



Evopsy & Seduction

*Understanding how are programmed
our sexual choices for lovers.*

By Fabrice Julien (www.diaryfrenchpua.com)

Evoopsy & Seduction

« With the intensity and tunnel vision of passion, we enjoy the illusion that we choose our love partner. The reality is known to zookeepers - the surest way to get members of any species to mate is to put them in the same cage. »

Cynthia Hazan

Table of contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Table of contents..... | 3 |
| Introduction..... | 6 |
| FREE PART | 9 |
| Introduction to Evopsy..... | 10 |
| Caution..... | 12 |
| We are preprogrammed..... | 16 |
| The selection..... | 20 |
| Can we speak of dominant male for humans?..... | 23 |
| We are not identical | 25 |
| Sexualization isn't absolute..... | 27 |
| All things being equal | 28 |
| Bugs in the programming..... | 29 |
| Game & Evopsy..... | 30 |
| THE VALUE | 33 |
| A too good guy/girl makes people want to get away..... | 34 |
| At what age is one the most attractive?..... | 36 |
| Preselection (screening)..... | 39 |
| Women and jerks/assholes..... | 40 |
| BEAUTY | 42 |
| Thumbnail analysis of beauty..... | 43 |
| Sexual differentiation..... | 46 |
| Beauty of women and youth..... | 47 |
| Symmetry..... | 48 |
| The waist-hip ratio..... | 49 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| The beauty of men and what improves it..... | 51 |
| Description of an attractive woman..... | 53 |
| Description of a sexy man..... | 55 |
| The importance of intelligence | 58 |
| Self-confidence..... | 60 |
| Pheromones | 61 |
| The differences between men and women..... | 63 |
| Femininity and masculinity | 65 |
| Androgyny..... | 66 |
| Homosexuals..... | 67 |
| SEX FOR RESSOURCES | 69 |
| Resources and fertility..... | 70 |
| The trade : sex for resources..... | 72 |
| Blended families, abuse and infanticide | 73 |
| SEXUAL STRATEGIES | 74 |
| Reproductive strategies | 75 |
| Sexual competition..... | 77 |
| Sexual competition between women..... | 78 |
| Sexual competition between males..... | 80 |
| Passing fancy or long-term commitment?..... | 82 |
| Long-term relationships <i>versus</i> Casual sex..... | 83 |
| Puritan slut..... | 85 |
| Real woman <i>versus</i> Fantasy of purity..... | 87 |
| Sex & Affection..... | 89 |
| Husband or lover?..... | 91 |
| Infidelity and jealousy..... | 93 |
| The desire for sexual variety..... | 95 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| IN A RELATIONSHIP..... | 98 |
| Love and happiness..... | 99 |
| Orgasms and semen..... | 102 |
| Children..... | 103 |
| The breaking-up..... | 104 |
| BONUS | 107 |
| Social issues..... | 108 |
| Permanent sexual arousal..... | 108 |
| Differences of interpretation..... | 110 |
| Feminism..... | 111 |
| The Islamic veil..... | 112 |
| Monogamy..... | 113 |
| Is everyone entitled to health care and love ?..... | 115 |
| Sources..... | 116 |
| My other works..... | 117 |

Introduction

This ebook is a book about popularization of evolutionary psychology... applied to seduction.

The Evopsy (evolutionary psychology) is the study of the biological origin of our behavior and its inviolability. In other words, the principles discussed here will continue to show their validity for several centuries.

We will study the programming of men and women when it comes to their love/sexual choices and we'll detail the universal preferences of men and women for certain characteristics.

We will also explain the behavior of men and women that we see every day (sometimes by judging it illogical) so that we can understand and accept everybody (ourselves and others). It'll decomplex you!

Too many people believe that the opposite sex thinks the same way and search the same thing. But it's wrong ! Men and women have evolved somewhat differently and it explains the differences of behavior and expression of social pressure, still today.

In fact, almost all our romantic behavior find an explanation when you know Evopsy. The day I discovered this discipline, I got passionate about it. And it played a big role in the fact that I became a Pick Up Artist. When you've got on what is based the game, you do not need to learn by heart anymore : you understand why and how.

It's only by understanding why and how sexual strategies of both sexes are in place that we can decide the best of ours. By seeing the game of the opponent and by having all the cards, we can make better decisions to win the game. In other words, knowing the women's (and men's) selection criteria and introducing as the he (or she) who meets them is probably the most effective way to seduce. For a sexual partner or for a romantic partner, the levers that need to be activated come straight from prehistory!

Evopsy & Seduction

All those who have questions about gender relations have a lot to learn from this discipline. So I will explain the concepts of the game (the underground science of seduction), basing myself on the results of experiments conducted by evolutionary psychology researchers.

For example, David Buss in 1997 conducted the following experiment:

He asked men to ask this question to unknown *"Hello it's been a few days I noticed you and I find you very attractive. Would you like to sleep with me ?"*

The result ? You can imagine. Almost EVERY women answered *"no"* and some with indignation. Yet it was politely asked!

Then he asked women to ask this question to strangers: *"Hello it's been a few days I noticed you and I find you very attractive. Would you like to sleep with me ?"*

The result ? 75% of men agreed. It probably won't surprise you but you all the same wonder why it works like that in life. We will analyze, of course, behind these diametrically opposed reactions, what gives the sexual power to women.

Another example ?

Terri Fisher, professor in the department of psychology at Ohio University, interviewed 293 people about their habits, including sexual ones. Some had to respond anonymously to a questionnaire, while others thought to be connected to a lie detector, which in reality was not working.

Respondents answered honestly to almost every question. But when it came to indicate the number of partners with whom they had sex, the results were different depending on the conditions under which those surveyed were asked.

When questioned and connected to what they thought was a lie detector, men reported fewer partners than others (those who were not connected to the fake detector) while the women admit more partners ! *"Men and women have different responses about their sexual behavior when they should be honest,"* concluded the researcher.

So when they answer anonymously, men tended to increase the number of their conquests, and women to lower this number. *"There is something unique about sexuality that leads people to really worry about matching the stereotypes of their gender,"* says Terri Fisher. *"Sexuality seems to be the only subject that make people feel so worried,"* says the professor.

Through this book, you will understand also why, when questioned, men tend to inflate the number of sexual partners they had and women to minimize it.

Besides, this book concerns men as well as women, and is therefore available to both sexes. I put a point of honor to give advice to both genders in this book. After all, what would we be without each other?

For a taste of the content, I invite you to browse the titles in the table of contents. Above all, I advise you to put aside your prejudices, to put aside your values and modesty, because what the follows can not only disturb politically correct people and sheep, but even people "well-mannered" people.

FREE PART

Introduction to Evopsy

Evolutionary psychology (sometimes abbreviated Evopsy) is a current whose goal is to explain, from the theory of biological evolution, the mechanisms of human thought and behavior.

This discipline, located at the crossroads of biology, psychology, anthropology, social sciences and paleo-archeology, examines psychological traits in an evolutionary perspective.

It is based on the fundamental assumption that the brain (like other organs) is the product of evolution, and thus of an adaptation to environmental and social constraints that our ancestors faced.

Evolutionary psychology identifies and explains the human traits that are the product of natural selection. In this ebook, we will study in particular the general traits that result from sexual selection (defined below).

Evolutionary psychology insists that most of human evolution took place under circumstances that no longer exist (mainly during the prehistoric era) and that behavior and internal states that characterizes us today have in fact been selected to be adapted to a world that no longer exists: there is what researchers call a "mismatch" between this environment that gave rise to the evolutionary adaptation and the contemporary environment of the human species.

We owe this concept to Konrad Lorenz. He was, for example, the first to postulate that the pleasure to eat sugar and fat comes from the rarity of these energy resources in prehistoric environment. Today, however, these products are easily accessible and this "natural" inclination for sugar and fat can have deleterious consequences (such as to frustrate adaptation) in the current environment (obesity, diabetes). Yet we continue to be, we believe, "naturally" attracted to sugar. In fact, we have been programmed to like it. Just as we have been programmed to look for certain characteristics when it comes to our sexual partners. And as our brains are evolving much more slowly than our environment (unless it is our environment that is evolving faster than our brain), it is important to be aware of this.

In this book, we will discuss Evopsy in terms of seduction and will deduce the attitudes necessary to be more successful with women. We'll find that the theories of the game are perfectly in this logic. This will also be an opportunity to rediscover the concept of "alpha male." Finally, we will focus on many results of experiments that we (men) will help us to better understand ourselves and better understand women (and which will also help women to understand men, of course).

In fact, realizing that some of our lackluster behaviors are natural (in the sense of "biological legacies") allows to enjoy life with more philosophy and to accept more easily (of course if you stay in limits set by law).

Of course we will avoid encouraging old macho *clichés* about gender differences. We will try to remain objective!

Caution

Why isn't Evopsy "politically correct"? Because this discipline offers a view of life in which people are not equal at birth. This seems obvious when I look around me in the street, but it apparently must not be said out loud. It is a taboo subject!

We hear since our childhood that we are all equal and unique. But do not forget that in the Declaration of Rights of Man and the Citizen (1789), men are born free and equal... certainly! But it's about "rights." In fact, everyone is not similarly armed for life, with the same genetic advantages. Besides, there is no human group where every members of the opposite sex arouse in us the same desire. Everyone is unique, OK, but the entire base is common... and since this is the basis of our ancestors primates, we also all are very similar and predictable. Why do you think the statistical services are capable of predicting the number of demonstrators, break-ins or traffic congestion if we all are as free and unpredictable than we like to think?

This science is also disturbing because it is not fun to understand that we are not free in front of our genetic inheritance. Our consciousness is only the tip of the iceberg: most of what goes on in our minds and in our bodies remain hidden from us. Saying it is not, however, being not politically not correct, it's just being realistic. But many people naively think they 100% know and control themselves. Or, they just want to keep their illusions...

We regularly hear that what really matters is the inner beauty. It counts, certainly. But be aware that there is a common basis for all cultures: they value what they perceive as "beauty" and "healthy". Almost no culture has ever valued what it considered as deformities. Moreover, beyond specific cultures ornaments, physical beauty always involves a certain symmetry of the face. You will not find a culture that values facial asymmetry. We will return course in detail about what makes a man (and a woman) beautiful in the eyes of the opposite sex. But what I am saying here is that this is apparently politically-incorrect to say that we are attracted to beauty. Because there are way more people who do not have these physical qualities (and/or do not cultivate them) than beautiful people, so the majority wins and imposes its dictates which however not always take our species up...



The counter-argument I hear most often is that these theories do not hold good for the simple reason that plump women were perceived as sexy one or two centuries ago whereas currently it is slim girls who are seen as sexy. Where from their conclusion : sexual attraction is not programmed.

Still, we must look further than the tip of your nose: the fat was valued when it was a sign of affluence and good health! Today, we know that too much fat is bad, so being thin is a sign of health and wealth because it proves we have the means to buy the right products and take care of us. Same for sunbathing: before that meant we were working in the fields like the poor, today it means we have enough money to go on holiday!

It is believed that advertisements convey unnatural images and encourage people to look like models. But the ideals of beauty are not arbitrary: they are indices of reproductive value of women. Although, I grant you, advertising abused and some women in these environments are still victims of the always-more: they order their form from models to have no female form! They are sometimes retouched in the pictures but cadaveric on the catwalks (breasts, hips, buttocks are photoshopped!)

One could almost say that they are just act as hangers. But let's go back to our demonstration.



Thus, the terms of the expression of our programming change, but the purpose remains the same: valuing what is perceived as signs of "good health" and "fertility".

You have now understood the logic: a simple analysis would conclude that everything is relative. An advanced analysis would conclude to be aware of differences between the eras, to wonder what they express and to realize that the goals are the same throughout the history of mankind.

The ruthless logic of Evopsy is thus (fortunately or unfortunately) constant throughout the ages. It is also reluctant to admit that there is not altruism without selfish afterthought. But accept that we are not perfect, due to any cause. Darwin, for example, said "*Our ancestors are the origin of our evil passions! The devil, in the guise of the baboon is our grandfather.*"

Well, you will read a lot of things that bother in this book, but I have ensured their veracity and I quote my main sources at the end (so it is not redundant, the others I quote them incrementally).

You have the choice to prefer to live in the illusion of happiness given by ignorance or to open your eyes and understand the behavior of people around you. Nietzsche said by the way that there is a gulf between the truth and the life (*The Birth of Tragedy*)!

If you prefer the illusion, so I guess I will receive hateful mails. But you can deny the facts... sometimes you'll take it on the chin and be disappointed by the behavior of others. If you read on the contrary, you'll arm yourself for life in society in order to intelligently compete.

The two life strategies are respectable. You are very free to read me or not.

I am sincerely convinced that ignoring the contributions of Evopsy, because it does not please you and because it does not match the conditioning that society instills us, would be counterproductive.

We are preprogrammed

The first idea that hurts the buttocks but must integrate is that we are not free behind our genetic inheritance. No need to use complicated concepts like the image of the father nor neuroses coming from childhood to understand and predict the behavior of a fertile woman without children (who would want some but have not yet because she has dedicated her life to her career) approaching menopause. No more than the behavior of a 50 years old rich man who cannot resist cheating on his 45 years old wife with a pretty young woman of 20 who could be his daughter but that makes him fit-in.

Note that I do not justify pedophilia but... how many of you would have resisted in the shoes of Vincent Cassel (in *Un moment d'égarement* version 2015)?



It is our genes that make us belong to the human species, it is also our genes that decide to which sex we belong, shape our bodies, our way of thinking, etc.

When we have children, we transmit them our genes. On the scale of human history, we can say that these are the genes that constantly manipulate us, to be transmitted to survive and exist in future generations. We die, but our genes survive if they manage to reproduce. We're kind of survival machines for genes. Richard Dawkins rightly defines a gene as *"a portion of chromosomal material that potentially lasts for enough generations to serve as natural selection unit."*

Genes control the living beings in the manner of a programmer who would have taught chess to a computer and can no longer intervene once the game started. The chess programs do not envisage every possibility to choose the best shot to play: they contain strategies associated with some weighting that the computer can eventually change, based on games already played. Similarly, genes, build carriers with various coping skills to survive and reproduce.

Our genes influence our behavior in the direction of reproduction. But rather than giving us the order to procreate, genes manage to we make us want to fuck. While they actually just want to be transmitted. And then, to survive, they give us the order to take care of our children.

What we do as parents is just trying to give the best opportunities to our children in the sexual competition that awaits them, which is also what our genes want us to do. Our ancestors were able to do all this, and they have given us these behaviors.

Genes however do not decide everything. The wider environment has an influence too : food availability, climate, other living beings around, the type of relationship with other people, culture, society, etc. Chance also plays a role because you could have the best genetic code of the world, if you are in the wrong place at the wrong time but take a brick on the head... it's game over!

The genetic program however cannot be too free because if at the end of his life, the man who conveys the gene had no viable children, the program disappears would disappear with him.

Over millions of generations before us, the too free programs were eliminated, and those that remain today do not leave us really free, they seek to manipulate us from inside. They try to give us a body and such a behavior that they find themselves in subsequent generations. I'm simplifying, of course, I am not trying to denounce a weird genetic conspiracy, I'm just talking about the fact that our instinct influences us.

On average (there are exceptions to everything), natural selection favors genes that program their survival machines so that they fit best to their environment, living conditions and relations with animals of the same species and of different species.

It's always about reproduction : these rules are immutable and always underlying, even when one is young. Otherwise why would 25 years old footballers already have several kids while with their finances, they could easily use condoms and flirt with a lot of supermodels? Knowing that the average age of a first child in France is 28 years. Pictured : Gerard Piqué and the evolution of his sperm.



Toronto International Film Festival
 OFFICIAL SELECTION

Calgary International Film Festival
 PEOPLE'S CHOICE AWARD

Genie Awards
 SCENARIO, ORIGINAL SONG,
 GOLDEN REEL AWARD

Valladolid International Film Festival
 BEST ACTOR
 BEST DIRECTOR

DAVID WOSNIAK,
 PÈRE DE 533 ENFANTS

20/6

PATRICK HUARD JULIE LE BRETON ANTOINE BERTRAND

STARBUCK

Un film de **KEN SCOTT**
 Écrit par **KEN SCOTT & MARTIN PETIT**

DIRECTEUR DE LA PHOTOGRAPHIE PIERRE GILL MONTAGE YVANN THIBAUDEAU SCÉNARIO MARCELLE DANIELLE LADRIE COSTUMEUR SHARON SCOTT DISTRIBUTION DES FILMS DANIEL POISSON PIERRE PAGEAU
 MUSIQUE DAVID LAFLECHE PRODUCTEUR GÉNÉRAL DANNY ROSSHEIN PRODUCTRICES ASSOCIÉES VALÉRIE D'AUTÉUIL PRODUCTEUR ASSOCIÉ KEN SCOTT RÉDACTEUR KEN SCOTT MARTIN PETIT PRÉSENTÉ PAR ANDRÉ ROULEAU
 ÉCRIT PAR KEN SCOTT © 2011 PCF STARBUCK LE FILM INC.

19

The selection

Sorry (even if it's not my fault), but over the centuries, the selection based itself on efficiency, not morality nor happiness. Do not throw me tomatoes, please, I am only the messenger!

Natural selection is defined as the fact that a number of people just pass on their genes. Indeed, it is not enough to live to breed, you must above all be selected by a partner and breed. That is what is specifically called sexual selection, component of natural selection.

Well-known but not really understood, the theory of natural selection is however not very complicated: if there is a variation on genetically transmitted character, then the characters that have facilitated this transmission of genes are more likely to be present in the next generation than those having impaired it. It is therefore not the best genes that will be passed : it's those that will be passed which will have been the best. It is very difficult for us to predict what will be the best genes in the next generation. The son of Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie will maybe look ugly. There is little chance but how to know? There is always a small element of chance that comes into play.

But let's go back to our ~~sheep~~ doggy styles. The idea behind sexual selection is that it is not enough, in a gendered species to be viable and healthy to transmit your genes: you must also find a fertile partner of the other sex with whom uniting to transmit. In other words, if there are two sexes and at least one sex partner can choose with whom he or she will pass on his or her genes, then there will be sexual competition between candidates.

The degree of sexual competition varies according to gender animal species. Most often, it is the male who will fight (usually physically but not always) to gain access to females. In fact, the distribution of sexual competition between the sexes depends on an essential criterion: the cost of having offspring for one of the sex. For cost, one must understand "*anything that has a negative impact on the next or previous offspring*" : the time required (e.g. pregnancy), the impact on health, the time required for weaning and raising children , etc.

In humans, it appears that the fathers were very important for the survival of children. In some Amazonian tribes, paternal orphans are killed: no one wants to take them over. In the challenging environment that prevailed for most of human history, a father was very important. Therefore, in humans, it's not just men who are in sexual competition, women too. Once they found a man, women want to keep him (we will also study how people manage competition between individuals of the same sex).

Of course, parental investment is not the same for each sex: women experiencing pregnancy for nine months... during this time the man can flutter as he wants: his investment in it is still much lower and therefore the selection criteria of each gender are not the same.

Much of the choice of human partners will be influenced by the Reproductive criteria, unlike the woman who will be largely influenced by the criteria of Survival. Those who know a little bit the Mystery seduction method already know what I mean. Basically, "survival" corresponds in theory to manhood, to be a leader, to have ambition, etc. While "reproduction" it's mostly about physical appearance.

The female strategy of looking for a dominant male, well known in the world of the game, is for the female to do not look for a caring father... but instead for good genes that produce visible effects, such as muscle or marks of health, reflecting longevity and maximum fertility. The females in this logic are seeking to optimize the transmission of their genes by mating with a partner with such characteristics in order to give birth to a beautiful male who also will possess those characteristics which will make many females of future the generations consider him.

However, a male too alpha would scare women who are afraid of not being able to keep him because he would have many offers to leave with another woman. This is the same logic that make the too beautiful women intimidate men, who often do not even dare to approach them.

There are not so long, every society made arrangements in one way or another, so that *"everyone has his or her each one"* and that no one or as few people as possible are frustrated of sex and offspring. Societies of the "arranged marriage" also still exist in some cultures.

But then, today, within us, have only the beautiful girls and the wealthy guys the right to love (or at least to reproduction)? Does evolutionary psychology condemn men and women who are just average, not too beautiful nor too rich? No, in the society we live in, to help us get our game well, charm, and ambition, are powerful weapons to cultivate. And good news: they do not fade, unlike beauty, and are not as ephemeral as can be the media success, for example.

I will reveal the keys so each one of my readers can succeed at the game of life!

Can we speak of dominant male for humans?

In zoology, the dominant male (or male alpha) is the individual in a group of animals that the others follow, obey or submit to.

The dominant male has the priority to eat or mate. In some species, the dominant male even has the exclusivity of females and is the only male that can mate. The dominant male may also, in some species have highly ritualized prerogatives such as the right to lead a procession.

The dominant male in the species of capuchin monkeys is the favorite of all the females of his species. But only the strongest females have a relationship with the dominant male. They must earn it! I reason a little like that... I maybe have genes of Capuchin!



The status of alpha male is related to physical force but sometimes other more complex criteria. For example, for the bonobo or the chimpanzee, the dominant male does not always credit his status to his only physical strength but also to indirect methods such as the ability to create "political" alliances. Like humans (Aristotle has also written that man is a political animal)!

This may bother some people to use indifferently "dominant male" in a sentence that speaks of a man and in another that speaks of the bonobo. Basically, what these people hate is that we can consider the man as an animal.

Yet this is the case (we are social animals according to certain, moral animals according to others) and if science agrees to say that there are dominant males in a lot of species and especially in our cousins the monkeys, then why not for humans?

The debate that would consist of asking if the Human is so wonderful that he deserves a capital H to designate his species, and should therefore escape the study zoologists, seems to me not really constructive and a proof of bad faith.

"Dominant male" is indeed a term of zoology. But the man is an animal like another one, so we can apply a term of zoology to Humans.

We are not identical

All our senses and all our daily observations show us that men and women are different. The most visible differences are clearly reflected at the physical level: primary and secondary sexual characteristics.



Intellectual differences are also notable. For example, the woman has a verbal intelligence far superior to the man: she will better understand the different meaning of a sentence. She talks more and not with the same objectives: it is found in every society that have been studied (universality of the influence of genes). Feminine intuition usually allows her to better understand the relationships between people: she will know very quickly who tries to seduce who, what is the emotional state of a couple, while that man will often not "see the matrix ".

In contrast, men are better in terms of visual-spatial intelligence: they dominate in tests asking to reconstruct an image or reading maps.

However, do not make me say what I did not say. We are not that different: we are more similar than different. One could compare the man and the woman with both word processing software each with special characteristics (such as Word and Open Office). Our similarities constitute 97% of our human nature: men and women have two legs, two arms, a body, a head, and our lives revolve around the same dimensions: personal, relational, professional and master. Our needs are essentially the same too: survival, to love and be loved, to flourish, to reproduce. Our fears too. In short, our brains have the same structures...

Men and women are similar but different. Not worse, nor better... just different!

The source of this difference is in our human nature, our genetic code, our atavism. All the humans share twenty-three pairs of chromosomes. Twenty-two pairs are identical: one, the sexual pair, is different.

The source of our differences lies also in our millions of years of evolution. The man always on the hunt, on guard, focused on his physical survival and the survival of his family, displaying ingenuity to stalk his prey, to do not get lost... All that makes a man and is etched in his nature.

The woman, often pregnant, living in the cave with the other women and children, having to learn how to live in a small space, anticipating potential danger, watching the fire, feeding her children from her body reserves, waiting for hunters to regain her strength, gathering all that is edible... all that makes a woman is etched in her nature.

The fairest conclusion is that men and women are not identical, they are complementary.

Sexualization isn't absolute

It should be understood, on the other hand, that the differences between men and women are not absolute.

It is easy to find counter-examples: many women are taller than many men (Big Up to Jamel Debbouze and Melissa Theuriau) although on AVERAGE, women are smaller than men.

| Pays | Hommes | Femmes | Âge |
|--------------------|----------|----------|--------------------------------|
| Allemagne | 179,8 cm | 172,5 cm | adultes |
| | 182,3 cm | 173,0 cm | adultes |
| Australie | 178,4 cm | 166,9 cm | 18 - 24 ans |
| Canada | 174cm | 167 cm | 18 - 24 ans |
| | 177 cm | 168 cm | |
| Belgique | 179,5 cm | 168 cm | adultes |
| Croatie | 182 cm | 172 cm | |
| Danemark | 182,1 cm | 173,2 cm | |
| Espagne | 178,5 cm | 167,3 cm | |
| États-Unis | 176,5 cm | 167,6 cm | adultes |
| | 177,7 cm | 168,1 cm | 15 - 25 ans |
| France | 175 cm | 167 cm | adultes |
| | 176,1 cm | 167,9 cm | 16 - 25 ans |
| Finlande | 182,6 cm | 171,5 cm | |
| Grèce | 178,0 cm | 171,0 cm | adultes |
| Italie | 175,2 cm | 165,1 cm | |
| Japon | 172,6 cm | 162,0 cm | adultes |
| Luxembourg | 179,1 cm | 169,6 cm | 15 - 25 ans |
| Portugal | 173,7 cm | 165,0 cm | |
| | 180,8 cm | 170,3 cm | |
| Pays-Bas | 183,8 cm | 172,6 cm | |
| | 184,0 cm | 173,6 cm | 21 ans |
| Monténégro | 185,6 cm | 174,3 cm | |
| Nouvelle-Zélande | 177,0 cm | 166,0 cm | 19 - 45 ans |
| Norvège | 179,7 cm | 170,9 cm | 18 - 19 ans hommes et femmes ? |
| République tchèque | 178,0 cm | 167,5 cm | |
| Roumanie | 172,0 cm | 164,0 cm | adultes |
| | 177,2 cm | 166 cm | |
| Suède | 181,1 cm | 170,9 cm | 16 - 24 ans |
| Suisse | 178,4 cm | 168,0 cm | |
| Tonga | 169,4 cm | 156,2 cm | 15 - 16 ans |
| Turquie | 175,0 cm | 167,2 cm | |
| Ukraine | 176,5 cm | 168,5 cm | |



These differences correspond to an "archetype", but it is only guidance. There are also men with women's intuition. In other words, each one of us is somewhere on the scale of "100% man" to "100% woman" but nobody is on the extremities. We all have some fragments of the code of the other sex in us, even if it does not dominate. Most of us are not totally sexed, we are a kind of mixture of feminine nature and masculine nature. What you will read is not an absolute truth but is true in general cases.

All things being equal

We must consider that this expression is always implied in this book and is here to show the boundaries of this knowledge and to remember the caution that must be preserved when it comes to its interpretation.

For example, when we say that being tall and muscular offers a reproductive advantage, we imply "all things being equal".

In real life, the benefit is not necessarily very obvious. First, maybe that the guy who has this combination will never dare to approach a girl or is impotent, which does not question the principle of the benefit but its realization for the individual.

Then maybe that this genetic combination has other consequences going against the reproduction of its bearer: for example, if, after a disaster, the last girl on earth is traumatized for one reason or another and fear tall men (do not laugh, I know some) she will not consider the handsome giant survivor and will prefer an opportunistic guy like me. In this particular case, it is obviously not an advantage anymore: the principle is challenged and the genes of this man who seemed nevertheless advantaged would disappear.

The human sciences are sciences like others who seek to define general laws based on variables.

The only problem is that these laws are far more numerous in the human sciences than in most disciplines, and most are difficult to quantify or even undiscovered.

This is the opposite approach that was chosen in Evopsy: instead of trying to list the variables, the researcher will consider those he knows and act like if all the others were unchanged.

This is the meaning of "all things being equal".

Bugs in the programming

Sexual selection started a long time ago and happened on the very long term: our brain has been optimized for a world that no longer exists. And had not enough time to adapt.

We must assimilate this notion that we have already mentioned, the "Mismatch" : our brains date of the Stone Age, so it was not selected to live in today's environment: overcrowding, sharing labor, etc.

We are currently facing an unprecedented sexual context, far from what our ancestors have known: reliable contraceptives, infertility treatments, artificial insemination, dating sites, sperm banks, AIDS ... The prehistoric brains of men and women did not know condoms, for example! And yet, it changes everything, sexually speaking!

We face these new conditions armed of old strategies that have worked at different times and in environments disappeared forever. The modern human has been shaped by a world that had nothing to do with the modern world and the change of the environment was not slow enough to allow a deep adaptation.

Fortunately, this book will focus on what it is good to keep in this programming but also and especially what it is counter-productive to keep. Basically, I invite you here to think for yourself about certain things you do or refrain. Why ? How? Is it really in your best interest to do that?

Game & Evopsy

All that has been said so far implies that what turns on every woman "100% woman" is determined by genetics.

The game has therefore applied to understand all this and to use evolutionary psychology to teach us what levers make respond women "programmed" as women.

However, as we have seen, some seek female characteristics in men. Just as some guys will be reassured by manly characteristics in a woman. Psychology and placement on the scale from "100% woman" to "100% man" will bring individual nuances in our analysis. But on average, men have more success by adopting a rather manly behavior and women by adopting a feminine behavior. It seems logical but many people have not yet integrated it (or have forgotten because of "feminism")!

In summary, according to Evopsy, women are genetically programmed to look for men who have the best genes and which can ensure the survival of their offspring (strength, resources...) As for men, they look for women offering a good genetic resume for their offspring (beauty, health...)

Through a study of evolutionary psychology, we can get to reproduce the attractive attitudes and avoid those that communicate we're not an attractive candidate.

A man with good attitudes also becomes as attractive to women as a girl who is a pure hottie would be attractive to us. She will as quickly as possible make a sorting out "pussies" with whom she will have a purely friendly relationship, and serious candidates for sex. This is natural and cannot be controlled! It is useless to blame her for that...

Just like it is useless to be mad to a man who does not wants to fuck a big sausage. This chick may be very nice but evolution does not care. It is uncompromising, contrary to what the Hollywood movies would like to make us believe.



Found on a blog by searching for "ugliest women in the world"

We almost all have a potential to turn on girls because it is more a psychological than a physical matter. Culture and society blur their instinct (thanks you Walt Disney ...) so the girls may not even consciously know what really pleases them in fact. That's why it is not a good idea to ask a friend with whom it is platonic to tell you how to seduce. No more than it is advisable to read women's magazines.

We've listed some characteristics that can make someone desirable (there are many others in the rest of the book). That said, people of the opposite sex will always have personal preferences out of our scope of influence.

For example, each woman has her own hierarchy of qualities she looks for in a man (e.g. social position > Confidence > beautiful physical appearance).

And even within this hierarchy, there are different hierarchies: the server of the hype club can be an alpha in the eyes of girls who give value to clubbing. He would be nothing for the girl who does not go in that club and does not care about people who drink alcohol listening to electro. The drugged will like a dealer or a rich guy who will pay her some powder. The sportive woman will like her ski instructor or yoga teacher, etc.

Most people know from adolescence where they stand in the hierarchy of reproduction: just a few trials during adolescence are enough to find it and then targeting at this level. It leaves traces!

Personally, I did not have much success when I was young and now I still wonder how I got there. You can climb in the hierarchy of reproduction but you will have to fight (do not take it too literally) against yourself and against others.

This is what is called inter-sexual selection, which corresponds to variable selection criteria from one person to another in the eyes of the opposite sex. Another example: a woman can give more importance in selecting certain attributes such as leadership, a tall man, his eye color, his impudence... While another may prefer the quality of speech, humor... the girl's education level can also influence the hierarchy of her preferences!

Finally, there are issues of perspective that comes into play: a politician like François Hollande is a dominant in Paris but if one day he finds himself lost in the jungle, he would be nothing in the eyes of a savage girl.

I hope you have better understood why seduction is such a delicate area, hard to study (many variables), and why the game works through the logic of large numbers (most women are programmed to love Men).

THE VALUE

If you want, you can read the entire ebook [here](#) !

Sources

- Wikipedia
- *Why rich men's wives are beautiful*, Philippe Guillou (one of my main sources)
- *The evolution of desire*, David Buss (another of my main sources)
- The blogs « Evopsy » and « Evoweb »
- *The selfish gene*, Richard Dawkins
- *Sperm wars*, Robin Baker

My other works

[The \(inconvenient\) truth about gender relations](#)

[How to sublimate your body language](#) (In that book I found a flaw in the programming of women, which allows to significantly increase one 's kissclose success rate).

[1000 sexy alpha funny lines](#)

[Secrets for seducing on the Internet](#)

[The awesome lover's manual](#)

[Newsletter](#)

See you soon on my [group](#) and/or my Facebook [page](#)!