Evolution Theory on Sex Sociality

Below are notes on the subject of sociobiology slightly edited from how I had prepared them for my radio show “Welcome to Reality” performed 8 November 2012 on WSBF-FM Clemson to explore the nature of feminism. It is hoped that these notes will be useful for self-study by the interested individual. No warranties on the fitness of the information for any purposes whatsoever is created or extended by this document or its authorship. On the show of 8 November 2012 I covered the material up to but not including ‘Female Marriage Value’. I may resume coverage there with my next show on 15 November 2012.

—‘Reality’ Doug, 8 November 2012

Notes: Evolutionary Theory on the Danger of Feminism

Sociobiology/Evolution Theory in Sociology:

(1) A theory of (soft) social science [see wiki on Sociobiology and EO Wilson.]

(2) “The Treatise of Love As it is Recognized by an Awful Bore,” 2nd Ed., by Anatoly Protopopov, translated from Russian to English by Mikhail Linetsky, available only only as an archive at http://www.oocities.org/protopop_1999/treatise.html

(3) My understanding of Evolution Theory.

What is evolution generally? See “The Selfish Gene” Replication molecules to memes (pp. 191,2nd – 192, 4th and next paragraph.

What is human evolution?

a. Pack animals -> tribes -> barbarians -> civilization

b. Consequences of large brain size in human pack:

Upshot: What women are: hypergamous. What men are: Survival Provisioners and/or Reproduction Provisioners. Thus, violated monogamy is the norm.

Encephalization Quotient (EQ): http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Encephalization_quotient

* Mother needs father for non-sexual resources, a 2nd role ->imperfect monogamy/cuckoldry

Red Queen quote on orgasm response: http://mxplx.com/Meme/499/

* Women are evolution judges of men/reproduction ‘wealth’ gatekeepers, apex fallacy/hypergamous

* Men gatekeepers of commitment -> women's ploy of shaming language

http://exposingfeminism.wordpress.com/shaming-tactics/

* Evolution of men more harsh and advanced leads to logic and emotional self-control, meme evolution dominated in men (particularly white and yellow men, of Eurasian decent).

c. Enters wealth created and best managed by men, then politics, never has been a matriarchy, must be judged by evolution as weak and undesirable.

Note: A handaxe is a rock chiseled into a teardrop shape used for cutting by primitive hominids.

TED Video, Denis Dutton: A Darwinian theory of beauty:
http://www.ted.com/talks/denis_dutton_a_darwinian_theory_of_beauty.html

* (10:50->15:25) about men's skill and logic creating wealth and beauty.

Why women are not oppressed:

Baumeister and Vohs, “Sexual Economics, Culture, Men, and Modern Sexual Trends,” Symposium: Mating Games , published online 18 October 2012, http://www.springerlink.com/content/vg7322727mgl1875/fulltext.html?MUD=MP

* Roy F. Baumeister: Department of Psychology, The Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

* Kathleen D. Vohs: Carlson School of Management, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

* [Identify profs, title, then read near bottom several paragraphs starting with: “The changes in gender politics since 1960...” and get to the 2nd next paragraph “All of this is a bit ironic...”]

d. Monogamous marriage and free civilization, production by provider males assured if no affairs from apex males, cuckoldry.

e. Feminism: cuckoldry of taxpayers by state, feminization of workplace, bureaucratic arts over productive bottom line, Made in America, no ‘real’ men, broken families.

Female Marriage Value

Question: What is in marriage for the man anymore without reproductive fidelity of the woman? Answer: Not enough. Goodbye, civilization. It is better for a man to be an exciting lover than a provider chump. No real man is a willing sucker. Are a woman's virginity, youth, and sexual fidelity essential for men's popular participation in marriage? Shaming language shows lack of market value.

Virgin fat deposits:

* http://blogs.discovery.com/jonathan_ross/2012/09/men-find-curvy-women-more-attractive-because-they-produce-smarter-babies.html

Female Sexual Awakening and Divorce:

[[Censored by Political Correctness: “Sluts Don't Deserve to be Loved”]] by dicipres cites several useful sources: http://dicipres.wordpress.com/2012/04/25/sluts-dont-deserve-to-be-loved/

* (1) Nicole Liddon, et al., “Divorce and Sexual Risk Among U.S. Women: Findings from the National Survey of Family Growth,” Journal of Women's Health (November 2010) http://online.liebertpub.com/doi/abs/10.1089/jwh.2010.1953

* (2) Jay Teachman, “Premarital Sex, Premarital Cohabitation, and the Risk of Subsequent Marital Dissolution Among Women,” Journal of Family and Marriage (May 2003) http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2003.00444.x/abstract

“Sexual Partner Divorce Risk” by The Social Pathologist http://socialpathology.blogspot.com/2010/09/sexual-partner-divorce-risk.html

* Refers to same Teachman article and to an unspecified Heritage Foundation study

* A graph from the Heritage Foundation study is annotated with statistics from the Teachman article.

I was able to determine the Heritage Foundation study by a Web search that found the FAQ page for the Harvard organization True Love Revolution: http://www.hcs.harvard.edu/tlr/faq.php:

Robert Rector et al., “Harmful Effects of Early Sexual Activity and Multiple Sexual Partners Among

Women: A Book of Charts," 26 June 2003, The Heritage Foundation. (bookofcharts.pdf)

* Downloaded bookofcharts.pdf from: http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2003/06/harmful-effects-of-early-sexual-activity-and-multiple-sexual-partners-among-women-a-book-of-charts

* (a) read negative consequences on multiple partners on p. 2/e6, and (b) read title and caption of chart 15 on p. 18/e22.

Question: Is there a feminist alternative to familial patriarchy that is civilized?

Harvard abstinence (True Love Revolution) vs. sex seminar:

Read from http://www.hcs.harvard.edu/tlr/index.php

Read from http://www.thecrimson.com/article/2012/10/26/orgasm-penis-seminar-mcdevitt/

Fifty Shades of Grey goes University edition

Per wikipedia: Fifty Shades of Grey is a 2011 erotic novel by British author E. L. James. Set largely in Seattle, it is the first instalment in a trilogy that traces the deepening relationship between a college graduate, Anastasia Steele, and a young business magnate, Christian Grey. It is notable for its explicitly erotic scenes featuring elements of sexual practices involving bondage/discipline, dominance/submission, and sadism/masochism (BDSM).

The second and third volumes are titled Fifty Shades Darker and Fifty Shades Freed, respectively. Fifty Shades of Grey has topped best-seller lists around the world, including the United Kingdom and the United States.[1][2] The series has sold 40 million copies worldwide,[3] with book rights having been sold in 37 countries,[4] and set the record as the fastest-selling paperback of all time, surpassing the Harry Potter series.[5] Critical reception of the novel has been mixed.

American University in D.C. is offering:

AMST-330 005 , AMERICAN STUDIES , SPRING 2013

Course Level: Undergraduate

Contemporary American Culture (3)

The 50 Shades Trilogy

The Fifty Shades of Grey trilogy is a publishing phenomenon that has dramatically impacted American culture and sexual health. Using the series as a case study, this course examines the interplay of sexuality, health, public relations and marketing. Topics covered include feminism, addiction, social media marketing, sexual expression versus sexual repression, targeting the mom demographic, domestic violence, literary criticism, and relationship and identity forming. The course also relies on academic texts, online resources, lectures, and guest speakers.

(Source: http://www.american.edu/provost/registrar/schedule/course-descriptions.cfm?subj=AMST&crs=330)

Social Fabric Dissolution with 2nd Wave Feminism

Mary Parke, "Are Married Parents Really Better for Children? : What Research Says About the Effects of Family Structure on Child Well-Being," annotated version, Center For Law and Policy (CLASP), available at www.clasp.org: http://www.clasp.org/publications/marriage_brief3_annotated.pdf

"Single-parent families are much more common today than they were 40 years ago. Rates have increased across race and income groups, but single parenthood is more prevalent among African Americans and Hispanics. Twenty-two percent of African American children were living in a single-parent home in 1960; by 2001, the percentage had more than doubled to 53 percent. For whites, the percentage nearly tripled, from 7 percent to 19 percent, over the same time period. Three out of 10 Hispanic children lived in single-parent families in 2001. "

* * * * *

"In 1994, Sara McLanahan and Gary Sandefur, using evidence from four nationally representative data sets, compared the outcomes of children growing up with both biological parents, with single parents, and with step-parents. McLanahan and Sandefur found that children who did not live with both biological parents were roughly twice as likely to be poor, to have a birth outside of marriage, to have behavioral and psychological problems, and to not graduate from high school. Other studies have reported associations between family structure and child health outcomes. For example, one study found children living in single-parent homes were more likely to experience health problems, such as accidents, injuries, and poisonings.

"Of course, most children in single-parent families will not experience these negative outcomes. But what is the level and degree of risk for the average child? The answer depends on the outcome being assessed as well as other factors. For example, McLanahan and Sandefur reported that single-parent families had a much higher poverty rate (26 percent) than either two-parent biological families (5 percent) or step-families (9 percent). They also found that the risk of dropping out of high school for the average white child was substantially lower in a two-parent biological family (11 percent) than in a single-parent family or step-family (28 percent). For the average African American child, the risk of dropping out of high school was 17 percent in a two-parent family versus 30 percent in a single- or step-parent family. And for the average Hispanic child, the risk of dropping out of school was 25 percent in a two-parent family and 49 percent in a single- or step-parent family.

"Up to half of the higher risk for negative educational outcomes for children in single-parent families is due to living with a significantly reduced household income. Other major factors are related to disruptions in family structure, including turmoil a child experiences when parents separate and/or re-couple with a step-parent (including residential instability), weaker connections between the child and his or her non-custodial parent (usually the father), and weakened connections to resources outside of the immediate family—that is, other adults and institutions in the community that the non-custodial parent may have provided access to.

"When controlling for other differences in family characteristics, such as race, level of parents' education, family size, and residential location, McLanahan and Sandefur found little difference in outcomes for children according to whether the single-parent families were a result of non-marital births or divorce. However, children of widowed parents do better than children of other types of

single-parent families with similar characteristics."

Wayne Parker, "Statistics on Fatherless Children in America," About.com Guide: http://fatherhood.about.com/od/fathersrights/a/fatherless_children.htm

* Read from the Web page.

"The Effects of Marriage and Divorce on Families and Children "

Description: Testimony of Gordon Berlin, Executive Vice President, MDRC (formerly Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation) Presented Before the Science, Technology and Space Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, United States Senate: http://www.mdrc.org/publications/386/testimony.html

"[C]hildren who grow up in an intact, two-parent family with both biological parents present do better on a wide range of outcomes than children who grow up in a single-parent family. Single parenthood is not the only, nor even the most important, cause of the higher rates of school dropout, teenage pregnancy, juvenile delinquency, or other negative outcomes we see; but it does contribute independently to these problems. Neither does single parenthood guarantee that children will not succeed; many, if not most, children who grow up in a single-parent household do succeed.

* * * * *

"If the failure of parents to marry and persistently high rates of divorce are behind the high percentage of children who grow up in a single-parent family, can and should policy attempt to reverse these trends? Since Daniel Patrick Moynihan first lamented what he identified as the decline of the black family in his 1965 report, The Negro Family: The Case for National Action, marriage has been a controversial subject for social policy and scholarship. The initial reaction to Moynihan was harsh; scholars argued vehemently that family structure and, thus, father absence was not a determinant of child well-being. But then in the 1980s, psychologists (Wallerstein and Kelly, 1980; Hetherington, 1982) began producing evidence that divorce among middle-class families was harmful to children. Renewed interest among sociologists and demographers (Furstenberg and Cherlin, 1994) in the link between poverty and single parenthood soon emerged, and as noted above, that work increasingly began building toward the conclusion that family structure did matter (McLanahan and Sandefur, 1994). Of course, the debate was not just about family structure and income differences; it was also about race and gender. When Moynihan wrote in 1965, 24 percent of all births among African-Americans occurred outside of marriage. Today, the black out-of-wedlock birthrate is almost 70 percent, and the white rate has reached nearly 24 percent. If single parenthood is a problem, that problem cuts across race and ethnicity.

"But the story has nuance. Yes, growing up with two parents is better for children, but only when both mother and father are the biological or "intact" (as opposed to remarried) parents. In fact, there is some evidence that second marriages can actually be harmful to adolescents. Moreover, marriage can help children only if the marriage is a healthy one. While the definition of a "healthy marriage" is itself subject to debate, it is typically characterized as high in positive interaction, satisfaction, and stability and low in conflict. Unhealthy marriages characterized by substantial parental conflict pose a clear risk for child well-being, both because of the direct negative effects that result when children witness conflict between parents, and because of conflict's indirect effects on parenting skills. Marital hostility is associated with increased aggression and disruptive behaviors on the part of children which, in turn, seem to lead to peer rejection, academic failure, and other antisocial behaviors (Cummings and Davies,

1994; Webster-Stratton, 2003).

Americans have less friends, 3->2: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/facebook/8876376/Most-adults-have-only-two-close-friends.html

Robert Putnam, author of Bowling Alone:

* bio: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Putnam

* describe repetitive graph trend of ‘social capital’ peaking in 1950s in 20th century.

* C-Span video interview (optional on time constraint): http://www.c-spanvideo.org/program/159499-1: (0:35-4:35; 14:12-;

* The article that went viral and led to the book is available online American Studies at the University of Virginia: http://xroads.virginia.edu/~HYPER/DETOC/assoc/bowling.html

Caroline Tell, “sry gotta bail mayb nxt tme,” 26 October 2012, New York Times: http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/28/fashion/let-your-smartphone-deliver-the-bad-news.html

Women with Men's Problems

Petronella Wyatt, “Love in the time of austerity,” 20 July 2012, The Telegraph: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/lifestyle/9414743/Love-in-the-time-of-austerity.html