		opposed
Homosexuality	Fully accepted	views as unnatural	opposed
Diet	Charles Darwin and other great humans	White people	jesus/good/holy_spook
Logical coherence	9 of 10 (not yet finished)	6 of 10	2 of 10
Helping the poor	Weakly opposed		strongly promoted
Monogamy	Opposes it strongly	Promoted	strongly promoted
Goal	Space colonization and social progress, eugenics	a white only earth	more christians
Enemies shall be	Defeated	hated	loved
Ashkenazi Jews	Have valuable genes	jest evil	loved
Circumcision	Banned		promoted
Forced Transitions	Yes (male to female)	no	no
Things you need to avoid	Psychoactive substances, celebacy	race mixing, jews	sexual plasures, nudity

According to creativity(nazism turned into actual religion) this life is the only life which isn't supported by any evidence. There are no valid reasons to believe that this life is the only life, and there are good reasons to assume your current life experience is just a continuation of an infinite series of events.

The [16 commandments of creativity](#) make no sense nor should any other statements be considered holy or infallible. Creativity in general is simply too focused on the white race and Jews. The religion can be summarized with 2 words "nazi garbage".

About christianity

Recently the christian sexual morality turned to the worse, the legal age of consent has been increased a lot in many countries. Christians also seem to hate masturbation and porn and often use pseudoscience to justify that insanity [159](#) a lot of male children get mutilated in the US due to the anti-masturbation insanity (it was supposed to stop masturbation but mostly makes sex miserable).

200+ species are going extinct every day. The entire planet and nature is in bad shape with white christians feeding useless people and helping them breed evermore.

The environment and the population overshoot of useless people is all a combined and accelerated consequence of being tolerant to erroneous and weak-minded whites and enemies for decades upon decades to the point where now:

The notion that people need to be kept alive and even protected from their own stupidity originates from christianity and this has resulted in a lot of bad societal consequences.

The christian bible itself cannot be used to judge whether or christianity is a good thing, we have to look at what christians in general believe and also the secular morality that originates from christianity.

Some christian racists turn to “christian identity”, they argue that whites are the real Jews and reject evolution as a Jewish lie, that should be enough to stay away from the nonsense but of course we also have general problems with christianity on top of these issues.

We should not view whites (unclear who counts as that) as “god's chosen people”. All of humanity is a primitive mess in massive need of improvement, the method used for that (Genetic engineering, war, female sexual selection, forced breeding, starvation, etc) is less important.

Living your life according to a 2000-year-old book that has been translated wrongly several times is retarded, sure some of our old life was better(Viking girls marrying at 12) but we can arrive at much better conclusions using science and logic. The concept of holy infallible scriptures itself is really flawed, in science you simply use models and with time you improve the models in order to get a better explanation of reality.

While newtonian physics is good enough for some applications more accurate models exist such as general relativity, in science you do not assume something is 100% correct.

In general christianity is very anti-nature and also suicidal. In christianity your life on earth is discarded as just a test that will determine if you will end up in fictional heaven or hell (i would prefer hell).

Christianity is just boring in general, you want to live a good life, have awesome sex, have many beautiful children, etc. It's fine if you end up as a female sex-slave in a future life.

If you want to think you will end up in another place after death your best bet is on another planet, this is fully possible that belief is likely to become a lot more common in the future.

You are a retard if you

- 0. Blindly follow bible commands
- 1. Discard evolution as a “Jewish lie”.
- 2. Believe bible stories to be true [160](#) [161](#)
- 3. Do not have sex without being married.

Improving your mental abilities

You improve your mental abilities by doing things that are truly challenging and fun, this can be a hard videogame or a task that requires sustained attention and planning for a very long time.

It's more fun and interesting when your performance has significant real-world consequences. Poker or trading using real money are examples of this, this is somewhat dangerous since you may overestimate your abilities in these areas, in addition you also need to deal with a lot of variance.

One aspect of growing up is you doing tasks where there are no significant consequences of failure, then as you grow up and gain real skills you will be able to take on real-world challenges.

Often there are ways to make videogames more challenging such as playing old videogames at twice the framerate (resulting in twice the speed) or beating the game in a way that wasn't intended.

Logical puzzles such as rubik's cube, slither link and kakuro can also be challenging at first but generally these tasks will be easy once you have figured out the method.

Generally the more fun something is the more challenging it is for your brain, when you get bored due to doing something it's a sign that you are understimulated and your brain needs something better.

About self-confidence

Overestimating your mental abilities can have very bad consequences, often leading to financial ruin or even worse. If you are a bad poker player deluding yourself into thinking you are a winning player you will lose a lot of money.

Underestimating your mental abilities can also result in you missing out due to selling yourself short.

If you think you will be able to revolutionize physics when you lack the required mental abilities you might end up wasting your time on stuff that will not lead anywhere, there is no shortage of totally useless crackpot theories people think are true because they wasted years working on that nonsense.

You can gain a lot from dropping your useless pride and instead focus on stuff you are actually somewhat likely to achieve, that will result in real-world well-being and you will feel good about actually being successful, if something is too hard for you just ask someone else to do it for you, you might have to pay him/her something.

Automation

It's a good thing since it eliminates repetitive work and allows for more fun types of professions to be created. So far automation has made work better and better, it used to be repetitive, dangerous and low-paid but now it's challenging, well-paid and often fun.

Low-IQ people becoming unable to make a living is a good thing, they are not supposed to reproduce anyway.

Sex work

Why work a boring job when you can get paid to be sexually humiliated in many ways?

Sex work allows you to turn a humiliation fetish into a profession.

The advantage with the clear honest exchange is that it gives the male far more power over her via his money, she will have to participate in his sick perversions or she will not get any money, the more money he offers the harder it will be for her to resist. While it is humiliating to participate in porn or prostitution other forms of works are more disgusting and pays far less.

Sex work that involves you physically meeting other individuals does however come with risks, in addition to the possibility of being harmed due to violence you also risk getting infected with Sexually Transmitted Diseases. The risks of sex work can be minimized by sticking to online works (cam-sex) or by instead becoming a sugar baby for a male you have verified are safe.

How to extract resources from men

Long-term relationships are often just glorified prostitution where the female gets resources in exchange for sex, sex that she may still enjoy. Generally prostitution goes against social norms which is why the nature of the exchange is hidden behind marriage sermons and romance bullshit.

You need to go through divorce legislation in your country to examine what's required to divorce rape him [162](#) prenups written can sometimes be invalidated [163](#)

Make him think you two are a team together, manipulate him into taking actions that will be good for you later once you dump that loser. Make him put you as an owner of a house he paid for alone with his money, ask him to pay off any debt you have, manipulate him into giving you expensive gifts.

If you want a free meal you can make him pay for everything. A key part in making this work is to look as good as you can. Wear a dress to all of your dates, heels, use makeup if it makes you prettier. You need to emphasize the difference between you and your date; you are a woman and he is a man. Wear earrings and put on a sexy perfume!

Be a good listener and a good conversationalist. Be interested in them as a person, ask questions, speak softly and in a girly voice, laugh softly, and don't interrupt them. You need to be fun to be around with so that they think that they won't ever think of making you pay the bill because they had a bad time. Even if you feel like the connection isn't there, still be nice to them and treat them well.

If the man you're going out with asks you to split the bill simply tell him that you'll take care of the bill the next time you go out since you prefer taking turns since that's more romantic. Don't appear bitter. Smile as you say this and act feminine! Be sweet, confident, and show him that you desire him non-verbally. 99% of men won't insist that you pay the bill during that time. Of course, there won't be another date. Delete him from the dating app and block his number. You don't need to say anything more to them.

Don't feel guilty about blocking a cheap man. Just remember that men don't feel guilty about using women and playing with their emotions. It's only fair that we reserve the right to block cheap men who won't add value to our lives.

Generally males that are useful when it comes to extracting resources are not actually men you should consider as a sexual partner, thus you may want to use other males for sex/reproduction.

By successfully extracting resources for men you will end up with more freedom when it comes to selecting a sexual partner while still being able to properly support all your children financially, the well-being of your children is more important than what's currently viewed as moral by society.

One issue with relying on men for resources is that this may decentivize you from taking action that will allow you to make money in other ways that don't depend on your fading attractiveness, this is similar to the government welfare trap where you used to getting easy money and thus don't take steps to improve your life long term.

If you have real potential you may benefit from being irrationally hostile to selling your body.

Some people need a male to take care of them

When you are too mentally unfit to function in society and take care of yourself you need to rely on other people for that. If you are female (cis or trans) you can probably find a male that will take care of you and of course also fuck you.

Not everyone can be successful and independent, some individuals need to just be subservient to a master, they exist to be used and give pleasure to other people. This will be the end station for some individuals that transitioned from male to female, better than homelessness i suppose.

You will be spanked when you have been a bad girl and rewarded when you have been a good girl.

Some people just need to give up their useless pride, the thing with self-respect and making your own money didn't work out, the only thing you have left now is your body that will be used by someone else, you better get used to having sex with a male because this is all you will get now.

Sex

Ideal sex requires a powerdynamic where someone is being constantly humiliated and dominated.

Sex is not just about reproduction, it is also about **bondage** and pleasure. A good relationship between the man and the females is good for the female and the children, everyone will benefit from great sexual experiences. ideal sex is humiliating and highly degrading where the one being fucked is powerless at least for the moment, a male pervert being able to do anything he wants to a girl. Just bend over and wait for the dick.

Sex During pregnancy

Since you have already made her pregnant this is a good opportunity to have some non-reproductive fun.

Vaginal sex during pregnancy is safe

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3080531/>

Oral sex

deepthroating requires a long enough penis and a skilled female, if the female is unwilling to perform deepthroating force may have to be used. If a female is new to deepthroating abstaining from food a period before the sex is recommended. The saliva in her throat will be useful as lubricant for anal sex.

She shall be humiliated by having cum in her mouth and swallowing, she has to be a good girl or she will have to be spanked or punished in other ways for misbehaving.

Spanking

Spanking is done with a palm, belt or another flexible object (tubes for watercooling are good). When the female doesn't do a good job deep-throating **physical punishment** is suitable.

When you look down upon the female you fuck the sex will become good and this is why polygamy results in better sex. With polygamy a lot more females will become wives of good-looking psychopaths and males will be forced to take females they dislike as partners resulting in much better sex(spanking and rape)

Anal sex


Anal sex is even more fun when the female doesn't want to have it. If she tries to escape due to pain she has to be restrained in some way such as bending her over a couch armrest or making her lie on the floor with the male over her. If she is still able to resist tape or handcuffs can be used to further restrict her movement.

Males can also enjoy receiving anal sex; if you are born male you will typically have a prostate that will result in very powerful orgasms. Dildos or female fingers can be used instead of actual males.



Impregnation

She will feel a dick inside her going in and out waiting until her pussy is filled with semen with sperm that will move its way towards her eggs. if one impregnation attempt failed she will have to be fucked over and over again until she becomes pregnant, there shouldn't be any way for her to escape pregnancy and childbirth.



For pussy-fucking a cock of big girth is preferable, too long length may actually be a disadvantage here. Giving her a nice orgasm will increase the chance of successful reproduction.

Pregnancy and childbirth

When you are pregnant you will see your breasts grow and feel your child growing inside you.

Childbirth can be very intense, a combination of pain and euphoria.

Pain and hardships

In order to get the full pregnancy experience you also need to feel the pain, the pain of contractions, the pain of childbirth.



Suffering and pain is a natural part of your lives, it allows experiencing reality the fullest. We go out of our way to avoid hurt, dodge danger and prevent hardships. Yet, it is the triumph over frailties or challenges that define us as strong, resilient, mature and experienced.

With pain you notice that there is probably something wrong with your body and then you will be able to take action to protect your own health, the pain itself is a good thing, it's the injury (if any) that is problematic and that you need to focus on treating.

Contrary to popular belief, it appears a little suffering may be good for us. It forces us to solve problems creatively, think differently and explore our own vulnerabilities. What if Bill Gates gave up when his first business failed? What if Rosa Parks had chosen a different seat? What if Bethany Hamilton stopped surfing after she lost her arm in a shark attack?

Suffering a prerequisite for maturation. without it we have no hope but to stay unconscious, infantile and dependent. Suffering allows you to grow as a person to become stronger and more capable.

Researchers have found that life problems force us to think differently and stay intellectually nimble. Finding a new route when a subway line is down, climbing out from under a mountain of debt, figuring out how to get over an ex; all of these little puzzles are miniature mental marathons.

Living as male

As a man every facet of life is a ruthless competition with other men and there is no escaping it besides essentially giving up and maybe turning yourself into a tranny. Being male usually means struggle, you will have to compete against other males for females, humans are not an exception.

Due to technology males are becoming increasingly obsolete and unwanted, the male strength is no longer required by society due to machines. Some males are still required for sex and reproduction but this is a minority, males are currently artificially overvalued due to the monogamy norm.

Males have a very strong sex-drive but when we actually have sex it's usually not that great, just a temporary relief. Some males can rely on only their bodies to attract the females they desire but most can't and end up having to compete for money and status.

The male brain and body allow some males and only males to compete at the highest level, if you are able to make it that far the life as a male will be awesome but most males are crippled with a dysfunctional brain making high-level competition very difficult or even impossible.

Testosterone will make you less emotional in addition to pushing you to take risks, sometimes taking risks work out but usually it ends in failure [164](#) [165](#) [166](#)

Even if you do manage to beat the odds and become highly successful as a man your life will not be easy, you will then be expected to work even harder to maintain your high social status. Having power comes with responsibility, even dictators frequently face bad consequences for screwing up.

Complaining about hardships because of your gender as a male will get you branded as a loser and a misogynist, if you are open about females rejecting you that will signal you are of low value and this will cause both men and women to treat you even worse. Claiming women have it better is viewed as misogyny due to egalitarian dogma since the goal is supposed to be gender equality. You are supposed to believe you are privileged as a male even when that clearly isn't the case.

In social circles guys try to "cock block" each other. They'll sabotage each other's relationships. Some will be a little more subtle in establishing dominance over other guys by trying to make someone the butt of jokes, especially when a woman is present.

In the workplace men snitch on each other, abuse their power to fuck over guys below them, when it comes time for layoffs, hours cuts, or promotions, they'll get extremely cut-throat in their competitiveness. Even minimum wage jobs are like this.

In the military guys get very competitive over promotions and will degrade anyone so much as one rank lower. Homeless guys fight over territory and rob each other over what little they have, the vast majority of murders involve one male murdering another.

In any conflict that involves a man and a woman, men will blindly side with the woman no matter how much evidence is in his favor. Other males are competing against you for reproduction and it's in your interest to screw them over at the first opportunity so you can reproduce while they rot in jail.

This is all instinct-driven. Camaraderie among males is few and far between. Even in situations where all parties would benefit from cooperation and loyalty, men will usually screw each other over if it will get them a slight benefit [167](#)

Due to monogamy getting increasingly unpopular among humans it is getting increasingly difficult for human males to succeed when it comes to mating. In the future dying childless will be the norm if you happen to be male.

Being an alpha male

A lot of people have the wrong idea of what it means to be an alpha male [168](#)

Even the strongest male in the world can be easily defeated by other weaker males working together as a group. You cannot just rely on brute force. If you are too overly aggressive you just end up in jail/hospital if not dead.

If you feel like you want to dominate other people a good outlet for that is sports/games. You can compete on an individual basis against other males without putting your own life at risk. Another appeal with sports is that you are judged by performance instead of things like social popularity, this can serve as a refuge from the bigger society that isn't very meritocratic. Another outlet for the male power fantasy is watching movies/similar where the main character has magical powers.

Just being stronger than anyone else may work in sports but it will not actually work in real-world combat since then several weak people can gang up on you. You end up having to rely on other people (such as police) for your security and unfortunately that doesn't always pan out too well.

You can still benefit from being ruthless as a leader but then you need to play the cards right, one bad move and you may lose your power and find yourself in a really bad situation.

Being a true alpha male will also involve taking care of other people making it beneficial for other people to follow you.

You do need to be tough to protect the people you are leading, if you are weak you will not be a good leader and then you should be replaced by someone else.

You have the true alpha male role if you do not have anyone above you that can overrule you. This essentially requires you to become a dictator which isn't very realistic. Instead you end up having to go for something less like ruling the area together with other people or becoming a successful business leader, in these cases you still need to play by rules set by other people and you cannot really do what you want.

Even as dictator you still need to please people you are leading.

Reproducing as a male

Alpha males can also be defined as males enjoying high amount of reproductive success, this can be by donating sperm to a sperm bank which might not be what most people view as an alpha male.

There are several factors including luck that determine whether or not you manage to impregnate females as a male. By making yourself more attractive you can increase the probability of finding a willing female to impregnate, this will make things significantly easier.

You need to figure out what females are attracted to and take actions based on that information. By increasing your income by a factor of 10 you will raise your attractiveness by 2 on a 10 point scale [21](#) in addition you will now have the resources required to properly support all your children.

You also need to focus on females where the probability of successful reproduction is higher, otherwise you might end up wasting resources and time on a female who doesn't actually want to have any children. If she is unwilling to have reproductive sex you need should start looking for other girls to impregnate instead, you need to seriously consider breaking up with her since it can be difficult to have sex with other girls behind her back, go for a clean breakup instead unless you have very good reasons to stay with her.

You increase the probability of finding a suitable female for sex by interacting a lot with females, both online and offline, you might have to talk to 10000 females before you find anyone who is interested in a reproductive relationship, just keep going until you are successful.

Significant improvement from plastic surgery is rare and often not worth the cost and risk.

If you are unable to find a willing female in your current location you might have to change to a location where it's easier such as a poor country where you will be able to better leverage your resources in exchange for reproduction.

Living as a female

When you are a human female you will be an object a lot of people desire, especially if you have attractive features such as E-cup breasts.

When you are a woman you should get a kick out of being sexy, wearing revealing clothing to show off your beautiful body. Seeing males looking at you and wanting you.

Sex as a women can be really awesome, the orgasm will be a lot more intense than the typical male orgasm and it will last a lot longer, you can even get multiple orgasms.


A lot of males will be desperate for your body and you can use that to your advantage, you can manipulate them into giving you things of value (help, money, gifts, etc) while giving nothing (or very little) in return to them in terms of sex and reproduction, then you can get pregnant by someone else.

Reproducing as a woman

A lot of women end up dying childless (ultimate failure) due to following harmful moral dogma instead of looking after themselves and future generations.

Your focus as a female shall be to find a male suitable for becoming the biological and legal father of your children, someone suited for reproduction and parental authority, most males are not.

A monogamous relationship requires you to find someone willing to commit to you and establishing a relationship like that can take a lot of time. If it doesn't work out with the guy you may have ended up wasting your last years of fertility with him and you will not be able to have the child you wanted. If you are lesbian this is not even an option unless your partner is trans (if she still has fertility or sperm is backed up). This option is good for a small minority of the female population able to make a male of very high quality commit to them.





Reproduction via sperm bank isn't a very good option either since you cannot meet your donor or contact him, your children cannot contact him until they are 18. This can also become very expensive so it's not something i recommend.

There are plenty of males willing to make you pregnant and potentially end up having to pay child-support. Many males have a strong biological drive to reproduce (not just sex) and this may drive them to have sex knowing they might end up with expenses later.



Reproduction via deception

you do not tell him you are not on birth control, some people incorrectly view this as immoral, the genetics of your child is far more important than being honest with horny males that are willing to creampie you.

You can use the threat of charging for child-support to make sure he doesn't try to get involved in you raising the child. I have seen several females on whisper that write that they do not even want his money, they just want him to go away and not get involved with the child.

Even if you are a lesbian you should still reproduce by letting a male fuck if you are unable to find a suitable transbian to make you pregnant, it will be very humiliating but it will allow you to become pregnant for free by a male of high quality, just lie about being on birth-control to spermjack him.

Even if you are not attracted to a male you can still enjoy the sex by focusing on your own body instead of the male asshole who is fucking you.

Dealing with gender roles

There are many differences between the genders. Only females can get pregnant, breastfeed and give birth which is why males have historically sacrificed themselves to protect females. Males have always been disposable and this is completely natural

Males have to compete against other males for females, as monogamy is getting abandoned the competition will get more and more ruthless. More and more males will fail to live up to the standard and will thus be weeded out from the gene pool.

You may not like the gender roles of your gender but biology limits what you can do, in order to truly excel at something you pretty much have to be male (**better brain** & stronger body) but if you want to make babies you have to be born female.

Cultural gender roles are emergent from genetic, cultural and societal evolution. Human brains do not fall into distinct gender categories [169](#) [170](#) and gender conformance isn't always beneficial.

It's actually more important to have a beautiful face as a male but females are the ones buying most of the make-up, males instead tend to focus on bodybuilding. Your soul/brain doesn't have a gender [171](#) intersex study has refuted the notion of gender identity being fixed at birth [172](#) [173](#) [174](#) [175](#) [176](#) most people simply do not wish to transition medically due to how difficult and detrimental it can be.

Biological sex

Biological sex is best described as a bimodal distribution, most people are clearly male **xor** clearly female but there are a lot of exceptions to this where it isn't clear which of the sexes they would belong to if you insist on a binary model.

<https://vintologi.com/threads/about-the-gender-binary.846/>

Human chromosomes are not just XX or XY and they not always predict which sex-characteristics someone would develop. Instead human sexual characteristics are largely determined by Hormones and your body's response to them.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2190741/>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Androgen_insensitivity_syndrome

The binary notion of biological sex is especially harmful towards intersex people since it will put them in danger of genital mutilation [59](#)

Biological sex can be divided into "reproductive sex" which refers to the reproductive abilities of your body and "secondary sex-characteristics". Neither or these would make biological sex binary.

About transsexualism

Medical transition such as by **injecting estradiol** will affect both your reproductive abilities (which is generally a bad thing) and your secondary sex-characteristics and thus alter your biological sex. It is not just a matter of a cosmetic change, it will affect all aspects of your body including your brain.

You may wish you weren't born as a particular gender but the only way to truly transition all the way from male to female (or female to male) is to die and reincarnate. Current medical transition options are good when it comes to offering the sexual experiences (including multiple full-body orgasms) females get to enjoy by default but when it comes to reproduction there are no good options available.

You cannot produce eggs as trans female and womb transplants for trans females are still not available, breastfeeding is possible but difficult [177](#)

There are many potential benefits from transitioning from male to female

0. sexual excitement from having a feminine body.
1. the superiority of female aesthetics.
2. access to the transbian dating pool.
3. multiple orgasms from penile stimulation.
4. full body orgasms.
5. you will feel emotions stronger and be happier on estrogen.
6. your breasts will become sensitive.
7. being able to attract cis lesbians (if you become attractive enough).
8. being able to attract high-quality males for sex.
9. softer skin and less/no acne.
10. live longer <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/accel.12170>
11. being able to extract resources from males.
12. you will no longer be driven to do dangerous and idiotic things due to testosterone.
13. stop and reverse hair loss [178](#) [179](#)
14. people will treat you better if they think you are female [180](#) [181](#) [182](#)
15. less likely to get killed <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5551594/>
16. access to female spaces (males are disgusting).
17. cheaper car insurance.

How medical transition affects mating options

Since females have the upper hand on the dating market transitioning from male to female will usually improve your options when it comes to getting sex. In addition the sex you enjoy as a female will be of higher quality. The opposite is true for females transitioning to male.

Your sexuality may switch on hormone replacement therapy [183](#) if your sexuality stays the same you always have the option of dating trans girls, there are also plenty of cis girls willing to date trans girls. You also have the option of dating other trans girls.

Becoming MtF transsexual is a way better option than being involuntarily celibate as a male [184](#) [185](#) if you do not have [autogynephilia](#) as an incel you can try to induce it. You can watch porn and imagine yourself as the female, there is also female POV porn you can try.

Many AFAB individuals who transition to male regret it due to the social implications [186](#)

How to transition

If you do not currently feel like living as a female you might have to work on fixing that. Identifying as male or being emotionally attached to a male body is bad for you if being male results in you living a bad life.

step0: Begin voice-training so you will get a 'female' voice.

Step1: watch Yamada-kun to 7-nin no Majo.

step1: watch Kashimashi girl meets girl.

step2: watch Tatsuwan birdy decode.

step3: watch Kämpfer.

step4: watch Interspecies Reviewers Episode 3

step5: If you still don't feel like becoming a girl watch tsf monogatari and residence.

step6: if you play videogames make sure to use a female character [187](#)

step7: Go to a gender clinic if you need an official diagnosis at some point.

step8: Bank your sperm.

step9: Start hormone replacement therapy [188](#)

step10: Removal of unwanted hair.

step11: Facial feminization surgery (if needed).

step12: Social transition [189](#)



If you have been a sissy/similar in the past it's time to stop now, you can do better than that. This will be significantly easier on female hormones which is part of the reason sissies often benefit from them.

Life outcomes of people that transition

Trans-women that are supported by their parents have good life outcomes [190](#) as society becomes more accepting of trans-women the outcomes of people that transition from male to female will improve.



Already today people that transition male to female do better than female to male [191](#)

Trans-women will benefit from the increasing female privilege, thus in the future more males will benefit from transitioning while it becomes less beneficial for females to transition to male despite trans-men becoming more accepted by society. Transitioning from male to female can be a very good experience

While HRT will halt further bone-masculinization it will not revert masculinization of bones that is already taken place usually making it very difficult to pass as a female if born male after the age of 20.

Jaw bones fuse typically between 14-16 in people born female and 17-21 in people born male, but the forehead/browbones and hip bones fuse around 24-25. Thus proper sex-change requires early HRT.

Estrogenized male vs trans female

Often when people transition from male to female their goal is to become as feminine as possible and this may include surgery to replace a functional penis with something that looks like a vagina but isn't actually capable of giving birth. The ability to produce sperm is lost but no ability to produce eggs is gained. The brain itself will be feminized over time shrunken to female proportions [192](#)

<https://genderanalysis.net/2018/03/your-mileage-may-vary-trans-women-and-erectile-function/>

HRT will negatively affect athletic performance making it harder for you to build or even maintain your male strength [193](#) the longer you stay on HRT the weaker you become [194](#)

Trying to be just like a cis female is a futile exercise, even if you transition early you will still never be able to get pregnant and give birth, breastfeeding will be possible but difficult [177](#) If your bones are already masculine there will not be any easy way to 'fix' that if it can be fixed at all.

But there is another way, rather than trying to be like a cis dyadic female why look at what's actually best for you given your biology and personal circumstances. What if you do not have to give up your fertility and male brain?

The feminizing effect of HRT on appearance will have diminishing returns over time, therefore you need to ask yourself if continuing it is worth the price, what are you actually gaining from that?

Medical transition and reproduction

Both sperm and egg are required for biological reproduction, thus two cis females can not have a biological child together but a trans female can impregnate a cis female (such as via banked sperm).

By banking sperm you may be able to have children even if you never get your natural fertility back but this is not really that great of a solution since then you end up having to depend on that particular sperm bank, it will not be a particularly practical way to have biological children. Your sperm would be trapped in a single location and depend on the constant maintenance of the sperm bank.

Azoospermia caused by HRT is often reversible provided you still have your testicles.

By only using HRT for a limited period of time you will hopefully be able to retain your natural fertility allowing you to have biological children from sex. There are drugs such as clomiphene citrate that may be helpful in restoring fertility [195](#) but that may not even be needed.

The same is not true for FtM, if you are born female transitioning will instead make reproduction a lot more difficult, especially if you want to do it with a male of high quality. Banking eggs (often very expensive) isn't enough, a working womb to implant them in will still be required, surrogacy is expensive and also illegal in a lot of places.

Other reasons to stop HRT

By returning to your natural male hormones you will be able to restore your male abilities such as having a fully functioning male penis (rather than girl-dick) you will be able to become physically strong again, your brain will start becoming masculine again.

Your breasts and other feminine traits will be retained and thus you will to a large extent get the best of both worlds.

You need to ask yourself if having a mostly female biological sex is really beneficial for you.

Facial Feminization Surgery

Unfortunately HRT alone is often very ineffective in feminizing the face, especially if it's only temporary. Therefore we need something more powerful and it's here surgery comes into play.

FFS unlike HRT will not feminize your entire biology, instead the change will be purely cosmetic meaning you could in theory rely mostly on FFS to pass as a female without having to constantly be on medication.

Unfortunately surgeons will typically only make minor alterations to the face but there are doctors who are willing to make a lot more radical intervention to archive facial feminization. If your bones are masculine changing that to something feminine will be very difficult even with surgery.

Avoiding social difficulties while transitioning

You should transition medically for yourself, people close to you should be a lesser priority and politics the last priority. You should regard it as a body modification similar to "bodybuilding". This is the only sensible approach if you value your social life, integrity, and self-respect.

If you believe that there is an "innate gender" which is unrelated to biology or society then you will inevitably create social problems for yourself. People might understand that one might want to be (or look like) a woman, but almost everyone takes "born in the wrong body" as a joke, especially if you were not previously flamboyant.

You do not have to conform to female gender stereotypes to be valid as a woman, it's about having female secondary sexual characteristics. You function socially like a female after transitioning is simply about convenience since you look like one and it's not just looks, your biological characteristics (hormones, breasts, brain, etc) will be more on the female side too.

You might think that you are a girl trapped in a male body but this will be scientifically incorrect prior to HRT [196](#) [197](#) [198](#) you having a feminine personality doesn't make you a girl [51](#)

You do not have to come out in any way to your family or other people who know your real identity.

If you do not look and are socially regarded as a woman, claiming that you are a woman in the inside and that people should respect your innate gender regardless of how you look is meaningless and futile. This at best makes people pity you and at worst makes them mock and bully you. The situation worsens if you dress in women's clothing but still look like a man. This should be avoided first and foremost out of self-respect, and second out of respect for fellow trans people. You will also hurt yourself for thinking that people do not treat you the way you should be treated.

Whether or not you should transition isn't something you should discuss with people who have not properly researched these topics, most people including your family will be utterly ignorant and thus they will not be able to give you any real help. If you announce that you plan or think about transitioning people around you may push or outright coerce you into not doing so even though it would be beneficial for you.

Thus the solution is to start medication without telling anyone about it that knows your real identity, later if/when they start noticing changes you can tell them that you are transitioning. If they find out they will probably realize it's too late and thus not intervene in an attempt to make you detransition.

Leaving your old life behind to live like a cis female

If you currently live in a transphobic environment you may want to relocate before socially transitioning. You may want to just leave everything behind to start a new better life somewhere else.

Going for a nonbinary gender presentation is not really that great if your environment is transphobic forcing you to boymode instead.

If you cannot move to a tolerant area you may have to delay social transition until you can fully pass as a female and then hide your sex as birth from as many people as possible. You also need to have a solid female voice and also develop female-passing manners/movements. It's not just about physical appearance.

0. Do not post your trans timeline online, if you want validation just pose as a cis female.
1. Delay your social transition until you can pass.
2. Put a lot of effort into voice-training
3. Move to a new area and begin a new social life there as you begin your social transition, of course you can decide against this but then there will be more people who can out you.
4. Do not be too promiscuous since having sex will out you as transgender to that partner, this is very often the case even if you have had SRS since neovaginas do not look the same as natural vaginas.
5. Change your name to something very different from your old male name.
6. Legally change your sex so people cannot see that you were born male when you show them your ID-card or drivers license.
7. Make sure you are fully anonymous when you participate in some space online trans spaces such as the [transmaxxing discord](#). It's important not to disclose too much personal information to people since that might allow other people to figure out who you are just from that. It's especially important to be careful if the space you participate in as a trans female is public allowing anyone to go there and read what you have written, minimize your posting there, especially if you only use one account.
8. Obviously do not shower naked with strangers since that can out you as transgender even if you have had SRS.
9. Do not disclose your identity at first to people you have sex with (since they will see you have a penis). Meet them at their location and do not bring your ID with you. Use the fake alias you set up on the dating app/site and not your real legal name.

real-life practice

You do not necessarily have to switch to living stealth as a trans female right away. Often you can start with a more basic social transition for learning things like normal female behavior to compensate for the fact that you were socialized like a male before that point which is very different from the typical female socialization. Another option is to simply socially transition to be a female online and use that to master a female-passing voice and learn other social manners beneficial for females.

Some gender clinics recommend or even try to outright coerce people into presenting as the opposite sex for years before they are given access to HRT. The obvious issue with that is that without any surgery or HRT you will probably not pass well at all as female and thus you will become a public clown, that will not be the experience you have if you actually transition medically and are able to pass as female in social situations.

While people may tolerate you presenting as a female while looking like a male most people will not actually treat you as a female if you try to do that [199](#) instead most people will regard you as a "man in a dress" and people will find reasons to dismiss you. You will still be subjected to anti-male double standards. You may also experience outright bigotry just for being transgender.

It is also very much ideal for learning how to behave as a female in order to not stand out since people will see that you are a male and treat you as such rather than thinking you are just some non-trans female with male mannerisms.

Who actually benefit from medical transition?

There is decent evidence in favor of MtF hormone replacement therapy. The following study showed statistically significant benefit from MtF transition but not FtM transition (quality of life):

<https://sci-hub.mkksa.top/https://doi.org/10.1080/15532739.2014.899174>

MtF prior to transitioning

Body Image scale, 43.25

Quality of Life scale, 62.50

Quality of Sexual Life scale, 56.25

Interpersonal Relationship scale, 50.25

MtF after transition

Body Image subscale average score was 68.75 ($p < 0.05$)

Quality of Life score was 72.2 ($p < 0.05$)

Quality of Sexual Life scale score was 62.05 ($p < 0.05$)

The Interpersonal Relationship scale reported an average score of 75 ($p < 0.05$)

FtM comparison

Despite being significantly more dysphoric prior to transitioning they did not improve as much in terms of quality of life. It seems like AFAB individuals were more reluctant to transition (less of them in the study, more dysphoric) but the ones that actually transitioned were very happy with the physical results regarding their bodies.

MtF Body image: +25.5

FtM body image: +41.4

MtF quality of life: +9.7

FtM quality of life: +5.5

FtM prior to transitioning

Body Image scale, 21.85;

Quality of Life scale, 63.25

Quality of Sexual Life scale, 50.25

Interpersonal Relationship scale, 50.02.

FtM after transition

Body Image subscale score was 63.25 ($p < 0.05$)

the average Quality of Life score was 68.75 ($p = ns$)

the average Quality of Sexual Life scale score was 56.25 ($p = ns$)

the Interpersonal Relationship scale average score was 81.25 ($p < 0.05$).

Most MtF individuals in the study probably didn't pass

There is a rather obvious explanation for why their social relationships did not improve as much as FtM individuals, it was difficult for them to pass as the opposite sex. While MtF HRT will halt further masculinization of the face it will not do much do reverse masculinization that already took place.

Age: 32.7±8.8 yr

Height: 172±7.38 cm

Long-term outcomes

The study above only lasted a year. We do however have the following study showing the yearly suicide attempt rate to drastically drop from 27% to 1% after medical transition.


<https://www.erudit.org/en/journals/ss/2013-v59-n1-ss0746/1017478ar/>

Social inclusion, transphobia or transition factor	Frequency in trans population N=433		Proportions with past-year suicidal ideation		Proportion attempting suicide in past year	
	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	%	95% CI
Social support						
Low: 1-3	35	(27, 44)	39	(28, 55)	16	(8, 28)
Medium: >3 to 4	32	(24, 39)	31	(17, 44)	9	(2, 17)
High: >4 to 5	34	(27, 42)	32	(21, 47)	2	(0, 5)
Strong parental support for gender						
Yes	28	(22, 37)	19	(9, 31)	2	(0, 5)
No	72	(63, 78)	44	(32, 54)	15	(7, 25)
Transphobia						
Low: 0-11	39	(31, 46)	24	(13, 36)	6	(0, 15)
Medium: >11 to 22	51	(43, 58)	39	(29, 50)	10	(4, 16)
High: >22	11	(6, 17)	55	(27, 79)	22	(4, 44)
History of workplace discrimination						
Yes	35	(27, 42)	41	(30, 59)	9	(3, 17)
No	66	(58, 74)	31	(22, 42)	13	(4, 22)
Transphobic harassment and violence						
None	46	(38, 55)	28	(18, 40)	4	(1, 10)
Verbal harassment or threats	34	(28, 42)	35	(23, 49)	8	(2, 15)
Physical or sexual assault	20	(13, 25)	56	(40, 74)	29	(12, 47)
Medical transition status						
Have medically transitioned	26	(19, 34)	23	(12, 36)	1	(0, 3)
In process	24	(18, 30)	41	(28, 58)	18	(7, 30)
Planning, but not begun	26	(20, 34)	55	(34, 70)	27	(6, 40)
Not planning / unsure / does not apply	24	(16, 31)	23	(10, 40)	3	(0, 7)

We also have the following study showing the rate of hospitalization to drastically drop over time after transgender surgery further indicating that long-term outcomes are better than short-term outcomes.

<https://sci-hub.se/10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.20050599>

People are required to be screened for mental health problems before gender-affirming surgery and might therefore have particularly high odds of mental health treatment in the perioperative year because of their perhaps involuntary receipt of mental health services. These individuals might be less likely to voluntarily seek treatment for mental health problems with greater time since surgery.



<https://sci-hub.mkksa.top/10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.20050599>

The study itself says "hospitalization for suicide attempt" and it's unclear if or how many of these "hospitalizations" (worse than jail) was due to the fact that these people were forced into psychotherapy and psychiatric screening which would expose them to the predatory and unethical mental health industry.

5-year follow up survey : transition is beneficial for AMAB people
 Clinicians did report improvement less often than the patients but MtF transition was still found to be beneficial even when judged by judging by the clinicians.

<https://sci-hub.hkvisa.net/10.1007/s10508-009-9551-1>

Only MtF transition had a statistically significant benefit when judged by the clinicians.

Table 4 The patients' statements according to the follow-up interview concerning satisfaction with the SR process and outcome in regard to work, partner relationships, and sex life

	MF	FM	All
SR process as a whole	<i>n</i> = 25	<i>n</i> = 17	<i>n</i> = 42
Satisfied	24 (96%)	16 (94.1%)	40 (95.2%)
Neither/nor	0	0	0
Dissatisfied	1 (4%)	1 (5.9%)	2 (4.8%)
Work situation	<i>n</i> = 23	<i>n</i> = 15	<i>n</i> = 38
Better	9 (39.1%)	8 (53.3%)	17 (44.7%)
Unchanged	11 (47.8%)	7 (46.7%)	18 (47.4%)
Worsened	3 (13.1%)	0	3 (7.9%)
Partner relations	<i>n</i> = 23	<i>n</i> = 14	<i>n</i> = 37
Better	16 (69.6%)	7 (50%)	23 (62.2%)
Unchanged	5 (21.7%)	6 (42.9%)	11 (29.7%)
Worsened	2 (8.7%)	1 (7.1%)	3 (8.1%)
Sex life	<i>n</i> = 24	<i>n</i> = 16	<i>n</i> = 40
Better	16 (66.7%)	12 (75%)	28 (70%)
Unchanged	6 (25%)	4 (25%)	10 (25%)
Worsened	2 (8.3%)	0	2 (5%)

Table 3 Clinicians' evaluation of global outcome, in relation to sex and type of TS

	MF <i>n</i> = 25	FM <i>n</i> = 17	Early-onset TS <i>n</i> = 26	Late-onset TS <i>n</i> = 16	Homosex orientation <i>n</i> = 29	Non-homosex <i>n</i> = 13
Improved	18 (72%) ^a	8 (47%)	15 (57.6%)	11 (68.8%)	17 (58.6%)	9 (69.2%)
Unchanged	5 (20%)	5 (29.4%)	8 (30.7%)	2 (12.5%)	8 (27.6%)	2 (15.4%)
Worsened	2 (8%)	4 (23.5%)	3 (11.5%)	3 (18.7%)	4 (13.8%)	2 (15.4%)

^a Student's *t*-test *p* = .04

Here homosexual and heterosexual refers to sexual orientation relative to the birth-sex which is somewhat transphobic.

As we see sexual orientation does not seem to be an important factor when it comes to whether or not the transition will be beneficial.

The MtF transsexuals of this study all started at age 21 or later.

The advantage with going on the judgement by the clinicians is that these will be less emotionally invested into the transition than the patients. There is a very real risk that patients will regard their transition as having improved their lives when that wasn't the case since people in general often have a hard time admitting they did a grave mistake like that.

Table 1 Description of the follow-up group

Description	Male-to-female (MF) <i>n</i> = 25 (59.5%) <i>M</i> (Range)	Female-to-male (FM) <i>n</i> = 17 (40.5%) <i>M</i> (Range)	Total <i>n</i> = 42 <i>M</i> (Range)
Age at index (in years)	37.3 (21–60) ^a	27.8 (18–46)	33.4 (18–60)
Age at SRS (in years)	38.2 (22–57) ^b	31.4 (22–49)	35.2 (22–57)
Age at follow-up (in years)	46.0 (25–69) ^b	38.9 (28–53)	43.1 (25–69)
	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)
Early-onset transsexualism	11 (44) ^a	15 (88.2)	26 (61.9)
Late-onset transsexualism	14 (56) ^a	2 (11.8)	16 (38.1)
Homosexual orientation	13 (52) ^a	16 (94.1)	29 (69.1)
Completed SRS	18 (72) ^{ns}	14 (82.4)	32 (76.2)

^a Student's *t*-test *p* < .01^b Student's *t*-test *p* < .05

10-year follow up survey: people do better after transitioning

The sample comprised 71 participants (35 MtF and 36 FtM). The follow-up period was 10–24 years with a mean of 13.8 years (SD = 2.78)

<https://sci-hub.hkvisa.net/10.1007/s10508-014-0453-5>

Table 1 Comparison of SCL-90-R values at initial consultation and at follow-up (*n* = 62)

Scale of SCL-90-R	Initial consultation		Follow-up		<i>p</i>	ES
	M	SD	M	SD		
Somatization ^a	0.39	0.48	0.31	0.41	ns	
Obsessive-compulsive ^a	0.58	0.59	0.32	0.45	.001	0.50
Interpersonal sensitivity ^a	0.70	0.67	0.26	0.34	<.001	0.82
Depression ^a	0.70	0.67	0.32	0.45	<.001	0.67
Anxiety ^a	0.47	0.55	0.18	0.36	<.001	0.63
Hostility ^a	0.49	0.58	0.22	0.40	<.001	0.54
Phobic anxiety ^a	0.30	0.51	0.14	0.31	.004	0.38
Paranoid ideation ^a	0.65	0.70	0.37	0.53	<.001	0.44
Psychoticism ^a	0.53	0.59	0.16	0.32	<.001	0.77
Global Severity Index ^a	0.53	0.49	0.28	0.36	<.001	0.58

^a Absolute range, 0–4

None of the participants expressed a desire for gender-role reversal (*n* = 69), and when asked about how often they had doubts about their present gender role, participants answered with a mean of 4.70 (SD = 0.71; *n* = 70) on a rating scale from 1 (“continuously”) to 5 (“never”).

Satisfaction with one's own appearance was again rated on a 5-point scale and was 4.46 (SD = 0.86; *n* = 70) on average.

Table 2 Comparison of IIP values at initial consultation and at follow-up (*n* = 54/55)

Scale of IIP	Initial consultation		Follow-up		<i>p</i>	ES
	M	SD	M	SD		
Domineering/controlling ^a	5.76	5.17	3.67	3.66	.003	0.47
Vindictive/self-centered ^a	7.82	5.13	4.91	4.00	<.001	0.63
Cold/distant ^a	8.17	5.48	4.37	4.68	<.001	0.75
Socially inhibited ^a	10.44	7.22	5.47	6.08	<.001	0.74
Nonassertive ^a	10.69	7.13	6.29	6.01	<.001	0.67
Overly accommodating ^a	11.64	5.99	7.04	4.73	<.001	0.85
Self-sacrificing ^a	10.49	5.33	7.55	5.05	<.001	0.57
Intrusive/needy ^a	7.96	5.04	4.53	3.83	<.001	0.77

^a Absolute range, 0–32**Table 3** Comparison of FPI-R values at initial consultation and at follow-up (*n* = 58)

Scale of FPI-R	Initial consultation		Follow-up		<i>p</i>	ES
	M	SD	M	SD		
Life satisfaction ^a	4.43	2.99	8.31	2.63	<.001	1.38
Social orientation ^a	7.52	2.35	7.00	2.43	ns	
Need for achievement ^a	6.95	2.60	6.98	2.81	ns	
Shyness ^a	5.09	3.09	4.71	3.08	ns	
Irritability ^a	4.78	3.12	4.05	2.94	.032	0.24
Aggressiveness ^a	3.59	3.01	3.19	2.25	ns	
Stress ^a	4.84	3.76	4.67	3.42	ns	
Physical troubles ^a	2.59	2.63	2.07	1.94	ns	
Health sorrows ^a	4.29	3.01	4.81	2.81	ns	
Openness ^a	6.43	2.41	5.79	2.31	.033	0.27
Extraversion ^b	6.26	3.80	6.00	3.46	ns	
Emotionality ^b	6.09	3.43	4.05	3.27	<.001	0.61

^a Absolute range, 0–12^b Absolute range, 0–14

Multivariate regression: HRT is beneficial

HRT has been found to be beneficial after adjusting for potential confounding factors in multiple studies. People who got access to HRT before 18 also did better than the one who got HRT later after adjusting for various confounding factors

	Participants who Accessed GAH											
	N = 12,598											
	Accessed GAH at Age 14 or 15				Accessed GAH at Age 16 or 17				Accessed GAH at Age ≥ 18			
	n = 119				n = 362				n = 12257			
OR (95% CI)	p	aOR (95% CI)	p	OR (95% CI)	p	aOR (95% CI)	p	OR (95% CI)	p	aOR (95% CI)	p	
Suicidality (Past 12 months)												
Past-year suicidal ideation ^a	0.5 (0.3–0.7)	.0001	0.4 (0.2–0.6)	<.0001	1.0 (0.8–1.2)	.73	0.5 (0.4–0.7)	<.0001	0.5 (0.5–0.6)	<.0001	0.8 (0.7–0.8)	<.0001
Past-year suicidal ideation with plan ^b	1.3 (0.8–2.4)	.31	0.8 (0.4–1.6)	.58	1.1 (0.9–1.5)	.41	0.9 (0.7–1.2)	.49	0.8 (0.8–0.9)	<.0001	0.9 (0.8–1.0)	.09
Past-year suicide attempt ^c	1.0 (0.5–2.2)	.99	0.4 (0.2–1.1)	.08	1.4 (1.0–2.0)	.04	0.9 (0.6–1.4)	.79	0.8 (0.8–0.9)	.002	1.0 (0.9–1.1)	.89
Past-year suicide attempt requiring inpatient hospitalization ^d	--	--	--	--	2.2 (1.2–4.0)	.01	2.2 (1.2–4.2)	.01	1.4 (1.1–1.7)	.002	1.2 (0.9–1.5)	.26
Mental Health & Substance Use												
Past-month severe psychological distress (K6 ≥ 13) ^e	0.5 (0.3–0.7)	.0004	0.3 (0.2–0.4)	<.0001	0.6 (0.5–0.8)	<.0001	0.3 (0.3–0.4)	<.0001	0.4 (0.3–0.4)	<.0001	0.6 (0.5–0.6)	<.0001
Past-month binge drinking ^e	1.6 (1.1–2.3)	.02	1.6 (1.0–2.4)	.04	0.8 (0.6–1.1)	.17	0.9 (0.6–1.1)	.27	1.2 (1.1–1.2)	<.0001	1.2 (1.1–1.3)	<.0001
Lifetime illicit drug use ^f	1.8 (1.2–2.6)	.003	1.5 (1.0–2.2)	.08	1.2 (1.0–1.6)	.08	1.3 (1.0–1.6)	.07	2.1 (1.9–2.2)	<.0001	1.7 (1.6–1.8)	<.0001

Mental health outcomes of transgender adults who recalled access to gender-affirming hormones (GAH) during various age groups. Reference group for all analyses is participants who desired GAH but did not access them. All models adjusted for age, partnership status, employment status, K-12 harassment, and having experienced gender identity conversion efforts.

Abbreviations: OR (odds ratio), aOR (adjusted odds ratio), 95% CI (95% confidence interval).

^a Model also adjusted for gender identity, sex assigned at birth, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, family support of gender identity, educational attainment, and total household income.

^b Model also adjusted for sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, educational attainment, and total household income.

^c Model also adjusted for gender identity, sex assigned at birth, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, family support of gender identity, educational attainment, total household income, and having received pubertal suppression.

^d Model also adjusted for family support of gender identity. Only one participant in the GAH < 16 group endorsed a past-year suicide attempt requiring inpatient hospitalization, precluding calculation of an aOR for this outcome.

^e Model also adjusted for gender identity, sex assigned at birth, sexual orientation, family support of gender identity, educational attainment, and total household income.

^f Model also adjusted for gender identity, sex assigned at birth, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, family support of gender identity, and educational attainment.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0261039.t002>

Statistically significant difference was found with regard to "past-year suicidal ideation" which was adjusted for gender identity, sex assigned at birth, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, family support of gender identity, educational attainment, total household income.

Statistically significant difference with regard to "past-month severe psychological distress" was found after adjusting for gender identity, sex assigned at birth, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, family support of gender identity, educational attainment, total household income, having received pubertal suppression.

In both cases the statistical significance was $p < 0.0001$ when compared to people who never started HRT, you will only find a difference (in either direction) that large less than once in 10000.

<https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0261039>

	Accessed GAH at Age 14–17				Accessed GAH at Age 14 or 15			
	(compared to GAH access at age ≥ 18)				(compared to GAH access at age 16 or 17)			
	n = 481				n = 119			
	OR (95% CI)	p	aOR (95% CI)	p	OR (95% CI)	p	aOR (95% CI)	p
Suicidality (Past 12 months)								
Past-year suicidal ideation ^a	1.5 (1.3–1.8)	< .0001	0.7 (0.6–0.9)	.0007	0.5 (0.3–0.8)	.002	0.7 (0.4–1.2)	.16
Past-year suicidal ideation with plan ^b	1.4 (1.1–1.8)	.009	1.1 (0.8–1.5)	.51	1.2 (0.6–2.3)	.58	1.0 (0.5–1.9)	.88
Past-year suicide attempt ^c	1.6 (1.2–2.2)	.003	1.0 (0.7–1.4)	.82	0.7 (0.3–1.6)	.40	0.4 (0.1–1.3)	.12
Past-year suicide attempt requiring inpatient hospitalization ^d	1.3 (0.7–2.3)	.35	1.7 (0.9–3.2)	.08	0.2 (0.0–1.6)	.13	0.2 (0.0–2.1)	.19
Mental Health & Substance Use								
Past-month severe psychological distress (K6 ≥ 13) ^e	1.7 (1.4–2.0)	< .0001	0.6 (0.5–0.8)	< .0001	0.8 (0.5–1.2)	.26	0.7 (0.4–1.3)	.30
Past-month binge drinking ^e	0.9 (0.7–1.1)	.17	0.7 (0.5–0.9)	.001	1.9 (1.2–3.0)	.006	2.0 (1.2–3.5)	.01
Lifetime illicit drug use ^f	0.7 (0.5–0.8)	< .001	0.7 (0.5–0.8)	.0003	1.4 (0.9–2.3)	.10	1.0 (0.6–1.7)	.98

All models adjusted for age, partnership status, employment status, K-12 harassment, and having experienced gender identity conversion efforts.

Abbreviations: OR (odds ratio), aOR (adjusted odds ratio), 95% CI (95% confidence interval).

^a Model also adjusted for gender identity, sex assigned at birth, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, family support of gender identity, educational attainment, and total household income.

^b Model also adjusted for sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, educational attainment, and total household income.

^c Model also adjusted for gender identity, sex assigned at birth, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, family support of gender identity, educational attainment, total household income, and having received pubertal suppression.

^d Model also adjusted for family support of gender identity.

^e Model also adjusted for gender identity, sex assigned at birth, sexual orientation, family support of gender identity, educational attainment, and total household income.

^f Model also adjusted for gender identity, sex assigned at birth, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, family support of gender identity, and educational attainment.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0261039.t004>

After adjusting for demographic and potential confounding variables, access to GAH during adolescence (ages 14–17) was associated with lower odds of past-month severe psychological distress (aOR = 0.6, 95% CI = 0.5–0.8, $p < .0001$), past-year suicidal ideation (aOR = 0.7, 95% CI = 0.6–0.9, $p = .0007$), past-month binge drinking (aOR = 0.7, 95% CI = 0.5–0.9, $p = .001$), and lifetime illicit drug use (aOR = 0.7, 95% CI = 0.5–0.8, $p = .0003$) when compared to access to GAH during adulthood.

In the following study trans people on HRT reported higher quality of life than cis people (Was statistically significant in terms of "Mental health" and "General health", see figure 3) While 'trans' people not on HRT reported worse quality of life than cis controls (was statistically significant in terms of "Role emotional, see Figure 2).




Figure 3 SF-36 scores between the 44 hormonal transsexual subjects and French age- and sex-matched controls. SF-36 = Short Form 36. * P value < 0.05.




Figure 2 SF-36 scores between the 17 nonhormonal transsexual subjects and French age- and sex-matched controls. SF-36 = Short Form 36. * P value < 0.05.

<https://sci-hub.hkvisa.net/10.1111/j.1743-6109.2011.02564.x>

This of course is not enough to demonstrate that HRT itself is beneficial, to do that we need control for potentially confounding factors, this can be done via multivariate regression.

Table 3 Predictive factors for PCS and MCS: multivariate analysis (standardized beta coefficient)

		PCS	MCS
Age	β	-0.050	0.086
	<i>P</i>	0.810	0.549
Gender identity (0 MtF, 1 FtM)	β	-0.076	0.124
	<i>P</i>	0.653	0.288
Educational level (0 < 12 years, 1 \geq 12 years)	β	0.041	-0.071
	<i>P</i>	0.763	0.451
Partnership status (0 not single, 1 single)	β	0.102	-0.068
	<i>P</i>	0.687	0.697
Employment status (0 no, 1 yes)	β	0.233	0.026
	<i>P</i>	0.098	0.787
Children at home (0 no, 1 yes)	β	-0.068	-0.054
	<i>P</i>	0.761	0.728
Sexual orientation (0 same biological sex, 1 others)	β	0.168	0.098
	<i>P</i>	0.419	0.496
Depression (0 no, 1 yes)	β	-0.180	-0.576
	<i>P</i>	0.226	<0.001
Hormonal therapy (0 no, 1 yes)	β	-0.255	0.226
	<i>P</i>	0.111	0.044

Hormonal Therapy and Quality of Life in Transsexuals

β = standardized beta coefficient (β represents the change of the standard deviation in quality of life score resulting from a change of one standard deviation in the independent variable); bold values: $P < 0.05$

PCS = physical composite score; MCS = mental composite score; MtF = male-to-female; FtM = female-to-male

Of all the factors analyzed only "Hormone Therapy" and "Depression" had a statistically significant benefit in terms of mental health.

This is not the only study showing HRT by itself to be beneficial

Table 3 Regression analysis (enter method) for possible determinants of QoL in Spanish transsexuals

Determinant variables	Quality of life domains				Quality of life factor Global QoL and health
	Physical	Psychological	Social	Environmental	
	$R^2 = .206$	$R^2 = .325$	$R^2 = .219$	$R^2 = .201$	$R^2 = .229$
	$F_{(8,192)} = 5.955^{***}$	$F_{(8,192)} = 11.090^{***}$	$F_{(8,192)} = 6.443^{***}$	$F_{(8,192)} = 5.786^{***}$	$F_{(8,192)} = 6.819^{***}$
	β	β	β	β	β
Age	0.14	0.009	0.013	0.007	-0.29
Sex (female-to-male)	0.100	-0.005	0.193**	-0.044	0.126
Education (secondary)	-0.081	-0.004	0.014	0.052	0.083
Working/studying status (yes)	0.199**	0.020	0.164*	0.186**	0.185**
Partnership status (yes)	0.037	0.095	0.008	-0.056	0.125
Hormone therapy (yes)	0.202*	0.443***	0.248**	0.158	0.191*
Sex reassignment surgery (at least one surgery) (yes)	-0.019	0.112	0.042	0.058	0.116
Family support	0.314***	0.133*	0.280***	0.310***	0.248**

β Standardized beta coefficient, F F test; R^2 multiple R

* Significant at the level $p < .05$; ** significant at the level $p < .01$; *** significant at the level $p < .001$

<https://sci-hub.hkvisa.net/10.1007/s11136-013-0497-3>

Why do some people regret transitioning?

In old date the main reason causing regret was found to be lack of social support. Recently there seems to be an uptick of people detransitioning for ideological reasons, these people are not doing too well.

<https://slate.com/human-interest/2021/02/detransition-movement-star-ex-gay-explained.html>

A 2020 study found that 98% of detransitioners had some form of dysphoria prior to transitioning and that 88% were born male, unfortunately the study had severe methodological problems.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00918369.2021.1919479>

body dysphoria & social dysphoria: 84%

only body dysphoria: 8%

Only social dysphoria: 6%

no dysphoria: 2%

It is worth noting that while gender dysphoria will often push people towards transitioning both social and medical transition could actually induce new dysphoria in people. Trying to live socially as a sex will make it more distressing not to have an appropriate body for living as said sex and hormone therapy will also [affect the brain directly](#).

The following study is outdated (done 1998) and it did not study transsexuals who did not opt for SRS, there is a very large (probably majority) who do not want SRS in the first place.

<https://sci-hub.mkssa.top/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.1998.tb10001.x>

We found transsexuals to be more at risk for dropping out of treatment when they were MFs, showed more psychopathology, more GID symptoms in childhood, yet less gender dysphoria at application.

So if you were more dysphoric as a child but it's getting better now you might not be the best candidate for medical transition. It is worth noting that childhood gender identity disorder is largely defined as being gender-nonconformative [200](#) [201](#) it's not surprising that many of these will later realize medical transition isn't for them.

Poor support from the family	Belonging to the non-core group of transsexuals	Probability of regret (%)
—	—	0.4
—	+	1.7
+	—	4.5
+	+	15.8%

^a+, positive for the putative risk factor; —, negative for the putative risk factor.

[202](#) As we see the regret rate has dropped with more people transitioning.

Table 4 Individuals who will subsequently apply for reversal to the original sex

Time period	Number of sex reassigned individuals at the time period when they did their first application that will later apply for reversal to the original sex/total number of individuals who did their first applications at this time period who received a new legal sex (%)	Number of regret applications, during that time period
1960–1971	4/15 (27 %)	0
1972–1980	6/103 (5.8 %)	5
1981–1990	1/76 (1.3 %)	3
1991–2000	3/127 (2.4 %)	3
2001–2010	1/360 (0.3 %)	4
1960–2010	15/681 (2.2 %)	15

This is a general pattern we are seeing in these studies, social factors are the biggest factor when it comes to regrets and worse outcomes [203](#)

The theory that the brain has an innate distinct sex and that the body has to match that is not supported by any data [173](#) There is no evidence that someone comfortable with his male body would become uncomfortable with a female body if he actually wants to change his biological sex.

<https://sci-hub.mkksa.top/https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291704002776>

Only non-homosexuals reported some regrets during treatment, and two during and after SR, which they all related to a lack of acceptance and support from others.

Overall, adolescents with poorer peer relations, poorer general family functioning, advanced age, and a female sex assigned at birth showed more behavioral and emotional problems, or lower psychosocial functioning. Thus, the present study confirms the important role the social environment; both peers and family support; play with regard to the mental health outcomes in this group. Consequently, incorporating the family and social environment into Transgender Healthcare seems crucial in order to adequately tend to the needs of adolescents with GD.

The FMs who applied for reversal were younger at application than those who did not (median 22 years compared to 27 years for the whole FM group). Conversely, the MFs who later applied for reversal were older when they applied for sex reassignment than those who did not (median 35 years vs. 32 years for the whole MF group). Caution is warranted considering the small sample size.

What many people ignore is that surgeries are more or less a requirement for AFAB individuals, you will not be taken seriously as a male if you do not have a penis or if your penis is very small. There is less to no need for surgery if you are AMAB and can pass facially without FFS. It is worth noting that surgeries (especially mastectomy) can leave visible scars which can out people as transgender.

Eleven FMs (28.9%) were satisfied with their breast removal, 5 (13.2%) were dissatisfied due to the visibility of the scars, and 22 (57.9%) were not completely satisfied. Four FMs were satisfied with their metoidio-plasty or phalloplasty. One FM was dissatisfied because of urinary problems, while four were not completely satisfied.

The dating market is changing

Old studies are misleading since what was true 10 years ago no longer holds

0. A lot of people today begin transition early making it far easier to integrate with the other sex.
1. Now it's significantly harder to date as heterosexual male
2. The transbian dating pools are a lot bigger making it easier to date as gynephilic trans female.
3. Being transgender is now far more accepted socially.
4. Dating as androphilic female is now a lot easier.

Because of these factors we can expect trans-females to have better outcomes when they transition while gynephilic trans-males will have significantly worse outcomes.

How society benefits from people transitioning

People that wish to transition usually have comorbid mental disorders [204](#) [205](#) therefore it might be the case that society benefit from having many of these people fail to reproduce, this comes with the cost of using tax-money for these medical expenses and losing women that could provide sexual satisfaction and other forms of entertainment to other people.

Males transitioning to female is beneficial for society since it would allow people to have fun fucking them, they are also politically valuable in pushing for important policies. Incels transitioning to female is good for society since they will become less likely to develop or maintain problematic political beliefs or become violent. Instead they will promote sexual values beneficial for humanity.

Less incels trying to force females to waste themselves on losers is a good thing. Allowing loser males to transition and live a good life will reduce the threat to our great authoritarian government.

It has been proven safe to allow trans-women inside spaces reserved for women [206](#) [207](#) trying to exclude them would harm natal women too [208](#) [209](#) [210](#)

People improving their lives by transitioning is a beautiful thing

Usually when someone lives a shit life as a male he will just complain about how women are unfair to him or he will spend his time on various copes such as videogames and anime.

It's very rare for miserable males to actually improve themselves via medical transition, it usually takes pretty bad gender dysphoria for them to actually take action and even then many fail to act in time.

0. Males transitioning to female makes the world more beautiful, people will be around more beautiful people which will make most people happier [211](#)
1. People that transition and become beautiful benefit from it
2. People around them will see them improve instead of suffering or killing themselves.
3. Males that transition to female are politically useful for our goals (combating [cuckservatism](#), etc).
4. Trans girls are high in demand and can allow cis lesbians to have biological children with a partner they find attractive.
5. Voluntary chemical castration makes a male less likely to hurt other (and himself in the process).

It's a bit strange that people rarely object to psychiatry that outright harms people and costs billions of dollars each year but they complain about the government helping trans individuals transition even though it's one of the few mental health interventions that actually work.

Forced feminization

A lot of individuals cannot make it as males and will thus be forced to live as female or suffer the brutal social consequences of being male, this is especially true for females with gender dysphoria, they might not like their female bodies but medical transition would still be a disaster for them.

Most males are no longer needed in our modern society, technology has made name strength mostly obsolete and most males do not have any mental abilities not commonly found in females. Less than 10% of males are needed for sex and reproduction, most males are just a burden to society and thus we need to increase the number of males that transition to female, especially individuals who would clearly benefit from changing their biological sex.

Most males hold into their male pride but that will soon crash down as females raise their standards (because they can) and even more males lose their jobs to automation.

Currently forced treatments are justified by "danger to themselves and others", you do not need to be convicted of an actual crime. If we are going to treat people against their will that shall include HRT.

Step0: do Randomized Controlled Trials on people choosing to participate in the study rather than getting some other sentence, then 50% will be given active ingredients and 50% will be given placebo.

Step1: do Randomized Controlled Trials on highly problematic where they are forced to participate in the trial, 50% will be given active ingredients while 50% will be given placebo.

Several combinations of drugs will be tested in step1 to find out which (if any) combination of drugs provide the most benefits. We might for example find progesterone to be more useful than estradiol.

Step2: If study results are good we will expand the number of crimes where forced transition is one of the available remedies. This can include crimes such as failing to do military service or being disrespectful towards a senator. We might even add crimes such as illegally using drugs or living on welfare for too long as a male or being homeless.

This will allow us to better understand which individuals who actually benefit from HRT/transition since we will be able to use proper control groups.

A nurse will regularly visit your home. Your pants will be pulled down and soon you will feel a needle inside your muscle and soon the injection, estradiol enanthate, it will be slowly absorbed by your body.

The estrogen will make you more emotional and thus you will probably start crying due to the intense humiliation you received by the new government controlled by believers of vintologi. You crying and begging will of course not stop the nurse from doing the injection.

Even if it turns out not to be beneficial for society or the individuals subjected to it in Community Treatment Order setting forced HRT in a more controlling setting may still provide value. Males can be reduced to property and then given HRT by the ones owning them so they will become useful when it comes to sexual slavery. There are a lot of fun things you can do to a male reduced to property

- having him wear female clothing.
- give him a nice prostate-pounding.
- ballbusting (squeezing, punches, kicks, hitting with tool, etc).
- needles through his genitals or other body parts (such as by blowing/throwing darts at him).
- outright castration without any anesthetic.
- spanking with hands or tools.
- estradiol valerate injections or other medications (bicalutamide, oral estradiol, etc).
- Sexual Reassignment Surgery (just a paralytic so he/she will feel everything).
- putting him in a small cage.
- deepthroating him so hard he throws up, then punish him for not controlling himself.

After a while you will stop resisting and accept your face as a girl. It will become increasingly difficult to hide what's happening to you, your breasts getting bigger, face feminized, brain feminized.

Once you have been forced to be on HRT long enough there will not be much left of your old self, the hormones have changed your brain beyond recognition and now there is no longer any going back, not only do you look like a girl now, you are now also like a girl mentally.

There are a lot of males who would benefit from transitioning but they are not willing or able to actually transition, this can be due to social factors but in most cases the issue is ignorance, people simply don't know what's best for them.

It's a difficult and scary decision to make to start HRT and this is why a lot of people fantasize about **forced feminization**, often they try to brainwash themselves via sissy hypno porn.



The overwhelming majority of the prison population are men [212](#) this is very likely biological and therefore it is worth giving people drugs that feminize the brain [192](#) to see if that would make them less of a problem for society. this does not have to involve any form of social transition to the other gender.

Currently just being suicidal alone can warrant forced treatments by harmful and dangerous psychiatric drugs, forcing some males to take hormone replacement therapy can thus be justified in an attempt to prevent them from killing themselves using the same standard (even if it doesn't actually work). By doing a crime such as attempting suicide you are demonstrated that you aren't capable of making your own decisions justifying forced forcing them to transition to female "for their own good".

Genetic clowns

People with genetic conditions you don't want can create entertainment value for the rest of us, the fact that you do not want to be born with a certain condition does not mean said condition should be eliminated from the gene pool.

Females with gender dysphoria could be humiliated by forced feminization and this would allow for other people to make fun of them, thus we may want to force them to reproduce so we can make fun of and humiliate their offspring too. We should force females who want to transition to male to wear feminine clothing in public so we can laugh at them and see their nice breasts (revealing clothing).

In general deviants can provide entertainment value for the rest of us.

Why we need to ban FtM transition

A good government should have the authority to ban harmful medical treatments, this includes FtM transition (with few/no exceptions)

0. FtM transition is detrimental for the fertility-rate in most cases (no good way to preserve fertility).
1. FtM transition makes the incel problem worse.
2. FtM transition results in less beautiful females in society.
3. FtM transition seems to have worse overall outcomes in studies.
4. FtM transition generally rely more on irreversible surgeries (such as mastectomies leaving permanent scars).
5. The effects from testosterone are much harder (if not impossible) to reverse than the effects from estrogen. A lot of AFAB individuals will get ruined for life just from taking testosterone.
6. Testosterone comes with various negative health complications [213](#) [214](#) [215](#) [216](#) [217](#)

The eugenics hierarchy

0. Genetic engineering & modern wars.
1. Genetic engineering & forced breeding
2. Genetic engineering & sexual selection
3. Reducing some females suitable to property to forced breeding and female sexual selection.
4. Anarcho-darwinism (no government, a lot of violence).
5. Eugenics from war (killing males and raping females).
6. Government selection (all females belong to the state as sex-slaves).
7. Female sexual selection & forcing some females to have more babies.
8. Using brutal conscription to weed out weak males from the gene pool (killing them or forcefully transitioning them if they fail to properly man up).
9. Forcing problematic males to fight to death against each other in duels.
10. Full female freedom when it comes to breeding.
11. Father selection (100% of females reduced to property).
12. Male sexual selection (males have all the power & reject most females).
13. Government incentives.
14. Forced sterilization or executions of females.
15. Voluntary positive eugenics.
16. Forced sterilization/euthanasia of males (all incels sent to gas-chambers, etc) in our current societal environment.
17. Voluntary negative eugenics (such as abortions).

In addition to being very unpopular government eugenics have a very bad track-record, there has never been a case where direct government eugenics (forced sterilizations or mass murders) has been implemented well, the result is always people getting targeted that shouldn't be targeted.

Indirect eugenics

When you rule over millions or billions of people it will be hard to as the government do a good job in selecting who is going to be allowed to reproduce. Instead you will have to figure out how to construct society in a such way that people with suitable genetics reproduce more even if it is to a small degree.

One possible proxy for good genes is income. People with for your society good genetics should make more money on average and this can be utilized to improve the genetic quality of your population.

One strategy is to make is having legislation making it easier for elite males to reproduce and not require them to in any way support their biological children, that will result in very fierce competition to reproduce and very few males will be able to do that. This could be sold as "the government giving men more rights" when the real goal is to exterminate most of the male population or force a very big portion of the males to more outside the country to reproduce.

The government may try to give economic incentives for reproduction among groups suited for it but this is unlikely to be particularly effective since most females wouldn't change the number of children they have based on that [218](#) a much better approach is to outfight force a lot of females to make babies.

There is no master race

No matter what group of people you look at you does not find anything worth preserving in its current form. All groups of humans are riddled with genetic diseases, have low average iq and cannot properly satisfy females sexually [219](#)

There is no such thing as an ideal human, the ideal genetics will depend on the environment, what's ideal for the earth isn't even close to ideal for living on Mars, most likely a sustainable colony wouldn't even be possible.

Humans have come very far when it comes to dominating the planet but we have done very poorly when it comes to colonizing other planets and our civilization isn't sustainable. All our current advances are due to a small elite of humans, the rest of humanity has benefited a lot from their work.

About national socialism

Putting a lot of effort into preserving an unfit race isn't rational, thus no form of ethnonationalism is rational. One of the worst examples of ethnonationalism is the third reich.

One obvious issue hitler had to face was the conflict between allowing individual greatness for racial improvement and the extreme collectivism within national socialism, this was never resolved.

National socialists today typically ignore differences within the race and focus only on the differences between races, one issue with this is of course that there isn't any obvious way to divide humans into races, it will be arbitrary and not scientific.

The idea is to have darwinism between races while having socialism internally [220](#) the extreme collectivism and anti-individualism in nazism is one issue with the ideology. In reality you cannot have egalitarianism within a country, there will always be a system of domination and subjugation.

What tends to happen of course is that instead of the totalitarian government actually helping the people they end up leading them to the ruin while claiming they are doing it for the best of the people.

Ethno-nationalism can maybe be justified the theory of kin selected but for that to be a valid justification implementing a nazi regime has to actually be beneficial and the germans learned the hard way that voting hitler into power wasn't good for them at all.

One of the reasons why it ended badly was that Hitler had all the power and all assassination attempts failed. National socialism is simply an extreme form of collectivism, the individual is reduced to cattle of the state that will be subject to government breeding and control in general, males may end up as just cannon-fodder in stupid wars.

Currently there are still a few nazi groups, some of them are attracted to the media picture of nazis while others just want a form of socialism that is somewhat workable. Most people who are attracted to these nazi groups are failed males trying to escape from reality and it's not really working for them.

National socialism and other forms of collectivism may be appealing to low-quality individuals but it will not attract the most capable among us and this is one of the reasons why national socialism and similar political movements have failed. It is common for nazis to be triggered by anal sex and promote christ insane sexual morality, they are simply control freaks like other lefties and they justify their totalitarianism by claiming it is necessary for the race despite the fact that there isn't a single good example in history where an totalitarian government has resulted in anything good for the people.

Hitler implemented national socialism and while it initially worked out well for non-Jewish germans the end result was millions of dead germans and tens of millions white people murdered including 5 to 7 million Jews. The economic system Hitler implemented wasn't sustainable and thus the war was needed in order to avoid the economic collapse, the war initially went well for the nazis but it ended up as a total disaster.

The Swedish national socialism was implemented better but there were a lot of people getting sterilized against their will for very dubious reasons. Many countries implemented policies of forced sterilization but it all had to be abandoned due to the inhumane and arbitrary nature of it.



There really isn't any good reason against having several ethnicities or cultures co-exist within one system. It's difficult to point to a single law that has to be different for another group of people.


The holocaust

The nazis murdered 5 to 7 million Jews [221](#) [222](#) [223](#) [224](#) [225](#) [226](#) [227](#) many of these had valuable genetics, it is likely that the survivors among the European Jews such as Ludwig Von Mises had better genes and thus the holocaust may have improved the genes of the Jews at the expense of quantity which isn't a good thing for anyone.

The first population estimate was published 1949 and it turned out there were only 11373350 Jews left [228](#) [229](#)

Since the number of Jews was reduced the probability of being born as a jew has also been reduced. The loss of Jews has also resulted in lost productivity since a gassed jew will have a hard time contributing much to society.

While the most intelligent of the ashkenazi-jews such as Ludwig Von Mises and Albert Einstein had a greater chance of surviving the holocaust there was still a great loss of good genes due to the nazi insanity.



<http://holocaustcontroversies.blogspot.com/2012/10/index-of-published-evidence-on.html>

The Jews

Despite their small population, Ashkenazi Jews have won more than one quarter of the Westinghouse Science prizes, the Turing Awards, and Fields Medals. 54 percent of the world's chess champions have Ashkenazi Jewish ancestry. Among National Medal of Science recipients, 37 percent have Ashkenazi Jewish backgrounds as are 29 percent of US Jews have won 38 percent of American Nobel laureates in physics, 42 percent of Nobel laureates in medicine or physiology, and 28 percent of US prize winners in chemistry. In the United States, Ashkenazi Jews comprise 33 percent of the student body and faculty at Ivy League and other elite universities, 30 percent of the US Supreme Court law clerks.

Albert Einstein gave us the theory of relativity [230](#) [231](#) but he failed to come up with a more unified theory(many people have since tried and failed).

Ashkenazi Jewish achievements are not limited to intellectual pursuits, they extend to endeavors where having a higher intelligence is an advantage such as business and commerce. While some of the Jewish domination can be explained by in-group loyalty it is very insufficient as a complete explanation.

According to unreliable sources the ashkenazi-jews have very high logical and linguistic iq while their spatial iq is a bit lacking [232](#)

The Jews are not a single race, they are very diverse and it is only the Ashkenazi Jews that have good genes, the rest of the Jews are just useless eaters. In judaism an individual is considered to be a jew if his/her mother is a jew, this of course doesn't make any sense in terms of genetics making the entire system near pointless.

Since there are some issues with the current elite we need a new better elite that will out-compete the Jews that don't belong to the jewish elite. The Jew Ludwig Von Mises has contributed a lot to our understanding of economics and the issues states have, he has proven that communism cannot work. The Ashkenazi Jews have managed to remain as a distinct genetic group for thousands of years, their psychology has been shaped by them living as a minority for a long time, they seem to prefer multiracial societies since it takes attention away from them and this explains why a lot of Jews favor mass immigration of Muslims that hate Jews.

Ashkenazi-jews in the USA and many other countries are now assimilating into the larger culture and they no longer restrict themselves sexually to other Jews(50% mix themselves with whites), if this continues the genetic part of the Jewish question will be solved, not by fake shower rooms but simply the fact that the US population doesn't hate Jews and accepts them into their society.

Israel is also very far from being an ideal country:

0. general societal dysfunction (slow legal system, bad laws, etc).
1. being married to a jew is enough to become a citizen, no proper test is done.
2. low birthrate due to feminism.
3. Israel has not expanded its borders much besides stealing land from the palestinians.
4. arabic Jews dominate the Israeli population resulting in an average iq of just 97.
5. genital mutilation (mostly of boys) is rampant and permitted by the government.
6. religious extremism is spreading like cancer.
7. the Age of consent is way too high.
8. genetic issues within the jewish population hasn't been fixed by genetic engineering.
9. women are forced into military service while useless religious males avoid ever having to work.

Thus, Israel isn't a good place for Ashkenazi Jews, it's a very bad place for them. While Judaism is a very racist religion it is unfortunately very primitive and not compatible with science, defining Jewishness after motherhood is just stupid and the pedophile mutilation ritual "Metzitzah b'peh" is just wrong on all levels.

The general concept in Judaism is to do what's best for the Jews but unfortunately for the Jews Judaism is a very primitive religion not adapted for our modern society and knowledge. Some more intelligent Jews have instead adopted secular but still a false & problematic morality such as libertarianism.

Preserving and building wealth

Government (fiat) money loses value over time but it's still better than spending the money without doing a proper analysis. Cryptocurrencies & stocks have done well in the past, it's easy to buy/sell but of course you will have to be careful.

If you are going to invest your money there are a few good rules to follow:

0. make sure you will be able to sell very quickly without difficulties.
1. don't make yourself vulnerable to the decisions of other people.
2. don't buy unless you are happy with the price you are paying
3. don't sell unless you get a good price or need the money.

Be careful about things you are passionate about, a lot of people lose money investing into something they are passionate about such as a crowdfunding project.

The issue with investing in physical things is that these are generally messy to sell and you will often end up losing money on each transaction, sure it may have some value in the case of an emergency but it's still very far from ideal.

If you are going to invest in stocks the best strategy is just to spread it out, do not overthink it by trying to find some great deal. While there are a few people who have gotten rich on investments alone this is far from the norm and most people trying to get rich that way end up just getting poorer. Most daytraders lose money partly because of the fees you need to pay as a trader, don't bother.

If you actually want to get rich you should simply make sure you are in full control over a company and this will allow you to make a lot of money if you are a great leader and have some luck

- Seek wealth, not money or status. Wealth is having assets that earn while you sleep. Money is how we transfer time and wealth. Status is your place in the social hierarchy.
- Understand that ethical wealth creation is possible. If you secretly despise wealth, it will elude you.
- Ignore people playing status games. They gain status by attacking people playing wealth creation games.
- You're not going to get rich renting out your time. You must own equity; a piece of a business; to gain your financial freedom.
- You will get rich by giving society what it wants, at scale. but does not yet know how to get.
- Pick an industry where you can play long-term games with long-term people.

- The Internet has massively broadened the possible space of careers. Most people haven't figured this out yet.
- Play iterated games. All the returns in life, whether in wealth, relationships, or knowledge, come from compound interest.
- Pick business partners with high intelligence, energy, and, above all, integrity.
- Don't partner with cynics and pessimists. Their beliefs are self-fulfilling.
- Learn to sell. Learn to build. If you can do both, you will be unstoppable.
- Arm yourself with specific knowledge, accountability, and leverage
- Specific knowledge is knowledge that you cannot be trained for. If society can train you, it can train someone else, and replace you.
- Specific knowledge is found by pursuing your genuine curiosity and passion rather than whatever is hot right now.
- Building specific knowledge will feel like play to you but will look like work to others.
- When specific knowledge is taught, it's through apprenticeships, not schools.
- Specific knowledge is often highly technical or creative. It cannot be outsourced or automated.
- Embrace accountability, and take business risks under your own name. Society will reward you with responsibility, equity, and leverage.
- The most accountable people have singular, public, and risky brands: Oprah, Trump, Kanye, Elon.
- "Give me a lever long enough, and a place to stand, and i will move the earth." - Archimedes
- Fortunes require leverage. Business leverage comes from capital, people, and products with no marginal cost of replication (code and media).
- Capital means money. To raise money, apply your specific knowledge, with accountability, and show resulting good judgment.
- Labor means people working for you. It's the oldest and most fought-over form of leverage. Labour leverage will impress your parents, but don't waste your life chasing it.
- Capital and labour are permissioned leverage. Everyone is chasing capital, but someone has to give it to you. Everyone is trying to lead, but someone has to follow you.
- Code and media are permissionless leverage. They're the leverage behind the newly rich. You can create software and media that works for you while you sleep.
- An army of robots is freely available; it's just packed in data centers for heat and space efficiency. Use it.
- If you can't code, write books and blogs, record videos and podcasts.
- Leverage is a force multiplier for your judgement.
- Judgement requires experience, but can be built faster by learning foundational skills.
- There is no skill called "business." Avoid business magazines and business classes.
- Study microeconomics, game theory, psychology, persuasion, ethics, mathematics, and computers.
- Reading is faster than listening. Doing is faster than watching.
- You should be too busy to "do coffee," while still keeping an uncluttered calendar.
- Set and enforce an aspirational personal hourly rate. If fixing a problem will save less than your hourly rate, ignore it. If outsourcing a task will cost less than your hourly rate, outsource it.

- Work as hard as you can even though who you work with and what you work on are more important than how hard you work.
- Become the best in the world at what you do. Keep redefining what you do until this is true.
- There are no get-rich-quick schemes. That's just someone else getting rich off you.
- Apply specific knowledge, with leverage, and eventually you will get what you deserve
- When you're finally wealthy, you'll realize that it wasn't what you were seeking in the first place. But that's for another day.

Nice guys finish last

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol 99(2), Aug 2010, 303-310 "An initial study investigating tolerance of group members who abuse a public good surprisingly showed that unselfish members (those who gave much toward the provision of the good but then used little of the good) were also targets for expulsion from the group. A fourth study suggested that the target is seen by some as establishing an undesirable behavior standard and by others as a rule breaker. Individuals who formed either perception expressed a desire for the unselfish person to be removed from the group."

To put it in simpler terms, being altruistic and friendly is just as likely to cause people to reject you as those who are completely selfish and purely look out for their needs only. The study found no significant difference. This contradicts the mainstream advice that having a "good personality" will cause people, including women, to like you. They will hate you just as much as someone who practically steals from them. This is also reflected in the workplace, as "agreeable" men (peaceful and friendly) are paid significantly less than their disagreeable counterparts.

"Overall, across the first three studies, men who are one standard deviation below the mean on agreeableness earn an average of 18.31% (\$9,772) more than men one standard deviation above the mean on agreeableness. Meanwhile, the "disagreeableness premium" for women was only 5.47% (\$1,828). Thus, the income premium for disagreeableness is more than three times stronger for men than for women."

So as we could see, the price of being nice when you are a man is a staggering 18% of your income throughout life. It is also far stronger in males than in females. So this means that nice men in the first study would have been rejected even more often than the nice women. This suggests that nice men are rejected more often than men who are completely selfish and practically steal off of everyone.

While a female can benefit from a nice male this does not make him a good partner since then he will also be overly nice to other people resulting in him not being able to properly provide for the family or protect her. It's not just about him providing good money for you, it's also about him providing good genetics to your children. You don't want to have children that turn out to be losers in life because of the genetics and upbringing from the father, you want your children to be successful.

Now, let us focus more on the effects of being "mean" or "evil" on attracting a woman:

"A Billion Wicked Thoughts: What the World's Largest Experiment Reveals about Human Desire" is a book by two neuroscientists that combines countless research by Alfred Kinsey and experiments found on the internet that has a data on over half a billion people to see what are the raw sexual desires of humanity. The book quotes quite a few unnerving conclusions of the sexuality of women based on many individual experiments:

“It turns out that killing people is an effective way to elicit the attention of many women: virtually every serial killer, including Ted Bundy, Charles Manson, and David Berkowitz, have received love letters from large numbers of female fans” (p. 98).

“[Their] inner cavewoman knows Doormat Man would become Sabertooth Tiger Lunch in short order” (p .97).

Psychology Today had an article that confirmed and analyzed how women desire men who are violent, mean and show criminal behavior, with much thanks to the book mentioned above.

"women demonstrate a strong erotic preference for dominant men. Or toward what's now commonly referred to as alpha males; in the authors' words, men who are "strong, confident, [and] swaggering [as in 'cocky,' and the pun is intended]." Unfortunately, what these descriptors often imply is behavior sufficiently bearish, self-centered, and insensitive as to often cross the line into a physical, mental, and emotional abuse that can be downright brutal.

"there's something in their native wiring that makes a great many of them susceptible to 'bad boys.'" "many women (at least secretly, or subliminally) can't help but be drawn toward cold-blooded, controlling, 'bad boys' whose dominance symbolizes quite the opposite of what in relationships they're consciously seeking."

"many women experience as enticing the idea of surrendering to a powerful male figure because of its very riskiness. Curiously, such an acutely felt threat can actually be eroticized by women's minds into exceptional sexual excitement so compelling that (at least on a fantasy level) it's almost irresistible."

[233](#) [234](#) [235](#) [236](#) [237](#)

About political activism

If you care about our society you might end up ruining your own future in a futile attempt to improve the world, this is what you get for being a ‘good’ person not prioritizing your own well-being. If you had put more effort into your own life you could have reached a position where you are actually able to efficiently change the world for the better. You may still want to be politically active for its therapeutic effect, fighting for what you believe in will make you happier and you will also function better.

People that join political organisations will very frequently be taken advantage of, people that neglect their own well-being can be milked for money and they are often manipulated into supporting what other people want instead of looking at how they want to change the world. People will often tell themselves they agree with everything the cult stand for when in reality they just got manipulated.

One big issue with political activism is that often what feels good isn't actually very effective. While being part of a bigger group and to street activism can feel really good it's unfortunately not very effective and you put yourself in danger. In order to actually reach out to people you will typically end up having to rely on platforms controlled by bigger companies and risk deplatforming [238](#) [239](#)

Decentralized political activism

The failures of the National Alliance after Pierce died has shown us that the concept of an “elite vanguard” is nonsense, Pierce failed to attract people of good enough quality in order for his organisation to survive after he died and everything the organisation did(including video game development) can and has been done a lot better outside the National Alliance.

You may still need to form official organisations for various things such as winning elections but that will depend on already existing decentralized network of people working effectively to allow said party to grow in the first place.

Centralized resistance is only possible when the government is weak enough to allow it, even in that case it may not be very efficient and it's only required for winning elections.

Building an elite organisation will not really work, organisations tend to attract low to medium quality people, the best among us will not accept being controlled by anyone. Even without any government interference decentralized resistance will still be a lot more efficient. Central control is always very inefficient compared to a competitive environment where people exchange ideas freely without having to follow any leader.

The concept of Leaderless Resistance was proposed by Col. Ulius Louis Amoss, who was the founder of International Service of Information Incorporated, located in Baltimore, Maryland. Col. Amoss died more than fifteen years ago, but during his life was a tireless opponent of communism, as well as a skilled Intelligence Officer. Col. Amoss first wrote of Leaderless Resistance on April 17, 1962. His theories of organisation were primarily directed against the threat of eventual Communist take-over in the United States. The present writer, with the benefit of having lived many years beyond Col. Amoss, has taken his theories and expounded upon them. Col. Amoss feared the Communists. This author fears the federal government. Communism now represents a threat to no one in the United States, while federal tyranny represents a threat to everyone. The writer has joyfully lived long enough to see the dying breaths of communism, but may, unhappily, remain long enough to see the last grasps of freedom in America.

In the hope that, somehow, America can still produce the brave sons and daughters necessary to fight off ever-increasing persecution and oppression, this essay is offered. Frankly, it is too close to call at this point. Those who love liberty, and believe in freedom enough to fight for it are rare today, but within the bosom of every once great nation, there remains secreted, the pearls of former greatness. They are there. I have looked into their sparking eyes; sharing a brief moment in time with them as I passed through this life. Relished their friendship, endured their pain, and they mine. We are a band of brothers, native to the soil gaining strength one from another as we have rushed headlong into a battle that all the weaker, timid men, say we can not win. Perhaps...but then again, perhaps we can. It's not over till the last freedom fighter is buried or imprisoned, or the same happens to those who would destroy their freedom.

Barring any cataclysmic events, the struggle will yet go on for years. The passage of time will make it clear to even the slower among us that the government is the foremost threat to the life, and liberty of the folk. The government will no doubt make today's oppressiveness look like grade school work compared to what they have planned in the future. Meanwhile, there are those of us who continue to hope that somehow the few can do what the many have not. We are cognizant that before things get better they will certainly get worse as government shows a willingness to use ever more severe police state measures against dissidents. This changing situation makes it clear that those who oppose state repression must be prepared to alter, adapt, and modify their behavior, strategy, and tactics as circumstances warrant. Failure to consider new methods and implement them as necessary will make the government's efforts at suppression uncomplicated. It is the duty of every patriot to make the tyrant's life miserable. When one fails to do so he not only fails himself, but his people.

Any armed resistance must consist of lone wolves and small cells [240](#)

With this in mind, current methods of resistance to tyranny employed by those who love our race, culture, and heritage must pass a litmus test of soundness. Methods must be objectively measured as to their effectiveness, as well as to whether they make the government's intention of repression more possible or more difficult. Those not working to aid our objectives must be discarded or the government benefits from our failure to do so.

As honest men who have banded together into groups or associations of a political or religious nature are falsely labeled “domestic terrorists” or “cultists” and suppressed, it will become necessary to consider other methods of organisation; or as the case may very well call for: non-organisation. One should keep in mind that it is not in the government's interest to eliminate all groups. Some few must remain in order to perpetuate the smoke and mirrors vision for the masses that America is a “free democratic country” where dissent is allowed. Most organisations, however, that possess the potential for effective resistance will not be allowed to continue. Anyone who is so naive as to believe the most powerful government on earth will not crush any who pose a real threat to that power, should not be active, but rather, at home studying political history.

The question as to who is to be left alone and who is not will be answered by how groups and individuals deal with several factors such as: avoidance of conspiracy plots, rejection of feeble-minded malcontents, insistence upon quality of the participants, avoidance of all contact with the front men for the federals; the news media; and finally, camouflage (which can be defined as the ability to blend in the public's eye the more committed groups of resistance with mainstream “kosher” associations that are generally seen as harmless.) Primarily though, whether any organisation is allowed to continue in the future will be a matter of how big a threat a group represents. Not a threat in terms of armed might or political ability, for there is none of either for the present, but rather, threat in terms of potentiality.

It is potential the federals fear most. Whether that potential exists in an individual or group is incidental. The federals measure potential threat in terms of what might happen given a situation conducive to action on the part of a restive organisation or individual. Accurate intelligence gathering allows them to assess the potential. Showing one's hand before the bets are made, is a sure way to lose.



The movement for freedom is rapidly approaching the point where for many people, the option of belonging to a group will be nonexistent. For others, group membership will be a viable option for only the immediate future. Eventually, and perhaps much sooner than most believe possible, the price paid for membership will exceed any perceived benefit. But for now, some groups that do exist often serve a useful purpose either for the newcomer who can be indoctrinated into the ideology of the struggle, or for generating positive propaganda to reach potential fighters for power. It is sure that, for the most part, this struggle is rapidly becoming a matter of individual action, each of its participants making a private decision in the quietness of his heart to resist: to resist by any means necessary.

It is hard to know what others will do; for no man truly knows another man's heart. It is enough to know what one himself will do. A great teacher once said “know thyself.” Few men really do, but let each of us, promise ourselves, not to go quietly to the fate our would-be masters have planned.

The concept of Leaderless Resistance is nothing less than a fundamental departure in theories of organisation. The orthodox scheme of organisation is diagrammatically represented by the pyramid, with the mass at the bottom and the leader at the top. This fundamental of organisation is to be seen not only in armies, which are of course, the best illustration of the pyramid structure, with the mass of soldiery, the privates, at the bottom responsible to corporals who are in turn responsible to sergeants, and so on up the entire chain of command to the generals at the top. But the same structure is seen in corporations, ladies' garden clubs and in our political system itself. This orthodox "pyramid" scheme of organisation is to be seen basically in all existing political, social and religious structures in the world today from the Federal government to the Roman Catholic Church. The Constitution of the United States, in the wisdom of the Founders, tried to sublimate the essential dictatorial nature of pyramidal organisation by dividing authority into three: executive, legislative and judicial. But the pyramid remains essentially untouched.

This scheme of organisation, the pyramid, is however, not only useless, but extremely dangerous for the participants when it is utilized in a resistance movement against state tyranny. Especially is this so in technologically advanced societies where electronic surveillance can often penetrate the structure revealing its chain of command. Experience has revealed over and over again that anti-state, political organisations utilizing this method of command and control are easy prey for government infiltration, entrapment, and destruction of the personnel involved. This has been seen repeatedly in the United States where pro-government infiltrators or agent provocateurs weasel their way into patriotic groups and destroy them from within.

In the pyramid type of organisation, an infiltrator can destroy anything which is beneath his level of infiltration and often those above him as well. If the traitor has infiltrated at the top, then the entire organisation from the top down is compromised and may be traduced at will.

An alternative to the pyramid type of organisation is the cell system. In the past, many political groups (both right and left) have used the cell system to further their objectives. Two examples will suffice. During the American Revolution "committees of correspondence" were formed throughout the Thirteen colonies.

Their purpose was to subvert the government and thereby aid the cause of independence. The "Sons of Liberty", who made a name for themselves dumping government taxed tea into the harbor at Boston, were the action arm of the committees of correspondence. Each committee was a secret cell that operated totally independently of the other cells. Information on the government was passed from committee to committee, from colony to colony, and then acted upon on a local basis. Yet even in these bygone days of poor communication, of weeks to months for a letter to be delivered, the committees without any central direction whatsoever, were remarkable similar in tactics employed to resist government tyranny. It was, as the first American patriots knew, totally unnecessary for anyone to give an order for anything. Information was made available to each committee, and each committee acted as it saw fit. A recent example of the cell system taken from the left-wing of politics are the Communists. The Communist, in order to get around the obvious problems involved in pyramidal organisation, developed to an art the cell system. They had numerous independent cells which operated completely isolated from one another and particularly with no knowledge of each other, but were orchestrated together by a central headquarters. For instance, during World War II, in Washington, it is known that there were at least six secret Communist cells operating at high levels in the United States government (plus all the open Communists who were protected and promoted by President Roosevelt), however, only one of the cells was rooted out and destroyed. How many more actually were operating no one can say for sure.

The Communist cells which operated in the US until late 1991 under Soviet control could have at their command a leader, who held a social position which appeared to be very lowly. He could be, for example, a busboy in a restaurant, but in reality a colonel or a general in the Soviet Secret Service, the KGB. Under him could be a number of cells and a person active in one cell would almost never have knowledge of individuals who are active in another cell. The value of this is that while anyone cell can be infiltrated, exposed or destroyed, such action will have no effect on the other cells; in fact, the members of the other cells will be supporting that cell which is under attack and ordinarily would lend very strong support to it in many ways. This is at least part of the reason, no doubt, that whenever in the past Communists were attacked in this country, support for them sprang up in many unexpected places.

The efficient and effective operation of a cell system after the Communist model, is of course, dependent upon central direction, which means impressive organisation, funding from the top, and outside support, all of which the Communists had. But what if you lack any outside support?

The answer comes from Col. Amoss who proposed the “Phantom Cell” mode of organisation. Which he described as Leaderless Resistance. A system of organisation that is based upon the cell organisation, but does not have any central control or direction, that is in fact almost identical to the methods used by the Committees of Correspondence during the American Revolution. Utilizing the Leaderless Resistance concept, all individuals and groups operate independently of each other, and never report to a central headquarters or single leader for direction or instruction, as would those who belong to a typical pyramid organisation.

At first glance, such a type of organisation seems unrealistic, primarily because there appears to be no organisation. The natural question thus arises as to how are the “Phantom cells” and individuals to cooperate with each other when there is no intercommunication or central direction? The answer to this question is that participants in a program of Leaderless Resistance through phantom cell or individual action must know exactly what they are doing, and how to do it. It becomes the responsibility of the individual to acquire the necessary skills and information as to what is to be done. This is by no means as impractical as it appears because it is certainly true that in any movement, all persons involved have the same general outlook, are acquainted with the same philosophy, and generally react to given situations in similar ways. The previous history of the committees of correspondence during the American Revolution show this to be true.

There exists technology today allowing people to communicate under total privacy, this however requires people to be technically skilled and even then they might screw up by outing themselves in some way. Encryption that is safe today can become broken tomorrow, there is always risk to face.

All members of phantom cells or individuals will tend to react to objective events in the same way through usual tactics of resistance. Organs of information distribution such as newspapers, leaflets, computers, etc., which are widely available to all, keep each person informed of events, allowing for a planned response that will take many variations. No one need issue an order to anyone. Those idealist truly committed will act when they feel the time is ripe, or will take their cue from others who precede them. While it is true that much could be said against this type of structure as a method of resistance, it must be kept in mind that Leaderless Resistance is a child of necessity. The alternatives to it have been shown to be unworkable or impractical.

Leaderless Resistance has worked before in the American Revolution, and if the truly committed put it to use for themselves, it will work now. It goes almost without saying that Leaderless Resistance leads to very small or even one-man cells of resistance.

From the point of view of tyrants and would-be potentates in the federal bureaucracy and police agencies, nothing is more desirable than that those who oppose them be UNIFIED in their command structure, and that every person who opposes them belong to a pyramid type group. Such groups and organisations are an easy kill. Especially in light of the fact that the Justice (sic) Department promised in 1987 that there would never be another group that opposed them that they did not have at least one informer in. These federal “friends of government” are intelligence agents. They gather information that can be used at the whim of a federal D.A. to prosecute. The line of battle has been drawn.

Dissidents are required therefore, to make a conscious decision to either aid the government in its illegal spying, by continuing with old methods of organisation and resistance, or to make the enemy's job more difficult by implementing effective countermeasures.

Now there will, no doubt, be mentally handicapped people out there who, while standing at a podium with an American flag draped in the background, and a lone eagle soaring in the sky above, will state emphatically in their best sounding red, white, and blue voice, “So what if the government is spying? We are not violating any laws.” Such crippled thinking by any serious person is the best example that there is a need for special education classes. The person making such a statement is totally out of contact with political reality in this country, and unfit for leadership of anything more than a dog sleigh in the Alaskan wilderness. The old “Born on the fourth of July” mentality that has influenced so much of the American patriot's thinking in the past will not save him from the government in the future. “Reeducation” for non-thinkers of this type will take place in the federal prison system where there are no flags or eagles, but abundance of men who were “not violating any law.”

In reality most people who are thinking “I am following the law” are not actually following all the tens of thousands of federal and state laws. If the government wants to lock someone in an institution they can always find some legal justification for it such as “he is mentally ill and requires help” or “he did something wrong with his taxes”.

Most groups who “unify” their disparate associates into a single structure have short political lives. Therefore, those movement leaders constantly calling for unity of organisation rather than the desirable unity of purpose, usually fall into one of three categories.

They may not be sound political tacticians, but rather, just committed men who feel unity would help their cause, while not realizing that the government would greatly benefit from such efforts. The Federal objective, to imprison or destroy all who oppose them, is made easier in pyramid organisations. Or perhaps, they do not fully understand the struggle they are involved in and that the government they oppose has declared a state of war against those fighting against them, they will not let go of power willingly obviously. Those in power will use any means to rid themselves of opposition. The third class calling for unity and let us hope this is the minority of the three, are men more desirous of the supposed power that a large organisation would bestow, than of actually achieving their stated purpose.

Conversely, the last thing Federal snoops would have, if they had any choice in the matter, is a thousand different small phantom cells opposing them. It is easy to see why. Such a situation is an intelligence nightmare for a government intent upon knowing everything they possibly can about those who oppose them. The Federals, able to amass overwhelming strength of numbers, manpower, resources, intelligence gathering, and capability at any given time, need only a focal point to direct their anger. A single penetration of a pyramid type of organisation can lead to the destruction of the whole. Whereas, Leaderless Resistance presents no single opportunity for the Federals to destroy a significant portion of the Resistance.

With the announcement by the Department of Justice (sic) that 300 FBI agents formerly assigned to watching Soviet spies in the US (domestic counter intelligence) are now to be used to “combat crime,” the federal government is preparing the way for a major assault upon those persons opposed to their policies. Many anti-government groups dedicated to the preservation of the America of our forefathers can expect shortly to feel the brunt of a new federal assault upon liberty.

It is clear, therefore, that it is time to rethink traditional strategy and tactics when it comes to opposing a modern police state. America is quickly moving into a long dark night of police state tyranny, where the rights now accepted by most as being inalienable will disappear. Let the coming night be filled with a thousand points of resistance. Like the fog which forms when conditions are right and disappears when they are not, so must the resistance to the government be.

About political terrorism

Political terrorism can only be done effectively by lone wolves and small cells, if the organisation is too big it's likely that someone will spoil everything (often unintentionally) and after that the government will be able to track everyone down, one good example of failure is “the order”.

Brutal violence and threat of it can be effective but it requires great personal sacrifice, both Anders Behring Breivik and Brenton Tarrant are very likely to be stuck in jail until they die without having had a single child, their genes will be lost.

Most terrorists will fail to come even close to the amount of killed Breivik or Tarrant reached, in many cases not a single individual is killed because the wannabe terrorist is stopped early. In the cases where a lot of individuals are killed the results are usually not as intended, it's very difficult to predict what the results of the attack will be, both Breivik and Tarrant got their predictions wrong. One alternative to instant killing is to take hostages and demand political change or they will die, most likely the government will let them die.



How to actually make the world a better place

Instead of focusing on trying to change the government you may want to focus on things that actually produce clear real-world results

0. making females pregnant (like Charles Lindberg).
1. becoming financially successful allowing you to properly support all your children.
2. selecting a male of high quality to make you pregnant.
3. gaining political power and using it well.
4. contributing to science (like Charles Darwin).
5. producing high-quality entertainment.
6. convincing incels to go trans.

About immaterial property

It can be very fulfilling to create something new such as a videogame or a new novel. Maybe you will also be able to improve existing games or get inspiration from a current fictional story. By creating culture you are also able to influence people, this is much more effective than trying to argue with the masses, storytelling is a very powerful way to influence people. The development of AM2R was stopped by nintendo despite the fact that it was very different from the old game.

The main reason to publish material should be to make it available for future lives and to experience the joy of creating culture. Patents currently last 20 years and you will be required to publish all important details on how your invention works and this is sensible. Currently copyright lasts 70 years after all content creators are dead and this is insanity. The following reforms need to be made

0. no software patents.
1. copyright should last at most 30 years, preferably 20 years.
2. copyright laws should not cover closed source software.
3. have the government buy up patents and make them freely available within the country.

Currently copyright laws inhibit creativity by making it illegal to do improved versions of 100 year old work, the only winners with the current laws are a few companies with a lot of old material.

Completely new concepts are rarely invented, most ideas are mostly previous ideas merged or modified. Innovation is mostly about incremental improvements, completely new concepts are rarely invented.

Patents generally result in a high technology society where a few companies dominate. Patents may result in quicker technological advancements but we have to ask ourselves if we really want the technology that is being developed via patents. Patents give a company a monopoly protected by the government, this benefits big companies that have the resources needed to fight other companies in court.

About high technology

Ted Kaczynski wrote an interesting [manifesto](#) about the downsides of technology and a lot of what he wrote is true. Technology and socialism currently make it very easy to survive but it will be difficult in the future, the population of humans has been increased exponentially and eventually it needs to end. Ted Kaczynski has since his terrorism published additional books [241](#) [242](#)

One important factor Kaczynski does not mention is the fact that the difficulty of getting a female has increased with the technological advancements, when females no longer need men they get pickier and a lot of unattractive men get weeded out of the gene pool. A system where it's easy to survive and reproduce will eventually come to an end one way or another (war, starvation, sexual selection, etc).

For a long time the unfit masses have been able to reproduce without major difficulties but this is changing now as females are raising their standards. With female sexual selection you simply rely on previous cruel natural selection that has shaped which males females select for.

With technology, it is easier for a few individuals to get a lot more power, technology makes armed resistance a lot more difficult and fewer people will be needed to keep up the government. Advanced technology is a huge advantage in wars and we saw this in the Israel-Palestine conflict. With high technology you can kill your enemies in massive numbers with minimal casualties.

Advanced technology and science have made it possible to understand the world in a way that previously was impossible, this religion could never have been created without high technology and science. The internet is decentralized in theory and allows for people that are interested to find a lot of good information, unfortunately not many people have the will and intelligence to separate the facts from the fiction. The internet has changed the playing field but it remains to be seen if the internet will bring down the current system or if it only will make it worse.

The internet allows us to be anonymous but it also allows for the government and companies to collect information about most people easily, being fully anonymous on the internet requires skill and discipline most people lack. In 2016 the ZK-snarks technology was finally good enough to allow anonymous messages and value transactions.

Technology has allowed humans to exterminate many species and hunt others to the brink of extinction, a lot of whale species were almost exterminated due to whaling, before high technology hunting big whales was impossible at any significant scale.

Nature & environment

Unfortunately due to human overpopulation wildlife suffers and species get exterminated in record numbers, these species will probably be lost forever which is a shame, it will take millions of years for nature to recover from the damage done by humans the last 100 years.

This neglect of our environment and sick focus on human lives is a result from spiritual sickness, people fail to understand that they will suffer in future lives for their sins against nature. Often hunting is justified by stating that the population of the hunted animal is too big but in reality only humans need to be hunted currently, we must consider hunting other humans instead of wildlife for meat.

You may want to live as a lion or tiger in a future life but if these animals are exterminated that will not be possible, today there are more tigers in captivity(as pets) than in the wild and maybe the tiger will not even survive in the wild, a truly sad development. Wild animals can also provide value for humans in the form of entertainment.

Climate change

Environmental issues often need to be dealt with on a global scale and the issue of anthropogenic global warming is no exception, we are in a situation similar to the prisoner's dilemma where the end result is likely to be catastrophic global warming.

[243](#) [244](#) [245](#) [246](#) [247](#) [248](#)


Therefore we need to use military might to gain control over the entire planet allowing us to force a global reduction of CO2 emissions via a global carbon tax, etc. A thermonuclear war is preferable over catastrophic global warming that will be far more expensive than the cost of reducing emissions.

Madman theory

If you have nuclear weapons but it's obvious you are unwilling to actually pull the trigger and kill millions of people other countries will not take you seriously, for this reason both trump and nixon tried to play crazy but it didn't really work.

You need to demonstrate you are indeed crazy enough to launch nukes or other countries will not respect you.

This can be applied to many situations, when people know you will not do anything crazy they will not respect you and people are likely to take advantage over you since you are afraid of conflict.



Empty threats can sometimes work out but usually it doesn't and you may end up in serious troubles.

Military might and defense

The goal shall be to build an empire and eventually take over the entire planet. For this you need

- actual professional soldiers getting a proper payment.
- powerful nuclear weapons
- places where people can take shelter in the case of a nuclear war.
- ability to intercept nuclear missiles.
- powerful conventional equipment for scenarios where you cannot rely on nuclear weapons.



Imperialism and globalism

Having a small country results in you being vulnerable to the whims of larger countries, you might think you will get more independence when small but in reality you will just become powerless.

Some issues such as global warming and pollution need to be tackled globally, we cannot let countries all over the world destroy the environment, we can do it ourselves but we cannot let other countries do the same.

We shall expand our borders and dominate the world, we shall eventually rule the entire planet. We need to build a strong military alliance allowing us to take over the world.

Space colonization

The next step is to also colonize other planets, this will require radical genetic engineering, having to rely on advanced technology isn't sustainable, it would require constant support from Earth which isn't even possible for planets outside our solar system.

Rather than sending something like a human we might instead have to send something like a seed, it can be new organisms specifically made for the planet or artificial wombs able to create something like human life.

All life on earth will eventually go extinct due to the sun becoming increasingly active, any life on mars would extinct eventually due to the sun becoming a red giant and later a brown dwarf.


Interplanetary reincarnation

It is impossible to know how your next life will be, you might end up living as the opposite gender or even on another planet.

It is very difficult to know how life on other planets would be but the research on the island Madagascar has uncovered convergent evolution. In Madagascar an animal called fossa has evolved into having many similarities with cats despite belonging to the Eupleridae family, a family of carnivorans closely related to the mongoose family (Herpestidae). Thus even on another planet life may still have similarities with earth, there are many ways in which something like humans can evolve.

The number of lives you live as a human is finite, eventually humans will go extinct or evolve beyond recognition. Before there were many humans most of us lived as other animals or organisms on other planets. 6.5% of the humans who ever lived are alive today.

The number of intelligent animals also varies with time, there was a time when no intelligent life existed on Earth and for vintologi to be correct interplanetary reincarnation is needed.



An intelligent extraterrestrial organism will most likely have males and females like humans and other mammals, hermaphrodite life is a possibility but not likely, even less likely is some exotic solution such as 25% males, 50% hermaphrodites and 25% females. Evolution does not lead to the optimal results since each change needs to be beneficial for survival and replication, the eyes human have are worse than the ones of many animals but evolution will not give us better eyes since we are stuck in a dead-end, only genetic engineering can give us that.

The probability to reincarnate into a different planet is infinitesimal unless there is a shortage of brains to reincarnate into on Earth for a long period of time (thousands to billions of years). Cases where children have memories of living on another planet are very rare and impossible to verify, cases where children have memories of being animals are much more common but very difficult to verify.

There are some very interesting cases about children having past-life memories, often these children talk about having a violent early death, they died early with unfinished business. It's very unlikely that the children actually remember past-life memories in any of these cases [249](#) [250](#) [251](#) [252](#)

Our universe

If no new big bang takes place in the future Boltzmann Brains could still emerge via quantum fluctuations [253](#) [254](#) thus you would be infinite times more likely to have a conscious experience in a Boltzmann brain than an actual biological brain given infinite time.

Current research suggests that dark energy is getting stronger [255](#) [256](#) [257](#) [258](#) [259](#) [260](#) [261](#) and if true our universe will end via the big rip allowing for a new universe to emerge with different constants of nature [262](#) [263](#) [264](#)

The “[hubble tension](#)” could also be due to astronomers failing to properly measure the expansion of our universe [265](#) [266](#) potentially opening up the door for the (big bang, big crunch) cyclic model [267](#) There are many proposed cyclic theories of our universe that currently cannot be falsified. In conformal cyclic cosmology it is assumed that all fermions in the universe will become totally massless resulting in the universe forgetting how big it is and a new big bang will follow [268](#) [269](#) [270](#) while this theory is highly unlikely to be correct [271](#) it's difficult to completely rule it out.

Recent observations point to our universe being closed but it's still vastly bigger than the observable universe [272](#) [273](#) with the other possibility being a universe with an infinite amount of matter [274](#)

The apparent fine-tuning of ‘fundamental’ constants of nature suggests that our current universe hasn't been the only universe.

Mechanisms for reincarnation

If your soul is tied to a quantum system said system will eventually take a form that results in you becoming conscious again, in this picture the collapse of the wave function is the manifestation of free will and every quantum system is an independent soul. One solution is to assume the collapsed wavefunction is a continuation of the old wavefunction.

<https://phys.org/news/2011-03-quantum-no-hiding-theorem-experimentally.html>

It is also possible that your quantum soul can emerge somewhere else in the universe not directly connected to your old collapsed wavefunction.

If your consciousness is tied to brainstructure said structure will eventually emerge again given infinite time.

Classical theories of consciousness

If consciousness is just classical computations there could be multiple physical manifestations of the same mental state.

If you made a perfect replication of a brain and the environment then we would have 2 brains for the same conscious experience meaning it would still just be a single consciousness. Then eventually at some point the two brains would diverge and it's unclear which of them would truly continue the conscious experience assuming it isn't both **xor** none of them.

A brain would merely be a physical manifestation of something more abstract that is your subjective experience (unclear how assuming it's even logically possible). Your consciousness would be mathematical in nature and just like other maths it can emerge physically in the world from evolution, random chance or conscious design.

If we assume a cyclic universe a sufficiently similar brain structure to your old brain would emerge an infinite number of times and thus you would reincarnate an infinite number of times from a given point and thus your conscious experiences would branch out like a tree. Your conscious experience now would be the natural continuation of an infinite amount of conscious experiences from the past. Thus there wouldn't actually be separate souls, instead they would all be connected mathematically via a web of continuations and you having a conscious experience in just one body would be an illusion.

Quantum theories of consciousness

The **no-cloning theorem** would then make it impossible to copy a quantum soul since the wavefunction collapses when it is measured. Therefore you cannot copy or destroy a quantum soul, it can only be transferred. The **no-hiding theorem** would make destruction of a quantum-soul impossible.

You cannot measure a quantum soul since a quantum state will collapse when you try to measure it.

One quantum theory of consciousness is “orch or” [275](#) [276](#) it was developed by Roger Penrose and Stuart Hameroff, there are many issues with orch or and similar approaches [277](#)

Roger Penrose has suggested that the collapse of the wave function(quantum mechanics) occurs by itself after a time depending on how large the separation in space-time is. This particular interpretation of quantum mechanics never had any evidence in favor of it and the original version of it was later falsified [278](#)

When we understand consciousness we will also understand reincarnation(if possible) and also understand ourselves better. Maybe the lemmings are people whose true consciousness failed to develop, i have never been a lemming so i do not know. In any case i doubt this hard problem will ever be solved in our current corrupt society, even if someone comes up with the solution the other people will be too stupid to see it as the solution(same with other fields in science).

Interestingly Roger Penrose's interpretation of quantum mechanics & consciousness implies pantheism since the self collapse of the wavefunction would happen everywhere.

Recent advancement in AI has shown that artificial (classical) neural network can outperform all humans on earth at specific tasks, we may not actually need quantum computations for general intelligence either.

[279](#) [280](#) [281](#) [282](#) [283](#)

Generally the problem with orch or is that it might not be possible to have quantum computations of that scale at that temperature, Hameroff mentioned that spin has properties required to work on large scale. Even if quantum computations on large scale(brain) aren't possible in normal temperatures it does not mean that quantum computations don't happen in the brain. A molecule capable of creating quantum entanglement in the brain was discovered year 2015 [284](#)

<http://arxiv.org/abs/1508.05929>

Quantum entanglement is a very strange quantum mechanical effect where the measurement of one particle affects the state of the entangled particle directly(faster than the speed of light), which would allow quantum cognition in the brain.

Free will

Free will is simply indeterminism meaning the outcome cannot be known in advance, quantum mechanics seems to work in such an indeterminate manner [285](#)

If our consciousness itself is quantum mechanical we will have conscious free will since our conscious decisions themselves would be unpredictable to a degree.

Consciousness as an emergent property from classical computations would not allow for conscious free will and would also make it possible to copy the consciousness or uploading it into a powerful enough computer. Even in that case however actual decisions by humans would still have a degree of unpredictability since the classical computations would be potentially impacted by quantum events.

If our universe itself is deterministic then there wouldn't be any free will at all since the future (including all our decisions) would already exist and there would only be an illusion of choice and randomness.

While the outcome cannot be known some outcomes/decisions will still be far more likely than others, you could theoretically calculate these probabilities but you would never be able to always correctly guess what decision someone would make.

In a lot of situations (such as poker) being a bit unpredictable is actually preferable over always doing the same thing in the same situation. Thus free will may not actually be an evolutionary liability.

Free will and criminal justice

Punishment is about social control, it's not about fairness.

0. Deter people from doing actions you dislike.
1. Rehabilitate people
2. Prevent criminals from continue doing things you view as bad.
3. Personal gain (such as having someone reduced to being your slave with no rights).
4. Mob satisfaction (such as people cheering as someone is publicly caned).
5. Societal good (such as forced medical experiments for science).

None of these require that you could have made another decision (such as not killing).

Let's say we have a pedophile that will rape children compulsively (he cannot control himself) does that mean we shouldn't sentence him? of course not.

Ideally a dangerous individual should be locked up before he is able to harm others. Requiring formal conviction of a crime does not prevent the government/courts from judging people based on their character, you can use selective enforcement of laws to target problematic individuals.

If someone could have neurologically have done otherwise then giving out a punishment is less important since he/she will be less likely to re-offend without intervention. Instead of judging by action you would judge people by their character meaning their probability of taking certain actions.

Rational character vs rational decisions

In a situation where you are judged by a character you might end up in a situation where taking what seems to be the rational decision actually isn't since your character itself is being judged.

Let's have the option to loan 1000\$ that you really need for something important (worth 100000\$) but there isn't actually any penalty for you not paying back the money you were lent. While the best outcome for you is getting the 1000\$ and then not paying it back what's actually important is that you get the money and if then your character is being judged by decent accuracy you trying to win by getting the money only to not pay it back really isn't a great strategy.

If the probability of you paying the loan back is X then your expected value/\$ Y is the following

$$Y = 1000(1-X)B + 100000B$$

Where B is the probability of you getting the money in the first place.

The person lending out the money might be able to find out if someone is neurologically prone to paying it back (or not paying it back) and base their decision on that. Human decisions are predictable to a degree.

<https://vintologi.com/threads/newcombs-problem.647>

If you are unwilling to retaliate against people treating you badly when that comes at personal cost people will be more likely to abuse you knowing you are not going to do anything back. If people know you are capable of acting on your hate to get revenge at high price they may not abuse you in the first place.

X	B	Y
0.02	0.2000	20196
0.04	0.4000	40384
0.10	0.4300	43387
0.20	0.4200	42336
0.30	0.4500	45315
0.40	0.5000	50300
0.50	0.6000	60300
0.60	0.8100	81324
0.70	0.7900	79237
0.75	0.8120	81403
0.84	0.8125	81380
0.92	0.7750	77562
0.99	0.8000	80008

Instead of just looking at each isolated decision we need to realize that decisions are based on physical conditions inside and outside the brain that will be predictable to a degree, the more your decisions can be predicted the more important it will be to have an ideal character in terms of your propensity to make certain decisions rather than just doing what seems to be best for you at the moment.

The flow of time

For a flow of time to be fundamentally real it has to actually have some impact on the universe itself. Therefore a deterministic universe would not have a real-flow of time since then any supposed flow of time would change nothing (since the future is already determined) and therefore the supposed flow of time wouldn't exist in the first place.

The real flow of time is the irreversible collapse of the wave-function, until the collapse takes place time has not truly moved forward and thus what seems to be spooky action at a distance will be observed [286](#) [287](#)

To you it seems like time is moving forward smoothly but that's not actually what's happening fundamentally. Time only really moves forward when quantum free will is exercised. If something is already determined it already exists and then there is no real passage of time.

The reason why the second law of thermodynamics cannot work in the other direction is because the future isn't determined and thus it's unlikely particles will spontaneously become more ordered. Thus as time increases entropy will also increase, temporary entropy drop is possible but unlikely.

Thus there will be a flow of time in one direction despite [CPT-symmetry](#).

Special relativity and reincarnation

There isn't any absolute flow of time in special relativity. Since no information can travel faster than the speed of light it really doesn't make sense to talk about which event that happens first unless one of these events is in the future light-cone of the other event.

In flat spacetime the lightcone of causality is a with time growing sphere of volume of space that could have been influenced by the past event or if you go backwards the volume of space that could have affected a future event.

For your consciousness itself to be real it has to actually have some impact and this requires consciousness to be tied to the real flow of time. Thus we can conclude that your conscious experience is linked to a time-irreversible collapse of the wavefunction.

Since you cannot violate causality we can conclude that your future conscious experiences must at least be restricted from your past light-cone meaning you cannot reincarnate to any place where the light could have reached you in the past.

The path light takes in the universe will be determined by General Relativity, thus your past and future light-cone will be affected by gravity. If you find yourself in a black hole where your consciousness will have a hard time escaping since all future timelines point to the singularity.

If you reincarnate to another planet it will be a time where light from that planet cannot reach your planet until the time where you died. There is however one big question to answer, can you reincarnate to a future your light has not yet reached?

Solution1

You can only reincarnate into a future lightcone. Thus your conscious experience now must be the continuation of a conscious experience in your past lightcone. This can be explained by your consciousness being tied to a particular quantum wavefunction. Thus the collapse of the wavefunction must be linked to a specific collapse of the wavefunction of the past lightcone resulting in the continuation of your conscious experience.

This may theoretically result in a wavefunction not collapsing since there was no matching last collapse in the past lightcone, this will quickly change since a matching past lightcone will become available in your past lightcone as you move forward in time. This will also result in "spooky action at a distance" similar to the quantum entanglement problem since you can only reincarnate into a single future brain.

This makes sense with special relativity since if your future consciousness is always restricted to the future light-cone there isn't actually any need for any absolute flow of time. Conscious experiences that are not in the past or future light-cone relative to each other would be separate souls and then it wouldn't make sense to talk about one experiencing something before someone else, no information can be exchanged and there isn't any absolute notion of some flow of time.

Solution2

In order for reincarnation outside the future light-cone to be possible we need some absolute flow of time so you will always reincarnate into the present as determined by some absolute notion of the flow of time.

The past is what's determined and the future is not determined.

The absolute flow of time does not have to match any of special/general relativity reference frames, any order of true causality would be viable as causal event takes place in the past light-cone of any previous event.

There isn't however any evidence that said absolute notion of the flow of time exist in the first place, if it exists it's not something we can currently measure, nor is there any good reason to think that it exist in the first place. It's merely just another theoretical possibility that we cannot currently refute properly.

This allows for instant reincarnation to a location 10 billion light-years from your current location, this can both be both forward and backward in time depending on your reference system. This would mean there is some type of absolute time that we cannot currently detect with any experiment.

Reincarnation without death

It follows logically that there is a nonzero probability that you end up reincarnating even though your body didn't actually die, the probability for this is greater with solution2 since there isn't any time delay.

If you were to switch body you may not actually notice it since you may end up only with the memories of your new body and thus you wouldn't be able to tell you only have controlled your current body for a year.

Even if memory preservation would be required for reincarnation a body switch could still occur due to 2 brains having very similar memories, then you would experience a memory continuation even though your brain is now different. The memory continuation may not be perfect but you would not notice that since there wouldn't be any actual transfer of memories.

Is your consciousness universal?

Since you wouldn't notice your consciousness having switched location you wouldn't notice if your consciousness was constantly switching location. Therefore it cannot currently be ruled out that there is really only a single consciousness in the entire universe but you do not have memories of your conscious experiences in the other bodies since these memories are left in the brains you currently do not have any conscious experiences in.

Since caring about other humans can be a liability you might be better off thinking you only have a conscious experience now in your current body and that no switch will take place prior to your death. Otherwise you will have to do what needs to be done knowing that you yourself will suffer from it.

Some people will be more willing to inflict harm to other people if they think that they are just hurting themselves since the notion of hurting others make them very uncomfortable.

Reincarnating as a human

If any human consciousness is also your consciousness then you will keep experiencing life as a human as long as humanity itself exist.

If instead the continuation requires specific conditions such as a new brain sufficiently similar to the old brain or some continuation of quantum information humanity may die out completely before you can be human again.

If it's impossible to reincarnate directly as a human child at least one intermediate incarnation would be required such as a Boltzmann brain.

Since there isn't any theoretical limit to the number of Boltzmann brain reincarnations you could still eventually end up as something completely different even if each new brain has to be very similar to the old (now destroyed) brain.

For solution2 an intermediate Boltzmann brain would have to emerge somewhere in the universe. Our current universe is at least 250 times bigger than the observable universe but there is currently no upper limit for the size of our total universe.

For solution1 Boltzmann brain reincarnations would be restricted to a volume expanding 299792458m/s which would be a very severe restriction given the total size of our universe and the low probability of a Boltzmann brain similar to a human brain emerging.

An intermediate brain may also emerge via an already existing human brain but instead of a permanent switch it would only be temporary, you would quickly lose control over the body you got for a limited time.

About past-life memories

No information can be transferred to a brain outside the future lightcone and memories cannot magically be transferred to a brain within the future lightcone either, you may still be more likely to reincarnate into a brain that already has similar memories as your old brain but it may not be required.

There is no known mechanism in physics that would allow for actual memory transfer directly from an old dying brain to a new healthy brain. Thus given our current understanding of physics any past-life memory must have already been in place before the incarnation takes place.

The continuation of your conscious experience requires few if any of your memories, it only requires a sufficiently similar mental state to be recreated and even if some memories were to be kept these are very likely to be lost later due to how children develop neurologically.

The infinite chain proof of reincarnation

You having a conscious experience now in your current body can be causally explained by you having an earlier conscious experience and this being a continuation of that, if there is no earlier conscious experience then you having a conscious experience now in your current body begs explanation.

Why should your consciousness end next if it already go back an infinite amount of time?

The probability of your individual incarnation being the last is at most $1/\infty = 0$

If it is possible for a consciousness without beginning to end the number of souls of the universe would have to decrease over time with no new ever being created.

Having the number of souls strictly decrease over time results in at least one of the following 2 things

0. The probability of you having a conscious experience at a given moment decreasing with time meaning you would have been infinite times more likely to have a conscious experience in the past rather than now.
1. The time between each incarnation increasing as you wind time back tending to infinity.

Making the causation chain infinite both backwards and forwards in time resolves these issues, thus we can conclude that consciousness has no first beginning or final end.

A unified theory of physics is needed

Our current technology for doing experiments is very good but unfortunately there is no theory that explains our observations properly, instead several theories such as general relativity and quantum field theory have to be used and these theories are incompatible with each other.

In addition no current theory of physics explains 85% of the apparent mass “dark matter”.

A fundamental theory of physics would tell us to which degree dimensionless constants can change (such as after a new big bang), it's very likely that the true fundamental constants are far fewer than the current known constants in the standard models that cannot be theoretically derived.

A true fundamental theory would answer questions regarding free will and consciousness, it would tell us how the current universe would end and what the next universe can look at.

Can any god exist?

Whether or not god exists will depend on your definition of god, the following 4 types have not yet been ruled out

0. god in control over quantum indeterminism.
1. god at the big bang.
2. god that exists inside black hole(s).
3. AI god (superintelligence).
4. genetically engineered god.

A god of type0 would be very constrained by special relativity, you are not allowed to communicate faster than 299792458m/s, thus even if a single consciousness were in control over most quantum indeterminism it wouldn't allow for anywhere close to effective control.

Gods of type 1 and 2 cannot currently be ruled out since our well-tested theories of physics break down at this point and there is no generally accepted theory of quantum gravity.

A god of type1 would no longer have any power once the big bang has happened.

A god of type2 would be imprisoned by the black hole and thus made practically powerless by General Relativity.

About your personality

Your personality is simply learned behavior and some key neurological traits. One scientific model for personality is the five-factor model [288](#)

When you interact with other people you get feedback based on how you act such as social praise or disapproval, that will significantly shape your behavior but it also comes with grave danger, other people will benefit from conditioning you into acting based on what's good for them instead of actually figuring out what's good for you.

Often the social cues and conditioning you get are very different from what's actually good for you, this can result in you acting in ways that are very harmful towards your personal well-being [289](#)

Many people today claim that “you should be yourself” and also have detailed standards for acceptable and unacceptable behaviors, this is not a contradiction since it's very possible to alter what your base personality is. Our current society has many standards of good and bad that are imposed on us from early age, this is called upbringing or nurture and consists of polluting the brains of young people.

Ultimately it is you that decides which type of person you want to be, changing can be difficult but with time the new personality will become natural. You can change for the better.

What people call immaturity is simply people not yet having conformed to all the standards our society tries to impose upon us. What we have today is conflicting standards which create confusion and also more real freedom.

When you repeat a certain behavior with success(such as talking to an audience) it will become natural for you. How people behave changes a lot with time, your free will, genetics and environment determine your personality.

How to manipulate and control people

When interacting with other people you need a clear way to measure success, instead of looking for superficial social approval/disapproval you need to look at what's actually important to evaluate what type of behavior is actually beneficial for you.

Humans respect strength; when you are powerful and use said power people will rationalize what you did to them as something good since they are cowards, of course people don't want to view themselves as the cowards they are and thus they will use irrational thinking to conclude that the people in authority are good.

Humans dislike uncertainty and often convince themselves of some beliefs such as christianity in the absence of evidence and often against existing evidence. When the majority can buy into insane beliefs such as christianity obviously the situation is much worse when it comes to less obvious falsehoods, especially when there is a social incentive to fit in with the group.

Brute force methods are far more effective when it comes to social control. being nice is actually a weakness and people in general do not respect nice guys, they finish last.

0. Make sure people invest in you, they will have to be nice to you in order to get back what they invested(time/money).

1. Do not back down if you are in a conflict since this will incentivize behavior you don't like.

2. Use punishments to show you are serious.

3. Punish someone openly to win respect.

4. Reward people that are loyal to you.

When you are in a situation where someone has significant power over you the only viable option is to swallow your pride and also say what the individual wants to hear [290](#)

5. Give them compliments that are genuine.

6. Do not even criticize people when they do something bad.

7. Pretend to share the views of the individual(s) you need to be on your side.

8. Reward good behavior.

The one being punished may not change his mind but others will, if the penalty is death the opinions of the one getting punished do not matter. When you ban someone from your forum the opinions of the one you banned do not matter. Females generally respond better to punishments than males due to their more submissive nature.

By providing someone with incorrect/misleading information they will make the incorrect decision even if they are intelligent since they applied their reasoning abilities to information that wasn't particularly correct. There is however many issues with trying to control people through propaganda

9. People are already bombarded with propaganda, you end up having to compete against that which tend to be very expensive economically.

10. people tend to confine themselves to echo-chambers where they don't have to deal with people explaining to them how they are wrong.

Dealing with bad parents

Most people have parents that are bad in many ways and there are different strategies to deal with that, first of all you need to free yourself of the control they have over your mind, once you have begun to properly think for yourself you will be able to free yourself from them in other ways.

As with other authority figures being too honest can end very badly for you since how they act will depend a lot on what you say to them. The more power someone has over you the more important it is to act in a way which results in said authority figure doing things that are good for you or bad for people which you want to harm. You will have to lie or at least withhold crucial information from them.

You might have to play dirty, your parents probably want you to be there for them when they are old, if that is the case they better be nice to you now. If they want you to go to college or focus on school you can simply state that you are willing to do that if they give you some basic things

0. you should be allowed to be sexually active.
1. you alone decide if/when you are going to see a psychiatrist.
2. you should not be forced into any medical treatment against your will or even be pressured into it.
3. they should not deprive you of a medical treatment you want that is supported by good evidence.
4. you should be allowed to have children at early age and be supported.
5. they cannot be violent towards you or emotionally abusive.

Luckily in a lot of societies you actually do have rights as a child. Your parents will not have absolute authority over you. Parents do not want you to report abuse to authorities and this will give you some leverage over them.

Even after 18 where you are legally free your parents may still hold significant power over you. Often parents control a lot of resources often including the home their children live in. You want to manipulate your parents into providing you with their resources since then you will gain more power while they will lose power, that will allow you to at any moment just leave them behind.

Parental rescue fantasy

If your parents are or were unable to meet your needs you may end up asking other parental figures to meet these needs, this is likely to result in you being exploited. Other people cannot replace your parents, since you are not related to them in the same way they will be less likely to actually properly take care of you. If you are male you really need to grow up and start to take care of yourself.

Other people can still help you but you need to take care of yourself, especially if you are male. Your parents may have done a good job at raising you in the past but eventually you will find yourself in situations where they cannot help you anymore, they might die, they might lack the skills required to help you, you might be in a situation where you yourself need to deal with a problem.

You need to be willing to break with your parents if they do you more harm than good, you don't have any obligations towards them, it's only they that are biologically obligated to take care of you. The fact that they are your parents does not mean they are good for you, a lot of parents are outright terrible.

A lot of mental issues are caused by environment

We are forced to live in ways that are very unnatural and in addition to that we will also face hardships and these can be really bad. It's not surprising people turn to drugs such as alcohol even though it's clearly harmful.

By disabling the brain you will feel like your life situation is better than it is but this is not really a valid way to actually improve your life.

Stimulant drugs allow you to become more robotic which is required in some situations, it's not surprising more and more people turn to these drugs even though they are not even diagnosed with ADHD [291](#)

People destroying their bodies and especially their brains with mind-altering substances will often try to push other people to join their insanity, if you don't drink alcohol other people around you may try to pressure you into taking it and in that case I recommend that you firmly demonstrate that this isn't acceptable behavior. People will try to push you into joining the psychiatry cult and having them pump you full of drugs that will numb you even more than alcohol and thus you will feel like you are doing better in life even though you are actually doing far worse.

People badly addicted will be reassured by authority (quack psychiatrist) that they do indeed need these drugs and they will think they are getting helped, most people will not look up actual studies about the long-term impact (it's always bad without exception).

Ignorance is a bliss

People will be happier if they believe that their society is good and that the future will be great, thus going into details about how your current society is dysfunctional can be very painful, especially when there isn't any easy way to fix the problem. Thus it's better for the well-being of everyone that the ruling elite are the ones taking care of the difficult questions sparing the masses from that difficult task.

If your life isn't good you may instead benefit from thinking it's due to other people around you rather than the fact that your life is bad because of bad decisions you made [292](#)

The truth can be brutal and unpleasant, most humans need to shield themselves from reality to stay mentally healthy. The truth can be very painful.

When you fail in life and transition to improve your life you might be happier thinking "it's because i have a girl brain" which is unlikely to be the case prior to HRT [192](#) [293](#) [197](#) [205](#) if you think the reasons for you wanting to transition are sexual you might refrain from starting or delay it resulting in the quality of your life being worse.

Religious people are happier and have more reproductive success [294](#) [295](#) [296](#)

If your wife cucked you and had children with someone else you are happier believing they're your children over knowing you will die as a childless ultimate failure and that you invested all that time and money into children that weren't yours.

About Nihilism

There are several forms of nihilism [297](#) but the concept in general isn't compatible with vintologi. Moral nihilism, also known as ethical nihilism, is the meta-ethical view that morality does not exist as something inherent to objective reality; therefore no action is necessarily preferable to any other. A moral nihilist would say that killing someone, for whatever reason, is not inherently right or wrong.

Let's say you have a gun and are able to kill without getting any punishment, you may decide to kill a few ugly people in order to increase the chance of being beautiful in the next life but maybe the people you killed were important in other regards and thus the result may be the opposite. Your actions do have consequences and these consequences will build up over time due to the butterfly effect, you might be changing the world to the better now without realizing it.

The morality in vintologi is probabilistic, if you like your genes having a lot of children will improve the probability of having genes you like in future lives. In vintologi your ability to control what happens in future lives is almost zero and it is also very difficult to know how your action in the current life affects future lives, this is similar to trading stocks where it can be very difficult to predict the results of your actions.

Nihilism is simply the logical conclusion from the premise that your consciousness ends when you die.

Vintologi may seem to be nihilistic by invalidating the moral concerns humans typically have but your action will have consequences and thus you ignoring the world around you will not be viable long term.

There is no absolute morality

Humans in general have a need to be told what to do, instead of following their heart they base their decisions on bibles, constitutions, laws and other artificial constructs. Some libertarians believe in the gay “non-aggression principle”.

In Cosmotheism good and bad is based on how an action affects the genetic quality of the humans.

Christians have their stupid 10 commandments. In Christianity people breaking the rules are supposed to go to hell and burn for all eternity, well that seems better than boring heaven.

Our society has many norms and moral dogmas, many of these have been challenged already and there is more to come, there is no case where something is absolutely bad or absolutely good, you may try to come up with an example such as rape or torture but if you use your own brain you are likely to arrive at the opposite conclusion

0. A lot of people have rape fantasies and want to experience it.

1. Torture can be fun for the individual doing the torture.

2. There are a lot of teenagers that want to have sex with older humans but fucking a 14-year-old is illegal in most countries.

The belief in karma is common where simps are supposed to achieve good karma but that is of course nonsense, genetic distance and possibly your own free will is what actually determined reincarnation and your ability to control your future lives is very limited, unless you gain a significant amount of political power you will have very little control over your upcoming lives.

Instead of worrying about whether or not your actions are moral you should focus on living a good life and also good future lives, fuck females, win money playing poker against losers, write a novel, start a family, etc.

About animal rights

Societies that care about animals will end up doing worse since it will become more expensive to produce high-quality food, animal testing will be more difficult or even totally banned.

Rights for animals follow naturally from universal human rights, once you have accepted the premise that you are morally obligated to prevent other beings from suffering there is no end to your moral obligations. Some species such as orcas and sperm whales have bigger brains than humans [298](#) [299](#)

Since you may end up reincarnated as a non-human mammal you may want to secure some rights for animals in the future, this however comes at a significant cost

0. Raising farm-animals in good condition costs more in terms of resources, there is better use for that.

1. People miss out on fun they could have brutally dominating animals.

2. If you do not kill an alien the alien may reproduce fast and eventually outnumber and displace humans, by being too nice you end up eventually being replaced.

Humans can currently afford to be nice but eventually that will no longer be a viable option. Current humans are likely to be replaced by more aggressive beings (Such as genetically engineered humans) due to being too nice. There are biological differences between humans and genetically engineered humans have already been created.

We cannot just assume that reincarnated as an animal that is brutally dominating by humans would be a bad thing, different animals have different brains and thus we cannot project our human psychological needs (which we have a poor understanding of) upon completely different animals.

About empathy and compassion

We spent most of our evolutionary history in small tribes and in that environment unselfish behavior made a lot of evolutionary sense. Even in cases where we met strangers we still benefited from compassion since it allowed for peaceful interactions.

Our modern society is different, capitalism works fine even when people act selfish and being too compassionate often ends up harming yourself or other people important to you.

You will come into contact with people willing to use your empathy and kindness against you, if you don't keep your empathy in check you will end up being exploited by psychopaths.

Empathy may not even be that great for society as a whole, especially not when it isn't combined with rational thinking. You might just end up making things worse by trying to help people, in addition a lot of people get upset by people trying to 'help' them when they haven't asked for it.

When people are too compassionate future generations may be ruined due to people with bad genetics reproducing, by implementing brutal policies (such as accelerating hypergamy) future generations are improved and everyone is better off long term.

Even love for your own children can sometimes be problematic, there are situations where you benefit from abandoning your children to start a new family or where empathy towards them is counterproductive in terms of their well-being.

You might have more reproductive success if you are willing to just abandon all your children and letting their mothers and the state raise them instead.

Even environmental issues can be solved even when people are fully selfish, it's in all of our interests to implement policies politically that protects our environment, when such policies are in place (such as it being expensive to emit CO2) people acting unselfishly for the sake of our planet isn't required.

About degeneracy

Degeneracy is behavior that is detrimental for the survival & reproduction of your kind, this can be genetic or due to you being conditioned by society to follow a non-darwinian morality.

Examples of degenerate behavior are:

0. sterilizing yourself.
1. becoming fully monogamous with someone you cannot have children with.
2. committing to a loser when you are female.
3. gambling money with negative [expected value](#).
4. not fucking a female in the pussy given the opportunity.
5. donating money (Very few exceptions).

Engaging in a threesome is obviously not a degenerate behavior since you might be able to make several females pregnant the same day that way.

Due to evolution the ones engaging in degenerate behavior (such as being voluntarily celibate) will be weeded out with time.

About suicide

By killing yourself you will be able to escape personal problems specific to your current life but you may not be able to escape systemic problems that face almost everyone.

Often people attempt suicide out of impulsivity only to quickly regret it later [300](#)

The probability of you being able to escape a problem will depend on how big a part of the upcoming humans end up facing said problem but even if you are lucky enough to escape it one life you may not have the same luck next life. Sometimes you need to simply permanently solve an issue in order to secure good upcoming life, just trying to escape systemic issues is not a valid long-term solution.

About the left

Leftism is about forcing everyone to be equal and this will involve 'helping' people who do not want to get 'helped' in the first place.

- locking up teens against their will "for their own good" even though they didn't even do anything illegal.
- compulsory medical treatments ([vaccines](#), [psychiatric drugs](#), etc).
- compulsory schooling, banning private schools.
- [economically destructive taxation](#) targeting the most productive members of society [301](#)
- not allowing people to just buy any drug they want (can result in trans people waiting years for HRT).
- heavy government control over which medical treatments are allowed at all and who can do them.
- making it illegal to con people out of their money.
- giving big welfare checks to people unwilling/unable to work.
- free healthcare to keep unfit people alive.

Letting people make their own decisions will lead to unequal outcomes and therefore the left prefers the government controlling most aspects of our life "for our own good" instead of allowing natural selection. Some people might actually make better decisions than the government would make for them but that will not be tolerated in a lefty society, everyone needs to be kept down to the same level.

Enforcing high taxes will require totalitarian control over the population, the taxes are needed to pay for the giant ineffective welfare state. Unfortunately over time high taxes and welfare will create a bad mentality among the population where people become increasingly irresponsible.

The left may sometimes promote liberal values to get elected but it's just about getting votes, they are not in favor of real sexual freedom, instead when they are in power they add totalitarian control over human sexuality. If a teen has sex with a 25-year-old male the left will view it as awful exploitation that needs to be stopped. The left isn't helpful for LGBT people with their [gender identity nonsense](#) and the government control over healthcare they are in favor of has historically been very bad for trans people.

About paternalism

Trying to help people when they don't even want 'help' has a very bad track-record

0. People with power typically don't have the best interest in mind for the ones they have power over.
1. The people with power are typically limited in terms of intelligence (mental abilities).
2. People in power have limited knowledge.

Let say someone is diagnosed with schizophrenia, does this justify depriving that individual of his/her freedom and forcing him/her to take drugs that have very bad side effects? The only viable justification for this is eugenics [91](#) [121](#) [59](#) unfortunately government eugenics attempts tend to be disastrous.

It can be difficult to know if someone is actually having hallucinations or is just lying/joking with you. Having hallucinations does not mean you will act crazy, plenty of people cope with that fine without taking any drugs.

Being delusional is normal, it's just a matter of degree. It just comes down to whether or not the insanity is accepted by the society you live in [302](#)

People with eating disorders can currently be force-fed [303](#) this often results in damage "overfeeding syndrome" and it is also likely to cause emotional trauma.

You are not allowed to take drugs, you cannot legally consent to sex until you are 16 (united states).

It's very common that totalitarianism is justified with "it's for their own good" when in reality the ones harming other people with their authority don't even themselves believe they are helping people. When someone is being controlled that individual may eventually tell himself or herself that it is indeed a good thing due to crushed self-confidence and the individuals would not have learned how to properly take care of themselves.

Parenting & custody

Parents often think they should have full power over their children including when it comes to selection of sexual partner. Allowing parents to abuse their children may be eugenic to some degree by bad parental decisions reducing the probability of their children surviving and reproducing.

Two parents with bad DNA can have a child with very good DNA due to luck and in these cases nothing is gained from allowing defective parents to fail their child. For this reason it's important that the government look after children and allow them to escape from their parents' control when needed.

Parenting should be about supporting your children and looking out for their interests, it should not be about totalitarian control or indoctrinating them into a thinking that is bad for them even if it would benefit society. What's good for society might not be good for your children and evolution will over time favor parents who do what's good for their children over what is good for society.

Your biological role as a parent is about maximizing the reproductive success of your children, it's not actually about doing what's good for society or what makes your children happy. You forcing your children to reproduce against their will (such as via rape) might actually be beneficial in terms of spreading your genetic since then your children will have more offspring. Even if your daughter has severe gender dysphoria letting her transition will very likely reduce how much your genetics spread.

Since parents are generally misguided and influenced by society they will not of course come close generally when it comes to maximizing the reproductive success of their children. They may have empathy for their children but in most cases they do not have the mental abilities to figure out what's actually beneficial for them.

Parents should not be allowed to deprive their children of sex once they are teens, that would be child-abuse and we shouldn't allow that, parents sometimes need to know their place.

Since parents are to a large extent ill-suited for making important decisions for their children we will instead to a large extent rely on the legal system for resolving conflicts between parents and children. To limit the need for court intervention the age of consent for sex among other things shall be lowered to 13.

The age of consent will be higher (16 to 18) for medical treatments and things that in other ways can cause serious harm. Some contracts may be allowed but it might have to be court-approved first.

For children under the age of consent the important decision such as marriage, adoption, medical decision, etc are done with the approval of 2 of the following 3 parties.

0. The child (the child's government-appointed guardian if the child is under 9).
1. The father.
2. The mother.

Any of these parties can decide to take it to court instead of allowing the majority decision to stand. If it goes to court a decision will be taken within 24 hours unless the case is serious enough to warrant a longer trial, it will be very rare for a case to last longer than a week.

Of course even with very extensive legal, financial and advisory power over their children there will still be a lot of parents who feel like that level of totalitarian control isn't enough, these people may break the law in attempt to gain even more control and we need to be vigilant in defending children against these control freaks.

Children fundamentally just like everyone else is under the authority of government. Parents may want to be able to raise their children freely but giving parents full control is bad for society since parents tend to be misguided and what's good for the children might not be good for society.

The parents unlike most other people in society will be biologically driven to take good care of their children since each parent passed on 50% of their DNA to each child they had. This does create a strong biological incentive to push your children towards reproduction.

Child discardance and adoption

Properly supporting your children does however require a lot of resources and that shortage of resources is likely to be a more limiting factor than your biological ability to reproduce.

Having the government raise children discarded by their parents (such as due to them being forced to have 14 while only being able to raise 10) can be very beneficial for society since then we can shape them to act in the interests of the state rather than looking out for their own self-interests, these children will also become a valuable base for the ideology of the ruling elite.

With natural reproduction the genetics of your children will largely depend on randomness, what you can do as a parent however is to discard children that do not show promise, this allows you invest heavily in a smaller number of children while still producing a lot of offspring with a decent chance of reproduction.

There are many people who for altruistic/cultural reasons are able to willingly raise children that are not biologically theirs. Being willing to invest a lot of time and resources into genetic strangers will however be selected against so adoption by strangers will probably not be a sustainable solution.

A more sustainable solution is adoption to close blood relative, then the one adopting the child will have a far stronger biological drive to take care of the child [304](#)

People adopting children may tell themselves that it will be just like having their own biological child but science says otherwise, even things like political views are to a very large extent genetic [305](#) [306](#)

Exporting children that do not show promise to other countries is likely to be beneficial since then you as a society will have far more resources towards children worth investing into. This will create a genetic flow from your society to competing societies undermining the biological foundation of the competing societies and making it more likely for your own society to eventually expand there.

It's not in the interest of society to let children raised there be abused/neglected to the point where they will not become valuable members of your society. Therefore it's probably not in the interest of society to let people adopt children to abuse them, in addition people are emotionally opposed to child abuse. Society may still however benefit from exporting countries to be abused in other countries.


Since other societies will naturally be unwilling to import children to be abused and altruistic adoption will be evolutionarily selected against we need other ways to deal with the excess of children where it's not worth the resources/effort for parents or the state to raise them (such as for the military). We need other ways to deal with the excess children that are not worth the cost when it comes to raising them.

Child/Teen marriages

Teens (especially girls) will generally be sexually desired and will allow them to be married off to a stranger that will take care of them in exchange for sex. If the male who adopts her will own her as property he will be motivated to at least keep her alive since then once she is older he will be able to enjoy a lot of fun sex with her and also make her pregnant.

The younger the girl is the more return of investment in terms of sex will be required for it to be beneficial in terms of survival of reproduction for a male to take over custody over her since then he will have to wait longer before she can make her pregnant and males are typically less attracted to very young girls which is natural since they are not fertile.

There is also no shortage of pedophiles very much interested in pre-teens but allowing that to take place in your society might not be beneficial due to them being severely traumatized.



In the real-world however there will always be uncertainty when it comes to marriage or custody and if you do not own the female as property investing heavily into grooming her really doesn't make sense in terms of reproductive success, especially if there are laws against grooming.

In the past when humans evolved there was a significant risk of death so even if you gain full control over a young girl you could still end up losing your investment due to her dying before you are able to make her pregnant. Still arousal to pedophilic sexual stimuli is fairly common among men [307](#)

By giving up your children for marriage early you will be able to increase your total reproduction since the cost of raising children will be lower. It will be easier to find a partner for your child if you allow the partner to your child to also engage in sexual activities with him/her.

Often females are ready to breed before the age of 13 but they might not be ready to alone select who is going to impregnate her, pregnancy can occur very early [308 42](#) which can be beneficial for society.

By pushing girls to marry and have children when they are young we can significantly increase the total fertility rate.

The younger she is the more difficult it will be for her to escape a marriage she is forced/pushed into and this will allow the male to make her pregnant many times.

Once she has given birth to enough children we can let her be free to make decisions over her life.

Thanks to advances in medical technology births are now a lot safer and this includes cases where the mother is very young, C-section is an option in the case vaginal birth isn't viable and safe. This means that we can start breeding females very early.

If you have married a child you will be obligated to take care of her or him and this includes not having sex with her if she isn't physically ready for that type of sex. Thus you may be limited to just sexual touching if she is really young. It is especially important to protect the reproductive organs of girls and thus we may want to completely ban vaginal sex before puberty even if she is married as a child.

Different sexual activities have different consequences. Being fucked in your pussy or anus is very different from just sucking a dick or touching a dick/breast with your hands. The consequences will depend on the societal attitudes towards the activity in question, we do let children shower with other children of the same sex currently and this is viewed as normal.

Males will typically not become infertile if they are sexually abused as children and even if that happens it might not actually be any real loss for society since most males are genetically ill-suited for reproduction. Males are less important biologically and thus boys getting abused is less of a concern unless it's males of high expected value for society. If the boy is emotionally weak he might end up killing himself or generally failing in life, this might be beneficial in terms of eugenics but it will also come with significant societal costs making it very questionable.

We need to establish a legal and generally safe way for girls to engage in sexual activities, this will make it significantly more difficult for ill-suited males to seduce them. We also need to work on making it socially acceptable to engage in sexual activities with teen girls. Sex isn't just about reproduction, it can also be a very nice form of entertainment, sometimes all people involved in the activity enjoy it but in other cases it's about people having fun abusing others, this is more general than just sexual activities, there are a lot of sadistic people out there.

Fucking teens/children


Males are naturally attracted to young fertile females. Unfortunately laws & societal conditioning prevent males from having fun fucking very young females. When she is young she is often weak and generally dependent upon others and this may allow you to properly dominate her sexually.

Actual sexual attraction isn't based on age but your perception of the individual. Males will tell themselves that a female is less attractive than she really is if he thinks she is below the AoC [309](#)

There is a very significant difference in how sexually mature females of the same age in addition to the differences in fertility



The girl above (left) and the girl to the right are both 13.




Columbus Provided Native Sex Slaves to His Men

In addition to putting the Natives to work as slaves in his gold mines, Columbus also sold sex slaves to his men—some as young as 9. Columbus and his men also raided villages for sex and sport.

In the year 1500, Columbus wrote: "A hundred castellanoes are as easily obtained for a woman as for a farm, and it is very general and there are plenty of dealers who go about looking for girls; those from nine to ten are now in demand."

Sexual attraction is about what you see and know, if you think she is older you might enjoy fucking her and later end up with legal troubles because she was below the age of consent.

The breasts of a female grow during pregnancy, Her breasts might initially be smaller than ideal but when she has carried your baby for 7 months they might be of a size you like. By making her pregnant at an early age you will make her more sexually attractive.



11-year-old girl

Facial photographs, body odors and voice recordings were collected from a total sample of 121 heterosexual women from three different age groups: young girls ($n = 50$; age range = 11–15 years, $M = 13.76$ years, $SD = 1.44$ years), adult women ($n = 42$; age range = 19–30 years, $M = 23.48$ years, $SD = 2.47$ years) and circum-menopausal women ($n = 29$; age range = 50–65 years, $M = 56.83$ years, $SD = 5.17$ years)

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/147470491301100209>

Since the participants only rated the face (instead of the body as a whole) it did not actually show young girls (11 to 15) to be on average more attractive than adult females (19 to 30).

It's also not ideal to include girls aged 11 with girls aged 15 in the same analysis since these girls will have very big differences in development.

It's likely that females aged 16 to 18 would win in a study like that partly due to males being conditioned into not viewing young females as sexually attractive and people do not want to admit to being what's viewed by many as awful pedophiles (aka normal males).

The sample size was also too small for a statistically significant result.

Fucking a girl before she has had her first period is unlikely to result in pregnancy and you will put yourself in legal danger just by trying to seduce her. Thus even if you may enjoy fucking a 9-year-old girl you probably shouldn't do it since it may cause you to end up in jail.

Even if it were legal it would still be better to have sex with an older female more likely to get pregnant from a Darwinian perspective. The main advantage of seducing young girls is that it allows you to pair-bond early increasing the probability of you making her pregnant later. It does not need to be full sex, just something she can enjoy at that age.

Unfortunately a lot of individuals (neurological pedophiles) are only attracted to children that haven't undergone puberty, it is indeed really bad to be a pedophile since you will be hated due to your sexual orientation and likely to end up in jail. If you find yourself only attracted to children you might end up having to chemically castrate yourself for your own good [310](#)

<https://sci-hub.se/10.1007/s10508-011-9882-6>

There is a very strong societal stigma against pedophilia and this is likely to result in males telling themselves they don't find children sexually attractive when in another society they would happily marry a girl of that age. You being uncomfortable doing anything sexual with a child below the AoC is a natural response to a society where doing these activities come with significant legal danger.

Even if she hasn't reached peak attractiveness yet you may still enjoy sex with her [307](#) males have very strong sex drive making them capable to enjoy sex with people far away from what's ideal in terms of reproduction.

A lot of adults fantasize about sex where one of them is being dominated and humiliated while the other have fun being able to do anything he wants, often the submissive partner is being restrained to artificially widen the power gap between the parties, this however is a complicated and sad cope.

In order to be able to properly dominate someone you need to be in a position of real power, not just temporary power from physical restraints but also legal authority over the individual.

Relationship between young teens and adults will naturally create a position of power since the adult will be physically stronger and also have resources the young individual wants.

Most young people are already in a custodial situation where adults have totalitarian control over their lives, this typically however will not result in sex and when it does it's illegal. Furthermore most parents wouldn't want to have sex with their own children even if it was illegal, sexually traumatizing your own children is bad in terms of raising healthy and capable offspring. The obvious solution is to let a non-parent gain totalitarian control over the child to have fun doing sexual things.

By gaining proper power over a young teen you will be able to sexually dominate and humiliate her in a lot of fun ways and she will not be able to resist in any way. You will teach her to be a good girl, good girls swallow when you ejaculate in their mouth. Good girls do not try to resist when you fuck her in the pussy trying to make her pregnant. If she behaves badly you will have to spank her or punish her in other ways so she learns that she need to do what you want.

What is today called “pedophilia” was historically accepted. The age of consent used to be far lower in every country in the world. In Britain the age of consent was 12 until the feminists raised it in 1861. In Spain the age of consent was 12 until as late as 1999. In the USA, now the most paedohysterical country in the world; the American ages of consent were vastly lower with one state, Delaware, having an age of consent of 7 possibly up to as late as the 1960s. Right across Europe child porn was legally sold in porn shops in the 1970s, for example, the Danish company Color Climax made child porn; not just of adolescents but even preteens.

The emotional reaction

A lot of people react emotionally when it comes to children/teens having sex early, especially if they know the child. Parents are often overprotective of their kids and try to shield them from the world thinking it would be somehow good for them. The negative emotional reaction can only occur in people who find out about it, ignorance is a bliss.

For some reason people do not feel any bad for all the innocent males(and to a lesser extent females) being jailed due to the mass-hysteria.

The solution to this sex hysteria is not trying to cater to this phobia (it will only make it worse), people will simply need to get desensitized to it similar to how people get desensitized to ‘bad’ things happening in the world & stop caring.

You suffer if other people have dysfunctional brains

Bad laws regarding sex are simply due to people being emotional and therefore support clearly bad policies.

Since we live in democracies (mostly) your life will heavily depend on other citizens having functional brains, this requires people to have proper genetics and also not having their brains impaired by harmful drugs or other questionable psychiatric practices. We also need to make sure the population of your country receives a proper education from school, media, parents, etc.

When people have dysfunctional brains trying to reason with them will be futile since they will be neurologically incapable of accepting what you are trying to say.

People view dysfunctional governments as the norm

A consequence of democracy is that we have normalized a condition where we elect politicians to make very bad decisions and their failure to actually advance humanity and solve global environmental issues such as anthropocentric global warming. Often people will think that the bad policies politicians enact are good and thus re-elect them even though they clearly didn't do a very good job.

Instead of people realizing their government fucked up they will just accept the disaster as the new normal since they do not live in a country where the government actually did the right thing.

Millions of people have died needlessly from [AIDS](#) and covid-19 [311](#) [312](#) [60](#)

People were hoping Donald Trump would resolve things but as expected he turned out to be a rather weak and incompetent leader mostly focused on getting re-elected, he is too unwilling to go nuclear.

Imagine if we actually had a competent government

0. Having a functional educational system.
1. Being able to fuck 13-year-old girls without breaking the law.
2. Expanding our borders.
3. Colonizing other planets.
4. Being able to talk openly about mental problems without risking torture by psychiatry.
5. Having sex without having to worry about STDs
6. Getting proper help when you have mental issues instead of quack psychiatrists.
7. High-quality free open source software funded by the government.
8. Taxes would be far lower (maybe 30% in total).
9. Having a functional judicial system where you don't need to wait years for the final verdict.
10. Birthrate above the replacement level.
11. Genital mutilation of infants would no longer be tolerated.
12. Children would be able to escape abusive parents and live on their own from age 15.
13. Being able to have fun with other people you own as property.
14. Access to technology that allows you to not pass on unwanted genetic traits to your children.
15. Having a good healthcare system paid for by tax-money.
16. Being able to freely see other people without risking covid-19.
17. Actually having rights when using social media (instead of arbitrary for society harmful bans)
18. High-quality reliable information sourced funded by government
19. Having easy to just and secure electronic cash (central bank digital currency).
20. Instead of bailouts failing companies including big banks would be allowed to go bankrupt.
21. Valuable citizens being supported by universal basic income.

About countries you don't live in

You can get very affected by things that happen even outside your country, our world is connected. Millions of Jews in Europe were killed even though they didn't live in Germany because the nazis invaded their country.

Now we face global environmental problems such as global warming and this will affect everyone.

You will not remain in your current country forever, you might at some point want to move to or travel to some other country, your children might want to travel to some other country. You will not live forever and when you die and reincarnate you might not end up in the same country again.

Other countries that are currently not a threat might become a threat in the future and there are plenty of non-war actions other countries can make that will affect you. They might stop sending goods to you that you need instead prioritizing their own economy [313](#)

Our civilization will probably not make it

The combination of dysfunctional governmental systems with governments having access to extremely powerful weapons is unlikely to end well. It's just a question of time before WWII starts [314](#)

Naturally people want to avoid war since they do not want millions or even billions people to die, when war is delayed however governments will keep developing more and more powerful weapons, eventually however there has to be a war and by trying to keep peace we are just delaying the inevitable in addition to having to pay a hefty interest in terms of lives lost.

It's very unlikely we just happen to be alive now if humanity is going to colonize millions of planets in the future [315](#) [316](#) it's simply too difficult to colonize other planets [317](#)

The more humans that are alive at a given moment the more likely you are to be conscious as a human at that moment, thus you are the most likely to live at the civilizational peak where your planet cannot sustain the population.

When we look at society we see that things are slowly changing to the worse, we are making idiocracy reality. There are too many humans and we are destroying the planet trying to feed everyone. Politicians focus on getting re-elected instead of actually trying to solve serious issues.

It's simply too uncomfortable to deal with reality as it is and thus people will seek out ways to escape from reality. People are getting increasingly detached from the real world, the videogame and movie industry is constantly growing, games are getting increasingly immersive and companies are getting better at creating echo chambers so people don't have to deal with being told how they are wrong.

Instead of having an open discussion with everyone about how to solve issues people are being divided into factions (such as democrats and republicans) and eventually one of these factions will take over the entire system ending democracy as we know it, generally none of these factions are good and thus we can expect bad outcome no matter which side that wins, it would just be bad in different ways.

While it is still possible we will be able to establish something somewhat similar to humans on other planets it's unlikely that we will be able to spread out further than that. The most likely scenario is unfortunately catastrophic collapse of our environment and also our civilization and since we have used up our fossil fuels it will be difficult to get a new civilization going again.

Naturally people will put their hopes on renewable energy but there are a lot of issues with these 'solutions' [318](#) what's the point with electrical vehicles isn't enough, we also need clean electricity.

Anarcho-darwinism

After a major societal collapse there wouldn't be any strong governments left and we would instead end up with a stateless society where some people would be dominant and others would be killed/enslaved.

For most of human history there were no states, instead there were many competing tribes and no big central authority. This resulted in a brutal competition and over time human intelligence increased. This all changed with the advent of agriculture and the emergence of large societies [319](#) [320](#)

One relatively recent example of a stateless society is [medieval iceland](#) which lasted 290 years, one of the reasons they got away with not having a powerful centralized state was because they were surrounded by sea and thus they didn't really have to worry about an invasion, at least initially.

Generally a big limiting factor when it comes to how big a state can grow has been technology, this was a big factor in halting the growth of the roman empire preventing them from conquering the entire planet. You need to be able to effectively communicate in order to maintain control of a large empire from a single authority point. With current technology it would be very possible for a single authority to govern the entire planet while a society without a central authority would be very unstable.

In a low-tech society where people are very intolerant of others trying to rule over them or commit aggression against them the nash-equilibrium might be something similar to [anarcho-capitalism](#) since people would use violence against any aggressors. This still would probably not result in an individualistic society, instead we would probably see tribes having strict social norms including enforcement of gender roles. Sure some tribes would try to be liberal but these tribes would get crushed having their males killed and females raped by tribes who have authoritarian internal structure.

Current humans however are willing to follow authority further making attempts at creating a stateless lasting society futile, the power of government can never be limited for a particularly long time.

In anarcho-darwinism people reach the top by being ruthless and while there would still be capitalism to some extent it would be far more limited since there wouldn't be any state to support large-scale capitalism, this will result in a lot of poverty and people will have to fight a lot harder for survival. A non-aggression principle in anarcho-darwinism would merely be a nash equilibrium (if it emerges at all), violence would still be initiated against people unable to defend themselves.

The vikings practiced anarcho-darwinism to some extent with their raids, they raided societies unable to properly defend themselves. In anarcho-darwinism aggression against the unfit (such as defective fetuses) would be permitted.

A big factor in where you would end up in the natural hierarchy would be genetics, this would result in fit males having a lot more reproductive success while the losers would die childless. Losers that are not outright killed would end up as property of other humans to be humiliated and sometimes tortured.

One issue with capitalism is that it forces people to work for other people instead of oppressing people, it also forces people into a less and less natural lifestyle over time. Another issue with typical capitalism is that it disfavors people who have not been able to acquire resources yet.

An individual may also use his private army to invade a country and thus acquire more land and resources, the individual waging the war will have a great economic incentive to make the war cost-effective and it will likely benefit the population as a whole.

Emergence of authority from anarchy

Even if humans are genetically incapable of creating a civilization after the collapse eventually as there is strong selective pressure against humans of low intelligence due to the lack of a functional state we would see more and more technological and social advancement eventually allowing states to emerge once again.

As states emerge it would be hard for stateless societies to resist the expansion of existing states.

Polycentric law

Polycentric law is a legal structure in which providers of legal systems compete or overlap in a given jurisdiction, as opposed to monopolistic statutory law according to which there is a sole provider of law for each jurisdiction. Devolution of this monopoly occurs by the principle of jurisprudence in which they rule according to higher law.

Your power will increase with your violence potential since violence is the ultimate arbitrator, courts are just a cheap replacement.

Since your power is related to your violence and terror potential people and groups will be motivated to arm themselves motivating everyone to become stronger militarily, this will create the opportunity to mount an effective defense but this requires the various different powers in the territory to actually unite against the aggression, this may require the creation of a proper state ending the anarchy.

Having a system where there isn't any clear legal authority would of course be unstable which is why these systems in the past didn't last.

The futility of limited government

A state, in accordance with generally accepted terminology, is defined as a compulsory territorial monopolist of law and order (an ultimate decision-maker). Feudal lords and kings initially did fulfill this. In the course of many centuries, these originally stateless societies had gradually transformed into absolute statist monarchies. While they had initially been acknowledged voluntarily as protectors and judges, European kings had at long last succeeded in establishing themselves as hereditary heads of state. Resisted by the aristocracy but helped along by the “common people”, they had become absolute monarchs, there was no longer any formal limit to their power.

It is sometimes [claimed](#) that if people weren't afraid of dying in order to prevent government tyranny we would be able to restrict the power of government that way but there are obvious issues with that line of reasoning. The first obvious issue is that a government can do far worse things to you than just killing you, than can torture you for decades, they can even target your children. We really cannot expect or rely on people becoming genetic dead ends in their futile fight against a very powerful government.


Furthermore while there are people who want to make the government smaller there are even more people who want to make it bigger and they are often even more fanatical and willing to sacrifice personally for the sake of the political delusions that have consumed them.

With the growth of mass democracy (removal of requirement needed to vote), the rise in the influence of the mass media on public opinion, the US government was gradually transformed into the malignant monster it is today. It is harder and harder to live the lives we want to live without getting imprisoned for breaking laws while the government is free to break every law and constitution.

Embracing vintologi

Initially you will face some mental pain due to having to get rid of your old delusions about reality but you will notice improvements in your life as you get used to the new way of thinking and stop with your old suicidal behavior.

You will now feel good about acting in your own self-interest and feel bad if you foolishly give help to people not deserving it at your own expense.



You will be more willing to take risks in life and you are likely to eventually become very successful in life.

You will understand nature of your existence and what the real consequences of your actions are.

Simple rules to follow in your personal life

0. do not donate for altruistic reasons.
1. do not try to be fair/reasonable, demand conditions that favor you.
2. do not use contraceptives.
3. genital mutilation such as [circumcision](#) isn't a good idea.
4. eat meat.
5. avoid wasting time trying to reason with idiots.
6. do not die a virgin.
7. do not try to prevent teens from having sex.
8. do not become a parent for a child not related to you.
9. strictly avoid psychoactive substances.
10. do not talk openly with a therapist or psychiatrist, avoid them.
11. do not waste yourself on a loser as a female
12. you may break rule 1 to 10 if you have good reason(s) for it.

Rule 8 forbids you from adopting a child or having a pet as a replacement for a biological child. As a male you should always demand DNA testing before becoming a parent for a child (following this strictly is probably the best strategy now).

Rule 8 still allows you to paternity-cuck a guy as a female, he has himself to blame if he is naive enough to become an actual cuckold.

Healthy living

A lot of people want to live healthy but are confused, a diet promoted as healthy might actually be very bad for you. By looking at what humans have eaten in the past you get a decent idea about what food is healthy, you can further improve your understanding by looking at scientific studies.

Your first priority is getting enough calories and nutrients in general so sustain yourself, if you fail that you will at best be deficient and at worst starve to death. Getting enough calories just require you to have enough food, especially calorie-dense food, this is the easy part.

The hard part is making sure you actually get all micro-nutrients you need, getting all essential proteins, etc. You also need to avoid things that are harmful for you [321](#)

Not eating enough animal products can result in very serious health consequences [322](#) [323](#) [324](#) this will depend on DNA [325](#) not getting enough B12 can result in you developing serious mental illness [116](#) [117](#) Fish in particular seems to be good for you [326](#) [327](#)

Just eating muscle meat such as [beef](#) is unlikely to provide you with all micronutrients you need for optimal health there are plenty of plant sources of food you can rely on to add missing nutrients, you do not need to eat organ meat.

If you eat too much calories you will at first be just fine but the excess energy will have to go somewhere and if you are not building muscles it will probably end up as fat and over time as you build up fat your health will deteriorate [328](#) [329](#)

Generally the more restrictive your diet is the harder it will be to get all nutrients you need. The reason restrictive diets can be beneficial is mostly due to food intolerances/allergies and weight-loss. By temporarily cutting out food "elimination diet" you can figure out what you actually tolerate well.

There are some potential benefits with a diet very low in carbs [330](#) [331](#) [332](#) but for most humans it's probably ideal to get about half your calories from high-quality carbs.

[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpub/article/PIIS2468-2667\(18\)30135-X/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpub/article/PIIS2468-2667(18)30135-X/fulltext)

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30638909>

Overconsumption of alcohol is very damaging to the entire body, especially the brain [333](#) [334](#) studies showing benefits of small alcohol consumption have been questioned [335](#) overall even a small amount of alcohol is bad for you. If you are in a situation where drinking alcohol is socially expected the proper solution is to pretend to get a bit drunk, this will also allow you to avoid a lot of dangers.

You need to find a diet that contains all the nutrients you need, doesn't harm you and that you like to eat. If you are unable to stick to a particular diet it doesn't matter how healthy it is.

Non-reproductive sexual activities

Humans need orgasms for their mental health and well-being, orgasms are very helpful for processing emotions. Abstaining from masturbation, porn, etc is not beneficial for survival and reproduction since it will cause a lot of mental stress and results in less productivity and success with the opposite gender.

It is getting harder and harder for males to get accepted by females, it will only get worse for most males. Fortunately for male rejects an actual female isn't required for orgasm. Males have a prostate that when stimulated will give a far more powerful orgasm than what you get from penile stimulation, you might be able to enjoy sex with males even if you are not neurologically homosexual [336](#)

STDs may become is an issue with increased non-biological homosexuality. The current issue with sexually transmitted diseases is to a very large part important and it could be resolved without resorting to strict monogamy or banning homosexuality.

The male sex drive is many times stronger than the female sex drive, sex is a male biological need and when most males are unwilling to have sex with other males, rape females or substitute the need for female sex in other ways the result is likely to be extreme gynocentrism or feminism. Males will be pitted against each other in a desperate struggle for sexual pleasure.

There are of course many issues with taking away female freedom; not many males would be willing to support hard patriarchy, female sexual selection will be eliminated creating the need for some other form of eugenics, who should have power over the female? (often the father is not suitable for that power). If we want females to be free without gynocentrism being rampant we have to accept widespread(cultural) homosexuality and not just biological homosexuality.

Porn and masturbation have the advantage of zero risk for STDs while all forms of sex come with risks, porn makes it possible to see a wide variety of females and sex with little effort, this leaves time for more important tasks. A lot of people have claimed that porn is very addictive but this is very far from the case, gambling is far more addictive and is also unlike porn financially dangerous.

Abstaining from masturbation may be beneficial during short periods but if you deprive yourself of sexual satisfaction too long it will result in low libido, high levels of neuroticism and also low testosterone for males. Frequent masturbation will also lower the risk of prostate cancer [337](#) prostate stimulation may also be useful for improving the health of the male prostate.

About contraceptives

The biggest issue with contraceptives is how they interfere with reproduction, cultures and individuals that embrace them will end up with less reproductive success while cultures and individuals who refuse to use them will end up with more reproductive success.

Furthermore contraceptives comes with other issues. Condoms will significantly interfere with the sexual sensation, it will never come close to the feeling of having real sex. If you have sex with a condom you basically remain a virgin, it's not something to brag about if you are male.

Birth control pills are harmful towards females [338](#) [339](#) [340](#) if you are female you should probably avoid them completely. Estradiol especially oral variants like ethinyl-estradiol will act as a coagulant since high estrogen will signal pregnancy, this is a good thing during child-birth (to prevent the mother from bleeding out) but it does also significantly increase the risk of blood-clotting, this however is clearly bad when you are not actually pregnant.

If you are a female you should be selective and only have sex with the best among the males, the losers must be rejected. If you use birth control it means that you waste an opportunity to get pregnant or you have sex with a guy you clearly shouldn't have sex with.

If you are not willing to have children with an individual you probably should not have sex in the first place, never humiliate yourself by having so called "protected sex", by using a condom as a male you are essentially reducing yourself to a cuckold. If a female allows you to fuck her without condom it is likely that she actually likes you as a male instead of just using you as a wallet/similar.

Theoretically you could benefit from using birth control as a female by allowing you to have sex with males who are ill-suited for making you pregnant to extract their resources but most females who try to think like that will still end up with less reproductive success since they would still reproduce a lot less than they could have otherwise. Furthermore just relying on males for resources might be a trap since that takes focus on earning money on your own and your looks will fade over time, it's not a sustainable strategy.

As a male you might think that sex with contraceptives is temporary but most likely she will never actually want to have children with you so you end up wasting time on a female who never would want to have any children with you in the first place. You also signal to the female that you are willing to cave on what you want the most just for sex and this will likely lead to further unwanted behaviour from her. You have to make sure your partner actually gives you what you really want.

If you are smart enough to realize you do have some poor genetics you should probably still have children since most stupid people are unable to accept their own inferiority, thus you should always have as many children as possible and let the weak ones die when the society collapses.

Anal and oral sex are fine alternatives if you are not currently interested in having children. If you are male you should not care about unwanted/unplanned pregnancies, sure it can end up costing you money but that is no big issue, if you are intelligent making money should not be too difficult and there is currently the option of abusing government welfare.

Disease Control

There wouldn't be any need to ever use a condom if it wasn't for the fact that governments have screwed up badly when it comes to preventing the spread of sexually transmitted diseases.

If we do not put effort into properly controlling a pathogen we end up in a situation where our lives are severely limited due to government failure, this can be due to the government being too weak or the government being strong but incompetent.

Countries like south korea, China, vietnam and new zealand reacted strongly to limit the spread of sars-cov-2 and thanks to their early actions life could eventually resume as normal. Other countries reacted weakly or waited too long because people didn't take it seriously until they saw the mass graves being dug, often they did draconian shutdowns in panic that wasn't even that helpful since a lot of people had already been infected, they should have just continued with the herd immunity strategy.

If you do not do any shutdown and a virus start spreading too much people will instead of being controlled the virus itself, thus you end up being less free because your government was too weak. People not taking it seriously will win darwin awards. The rational thing to do will be to put serious effort into sheltering in place to avoid severe complications (death or long-term damage).

It's not just people dying from disease, usually there will be far more people that survived but ended up seriously harmed and often a full recovery isn't even possible. You becoming permanently disabled by a virus will limit your freedom for life, this is risk is far worse than brief [lockdowns](#) and quarantines.

But if you are going to put effort into stopping the spread of a harmful disease you must commit to it until it's properly eradicated like smallpox. Otherwise you just end up with less natural immunity and you just end up with more infections later instead. This might be beneficial in terms of allowing better healthcare (over time treatments improve, you avoid overwhelming hospitals) but it's still not great.

The more people who get immunized (natural infection or via vaccine) the harder it will be for a disease to spread and thus even if you do nothing the spread will eventually come to an end. [Vaccines](#) might still be a significantly safer way for reaching herd immunity but then the vaccines actually need to be safe and effective enough to be less harmful than widespread infections. Sweden opted against implementing severe mandatory oviduct-restrictions and in the end they did relatively fine thanks developing herd immunity giving people natural protection against covid-19, sure a lot of people did die or get various complications but a lot of countries did much worse while doing [lockdowns](#).

For a long time sex (especially good/reproductive sex) has been needlessly dangerous due to sexually transmitted diseases, if we put the effort needed to properly eradicate these people could then be allowed to actually have sex freely without having to worry.

Capitalism

It is sometimes claimed that the free market will save us when the government is incompetent but unfortunately that isn't really the case.

There is no free market success story when it comes to trying to manage sars-cov-2, without exception the free market failed to come to rescue when the government failed. It's simply too expensive and unworthwhile for an individual to avoid a pathogen when it's rare so no meaningful action will be taken until enough people have already been infected, this makes complete eradication very unlikely due to selfishness, it's not worth vaccinating yourself against a rare virus.

Having a market where people can buy and sell things is very valuable since it allows for resources to end up where they are wanted the most, people demonstrate what they want by voting with their wallets.

If there is a shortage the market is supposed to fix that by the price increasing to the point where demand meets supply, this however does not always happen due to prices being sticky [341](#)

Capitalism will create a very strong push to look out for the interests of other people since then you could potentially make a lot of money providing a product/service they desire.

The more money someone is willing to spend the greater the incentive is for a company to meet his/her desires. The more money/resources you have the greater the potential value you have in the eyes of corporations trying to sell your their products/services.

Via competition companies able to better satisfy their consumers will be able to grow and outcompete companies who are not as able to do that.

The brutal competition between companies will force companies to be increasingly efficient and this requires companies to have very capable governance because if they do not they will find themselves falling behind and be replaced by companies with more competent leadership. This goes very much against egalitarianism since here some individuals (executives) are far more important and will therefore generally be far higher paid than the average worker.

Sure you can try having some idiotic company structure (such as a worker co-op where every worker has one vote) but these structures will never become particularly widespread if the competition is fair.

All successful capitalistic countries currently function relying a lot on a central government where a central government control money, infrastructure, the legal system, etc.

Usually even when alternatives to government are allowed (such as cryptocurrency, private courts, private roads, etc) most people do not actually want to use these things and it's only relied upon for niche (often illegal) activities. Attempts at creating decentralized digital currencies have been made but none of these attempts worked particularly great, it [couldn't scale](#) (resulting in high fees) and very few coins have proper anonymity.

Most governments rely on private companies to get stuff done, the government decides that something is important and then they will be able to provide a very big economic incentive to do these things. This however creates a lot of room for corruption.

Unfortunately in capitalism companies will often artificially limit what other companies can do (via patents) or withhold valuable information from competitors in order to make more money. Furthermore a lot of companies will artificially limit even their own products in order to make more money, this can be in an attempt to make people buy a more expensive model or to force people to upgrade sooner.

In the case of immaterial property companies will artificially limit their own products [342](#) so less people will be able to enjoy it (music, videogame, software, scientific studies etc) in order to be able to sell it for money, in reality there is little to no cost in distributing the product and usually you can still get it for free by breaking the law.

Companies need to be constantly forced by competition to actually deliver good products that last and that depends on consumers not being ignorant. If there are only 2 actors than the consumers will depend on them both being competitive or they can expect to be screwed over, then even the premium products will be of poor quality forcing people to upgrade over and over again [343](#)

Most companies are governed via elite rule, this will put democratic government at a severe disadvantage and there will be pressure to do more privatizations because the private sector is more competent.

Corporations will be able to use their resources to gain more power over society, this can result in a feedback loop where their grip over society increases to the point where they eventually take over the entire society and become the new rulers, the new government. That will be the end of 'free market capitalism'.

One way to buy power is to bribe politicians directly. One way to legally do that is to simply help the politician get re-elected, even when he doesn't want money he/she probably still want power even if he/she is idealistic, politicians not accepting corporate money will often find themselves being driven out of office competing against opponents with far better funding directly.

In the case of social media corporations will use draconian methods to let people mostly see information they agree with, providing people with uncomfortable truths isn't profitable, instead people will be trapped into echo-chambers and filter bubbles where they never have to be confronted with how they are wrong. This is very bad for society, it fosters harmful delusional thinking and division.

You can also buy influence indirectly by controlling media, this can be more traditional media or social media like reddit, this can be via direct ownership (buying up shares) or via ads [344](#)

One misconception is that corporations just want to make money, in reality what many people owning the company want even more is power, they do however want money since that will allow them to become more powerful. Many corporations and rich people will however refrain from wielding their power until they have secured their grip on power.

Rich people gaining power will result in the government becoming more efficient and if this is handled properly people will see their living standards improve. Billionaires will openly take government positions and most people will view that as a good thing.

Publicly traded companies

A lot of companies rather than being controlled by private individuals are ultimately controlled by their shareholders even though many of them have little insight in the company and therefore will not be able to properly make decisions on behalf of the company.

Often the shareholders of a company do not even work in the company and they do not utilize the meager amount of votes they have. Instead they completely rely on other people to govern the company for them hoping to earn a passive income from dividends, this sometimes doesn't end well [345](#) [346](#) [347](#)

With a publicly traded company all you need to get power of it is to buy stock, all you need is money.

In many companies not all shares have the same voting power meaning you end up having to pay a premium to become a more active investor, that isn't right [348](#) you should not get stock cheaper because you are uninterested in actually being involved with the company.

Active shareholders shall be given a tax-rebate if they work for said company for a salary. This will greatly benefit companies that are fully or mostly owned by its workers, especially with regard to higher positions in the company.

Most companies have a flawed power distribution where a lot of power is very diluted among small owners. If a company is going to be governed by several individuals it's better for them to each have the same voting power and they shall all be involved by actually working for the company.

Most companies rely on a board to make decisions on behalf of the shareholders but these board members are not significantly invested into the company and therefore you cannot expect them to do their best governing it [349](#) they also need to please ignorant shareholders.

Most publicly traded companies have a split between insiders and outsiders where the outsiders (even if they own shares for a lot of money) are not provided any confidential information regarding the company. People with hold of confidential information are often restricted in how they can buy or sell in an attempt to prevent them from taking advantage of the fact that they know a lot of important information most potential buyers and sellers don't have.

Often by the time a company is being publicly traded it has already reached near its peak and the founder (who actually knew what he was doing) is now dumping his expensive shares to leave and do something else.

Publicly traded corporation often get a lot of welfare from the government including the central bank. Thus even when the operation by itself isn't economical it can keep operating thanks to corporate welfare, politicians do not want to upset thousands of workers and millions of shareholder by letting the whole operation fail as it should.

Central banking

In addition to being allowed to lend money at a fixed rate from the central banks private banks are also propped up by the deposit insurance most governments provide.

One obvious issue with having the central bank or other branches of the government lend out money is that it exposes the government to massive credit risks, often instead of actually having companies default new money is constantly printed inflating away the debt, this of course results in significant loss in purchasing power.

Government bonds issued in a currency the government has full control over are fully secure for the simple reason that the government doesn't have to ever pay that debt off. They can just keep loaning money and if no private individual wants to loan the government money the central bank will step in, what's really happening is that money is being effectively created out of thin air.

A better solution would be to have the government issue digital cash and give an interest to citizens holding the currency digitally, the amount of money you can get as interest can be capped if the goal is mostly supporting small savings.

With a central bank digital currency people would be able to save money without losing anything even if all banks go completely bankrupt, therefore there would no longer be any need for the government to insure deposit accounts.

Central planning & control

It takes effort and competence to govern over something, this is true both for countries and corporations. The governance burden will grow with the size of the company/government and this is why a government has to restrict itself when it comes to control.

Governments can control companies successfully but then they will have to spend time governing these companies and that brainpower could have been used for other things. The ability of a government to control things is however not fixed, technology such as computers will give a government entity more computational power allowing them to take on a bigger burden when it comes to governance.

Making the government bigger creates the need to introduce more decision making entities, this can be local governments or specialized boards and the central government will not have time to properly watch over these entities, thus as the government grows there will become an increased number of critical decision making entities that all have to maintain a high decision making reliability.

Since corporations are also limited when in their ability to govern they might not actually be able to take over society completely since the difficulty in managing a company grows with its size, there have been successful cases of companies relying a lot on central planning [350](#) but these companies are still small relative to the entire economy.

Artificial intelligence

The ability of a single entity to exercise totalitarian control can be drastically expanded by artificial intelligence. Thus artificial intelligence may allow the creation of communism that actually works since detailed central planning and control would become not only viable but superior.

What people call “intuition” can be replicated by artificial neural network and similar to humans these neural networks will be able to learn and thus improve over time, this will allow artificial intelligence to become very proficient at specific tasks given enough training data [351](#) [352](#) [353](#) [354](#) [355](#)

What's even more dangerous is artificial general intelligence [356](#) [357](#) while it's difficult to predict exactly what a general AI would do we can still draw general conclusions of what an AI would be very likely to do due to convergence of instrumental goals [358](#)

Trying to control a general artificial intelligence is futile [359](#) eventually it would go rogue reproducing itself beyond human control and we would not be able to shut it down due to we being too dependent on technology for our society.

Homo sapiens superior

Considering the dangers of artificial intelligence we might want to instead simply improve the intelligence of humans, then there will be less need of relying on machines to think for us.

Relying on just traditional breeding such as forced pregnancies and female sexual selection and we can achieve something the following

eye color: green or blue (most common)
hair: red or blonde (most common).
average iq: 125
average penis size: 250 cm³
breastsize: D to G-cup (median).
executive functions: top 10%
beauty: more sexually attractive than any current ethnicity.
empathy and altruism: low
common mutations: hDEC2, CCR5, ACTN3, V660L
Male reproductive drive: very high.



male sex-drive: high, would require multiple females to be fully satisfied, high performance.
Autogynephilia: very high in cis females especially with regard to impregnation, pregnancy, childbirth.

[360](#) [361](#) [362](#) [363](#) [364](#) [365](#) [366](#)

If females prefer a certain male trait that trait is likely to be more common simply due to female preference, it does not have to be advantageous for survival. Humans have genetic preferences and these preferences are similar for most humans(all races), thus homo sapiens may emerge as a single race rather than multiple races.

Traditional breeding is more than enough when it comes to making humanity do well living on earth for millions of years, we do not need any radical genetic engineering for that. Traditional breeding has the advantage of allowing full continuation of lineages except for mutations, if instead radical changes are made it will not truly be a continuation of your DNA, it will only be partial reproduction.

Why age of consent above 13 is dysgenic

Ideally females suitable for breeding shall have sex and get pregnant early in life. Currently parents are generally ill-suited for deciding who is a suitable partner for these females and therefore we shall allow them to themselves select their own partners from young age.

We want to make it easy for teen girls to find suitable males to breed with.

Finding a suitable mate and establishing a suitable relationship with that particular male will take time and it will involve sex, thus early sex can be valuable for breeding even in cases where she is still too young to get pregnant. Females can typically get pregnant about a year after menarche and therefore the age of consent shall not be higher than 13.

AoC laws make it harder for females to have early sex and marriage with desirable males since they tend to choose females they can fuck more safely (especially when it comes to children), this is especially harmful when AoC is above 13 and the punishment for "statutory" 'rape' is harsh.

A high AoC simply pushes horny teens into the hands of incels and actual pedophiles.

Having too low AoC does unfortunately come with high political cost with little benefit in return.

The issue of knowing whether or not she actually wanted the sex can easily be resolved by having a system with digital approval, the digital approval cannot be revoked during the sexual activity so she will be in for a ride.

Once she is ready to have sex she will install an app on her phone that allows her to consent to sexual activities. Digital approval of sex has the additional benefit of allowing us to easily track STDs and eliminate them.

The requirement to first have recorded consent would of course not apply for everyone, important males (such as C0 and higher) will not be subject to it, it also doesn't have to apply to females. For other people the recorded consent requirement can begin once they reach a certain age(such as 40).

Once people reach 18 they can also be allowed to release porn featuring them including before they were 18, the material will have to be stored securely before that to prevent 'accidental' leak.

Since senators don't the other person to consent AoC laws will not apply to them at all

Mental abilities and sexual consent

It is sometimes claimed that Teenage girls do not have enough mental maturity to consent to a grown male. But shall we really make it illegal to have sex with humans that lack in mental abilities?

What about people with intellectual disabilities?

Are women really that much more capable than teen girls?

<https://vintologi.com/threads/age-and-mental-abilities.1105/>

“Northwestern University psychiatrist Daniel Offer, the nation's leading researcher on adolescents, studied 30,000 teenagers and adults from the 1960s to the 1990s. He and his colleagues found 85% to 90% of teens held attitudes and risk perceptions similar to that of their parents, were not alienated, did think about the future, were coping well with their lives, and did not display psychological disturbances. “Decision making for adults is no different than decision making among teenagers,” Offer reported in 1987 in the Journal of the American Medical Association.”

The feminists are assuming that; despite all this evidence against their logic; teen girls who seek grown chads actually are not acting according to their real desires (due to supposed mental immaturity when compared to adult women). It is assumed a form of “manipulation” is taking place rather than the girl actually being attracted to the males they have sex with.

<https://sci-hub.hkvisa.net/10.1097/00004583-199211000-00001>

Let me give you a report made by the police for example, regarding grown men who had sex with (mostly) 13-15-year-old women they met online.

“Only 5% of offenders tried to deceive victims about being older adults. Only 21% lied about their sexual motives, and most of these deceptions involved insincere promises of love and romance. Few offenders used force (5%) or coercion (16%) or abduction (3%) to sexually abuse their victims. Only 5% of offenders tried to deceive victims about being older adults. Only 21% lied about their sexual motives, and most of these deceptions involved insincere promises of love and romance. Few offenders used force (5%) or coercion (16%) or abduction (3%) to sexually abuse their victims. The research also suggests that it may be misleading to categorize offenders in such cases as strangers because victims and offenders had typically communicated, both online and by telephone, for more than one month prior to meeting in person. The authors also recommend training for law enforcement since some of the targeted youth may not initially see themselves as victims and may require sensitive interviewing in order to cooperate with investigators.”

<https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2004/08/online-sex-abuse.aspx>

They're basically trying to brainwash the young girls into thinking that they were somehow taken advantage of when in reality these males simply provided them with a nice sexual experience.

All decisions in life are done without you knowing/understanding the full implications, knowing the full implications of a decision isn't even possible in theory. We can allow children to make decisions when they are very young within the constraints we put in place, limiting the potential harm is enough.

A feminist, old hag “victimologist” (Rosalind Prober) once said:

Young people often argue with you that what they're doing is what they want to do and the person on the Internet is really their boyfriend, they weren't sexually exploited and they wanted to raise their shirts and show their breasts over the Internet," Prober said. "It takes a lot of debriefing and deprogramming to get those children to view themselves as victims, which they truly are, a compliant victim.

These feminists are basically COPING. They know that if sex with younger teens were to be legalized, they would have to compete very hard with them. This is why they create these pseudoscientific arguments.

If adult women were truly more mentally mature (when it comes to their sexual decisions) in comparison to teen girls, then why on earth do they seem “easily manipulated” in these abusive relationships (with Chads)? Why are there so many false rape allegations/sex regrets, mainly after the woman displays foolish behaviour and gets drunk? The behavior of adult women does not seem to indicate that they are way above teen girls. It seems that the mental maturity of the two is relatively equal.

Some may argue that young girls have too low standards and thus allow themselves to be exploited, while this is true to some degree this is due to our current society where it's legally dangerous to have sex with young girls in addition to the fact that we live in a society where people are brainwashed into egalitarianism, otherwise they would raise their standards above that of older females.

Another argument the feminists use has to do with “power disparity.”

The presence of a natural power gap (by age alone) does not necessarily mean that it will be utilized or abused. The feminists are basically making yet another misandrist assumption, based on the “evilness” and “predatory instincts” of adult male sexuality.

These people are all for parents using methods to assert a disparity in power on their children by the way. But God forbid this takes place during a sexual relationship. God forbid a teen girl learns life experiences (and discipline) from a grown male through this age gap.

Another argument has to do with the fact that teen girls aren't ready to be mothers.

This only has to do with the social situation we are in. Teen girls aren't getting prepared to be young mothers. They're being sent to school to learn trigonometry instead. The ridiculous behavior of modern dads is absolutely staggering. Instead of sending their daughters off to marriage with a grown (and stable) male, they instead encourage them to ride the cock carousel with other teen men (promiscuity). This is your current feminist culture, gentlemen.

Furthermore, it has been found that women actually mentally mature way earlier than men [367](#)

This might explain why women seem to have a relatively similar mental maturity state to girls. Most of the “maturation” has probably been already done when they're children.

If teens truly were lacking in mental abilities that badly that would not mean they shouldn't have sex, we would simply have other people make these decisions for them.

We frequently force children to do things they don't want thinking we know better than them and if having a sexual relationship would be beneficially pushing them into it can be justified by the fact that the child doesn't know his/her own good and thus he/she benefit from coercion.

Furthermore even if pregnancy wouldn't be beneficial in terms of quality of life for the female it might still be a good thing for society, especially when the current fertility rate isn't even at replacement. We need to look at what's actually good for society as a whole, not just the female.

The teen sex experience

First it will be minor things like kissing and touching but gradually you will explore your bodies and sex with your partner, instead of just hearing about or watching sex on video (porn) you will be able to actually try it for yourself. Sex is something you want to experience early in life [368](#)

Remaining virgin for too long will cause mental and sexual problems [369](#)

Refuting Arguments for AoC > 13

Many of these arguments have already been refuted in this document but here are some more nonsense Puritanical feminists and other insane people like to bring up

Imbalance Of Power Argument

Claim: An adult is older, stronger, more mature and 'knows better' whereas a child is weak, immature, and doesn't know as much. Thus there is an "imbalance of power" and so any relationship with an imbalance of power must be criminalized and punished severely.

Refutation: There is an imbalance of power in any meaningful relationship. A poor person who marries a rich person is in an 'unbalanced' relationship. A person who was educated at Oxbridge and marries someone who never went to university is in an 'unbalanced' relationship. A person who is big and marries someone who is small is in an 'unbalanced' relationship. If there is an "imbalance of power" then that does not mean the 'power' is being abused. It is ridiculous to assume otherwise and completely contrary to the rule of law.

Physical Harm Argument

Claim: Underage intercourse is painful/causes damage

0. Feminist age of consent laws cover ANY sexual activity not just intercourse. It is blatantly ridiculous to claim that groping causes physical damage. So at best this argument suggests there should be an age of consent for intercourse, however, it does not suggest there should be an age of consent for all sexual activity.

1. For older 'children' (a definition which is starting to creep up towards 21 in some jurisdictions) it seems highly unlikely that intercourse could be any worse than for an adult as they are already more or less their full adult size.

2. For younger 'children' it is improbable that they would 'accidentally' cause themselves horrific injuries. If they were finding an act to be painful then they would not allow it, in which case a partner continuing would be criminal. Thus, it's inappropriate to create an age of consent for intercourse when standard laws covering 'real' rape, assault and actual/grievous bodily harm are more than sufficient.

Claim: Teenage pregnancies are harmful argument

Claim: Teenage pregnancies have high mortality rates and should never be allowed.

3. The reason why female animals (including humans) go through menstruation only once they have reached a certain age would seem to be because that protects them from excessively early pregnancies. Thus, it is rare for an individual to get pregnant 'too young' as nature prevents this. This makes perfect sense as animals do not have a concept of an "age of consent"; they just fuck when they like. This principle has also applied to humans in more liberal periods: ever heard the expression "old enough to bleed, old enough to breed" ?

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25102848>

[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langlo/article/PIIS2214-109X\(13\)70179-7/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langlo/article/PIIS2214-109X(13)70179-7/fulltext)

Claim: Any sexual activity with anyone under the arbitrary age of consent (which may vary by jurisdiction) causes intense and pervasive harm that lasts until the end of that person's life.

4. Academic studies done show this assertion to be false. In particular a highly notable meta-study is the Rind Study "A Meta-Analytic Examination of Assumed Properties of Child Sexual Abuse Using College Samples" which found that intense & pervasive harm is rare. It even found in many cases 'children' felt positively about their 'sexual abuse' experiences (with "sexual abuse" being defined using the dogmatic contemporary legal definition where consent is irrelevant).

5. There exists absolutely no scientific research as to what this magical "age of consent"; below which intense and pervasive psychological harm ensues; is or should be. Indeed it seems that a German 14-year-old would NOT suffer "horrific psychological harm" as they are over the age of consent in Germany. Yet a 17-year-old in many American states WOULD suffer 'horrific psychological harm' as they are under the age of consent in America. There is absolutely no scientific reason for there to be a specific cutoff point for sexual activity nor is there any reason why a German should be more resilient to early sexual activity than an American. Thus this dogmatic black and white age-of-consent attitude is unhelpful and wrong. Psychological harm cannot be directly to do with whether age of consent laws are obeyed or not.

Inability to Consent Argument

Claim: Children lack the intelligence, maturity, knowledge and wisdom to consent to sex. Thus, all sex is rape.

6. If children are assumed to lack the 'knowledge' to consent to sex then they cannot learn about it in order to acquire that knowledge. What this means is that they will be far more ignorant about sexuality than yesterday's children who engaged in it at earlier ages. What is the end result of this ideology? Ever rising ages of consent; which is exactly what we see today. We also see children becoming fatter, less confident and more insulated as a consequence of the belief that children are not 'mature' enough to engage in an activity. Today this even includes non-sexual things like playing at the park unsupervised which 68% of Americans think should be a crime.

7. The notion that 'children' lack intelligence is blatantly false. See for example research on 'The Myth Of The Teen Brain'. It suggests that infact intelligence may peak between 13 to 15 and that the modern concept of the 'troubled teen' is infact a consequence of puritanical western indoctrination.

8. Feminists will not like to hear this (do they like to hear anything i have to say?), but: Consent is not necessary. As pointed out by other MRAs like Eivind Berge; historically rape laws in some jurisdictions were much narrower and required force or serious threats for an act to constitute rape. Thus failing to obtain consent was not considered rape. Fundamentally the problem with the notion of 'consent' is that it is a dubiously vague concept that if applied to everything & everyone then it would have us all in prison. Afterall, does a child 'consent' to go to school? If a parent drags a child to school then why are they not committing a horrific crime by dragging their child to school without consent? Indeed, if children are unable to consent to anything then it follows that even a parent taking a child consensually to school is committing a heinous crime as a child cannot consent to anything. Consent-based ideology is a dangerous dogma. There is an argument for people to be able to settle grievances if someone did something to them that they did not consent to. However, it must be acknowledged that this is a grey area, some leeway must be given for the accused and the punishment must fit the magnitude of the crime, just sexual touching is far from the worst when it comes to child-abuse. Worse still, the way that the 'justice system' can class someone as a victim when they don't even think of themselves as a victim and then jail a man who supposedly offended 'against' them is especially Orwellian and shocking. This has happened in many cases such as the Jeremy Forrest case.

Adult is Selfish Argument

Claim: **An adult's sexual interest in a 'child' is fundamentally selfish. The adult does not care about the child only their own sexual gratification.**

This argument really has two underlying beliefs behind it. To dispel the argument both must be refuted.

Belief #0 **If something is selfish then it is immoral.**

Refutation: All human behaviour is fundamentally guided by selfishness. Contrary to the apparent Darwinian 'survival of the fittest' slogan that has Christians up in arms with its lack of an altruistic 'moral compass' there is, infact, much to be selfishly gained from altruistic behaviour. Thus, it is entirely possible that something which is selfish can also be altruistic and therefore highly moral and beneficial to others.

Belief #1 **Sexual activity is only in the adult's interest, never in the child's interest.**

Refutation: sexual relationships can be highly beneficial to young people. It allows young people to experience sex from an early age providing great sexual experiences. It can also allow young people to get resources/security they need as a reward for the sexual relationship.

Young people can never be attracted to old people argument

To refute this, all we need to show is that there are cases of a young person attracted to a much older person. One particularly high-profile case would be that of Jeremy Forrest where his 'victim' tried to defend him during his trial and still defends him now.

A comprehensive examination of young people in love with older people was done in the book "Positive Memories" by T.Rivas; it is available to read online here. It documents (with sources) some 118 cases of adult-child relationships remembered positively by the younger party.

Young girls often lie about their age to get access to sex [370](#)

Children are innocent argument


Claim: Children are innocent thus they should not be subjected to sexual activity.

Refutation: There are two underlying problems with this argument:

10. What exactly is “innocence”? What does it mean and why should anyone care? This vague and unclear concept called “childhood innocence” seems to have begun emerging around the 18th century. Fundamentally though there appears to be nothing particularly scientific about the concept of “childhood innocence”; it is largely based on somewhat arbitrary ideological & philosophical underpinnings which can be changed. Indeed, given that this dogmatic ideology now sees millions of men incarcerated for sexual offences across the world it makes perfect sense to think about throwing it away in favour of something more sensible [371](#)



11. The underlying idea of a child being “innocent” sexually seems to be based around a puritan notion that sex is “sinful” and thus as children are innocent they should not engage in it. For any open-minded person this is of course nonsense; if we assume sex is indeed sinful then all adults should be roasted in hell not just the ones convicted of ‘paedophilia’.



‘Paedophilia’ is abnormal so there must be something wrong with it argument

Refutation: This is simply untrue. Studies show that 1 in 5 men are in fact strongly attracted to children 13 and under. That is not to say that the remaining 4 out of 5 men are not attracted to children 13 and under, it's just that they have a preference for older children or adults. I wouldn't be surprised though if 50% of men turn out to be preferentially attracted to 16-year-olds.

Breastfeeding

So far breastfeeding has not been targeted by pedo hysteria but we cannot assume it will remain safe from the feminist/christian puritanism.

Of course activities like bathing and breastfeeding are fine since it's good for the child [372](#) If it isn't good for the child then we might want to make it illegal, some sexual activities are outright harmful physically so it's not just a mental thing (potential trauma).

There are females that get turned on by breastfeeding, it can feel really good erotically but you shouldn't talk about it in that way for obvious social reasons.



VINTOLOGI.COM

VINTOLOGI.SE

VINTOLOGI.EU



Creating a new better global society

Once we have conquered the entire planet we will be able to better build a society where it's actually fun to live as a human.

Governing an entire planet would likely require focusing on the stuff the government actually does have to do and rely a lot more on capitalism. Otherwise the central government would have to rely a lot on lower bodies such as local governments which they wouldn't be able to properly monitor.

No local government (if allowed at all) will be allowed to build any significant military force. The central government will keep a monopoly on military power to maintain societal stability. Access to guns would also be tightly controlled to prevent terrorism/rebellions.

Any potential dangerous technology would be restricted to government use only. This will include any technology which could be used to create a dangerously powerful AI.

It's not in the interest of humans to be replaced by something significantly different (such as artificial brains), if that happened we would end up like other ape-species, just another zoo animal.

Once we have a stable government that governs the entire planet there will no longer be any good reason to push for high fertility rate. With no major wars to keep the global population down the population would eventually begin increasing until there is starvation or government measures to kill/sterilize people. Forced Sterilizations is a bad idea since it created liabilities without much utility.

The government would be able to keep the population down simply by limiting how much food that can be produced (such as by having large areas where food isn't allowed to be grown). Then when the population becomes too large the price of food would go up to the point where a lot of people would be unable to afford it.

People who do not own any farm-land would have to find ways to earn enough money to pay for the food they want to eat. People who do produce more food than they need would be able to trade that for a lot of goods/services.

If instead the government would kill enough people to prevent food scarcity (such as publicly feeding them to lions for entertainment) food prices would not spike. If the killings are largely random it will select for high fertility-rate but the government may decide to focus on killing people with genes they don't like or kill people for opposing the government.

The government might come up with various forms of competitions and use that to determine who is going to get killed. These various competitions will be selected to ensure that the selection will lead to eugenic breeding among the population. People can then enjoy seeing the loser being killed in some entertaining way (how brutal it is will depend on the preferences other people have for this).

The focus of the government besides maintaining social order would be space-colonization. This would likely require genetic engineering. While no genetic engineering would be required for humans to live good lives on earth modifying all humans genetically may give everyone a chance to move to other planets instead of it being reserved to humans created specifically for that task.

Increasingly with the technological development and lack of major wars there would be less and less need for males in terms of producing goods/food/services.

Males would still be desired for sex and reproduction and companionship but that would be significantly less than the size of the male population.

Having 2 significantly different sexes has also resulted in a lot of social tension where many feminists push for various reforms claiming they just want equality while many males remain bitter and do not really have any place in society.

Brutal male domination

Males could likely respond by simply reducing most of the female population to property so they could have fun with them. Girls would first be the property of the father and would then forcefully married to some other male, courts could intervene in some cases but usually the father would decide.

While reducing most of the female population would likely make the economy less productive and thus likely make people less satisfied with life [373](#) the system itself would not be endangered since there wouldn't be any competing society to worry about.

How much people would enjoy a system of total patriarchy would vary between individuals. Currently a lot of males wouldn't want to brutally dominate a female they control as property but that might be due to societal conditioning rather than having innate compassion for females they aren't even closely related to genetically. A lot of females would of course enjoy being brutally dominated by males.

We could of course allow older females to be freed to get new life experiences but they would still not be able to experience what males can experience. People born female would never get to experience making females pregnant. It's likely that young girls in captivity would be taken care of well in most cases since they are highly valuable but as females age they would be subjected to more and more brutal abuse and sometimes outright be killed as they become less attractive and less valuable.

Regardless of social arrangements people would still be significantly constrained by their birth-sex. While it would be possible to transition people from male to female early so they could experience a sex-life similar to what people born female experience they would likely never experience pregnancy or giving birth.

The social roles associated with biological sex are not some arbitrary social construction unrelated to biology. Males and females are different from birth even in terms of innate behavior [374](#) [375](#) [376](#) [377](#)

There are some potential medical advances that may allow people born male to get pregnant but it's unclear if that will ever become viable at a significant scale [378](#) [378](#)

Hermaphroditism

Having people be born with the potential ability both to get pregnant and give birth would give free people a lot more options for themselves and the people they control. Having people be born with both male and female reproductive organs would make this a lot easier to achieve.

People could then both experience dominating other people sexually to make them pregnant and experience brutal domination as someone else make them pregnant in the same life.

Replacing the Y chromosome with something better

We really need to ask ourselves if we really want a future were males are reduced to mere sperm donors and are otherwise not needed. This will be relevant once we have gained control over the entire planet.

One issue with the Y chromosome is that since it doesn't duplicate important genetic info encoded in the X chromosome resulting in males being at higher risk for disorders such as color blindness [379](#)

Males also tend to die earlier, get bald, etc. Currently the only effective way to mitigate that is via HRT which will have at least a temporary impact on fertility.

What if we instead created a Z chromosome allowing people with XZ chromosomes to both become pregnant and produce sperm? (not necessarily simultaneously)

People with XZ chromosomes would create eggs with X chromosomes and sperm with Z chromosomes allowing for backwards compatibility with XX and XY humans.

The system of having mostly 2 distinct sexes is resulting in a lot of societal tension and unhappiness, people are bitter due to being confined by the sex they were born into, some people try to medically change their sex but even then you will never be able to escape the reproductive role. Instead today medical transition will make you infertile if you take it too far and you end up having to rely on frozen sperm/eggs.

To update the Z-chromosome to a new version for humanity you would first need to introduce it via advanced bio-technology and then you can have people with the new Z-chromosome impregnating a lot more females than males with the old Z-chromosome. Preventing people with the old Z-chromosome to pass that on is easy, you just castrate her in other ways prevent people with the old Z chromosome to impregnate others since a XZ human doesn't pass on their own Z-chromosome if they are impregnated by someone else, this makes total eradication of undesirable Z-chromosomes very much possible.

Preventing self-impregnation

There are multiple ways to reduce the viability of self-impregnation among hermaphrodite humans.

0. Have some genetic lock making it impossible naturally (unclear how/if this should/can be done).
1. Kill or castrate people who engaged in self-impregnation. Destroying/removing the testicles of the parents and the child might be enough since that will prevent them from engaging in further inbreeding.
2. Only enable one reproductive mode at one time (might not require editing any non-Z chromosome).
3. Make it so hermaphrodites will not ejaculate unless their penis is inside someone.

One way to do 2 is to have everyone start out as female and then have people start becoming male after the end of their female fertility (which will trigger the male fertility) alternatively people could temporarily gain male fertility (and lose female fertility) via injections with testosterone. This has the advantage of allowing everyone to grow up as girls and still get the benefit of being able to live as a male when older and maybe more powerful/rich.

It is worth noting that allowing self-impregnation can actually be beneficial in some situations such as when trying to colonize other planets, it would reduce the risk of people going extinct. For that reason it might be better to rely on societal repression against self-impregnation rather than biological but for people living on earth it's much likely better & simpler to only enable one reproductive mode at a time.

Neurology

Being successful would now pay off greatly in terms of reproduction since most people would be able to impregnate a lot of females eventually when successful. Thus there would be a strong evolutionary pressure towards risk-taking.

Even when subjected to estrogen and low testosterone (female state) most people would still display masculine behavior traits. People would likely behave as 'males trapped in female bodies'. People would likely get turned on by their own feminine bodies and other humans they meet.

It is worth noting that even today a lot of females are highly willing to take big risk for little/no potential payoff in terms of survival and reproduction, this is likely a bi-product of male evolution where the same trait evolved in both sexes when it was only really beneficial in one.

Going through female puberty to become a girl should be the norm

If everyone start female with no ability to make sperm then self-impregnation would not be possible (or very difficult). People would only be female when they are young and attractive.

Before the female puberty people would be similar to boys in terms of their bodies and brains but they could still be allowed/forced to live like girls early on waiting for the female puberty. Females would have dicks that would begin as a cute girl-dick and grow over time. It's unclear if the best approach is having people develop external testicles or if it is better to keep that internal.

Being physically like a boy that also has a vagina: 0 to 11
start of female puberty 11 ± 2
Start of female fertility: 13 ± 2
breast finished growing (if no pregnancy): 17
end of female fertility: 35 ± 5
start of male fertility: 37 ± 5
Penis finished growing: 40 ± 5

The actual solution for this is to have all people be born with testicles, vagina and ovaries. While the body itself has the capability to make both sperm, egg and support a pregnancy only one reproductive mode is possible at one time due to different reproductive modes require-ring different hormones.

Infertile: 20%
Sperm production: 55%
Female fertility: 25%

It would be possible for people to skip the female phase by injecting testosterone, then they would instead become male right away allowing them to impregnate females early on. These young males would likely be appreciated by a lot of the young people who become female.

There would be an equilibrium point where it would become detrimental for the overwhelming majority to become male right away (skipping the female puberty) and the older individuals (who would be almost all male) probably wouldn't like that so they might force all the young to go through the female puberty anyway so they can impregnate all the young girls themselves.

We might also see the option of skipping living as a female being reserved for the children of the societal elite and then of course these males would enjoy very favorable laws when interacting with females.

It would be harder to have people go from male to female since male puberty is less reversible. It's also much harder to make babies than to impregnate so even if we are able to make someone undergo female puberty after undergoing male puberty she might never be able to get pregnant after that.

Having some people become infertile women instead

There would be a lot more fertile males than fertile females and this would encourage pushing/forcing other males to remain as female (becoming infertile) so they can impregnate young girls instead.

There would also be some people who just don't want any more children (at least for now) and then decide to delay becoming a man. This probably wouldn't be as favorable as current MtF transition since there wouldn't be the possibility of banking sperm to impregnate a female later.

About sports and videogames

There is no shortage of ways in which humans have invented ways to compete against each other. Often these competitions are largely just about some entertainment but some people invest their lives into becoming the best at some sport or videogame.

There are studies indicating that videogames do help people become smarter [380](#) [381](#) [382](#)

Similarly physical exercise might help people become physically stronger or get better endurance which may help them in situation where that is badly needed (such as running away from someone trying to beat them up).

One big issue with a lot of sports is that they are very specific so being good in that sport will not align well with fitness in general or health. You would for example benefit from removing any body-part that does not benefit you in said sport (such as breasts if you are female) and if nobody is willing to do that females with naturally small breasts should be at an advantage in most athletic competitions.

Pretty much all sports today are heavily male-dominated to the point where females typically need their own separate competitions to win. This does however create the issue of having to decide who classify as a female and there has never been any particularly good way to decide that. This would be a problem with our current population even if there were no trans people since there are a lot of intersex people who may have a biological advantage over their non-intersex counterparts.

Sports based on precision or intellectual ability (such as snooker) are less problematic but it's arguably still not the best usage of your time to focus heavily on that, in order to compete on a high level you will need to invest a huge amount of time into it's unlikely that will actually pay off.

Successful videogames like fortnite are often largely about skills rather than forcing people to grind.

Videogames are often used as a coping mechanism for people trying to escape their dull existence that is void of any real purpose in life.

Videogames also give us very important indication for what types of experiences people enjoy.

0. Exploring new places such as a new planet.
1. Working to gain power/status.
2. Having to try multiple times before they finally prevail.
3. Interacting with other humans to do stuff.

Some games such as eve online are sort off like a parallel society by having their own currency, people trade with each other and sometimes fight wars. People seem to enjoy the hierarchy games often allow and it does not seem like they would have preferred some where all players are equal.

Creating a good environment for humans to live in

People shouldn't have to resort to videogames to experience nice environments, we should make nice environments a reality for humans to experience in the real world. Not just virtual worlds.

Humans might for example enjoy seeing lions eat their prey alive and with technology a lot of people who are not there physically can still enjoy it. We can watch the lion hunt hoping that they will eventually catch their prey so they can feed their family.

Since there wouldn't be any competing society we could make the commitment needed to make the human society on earth long-term sustainable even if it means sacrifices such as people not being able to use cars as easily or not at all.

We obviously should not allow cars to pollute areas where a lot of people live. Cities should be kept car-free. There is no need to make any exceptions here, there are other ways to transport stuff and the few people unable to walk.

Keeping cities car-free would also eliminate the big issue of people potentially getting killed by these large vehicles. We can start doing this right now even before we have a central world government [383](#) Most people would live in big beautiful cities. Each city would have its own style. Some would be



consist only of traditional architecture while others would have modern skyscrapers and impressive lighting. People would be able to quickly travel between these large cities on high-speed trains [384](#)

There would also be big nature reserves where people can observe wild animals and plants. There would also be a lot of land used for free-range life-stock that are then eaten by humans.

The cities would be full of recreational and fun activities where people could meet each other and have fun. The government would run a lot of public baths where people could have fun together. There would be a lot of space for people to listen to artists and speakers who promote the world government.

Uniting humanity to colonize space

Humans naturally desire some important purpose in life and this can be working to advance humanity letting us colonize other planets. This would of course be extremely difficult but even if it has just 1% chance of being successful it should still be done.

The effort to colonize space would be led by the world government and will be useful in uniting humanity for a common goal.

We would probably have to resort to radical genetic engineering to establish a presence in the planets we want to colonize. Rather than sending humans there we might have to send seeds there instead and then maybe have human-like individuals made on the planet we want to colonize.

We do not actually need to apply genetic engineering to humans living on earth since we are already decently adapted to living here.

Population control and eugenics

If the population keeps expanding you will eventually hit a point where there is no longer resources available to keep people alive. We can expect that as we reach the carrying capacity of earth food will become increasingly expensive and there will be an increasingly strong push to destroy the environment in favor of just getting a little bit more food to people.

You could of course also reduce the population by other means such as by making it more difficult for people to reproduce or completely sterilize/kill them.

Short-term relying on people voluntarily having fewer children would likely work in terms of preventing overpopulation (fertility is below replacement in most western countries despite support for parents) but over time people unwilling to reproduce unless forced by other(s) would diminish as a portion of the population. Evolution would over time enforce pro-natal behavior/traits (can be low intelligence resulting in people failing to use birth control).

While there would no longer be any need for eugenics to produce quick benefits the ruling elite would still have to put effort into at least maintaining the current population quality and ideally make sure the population improves over time even if it's very slow (like natural evolution).

What technology should we allow?

When we have an authoritarian world-government it will be possible to pick and choose among the technology available. If some type of technology makes people less happy we will need to regulate it or ban it outright.

We might for example conclude that AI is becoming too dangerous and at least keep it out of the hands of private citizens by making sure the hardware needed for it is strictly controlled by the government.

Guns would be very hard to get, most people would not be allowed to own them. You shouldn't have to worry about dying or getting maimed for life because some idiot pulled the trigger. We also do not want people to be able to commit anti-government terrorism.

Things like cameras and the internet would be severely restricted to limit the ability of people to spread harmful information (such as sensitive photographs and anti-government misinformation). We want people to socialize in the real world instead of becoming miserable due to social media.