

Corporate Machiavelli

ARCHIVE

www.TheRedArchive.com

ABOUT THIS ARCHIVE

An archive of the blog **Corporate Machiavelli**, as held by TheRedArchive: 54 posts published in October 2020.

About TheRedArchive. TheRedArchive is a free, public archive of the Red Pill community, built so that none of this writing can quietly disappear. It holds **1,686,402 posts** and **38,839,914 comments** from 45 subreddits and 56 blogs. Much of it survives nowhere else — the accounts deleted, the subreddits banned, the websites long offline. All of it is free to read, search and download, and always will be, at www.TheRedArchive.com.

Support the mission. This Red Pill archive is free — no paywall, no account — but keeping it online isn't. I pay for the servers, the storage and the bandwidth myself, so that this valuable knowledge stays online. If you want to support the mission and archive, become one of the people who help keep it online at www.TheRedArchive.com/#help.

Share this file freely, and keep a copy of your own. What sits on one server can be taken down; what sits on a thousand hard drives cannot.

Best regards,

/u/dream-hunter

Founder of TheRedArchive
July 28, 2026

Facets of Cunning

machiavelllicorporate · 21 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Facets of Cunning
 - 2A) Analytical Mind
 - 2B) Charm
 - 2C) Persuasion
 - 2D) Mask Wearing, PowerTalk
 - 2E) Intimidation/Bullying
- 3) Gender Disparities
- 4) Relevant Reading

1) Preamble:

What follows is a list of competencies any aspiring machiavellian must master. They are basic and necessary, not advanced or supplementary. All are tools to be used or withheld depending on your own discretion.

With any skill it's impossible to learn and memorize how to deal with every possible situation, and Machiavellianism (Cunning) is no exception. What you can do is master the basics and train your intuition such that you can effectively figure out any situation that may arise.

2) Facets of Cunning:

2A) Analytical Mind

You must be able to read body language and vocal tonality accurately and be able to understand the covert subtext behind any overtly spoken words. As Illimitable Man said, "Communication is multi-layered; you should always understand what is being said, what is truly meant and what may possibly be implied."

Cold reading is the ability to make accurate deductions regarding an individual's psychological makeup from nothing more than looking at them. Warm reading is cold reading but with time being spent interacting with the person, listening to how they talk, and observing their actions.

It is inevitable that the deductions you make about a person's psychological makeup will be more accurate after spending enough time with them to do warm reading than if you were to only do a cold read, but nonetheless both warm reading and cold reading are capabilities you must master to have any hope of navigating the game of power effectively.

The specific deductions that should be made from specific clues is culturally dependent and changes from one time and place to another.

In modern America, a man wearing a 'MAGA' hat indicates he is politically Rightwing, while a woman having blue hair indicates she is politically Leftwing.

Such deductions are so easy that even the least cunning among us could figure them out; to master the 'Analytical Mind' facet of cunning you must get to the point of being able to make deductions that are accurate, consequential, and not obvious to most people.

Cold reading is easier in modern America than in most societies in the sense that our time and place is one where you can know virtually everything about a person's worldview and political preferences with very little information

about them.

If they work in academia or journalism, they are probably leftwing and think Donald Trump is Satan. If they are in the military or work in finance, they are probably rightwing and think cutting taxes will magically create an economic utopia. In most societies, making accurate and thorough deductions about a person's worldview from such little information as their job title is difficult or impossible.

The 'Analytical Mind' facet of cunning must be distinguished from having a high IQ. To have a high IQ is to be capable of comprehending complexity, whether expressed verbally or mathematically. The 'Analytical Mind' facet of cunning is the ability to read body language, vocal tonality, personalities, and social situations accurately.

Autistic men often have sky high IQs and are incredibly good at manipulating mathematical and verbal abstractions (they can do calculus in their sleep), but are hopelessly incapable of reading body language or vocal tonality; they are entirely separate sets of abilities.

Meanwhile, there are many women with only average or even below average IQs who could never learn calculus but who can quickly analyze people's body language and vocal tonality with razor sharp accuracy.

2B) Charm

Charm is the ability to make people view you positively; to make them like and trust you. When people like you, it makes them more inclined to help you and more hesitant to harm you. Conversely when people dislike you it makes them less inclined to help you and more willing to harm you.

Charm is arguably the most important facet of cunning for the modern world. For most of the venues you face in modern society, particularly those where the stakes are high, your ability to charm people will be a make or break factor.

Job Interviews? Charm the hiring manager and get a job. Fail to charm the hiring manager and be unemployed.

Office Politics? Charm your superiors and you will be promoted. Fail to charm your superiors and you will be fired or kept around but never ascend.

Sales/Marketing? Charm your clients and they will buy from you. Many people will buy a product for no real reason other than because they like the salesmen representing it.

There is no surefire strategy for charming people, since what charms one person may offend another. Indeed, being reasonably good at cold reading is a basic requirement for being good at charm; you must be able to cold read people's personalities, and present yourself in a way that will charm their specific personality.

When attempting to charm, always take the sensibilities and biases of the specific target (person) at hand into account.

2C) Persuasion

Persuasion, the ability to make people perceive that you are credible, what you are saying is true, and the ability to change people's opinions, is often a make or break factor.

Charm and Persuasion are not the same thing, but they do correlate positively in the sense that if you can charm someone the probability of them being persuaded by what you say dramatically increases; if people like you, they are inclined to think that what you say is true, and if they dislike you they are inclined to think that what you say is false.

Generally speaking persuasion is a laborious and risky activity. Most people rarely if ever change their mind once their initial opinion has been formed, and if you attempt to change a person's mind they are likely to be offended that you have expressed disagreement with the opinion they currently hold. Most people are ego invested in their opinions and beliefs; if you express any disagreement with them, they take it as a personal insult.

As such, in most situations you're best bet is to simply smile and nod; maintain the pretense that you agree with their opinion, even if you don't. It is unwise to make enemies unnecessarily.

Persuasion is laborious not in the sense of being energy intensive, but in the sense that it takes time; most people who do change their opinion take a long time to do so, and your time would be better spent elsewhere. Only attempt to persuade someone if the matter is important enough such that it is worth the time and the risk, *and* you are convinced you have a reasonable chance of successfully persuading them.

When persuading someone do so as *gently and politely* as possible. To be harsh or blunt when correcting someone or changing their opinion is generally ineffective; it offends their ego, and causes them to instinctively reject everything you say.

It is usually ineffective to directly state that you think their current opinion is wrong. Instead, start by appearing to agree with their opinion then gently express how you think their opinion might be *slightly* wrong.

Directly expressing disagreement causes the other person to view you as an adversary who should not be trusted, and whose words should be rejected. By appearing to agree with their current opinion (at least as a starting point), you cause the target to view you as an ally, someone who should be listened to.

It is often the case that changing someone's opinion totally is impossible, but partially changing their opinion is doable.

If a person insists that $2+2 = 8$, it may be impossible to convince them that $2+2 = 4$, but doable to convince them that $2+2 = 7$

A moderate step in the right direction (to 7) is often sufficient for the purposes at hand; getting them to the perfect destination (4) is usually unnecessary.

2D) Mask Wearing, PowerTalk

There are those who will say you should 'just be yourself'. This is terrible advice. Far better advice is this: *wear the mask that the day and the moment require.*

What charms one person may offend another, and vice versa; for the sake of charming people, mask wearing will be necessary.

The probability that who you actually are (your natural personality without wearing a mask) will be considered charming by everyone is practically zero.

If you know a person who everyone considers likeable, be skeptical of them; the probability they naturally have a personality that everyone finds likeable is low. The probability they are a competent machiavellian executer who can effectively wear a mask is very high.

'StraightTalk' is saying what you actually think. 'PowerTalk' is *not* saying what you actually think, but rather saying what will be most tactically effective for the situation you are in.

Those who use PowerTalk filter their speech, self censor, and outright say things they don't believe are true, all for the sake of tactical expediency. Needless to say, for the sake of succeeding in the game of power your default mode of speech should be PowerTalk.

For the sake of charming people or at minimum not outright offending them, you will need to maintain the pretense that you like them and think positively of them, even if in reality you despise them.

For the sake of not being ostracized (or even worse imprisoned or executed), you will need to outwardly express opinions that are politically correct for the time and place you live in, even if they are opinions you don't actually agree with (see Law 38).

If your real opinion is that IQ is a legitimate measurement of intelligence, and in the time and place you live it is

politically correct to say that IQ isn't real and every person is equally smart, you need to outwardly express the opinion that everyone is equally smart, or simply say nothing.

The minimum applications of PowerTalk you will need to be able to execute effectively are as follows: maintain the pretense that you like every person you encounter (Law 43), and pay lip service to whatever is politically correct in the time and place where you live (Law 38).

Regarding Law 43, you must maintain the pretense that you like every person you encounter for the sake of charming as many people as possible, or at minimum not offending them. It is in your best interest to have as many allies as possible and as few enemies as possible.

Regarding Law 38 (Think As You Like, But Behave Like Others), if you live in 1950 Russia pay lip service to the notion that Communism is a good idea and Stalin is a good leader. If you live in 2020 Saudi Arabia, pay lip service to the idea that there is no God but Allah and Mohammed is his profit. If you live in 2020 America, pay lip service to the notion that gender is a social construct.

Apply Law 38 effectively or you will suffer ostracism, and possibly imprisonment or execution.

For almost every situation you face, saying what you actually think (StraightTalk) will be tactically counterproductive, while regulating your speech (PowerTalk) will be tactically effective.

In the office? Use PowerTalk; you are playing the game of Office Politics; success means promotion and failure means firing.

With a client? Use PowerTalk. You are doing sales work; success means more money, failure means less money.

With family members? Use PowerTalk; you are playing the game of Family Politics; success means access to your family's resources, failure means ostracism.

Whenever you hear a powerful person speak in public (and even in private), they are using PowerTalk; none of them are saying what they actually think.

You may notice that women use PowerTalk more instinctively than men do (at least, women pay lip service to whatever is politically correct for the society they live in more instinctively than men do), and autistic men seem to be almost entirely incapable of PowerTalk; autists are hopelessly driven to say what they actually think (StraightTalk) the consequences be damned.

When using PowerTalk there is a paradox. You must monitor every word that comes out of your mouth; everything you say must be carefully calculated. At the same time, if it appears that you are calculating what you're saying, people perceive you as awkward at best and dishonest at worst.

Your words must be inwardly calculated, while on the outside seem to flow naturally, with an ease that makes people perceive you are saying what you actually think.

This sounds like an impossible task. It will be if you speak a million sentences a day. However, if you speak only 100 sentences a day it's very doable. Limit how much you talk, and regulating everything you say becomes a practical endeavor.

You don't have to closely monitor yourself all the time in every environment. Just in the venues where the stakes are high enough to matter (there is a significant amount of money to be made or lost).

2E) Intimidation (Bullying)

Intimidation is a tactic that can be used for the sake of getting cooperation and in some cases should be.

Beware, intimidation is a high risk high reward tactic. The high reward is that you might get cooperation. On the other hand, there is the risk that you won't get cooperation and instead make an enemy. Indeed, intimidation could very well win the target's cooperation, but still cause them to dislike you, thereby getting you an enemy.

Unlike intimidation, charm is a low risk high reward tactic. With charm, the worst case scenario is nothing happens. The best case scenario is that you win the target's cooperation *and* win an ally since they like you.

It is in your best interest to have as many allies as possible and as few enemies as possible, and as such you should use charm as often as possible and intimidation as rarely as possible, if ever.

Your use of intimidation should be calculated, not impulsive.

If you use intimidation because you have consciously calculated that it is the most effective tactic for the situation you face, and the potential reward make the downside risk worth it, then so be it. If you are using intimidation because feelings of anger have biased you into it, you are a fool.

Only use intimidation if the following conditions have been met:

- You tried using charm and it failed (or you simply lack the time to attempt to use charm)
- The matter at hand is important enough (getting the target's cooperation is important enough) such that the downside risk of getting a new enemy is a risk worth taking
- You wield power over the target and they know it, or at least they can be made to perceive that you wield power over them (attempting to use intimidation on someone who wields more power over you than you do over them, and who knows it, would be tactical suicide; your attempt at intimidation would annoy them and they'd use their power to wreck you)

When executing intimidation, your execution must be perfect. Appearing to be low on agreeableness and high on neuroticism will result in failure; high neuroticism causes people to view you as a whiney child, rather than someone worthy of fear or respect.

Instead, you must appear to be low on both agreeableness *and* low on neuroticism; this causes people to perceive you as a cold blooded killer; someone who inspires fear.

Frank Underwood exhibits low agreeableness and low neuroticism, Will Conway exhibits low agreeableness and high neuroticism (both are fictional characters from House of Cards).

Intimidation is a high risk high reward tactic you should keep in your back pocket, with the hope that you never have to use it. Charm on the other hand is a low risk high reward tactic that you should use all day every day.

3) Gender Disparities:

You will find that for each facet of cunning previously detailed, women on average do better than men. The average woman is far better than the average man at reading body language, charming, persuading, and deceiving.

Intimidation is the exception; men tend to do better with executing intimidation than women because men rank lower on both agreeableness and neuroticism; low agreeableness and neuroticism makes men more psychologically comfortable with direct, overt, and intense conflict.

4) Relevant Reading:

'Machiavellian Social Competencies' (Illimitable Man)

The 48 Laws of Power (Robert Greene)

The Definitive Book of Body Language (Pease)

Traits to Understand

machiavellicorporate · 21 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Worldly Wealth
- 3) Intelligences
 - 3A) IQ
 - 3B) Realism
 - 3C) Cunning
- 4) Big 5 Personality Traits
 - 4A) Extroversion
 - 4B) Agreeableness
 - 4C) Neuroticism
 - 4D) Agreeableness and Neuroticism, Comfort With Conflict
 - 4E) Conscientiousness
 - 4F) Openness

1) Preamble:

What follows are a list of traits you must understand in order to have any hope of comprehending the content within the rest of this publication. If you are well educated in matters of strategy and psychology, give this essay a skip; you already know it.

2) Worldly Wealth:

Worldly wealth is what every man wants: money, power, status.

It's what billionaires have plenty of and the homeless have none of.

3) Intelligences:

3A) IQ (Cognitive Ability)

IQ is nothing more than cognitive processing power. It measures a person's ability to comprehend complexity.

People with high IQs are commonly referred to as 'smart'. They are capable of analyzing complex information fast and accurately, doing advanced mathematics, have good memories, and so on.

People with low IQs are commonly referred to as 'dumb'. Their reading comprehension is below average, and their ability to understand complex information is poor.

IQ is a ruthlessly good predictor of long term life success, and indeed it is the single best predictor of income. If there is one advantage you could give a child for succeeding at life it would be this: give them a high IQ.

An individual's IQ is partially determined by both genetics and early childhood environment. Tragically, IQ is not changeable once a person has reached adulthood; if you have a low IQ, there is nothing that can be done to help you (or at least nothing that has yet been discovered).

Men and women have equal IQs on average, however male IQ is more variable than female IQ. What this means is that most geniuses are men, and most idiots are also men.

3B) Realism

Realism is simply being in touch with reality. Choosing to believe ugly truths, rather than happy lies.

Those with high realism prioritize facts over feelings and fill their mind with what they perceive to be true, even if it offends their sensibilities. Those with low realism prioritize feelings over facts and will reject something they subconsciously realize is true if it offends their sensibilities.

If a person rejects the truth when there is plenty of evidence to support that the thing is true, they probably aren't doing this due to a lack of IQ points; usually it's due to a lack of realism.

You might think that 'realism' is simply an extension of IQ, but you would be wrong. To have a high IQ is to have immense processing power. To have high realism is to be in touch with reality. There are many high IQ people who are hopelessly out of touch with reality. Some say things like "IQ isn't real" and "Gender is just a social construct".

A person with a high IQ *and* high realism has a mind with immense processing power, and will use that cognitive horsepower to figure out what the truth is. A person with a high IQ but low realism has a mind with immense processing power, and they will use their cognitive horsepower to manufacture rationalizations for lies that appeal to their sensibilities, rather than for the sake of finding the truth.

Historical and contemporary examples of people with high IQs but low realism are endless.

There are high IQ university professors who honestly believe that there are no behavioral or psychological differences between men and women driven by biology and genetics.

There are high IQ priests who believe in God, but who will laugh at a child who believes in Santa Clause, not realizing they are both equally delusional.

There are high IQ intellectuals who think communism is a viable economic system.

Men average higher on realism than women, and amongst the people with the best realism almost all of them are men.

It has been noticed by many that autistic men are often exceptionally good at logical reasoning. Autists usually don't have exceptionally high IQs; what they do have is exceptionally high realism.

To be clear men in general should not be given too much credit; most men, like almost all women, are low realism. A minority of men are high realism; they are disproportionately autistic.

3C) Cunning

Cunning is often euphemistically referred to as 'people skills' or 'social skills'. Within this publication it will sometimes be referred to as 'machievellianism' or 'machievellian intelligence'.

To be 'high cunning' is to have the ability to charm people (make them like and trust you), persuade people, lie convincingly, read body language and vocal tonality accurately, and analyze social situations accurately.

To be 'low cunning' is to be bad at charming people (socially awkward), inept in matters of persuasion, incapable of lying convincingly, and incapable of reading body language or vocal tonality accurately.

Cunning is distinct from IQ, and the correlation between them seems to be zero. There are many men with sky high IQs who are hopelessly socially awkward; they don't lack intelligence, they lack cunning.

The average woman is more cunning than the average man. Yet at the same time, cunning seems to have far greater variance amongst men than among women. Among the most cunning people on the planet (think Robert Greene and Vladimir Putin), almost all of them are men. The least cunning people are autists, who are mostly men.

4) Big 5 Personality Traits:

The Big 5 Model is a set of heuristics for understanding a person's psychological profile. While they are useful, there are inevitably aspects of a person's mind that can't be boiled down and encapsulated within the quantitative model of 'The Big 5'.

If a person is immensely important to your life (say a potential spouse), then you will need to dig far deeper into their psychological makeup than simply ranking them on each of The Big 5 Traits.

However, if a person is of only moderate importance to your life (say a subordinate employee), then estimating how they rank on each of The Big 5 Traits is enough; no need to dig any deeper into their psychological makeup than that.

4A) Extroversion

Extroversion measures the degree to which a person experiences enthusiasm or positive emotion, particularly from engaging in social interactions.

Those who rank high on extroversion (extroverts) find social interactions to be energizing. Those who rank low on extroversion (introverts) find social interactions to be exhausting. Extroverts tend to smile and laugh more often and with greater intensity than introverts.

Whether a person is extroverted or introverted and to what degree, is not determined by their 'attitude' or any conscious choice so much as it is by their neurochemistry; extroversion seems to be driven by dopaminergic function.

Those with high levels of dopamine tend to be extroverted, while those with low levels of dopamine tend to be introverted.

Many stimulants that enhance dopaminergic function within the brain also increase extroversion, at least temporarily. Caffeine is a notable example

Within America extroversion is viewed as good and introversion is viewed as bad, or at least boring. In truth, both extremes boost performance in different domains.

Extroverts tend to be better at activities that require charming people or being 'charismatic' (think sales).

Introverts are better at delaying gratification (since they have less dopamine driving them to seize any perceived reward that appears) and are better at doing cognitively difficult work for long periods alone, in silence. This is advantageous in fields such as engineering or writing.

The reason extroverts enjoy social interactions more than introverts is not because they desire intimate relationships or love (that's driven by agreeableness); it's because they enjoy the *stimulation* that comes from social interaction. In the same spirit, extroverts find bright lights and loud music to be enjoyable, while introverts find them to be annoying or even painful.

4B) Agreeableness

Agreeableness is essentially a measurement of how prone a person is to feeling compassion for others. There is an *inverse* relationship between agreeableness and ruthlessness; the lower a person ranks on agreeableness, the greater their capacity for ruthlessness.

Agreeable people tend to be compassionate, polite, and have a desire for positive intimate relationships. They find conflict to be painful, even traumatizing.

Disagreeable people tend to be callous, blunt, and selfish.

Men average lower on agreeableness than women, and this seems to be due to having higher testosterone levels.

The slight gender difference at the average leads to immense differences at the extremes, and the extremes are what matter. At the extreme low end of agreeableness, amongst the people who are ruthless enough such that they'd be willing to carry out murder, almost all of them are men.

You might think high agreeableness is virtuous and low agreeableness is evil, but do keep in mind the following; agreeable people are conflict avoidant and will often appear polite while waiting for a chance to stab you in the back. Generally speaking, if a disagreeable person has a gripe with you they will articulate it clearly and directly.

To be clear most disagreeable people don't enjoy conflict; they simply tolerate it while experiencing far less pain from it than an agreeable person would.

4C) Neuroticism

Neuroticism can be thought of as a person's propensity to experience negative emotions, particularly sadness and fear. There is an *inverse* relationship between neuroticism and stress tolerance; to have a high stress tolerance is to rank low on neuroticism.

Every person has a finite stress tolerance, and when they hit its limit they will either panic with fear or explode in anger.

Anger and fear are 2 sides of the same coin; they are both driven by stress.

Men average slightly lower on neuroticism than women and this seems to be due to the fact that men have more testosterone. It seems to be the case that having high testosterone levels suppresses neuroticism (the specific biochemical mechanism being that testosterone suppresses the stress hormone cortisol).

As with agreeableness, a slight difference in the average leads to huge differences at the extremes. Amongst people who have incredibly high stress tolerances (extremely low neuroticism), almost all of them are men. Amongst people who have very low stress tolerances ('anxiety disorders'), almost all of them are women.

Many mistakenly attribute anger to low agreeableness, when the real culprit is high neuroticism. Many mistakenly attribute being nervous about social interactions to low extroversion (being introverted), when the real culprit is high neuroticism. Anger, and anxiety surrounding social interactions, are both driven by high neuroticism; not a lack of agreeableness, or a lack of extroversion.

4D) Agreeableness and Neuroticism, Comfort With Conflict

The lower a person ranks on agreeableness and the lower they rank on neuroticism, the more psychologically comfortable they will be with conflict. 'Conflict' can range from a heated argument on the gentle side, to mortal combat on the intense side.

Those who rank high on agreeableness find conflict to be painful because they find exposure to malevolence to be traumatizing.

Those who rank high on neuroticism find conflict to be painful because they are more sensitive than the average person to stressors of any kind, whether those stressors are malevolent or not is irrelevant.

Men averaging lower on both agreeableness and neuroticism than women (due to their higher testosterone levels) results in men being on average more comfortable with conflict than women.

The people on the planet who are the most comfortable with conflict are psychopaths, who are exclusively male; they experience zero fear (zero neuroticism) and zero compassion (zero agreeableness).

To be clear, the zero agreeableness and zero neuroticism of psychopathic men doesn't come from them having unusually high testosterone levels; it comes as a result of them having suppressed or non-existent amygdala function in the brain (psychopathy is driven by an unusual neurological structure, not an unusual hormone profile).

4E) Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness is The Big 5's way of measuring how hardworking or lazy a person is. Conscientious people work hard and keep their belongings organized. Unconscientious people are lazy and disorganized.

Conscientiousness can be further divided into the sub-traits 'Orderliness' and 'Industriousness'.

Industriousness determines how hardworking a person is. Orderliness drives disgust sensitivity; how much a person desires for the environment to be clean and organized.

It is worth distinguishing between industriousness and orderliness for a simple reason; it affects political affiliations. People who rank high on orderliness tend to be Rightwing, while people who rank low on orderliness tend to be Leftwing. On the other hand, the correlation between industriousness and political affiliation seems to be zero. Conservatives are more orderly than liberals, but they aren't any more or less industrious.

Many unproductive people are disparagingly called 'lazy', when in truth their problem isn't their personality (low industriousness), but rather it's biological (low energy). Some people have less energy than others, and the old have less energy than the young. If you lack energy, there are drugs that will help you (caffeine). If you lack industriousness, no drug can save you.

For purposes of this publication 'Energy' and 'Industriousness' will be used interchangeably, but it is worth knowing that they aren't actually the same thing; energy levels are determined by physical health, while industriousness is a matter of personality.

4F) Openness

Openness is The Big 5's way of measuring creativity. Those who rank high on openness enjoy creative activities; they think creating art and music is fun, they enjoy visiting museums. Those who rank low on openness find such things to be boring, or at least they are not as motivated to pursue them as those who rank high on openness.

Openness seems to be what drives entrepreneurship; the creation of new business ventures.

It is the case that openness correlates with IQ, however they are not one in the same. Virtually all low IQ people are low openness, but not all high IQ people are high openness.

People who are high IQ and high openness are intelligent and creative, while those who are high IQ and low openness are intelligent but *not* creative (such people make great accountants).

Before you start shedding tears for those who rank low on openness, realize that there are many downsides associated with high openness.

Those who rank high on openness seem to be *involuntarily creative*; they spontaneously think of new ideas and new ways of being in the world. If they don't engage in creative activity, they become terribly depressed.

From a financial perspective, creativity is a high risk – high reward strategy. More accurately, it is a suicidal strategy. Amongst those who engage in creative endeavors you will find that most are starving, while a tiny minority are spectacularly rich. This is true of artists, musicians, actors, and entrepreneurs; most make little or no money, while a tiny minority are millionaires.

Openness predicts political affiliation; those who rank high on openness tend to be Leftwing, while those who rank low on openness tend to be Rightwing.

Taken together with conscientiousness, you will find that Leftwingers tend to be high openness and low orderliness, while Rightwingers tend to be low openness and high orderliness.

Zero Sum Games

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Duplicity, Outwardly Kind and Inwardly Ruthless
- 3) Power and Status
- 4) Dating Market, Male Reproductive Success
- 5) Business
 - 5A) Sales/Marketing
 - 5B) Office Politics
 - 5C) Job Interviews
- 6) Looks, Halo Effect
- 7) Education, University Admissions
- 8) Envy and Schadenfreude, Evolutionary Purposes
- 9) Pareto Distribution
 - 9A) Worldly Wealth
 - 9B) Male Reproductive Success
 - 9C) Consequences of the Pareto Distribution
- 10) Positive Sum Games
 - 10A) Wealth
 - 10B) Wisdom

1) Preamble:

“War rages everywhere.” –Illimitable Man

In modern America it is something of a dogma that zero sum competition doesn't exist and that everyone can be a winner.

The truth is this; *war rages everywhere*, ‘war’ being any situation where you face zero sum conflict or competition.

It is both sad and true to say that zero sum games are common while positive sum games are rare. The aim of this essay is to examine the key areas of life that are zero sum in nature.

2) Duplicity, Outwardly Kind and Inwardly Ruthless:

While you should inwardly be aware of the zero sum nature of the situations you face and be willing to destroy others for your own gain, outwardly you must appear to be a polite, compassionate, and virtuous person. Such an appearance causes other people to like you (or at least not outright hate you), which makes them more willing to help you and more hesitant to harm you.

3) Power and Status:

Power and Status are not precisely the same thing, but they are so closely correlated that differentiating between them is almost pointless.

They are both zero sum in nature.

A man can only be considered ‘high status’ if he is *higher* status than other men; being a billionaire grants a man high status only because most men are not billionaires.

Power is zero sum in nature, in the sense that one party can only wield power over another insofar as the other party

is powerless.

There are practical reasons to care about your relative level of status and power, beyond just the vanity of having your ego stroked.

When people perceive you are high status it makes them eager to do you favors, since they perceive you are likely to have the power to repay them in a meaningful way. It also makes people hesitant to harm you, because they perceive that you likely have the power to retaliate in a meaningful way.

4) Dating Market, Male Reproductive Success:

In order for you to get commitment from that special someone, everyone else has to not get commitment from them.

The dating market is a zero sum game, particularly for heterosexual men.

Males are in zero sum competition with one another for reproductive opportunities, females are not. One man having a child with a woman prevents any other man from having a child by her (at least for the next 9 months). However, one woman having a child with a man *does not* prevent other women from having a child by him.

It seems to be the case that men are more prone to thinking in zero sum terms than women are, and this could be an extension of the fact that in our evolutionary past men *were* engaged in zero sum competition for reproductive opportunities, while women were not.

Intrasexual competition among men is far more intense than intrasexual competition among women.

There is female ingroup preference (women automatically side with other women), but there is no male ingroup preference (men do NOT automatically side with other men). Why? Because men are by default in zero sum competition with one another, at least for reproductive opportunities, while women are not.

Quite sinisterly, another man dying indirectly benefits all the other men left alive; it means they have one less competitor in the race for reproductive opportunities. This may explain why males kill each other far more often than females do.

For insight on why men kill each other, see Martin Daly's book ***Killing the Competition***

5) Business:

The business world involves endless zero sum competition.

5A) Sales/Marketing:

Sales/Marketing is zero sum in nature; you and your competitors are engaged in a zero sum game of winning market share.

Every piece of market share one of your competitors takes is a piece of market share you *can't* have, and vice versa.

5B) Office Politics:

Office Politics is a zero sum game.

Your goal is to maximize the probability of being promoted and to minimize the probability of being fired, and *you are in zero sum competition with coworkers of the same rank as you for the same promotion opportunities*. You are also in zero sum competition with them for keeping your position when layoff season comes.

It is objectively in your best interest for your coworkers to fail, so that your own probability of being handed a promotion is maximized.

There may be cases where the number of promotions available is greater than the number of employees competing

for them, in which case the game is no longer zero sum. Such cases are exceptionally rare; odds are you will go your entire career without encountering one of them.

5C) Job Interviews:

Job Interviews are usually a zero sum game, because in most cases the number of people applying for the open position is far greater than the number of open positions available; in order for you to be given a job offer, others must *not* be given a job offer.

6) Looks, Halo Effect:

It is the case that being good looking gives a person a 'halo effect'; it causes others to perceive them as more likeable, more trustworthy, and more competent.

Good looking men are more likely to be hired for jobs than ugly men, and more likely to be promoted up the corporate hierarchy.

Of course, this is insanity since in reality the true correlation between physical attractiveness and competence or trustworthiness is *zero*. Sadly, it is a form of insanity that most humans are plagued by.

Physical attractiveness is a zero sum game in the following sense; the halo effect you get from being good looking only exists insofar as you are *better looking* than other members of your gender who are roughly your own age.

If every 30 year old man was as handsome as the 30 year old Brad Pitt, none of them would benefit from the halo effect.

It is objectively in your best interest for yourself to be good looking, while every other man or woman your own age is ugly.

For details on the 'Halo Effect', see Robert Cialdini's book *Influence*

7) Education, University Admissions:

University admissions is a zero sum game, particularly when dealing with elite universities; in order for you to be admitted to Harvard, at least one other applicant has to *not* be admitted to Harvard.

8) Envy and Schadenfreude, Evolutionary Purposes:

Envy is feelings of unhappiness when others succeed. Schadenfreude is feelings of happiness when others fail.

The reason we evolved to feel envy and schadenfreude is rather straightforward; in our evolutionary past, zero sum games were common and positive sum games were rare, so it was rational to be happy about others failing and unhappy about others succeeding; the failure of others marginally improved one's own odds of success, while the success of others marginally decreased one's own odds of success.

In our modern world, zero sum games take the form of college admissions, job interviews, and office politics. In caveman world (our evolutionary environment), zero sum games took the form of competition over finite resources (animals that could be hunted or farmland), and men engaging in competition for reproductive opportunities (sexual access to women).

Humans are hardwired for zero sum thinking (envy and schadenfreude), because for all of the evolutionary timeline and even today zero sum games have been ubiquitous.

9) Pareto Distribution:

In statistics classes university students are taught that everything of consequence is normally distributed; everything that matters in life can be represented by a bell curve.

Tragically this is false; many of the most important things in life are pareto distributed.

'Pareto distributed' is a euphemism for *a tiny minority of people get everything, and most people get little or nothing*.

9A) Worldly Wealth:

Worldly Wealth (Power, Status, Wealth) is pareto distributed.

A minority of people are powerful, high status, and rich. Most people are powerless, low status, and poor.

Historically the existence of a middle class has been exceptional; in most societies there is no middle class, only a minority who are rich and the majority who are poor.

9B) Male Reproductive Success:

Male reproductive success is pareto distributed.

This is a euphemism for *women consider a minority of men (top tier men) to be very attractive, and most men to be unattractive*. Consequently, a minority of men have many offspring while most men have few or no offspring.

Male reproductive success correlates closely with Worldly Wealth; women consider high status men (who are a minority) to be attractive, and low status men (who are a majority) to be unattractive.

9C) Consequences of the Pareto Distribution:

The fact that Worldly Wealth is pareto distributed has some practical consequences:

- Losers are the majority. Winners are a minority.
- To be average is to be a loser.
- Shoot for the stars or drown; there is no middle-ground.

10) Positive Sum Games:

Fortunately, there are positive sum games in life; games where you can work together with others for mutual benefit.

10A) Wealth:

While power and status are zero sum games, wealth is a positive sum game.

Free market capitalism can make everyone richer on an absolute basis.

Relative wealth (being richer than other people) is a zero sum game, but absolute wealth (how much material wealth you have) is a positive sum game.

10B) Wisdom:

Wisdom is a positive sum game; open discourse can make everyone wiser.

Secrets should go with you to the grave, but wisdom should not.

If there is valuable wisdom inside your head, you have a sacred obligation to write it down and publish it before you die.

Family Politics, Machiavellian Venue

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Strategy for Winning
- 3) Powerful Men, Influential Women
- 4) Epilogue

1) Preamble:

The game of Family Politics is Office Politics on steroids.

Imagine Office Politics, except every person is emotionally involved with everyone else, the game is going 24/7, and you can never hit the 'reset' button by finding a new family (whereas with Office Politics you could reset the game by finding a new employer).

With Office Politics, your goal is to make your superiors view you as both competent and likeable, to maximize the odds of promotion. With Family Politics, your goal is to make those who wield control over money and valuable connections to like you, so that they are inclined to use what power they wield to help you.

If you were born into a poor family, then Family Politics is a low stakes venue; you have very little to gain or lose.

If you had the good fortune of being born into a rich family, then Family Politics is a high stakes venue; success or failure could change the trajectory of your life.

2) Strategy for Winning:

In the game of Office Politics the strategy for winning is rather straightforward; identify who your critical superiors are (those who wield decision-making power over whether you are promoted or fired) and make them like you at all costs. Prioritize giving them A+ work, while everyone else gets A- work.

With Family Politics, the strategy is similar; identify who in the family wields control over the money and valuable connections, and make them like you at all costs.

How to go about making them like you could be somewhat complicated. The essay I've written on 'Charm' in general should help you, but you will need to analyze the individual psychologies of the people in your family to know precisely what will and will not appeal to them; I cannot do this for you.

One key tactic will be this; identify other members of the family who the powerful members of the family care about intensely, and be nice to them. Suppose your uncle is the one who wields control over the money and valuable connections, and that your uncle cares intensely about the well being of your sister. *Be nice to your sister*; this will be necessary (although likely not sufficient) for winning the favor of your uncle.

Parents (as well as aunts and uncles) *do* pick favorites. Ideally you are one of the favorites, but if not the next best thing is to befriend and appear to be nice to the favorites.

3) Powerful Men, Influential Women:

Men from rich families usually have lucrative careers or businesses, whereas women from rich families generally do *NOT* have high incomes; they simply live off their father's money or their husband's money.

The tactical implication is this; in most rich families it is the case that there are men who wield direct control over the money and valuable connections, while there are women who wield influence over said men. Men build and

control civilization, women manipulate men.

Getting the women within your family to like you is critical; if the women like you, you might be viewed positively by the powerful men in the family, and you might be viewed negatively by them. However, if the women *dislike* you, then you will certainly be disliked by the powerful men in the family, since the women will encourage them to dislike you.

Getting the approval of the women is necessary (though not sufficient) for succeeding in the game of Family Politics.

Generally speaking women are consensus seeking; if 1 woman in the family likes you, chances are they all like you. If 1 woman in the family dislikes you, chances are they all dislike you.

The heart of female ingroup preference is this; women tend to hold the same opinions as one another.

4) Epilogue:

Does this all sound very cynical? It is.

The game of power never stops, even in your own home.

Being born into a rich family is only a privilege insofar as your parents (or whoever holds the money) are willing to use their power to improve your life; if your family is rich, but everyone in your family hates you, your family's wealth will do you little good.

Narcissistic Men, Neurotypical Women

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Negative Femininity
- 3) Negative Masculinity
- 4) Callous, yet Hypersensitive
- 5) Deeply Superficial
- 6) Charming Narcissistic Men
- 7) Ego Over Tactical Efficacy
- 8) Confidence vs Narcissism
- 9) Charismatic Narcissists
- 10) Causes of Narcissism
- 11) Reflections from Illimitable Man
- 12) Law 19, The Arrogant and Proud Man
- 13) Further Reflections

1) Preamble:

Understanding narcissistic men is critical since you will certainly have to deal with them.

There is one narcissistic man, with many faces.

Narcissistic men vary in terms of their intelligence (IQ), but in terms of their baseline personality they are almost all identical.

Narcissistic men express negative masculinity on the outside and embody negative femininity on the inside. They represent the worst tendencies of men, and also the worst tendencies of women; an angry gorilla on the outside, a whiney 13 year old girl on the inside.

2) Negative Femininity:

What follows are traits that narcissistic men and the worst neurotypical women have in common:

- Revels in attention
- Gossipy. Speaks negatively of others when they aren't around.
- Petty, Vindictive
- Manufactures conflict and drama out of nothing.
- Neurotic. Ranks high on personality trait neuroticism.
- Aesthetically minded. Judges people heavily on how physically attractive they are.
- Thin Skinned. Vulnerable to provocation (Law 39 offensive application). Will be enraged by insults, and will interpret neutral comments as insults.
- Cunning, yet easily manipulated. High attack and low defense. Good at manipulating others, yet they themselves are easily manipulated. Both narcissistic men and neurotypical women are vulnerable to provocation (Law 39 offensive application) because they are deeply affected by insults, and they are also both vulnerable to charm, since they both lap up complements.

-Deeply superficial. Loves shiny things. Luxurious jewelry, expensive cars, and beautiful mansions.

3) Negative Masculinity:

What follows are traits that narcissistic men and the worst neurotypical men have in common:

–Arrogant

–Prone to extreme anger, even impulsive violence.

–Narcissistic denigration; denigrating others, so that they can feel superior in comparison.

4) Callous, yet Hypersensitive:

Narcissistic men have a callous indifference to the feelings of others, yet they themselves are hypersensitive.

They insult others without hesitation, yet they themselves are deeply hurt by insults and their hurt always manifests as anger rather than as pain or sadness.

They speak to others with insolence, yet expect others to respond to them while maintaining the pinnacle of politeness.

The hallmark of a narcissistic man is this; he is arrogant, yet also thin skinned.

5) Deeply Superficial:

Narcissistic men are deeply superficial people.

They care intensely about physical attractiveness; both how they look and how other people look. They care intensely about worldly wealth; money, power, and status.

They judge others heavily by what they look like and what their status in the macro hierarchy is, and they also judge themselves heavily based on these things.

Narcissists are *not* spiritually minded; you will never meet a narcissist who spends a significant amount of their time reading philosophy.

6) Charming Narcissistic Men:

There is a formula for charming narcissistic men: be high status (just not so much that they dislike you because you outshine them), be good looking, and hatebond with them; hate the same things and people that they hate.

7) Ego Over Tactical Efficacy:

Many people will prioritize their ego over doing what is most tactically effective. They will reject strategies that would give positive outcomes because such strategies offend their ego, and they will use strategies that give negative or inferior outcomes because such strategies stroke their ego. Narcissistic men are the epitome of this, not the exception.

Every person on the planet will foolishly prioritize their ego over doing what is most tactically effective, at least some of the time. However, narcissistic men do this far more often than most people.

8) Confidence vs Narcissism:

It is important to distinguish between narcissists and people who simply have a healthy sense of confidence.

Narcissism is petty, vindictive, and immature. Confidence is calm and mature.

Narcissists rank high on neuroticism, confident people rank low on neuroticism.

Narcissists feel anger when insulted, confident people have zero emotional reaction to insults.

Confidence is marked by calmness. Narcissism is marked by arrogance on the outside, and neuroticism on the inside.

For an example of narcissism, see the fictional character Will Conway. For an example of confidence, see the fictional character Frank Underwood. Both are from the American drama 'House of Cards'.

9) Charismatic Narcissists:

It would be dishonest to say that narcissism is all bad; grandiose narcissists often make great salesmen, con-men, and politicians.

While wise men find narcissists to be distasteful, fools (the masses) often find narcissists to be charismatic.

If you are in one on one conversation with a very intelligent man, the grandiosity of narcissism is likely to annoy him.

If you are trying to appeal to a large crowd of people, most of who are of average intelligence, they are likely to feel that the grandiosity of narcissism is charismatic.

In our own time, Donald Trump has the appearance of being a grandiose narcissist and roughly half the American masses are in love with him.

10) Causes of Narcissism:

Psychopathy and Autism seem to have genetic underpinnings; it seems to be the case that psychopathic and autistic men were simply 'born that way'.

Narcissism on the other hand seems to be heavily driven by early childhood environment. Boys who are naturally disagreeable (due to genetics) and who are also abused during the first 10 years of life are disproportionately likely to grow up to become narcissists.

If child abuse were eliminated, within 1 generation narcissistic men would become far more rare.

11) Reflections from Illimitable Man:

"Confident people handle pressure with composure and quiet decorum. Narcissistic people scream like a barbarian at the gate. Narcissism is status orientated, confidence isn't. Narcissism is petty and vengeful, confidence isn't. Confidence is mature, narcissism is immature."

"Narcissism has to remind people how inferior they are, confidence doesn't."

"The difference between confidence and narcissism is that narcissism is petty and vengeful, confidence isn't."

"The more narcissistic the man, the more he:

- Is vain (like women)
- Needs attention (like women)
- Judges people HEAVILY on appearance (like women)
- Is drawn to high status (like women)
- Gets outraged (like women)
- Tries to be popular (like women)"

"The more egotistical the person, the more mercenary, the lower their trustworthiness and the lower their integrity, the less logical, the less loyal, the more traitorous, the more petty, the less spiritual, the more opportunistic and the more material. We've all met this person."

“Be wary of gossip. It’s often insidious, agenda driven and malicious. It is low-minded social violence designed to ostracise out of an insatiable vengeance for unresolved affronts to the ego, rather than maturely move on in peace.”

12) Law 19, The Arrogant and Proud Man:

“Although he may initially disguise it, this man’s touchy pride makes him very dangerous. Any perceived slight will lead to a vengeance of overwhelming violence. You may say to yourself, “But I only said such-and-such at a party, where everyone was drunk. ...” It does not matter. There is no sanity behind his overreaction, so do not waste time trying to figure him out. If at any point in your dealings with a person you sense an oversensitive and overactive pride, flee! Whatever you are hoping for from him isn’t worth it.” -Law 19

13) Further Reflections:

Your confidence must be completely internalized; independent of external circumstances.

If you are confident for a reason, that’s a problem since that reason can be taken away.

If compliments make you confident, that’s a problem since it indicates you thirst for external validation.

Narcissists need something to serve as ‘narcissistic supply’. Confident people don’t; their confidence is simply always there, even in the absence of narcissistic supply.

Don’t trust a narcissistic man; his betrayal is a matter of ‘when’, not ‘if’.

Where there are problems, autistic men with high IQs will solve them. Where there are no problems, neurotypical women and narcissistic men will manufacture them so that they can enjoy the drama.

Finite Resources: Energy, Stress, Pain

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

1) Preamble:

“A wise man calibrates himself to his limits. A lazy man doesn’t go near his limits. A fool surpasses his limits, to his detriment.” -Illimitable Man

Many ambitious men like to believe they have an infinite supply of energy, stress tolerance, and pain tolerance. Tragically they are all wrong. Many learn this the hard way.

You find out where the limits of your energy are when you collapse with exhaustion. You find the limits of your stress tolerance when you either explode in rage or become overwhelmed by fear. You find out where the limit of your pain tolerance is when suicide becomes appealing.

2) Stress, One Dimensional:

Stress is a one-dimensional phenomenon in the sense that your brain does not distinguish between different sources of stress. So far as your brain is concerned, cortisol that is induced by a man holding a gun to your chest, or a neighbor playing loud music, is identical.

Your brain does distinguish between the *intensity* of different stressors, but not between *types* of stressors.

Every person has a finite stress tolerance, and when they hit the limit of it they will either explode in rage or become paralyzed by fear.

Anger and Fear are 2 sides of the same coin; anger is the offensive expression of stress, fear is the defensive expression of stress.

Stress is the ‘Fight or Flight’ response; anger tells you to fight, fear tells you to run away.

Meditation can be used to train yourself to have a higher stress tolerance; meditation will decrease your baseline level of neuroticism.

Think of meditation as a means of preparing yourself for the worst day of your life; sooner or later the most stressful day of your life will arrive, and when it does the hours you spent meditating will prove to be a worthwhile investment.

It seems to be the case that testosterone suppresses cortisol; having high testosterone levels causes a person to be lower on neuroticism.

This in large part explains why men average lower on neuroticism than women.

It also seems to be the case that when men with high testosterone levels hit the limit of their stress tolerance, they almost always express anger, never fear; their bias is towards ‘fight’ rather than ‘flight’.

3) Great Men Breaking:

“Many men seem great, until you get to know them personally.” -Baltasar Gracian

To be invincible is impossible. To appear invincible in front of those who don’t know you personally is easy.

The more you get to know someone the harder it is for them to conceal their weaknesses. Conversely, the better someone gets to know you the harder it will be for you to conceal your own weaknesses.

Powerful men are usually far more admired by the general public than they are by their close friends and family members.

Why?

Because most people see the mask they present to the public, their family and friends see the real version of them; who they actually are is far inferior to the mask they present to the world.

It is both terrifying and exhilarating to see a powerful man hit the edge of his limits; they all seem invincible, right up until the moment they don't.

Brute Force Strategy

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

1) Preamble:

“The best strategy is always to be very strong...” -Carl von Clausewitz

Battles that are won by strategy are rare; most are won by sheer brute force.

The aim of this essay is to lay out the Brute Force Strategy (BFS) that can be used to succeed in different areas of life.

BFS will *not* get you to the top 1% of a domain of performance, but it *will* get you into the top 20%.

2) Transcending Macro Dominance Hierarchies:

The BFS for transcending macro hierarchies is this: have a high IQ and high energy levels.

If you have an IQ of 120+ and the energy to work 60 hours a week, the probability of you ending up rich and powerful is fairly good, and the probability of you ending up poor and powerless is practically zero.

High IQ + High Energy is an insurance policy against poverty.

3) Seduction:

The BFS for seduction is this: be extremely good looking, and have high status in the macro dominance hierarchy.

If you are a man who is handsome and high status, getting women to sleep with you will be laughably easy.

If you are a man who is ugly and low status, getting women to sleep with you will be impossible.

4) Sales Work:

The BFS for sales is this: be good looking, be extroverted, and have high energy levels.

If you are a sales rep who is good looking, enthusiastic (extroverted), and who has the energy to work 60+ hours a week, the overwhelming probability is you will be in the top 20% of sales reps.

Success Predictors, Areas of Life

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) School, Grades
- 3) Corporate Jobs, Complex Jobs
- 4) Job Interviews
- 5) Seduction, Dating

1) Preamble:

A question as old as time is why some succeed in life while others fail.

The aim of this piece is to address specific areas of life most people care about and the traits that drive success or failure in these areas.

2) School, Grades:

The 2 best predictors of academic success are IQ and Energy/Industriousness.

Smart people who work hard tend to succeed, while dumb people who are lazy tend to fail.

3) Corporate Jobs, Complex Jobs:

In most corporate jobs (complex jobs), the 2 best predictors of success are IQ and Energy/Industriousness.

Notice that the best predictors of academic success and the best predictors of success in complex jobs are the same.

People who do well in school tend to also do well in the corporate world. This is *not* because the knowledge gained in school enhances performance in the corporate world; it doesn't. Most of the information you learn in school has no real world application.

It is because the traits that enable a person to succeed in school also enable a person to succeed in the corporate world; a high IQ and the energy to work 60+ hours a week.

Addendum: Low Neuroticism, Low Agreeableness, and being good looking are also advantages for succeeding in the corporate world. Having a high stress tolerance, being willing to harm others for one's own gain, and benefiting from the halo effect (physical attractiveness) all boost lifetime earnings.

4) Job Interviews:

Despite what hiring managers might tell you, job interviews do not select for competence; they select for likeability.

The correlation between success in job interviews and performance in most complex jobs is *dead zero*.

IQ and Energy/Industriousness are what predict success in complex jobs.

What predicts success in job interviews? Extroversion, Agreeableness, Height, and Physical Attractiveness.

Job interviews select for people who are extroverted, agreeable, tall, and good looking.

5) Seduction, Dating:

There are traits that reliably predict how attractive or not attractive a man will be in the eyes of women.

Looks, Socioeconomic Status, and Confidence are the best predictors of a man's romantic success with women.

Men who are good looking, high status in the macro dominance hierarchy (high socioeconomic status), and low on neuroticism (confident) tend to do very well with women.

Men who are ugly, low status in the macro dominance hierarchy (poor), and high on neuroticism (fearful) are considered repulsive by women.

In some sense, what men are like is a reflection of what women consider to be sexually attractive; all the men who our female ancestors didn't consider to be sexually attractive failed to reproduce and were eliminated from the gene pool.

Logic vs Cunning

machiavelliacorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Required Reading
- 2) Preamble
- 3) Logic vs Cunning, Antitheticals
 - 3A) Emotion, Terrible for Logic, Great for Cunning
 - 3B) Emotionality of Language
 - 3C) Substance vs Style
 - 3D) Statistics vs Anecdotes
 - 3E) StraightTalk vs PowerTalk
 - 3F) Logical Fallacies
 - 3G) Truth vs Persuasion
 - 3H) Antitheticals, Big 5 Personality Traits:
 - 3I) Complexity of Language
 - 3J) Topic Choice Antitheticals
- 4) Gender Differences and Autism
 - 4A) Gender Differences
 - 4B) Autism
 - 4C) Masculinized Logic, Feminized Cunning
 - 4D) Corporate Example
- 5) Naturally Logical, Learned Cunning
- 6) Epilogue
 - 6A) TLDR
 - 6B) Logic, More Than Just IQ
 - 6C) Detecting Who is Good at Logic
- 7) Recommended Reading
- 8) Reflections from Illimitable Man

1) Required Reading:

Machiavellian Thinking vs Conventional Logic (Illimitable Man)

2) Preamble:

“...logic is antithetical to cunning.” -Illimitable Man

That which is conducive to logic and that which is conducive to cunning are antithetical.

More specifically, that which is conducive to doing rigorous logical reasoning for the sake of finding the truth, and that which is conducive to charm and persuasion (2 key facets of cunning), are antithetical.

When doing logical reasoning, your goal is to get an accurate map of reality. With charm, your goal is to make the other person like you. With persuasion, your goal is to change the other person's opinion or course of action.

Most people don't find logic to be charming, or persuasive. Quite the opposite; they find logic to be offensive, the antithesis of charming. Instead of considering logic to be persuasive, they consider emotion and logical fallacies to be persuasive.

The aim of this essay is to illustrate the specific ways in which Logic and Cunning are antithetical.

3) Logic vs Cunning, Antitheticals:

3A) Emotion: Terrible for Logic, Great for Cunning:

When doing logical reasoning, experiencing emotion is a liability; the more emotionally detached you are the better. Emotion may bias you positively or negatively, in either case giving you an inaccurate view of reality.

When doing logical reasoning, facts mean everything and feelings mean nothing.

However, when charming or persuading others you certainly should play on their emotions.

In matters of charm and persuasion, facts often mean very little, whereas feelings mean everything.

Emotional people cannot be reasoned with; don't appeal to logic when dealing with them. However they can be manipulated, and with incredible ease.

With both Logic and Cunning, it is best for you yourself to be emotionally detached; calm (low neuroticism).

The benefit for logic is straightforward; a lack of negative emotion will prevent you from being overly pessimistic in your assessment of reality.

Being low on neuroticism is also beneficial for charm and persuasion. Not exhibiting any fear, anger, or sadness causes people to perceive you as likeable (charm) and credible (persuasion).

3B) Emotionality of Language:

When doing logical reasoning, your speech should be direct and free of emotion; communicating as much critical information as possible in as few words as possible.

When charming and persuading, it is wise to make your language emanate emotion, and it is often wise to communicate your point indirectly; using more words than is absolutely necessary may help with this.

Communicating your point indirectly is critical if it is a point that is likely to offend the sensibilities of your target; they are more likely to accept a bitter truth if it is expressed indirectly and gently, rather than directly and harshly.

For an example of the type of language that is conducive to logical reasoning, see the writings of **WallStreetPlayboys**. It's direct, zero fluff.

For an example of the type of language that is conducive to charming people, see the writings of **Mark Manson**. There is a lot of fluff in his writings that is designed to play on people's emotions, rather than to communicate concrete information.

Logical Reasoning = communicate with concrete information

Charm and Persuasion = give people feel good fluff

3C) Substance vs Style:

When doing logical reasoning, substance is all that matters, style means nothing. What is said matters, how it is said means nothing.

When persuading others, substance does matter, but style also matters a great deal. In addition to what you say, *how you say it* is critical. So far as charm and persuasion are concerned, tone matters more than substance.

Most people decide whether or not to believe what you say, not based on the logic and facts you present to support your opinion, but by how you present your opinion. They pay attention to your style, rather than substance.

If you appear calm and confident when speaking, people tend to assume you are credible. If you appear nervous or defensive, you are perceived as uncredible. All of this is the case regardless of whether what you are saying is in actuality true or false.

3D) Statistics vs Anecdotes:

“Cunning and rhetoric almost always triumph over logic, fact and statistic in matters of persuasion.” - Illimitable Man

For the sake of doing logical reasoning, anecdotes should be ignored as much as possible. Anyone can manufacture an anecdote that will corroborate any narrative imaginable. Statistics should be used, since statistics are the *totality* of all the available anecdotes.

However, when persuading others statistics are usually ineffective; most people are not good enough at logic to process and analyze statistics accurately. As such, use anecdotes. Most people are persuaded by anecdotal evidence, particularly emotionally charged anecdotes.

Humans tend to forget facts and statistics, but remember stories, particularly emotionally charged stories. To be a great persuader, you must be a great storyteller.

3E) StraightTalk vs PowerTalk

“No one is hated more than he who speaks the truth.” -Plato

‘StraightTalk’ means saying what you actually think.

‘PowerTalk’ means *not* saying what you actually think, but instead regulating your speech based on who you are talking to.

For the sake of logical reasoning, StraightTalk should be the modality used; your goal is to find the truth. Blunt, direct language is most effective; if the sensibilities of others are offended, or even if your own sensibilities are offended, it means nothing.

For the sake of charm and persuasion, PowerTalk should be the modality used. Saying what you actually think is most likely counterproductive, since what you actually think is likely to offend a great many people.

Instead, regulate your speech and tell people what they want to hear (charm). When persuading, formulate what you say in a way that will appeal to the biases and sensibilities of the person you are trying to persuade, even if you don’t actually believe everything you say.

Logic and Charm are directly antithetical in the sense that when doing logical reasoning your goal is to find the truth, and the truth of most important matters is ugly. In the words of Illimitable Man, “Reality is not politically correct.” If you tell people truths that are ugly, they will not be charmed by you; they will dislike you.

When charming people, say what is politically correct for the time and place you live in, or tell them things that appeal to their sensibilities (things that won’t offend them).

When charming people, prioritize feelings over facts, and political correctness over reality.

When doing logical reasoning, feelings and political correctness mean nothing; facts and reality are all that matter.

In the words of my younger brother, “For charm, put fealz over realz. For the sake of logic, put realz over fealz.”

3F) Logical Fallacies:

“Logical fallacies double as effective Machiavellian power plays, for logic is antithetical to cunning...Where some see logical fallacies, others see Machiavellian tactics.” -Illimitable Man

“Logic never sells.” -WallStreetPlayboys

When doing logical reasoning, logical fallacies are a liability; they will lead you to an incorrect conclusion.

However, when persuading others logical fallacies are an asset; many people fall for them.

Ad Hominem is a logical fallacy that almost everyone will fall for.

3G) Truth vs Persuasion:

“In many circumstances, logic and fact are an obstruction to the Machiavellian motive; they expose duplicity by contradicting narrative with fact, and so the Machiavellian practices caution with the logical, for they are less easily duped...”

People who understand logic but do not obey its authoritative confines will try to exploit your logic. They are what I refer to as “Rational Machiavellians”.

They tend to be men blessed with high reasoning faculty, but adept in the ways of cunning, and as such, can switch between rational and Machiavellian modes of thought. Such ability is rare...This ability is a binary cognitive modality that, in my view, all men looking to build or maintain power should embody.” - Illimitable Man

When doing logical reasoning your goal is to find the truth. When persuading, your goal is to change the other person's opinion, not necessarily to what is actually true.

When doing logical reasoning, you need facts and reality to be presented as accurately as possible. **When persuading, you need to present facts and reality in a way that corroborates the story you are trying to sell, not necessarily in a way that accurately reflects reality.**

3H) Antitheticals, Big 5 Personality Traits:

When doing logical reasoning, it is best to be low on enthusiasm (extroversion) and politeness (agreeableness).

Low enthusiasm prevents positive emotion from biasing you, and making your view of reality overly optimistic.

Low politeness is beneficial, since it prevents you from shying away from the truth because it offends the sensibilities of others, or your own sensibilities.

People who rank high on politeness will instinctively avoid the truth if it is unpleasant or offensive.

When charming others ranking high on both enthusiasm and politeness is helpful, if not outright necessary.

You must develop the ability to dial your level of enthusiasm up or down, depending on whether in the moment you need to charm, or analyze reality. Illimitable Man refers to this as ‘Utilitarian Ambiversion’.

3I) Complexity of Language:

“You have to become an extremely clear communicator.

If people don't understand it quickly they assume *you* are dumb.

Why? Average people think they are smart so if they don't get it fast, they don't blame themselves. They blame you.” -WallStreetPlayboys

When doing logical reasoning, the language you use will need to be complex. Big words and complex sentence structures will be needed for the sake of expressing all the complexity of the issue.

However, complex language tends to annoy most people. As such, when charming and persuading simplify your language as much as possible; use simple sentence structures and small words. If this requires you to omit some nuance and complexity from the information you communicate, so be it; being thorough with what you say is not the priority, being likeable is.

With logical reasoning, you should be thinking at a 12th grade level. For charm and persuasion, you should be talking at a 4th grade level.

On rare occasions, you will be attempting to charm someone with an IQ of 130+ and they may be charmed by big words and complex sentence structures that communicate all the nuances associated with the topic being discussed. Be aware that such people are the exception, not the rule.

3J) Topic Choice Antitheticals:

When doing logical reasoning, you will often be dealing with abstract topics (philosophical theories, international monetary policy, ect). However, most people in the population find such topics to be boring or annoying.

As such, when charming people you should make conversation about the banal topics that interest most people (the weather, the local football game, Kardashians).

Note that Kim Kardashian has millions of readers, while Nietzsche's philosophical theories do not.

4) Gender Differences and Autism:

4A) Gender Differences:

Generally speaking men tend towards the traits that are conducive for logical reasoning, while women tend towards the traits that are conducive for charming and persuading people.

Women rank higher on enthusiasm and politeness (extroversion and agreeableness) than men. Women also pay lip service to whatever is currently politically correct more instinctively than men.

Women instinctively prioritize feelings over facts; men do this as well, but not as often and not to the same degree.

The reason men and women would have evolved to be this way is rather straightforward.

In our hunter gatherer past, men survived by being good at hunting. Charming other people was not necessary for success in hunting, but being good or at least decent at logical reasoning was.

Women on the other hand survived by *avoiding ostracism*; making other members of the tribe like them so that they would be provided with protection and resources. Men also benefited by having others in the tribe like them, but not to the same degree.

In a hunter gatherer tribe, ostracism would be damaging for a man's survival prospects, but he could conceivably survive on his own until he found another tribe. However, for a woman ostracism would be a death sentence; the probability she could survive on her own without the aid of a tribe would be practically zero, particularly if she was burdened by pregnancy.

Being good at logic would help a person's survival, and being good at charm would also help a person's survival, the difference being that for men logic would be most important whereas for women charm would have been most important.

Caveat: Men and women average equal on the Big 5 Trait 'Extroversion'. Extroversion breaks down into the sub-traits 'Assertiveness' and 'Enthusiasm'. Men average higher on Assertiveness, women average higher on Enthusiasm.

4B) Autism:

Autists represent an extreme personality that is great at logic, but terrible at charm.

Autists seem to be incapable of keeping track of what is politically correct or incorrect; they are incapable of predicting in advance what statements will be offensive, and what statements will be charming or at least neutral.

While this is a liability in terms of charming people, it is an asset for logical reasoning; their search for the truth is not in any way impeded by political correctness. Autists don't shy away from the truth because it offends the sensibilities of others, or because it offends their own sensibilities.

Beyond being bad at charm, autists seem to fail with almost *all* facets of cunning.

Many are intelligent enough to be capable of doing calculus in their head, yet at the same time they are utterly incapable of reading the body language, vocal tonality, and psychologies of other people. They are incapable of subtextual communication (detecting the subtext beneath what is said overtly).

Autists are great with computers, but terrible with people; great at logic, terrible at cunning.

Factual correctness and political correctness are often mutually exclusive, and autists instinctively say what they perceive to be factually correct, even if they know it is politically incorrect (autists instinctively use StraightTalk, not PowerTalk).

This may be giving them too much credit; most autists seem to be incapable of even *knowing* what is currently politically correct; they seem incapable of keeping track of such things.

It's not that they could use StraightTalk or PowerTalk and voluntarily choose to use StraightTalk, but rather that they are capable of StraightTalk and completely incapable of PowerTalk.

4C) Masculinized Logic, Feminized Cunning:

In terms of the ability to engage in rigorous logical reasoning, men average slightly higher than women and autistic people rank extremely high.

In terms of the ability to charm people, men average slightly lower than women, and autistic people rank extremely low.

Bear in mind that the overwhelming majority of autists are men, and that autism is what happens when a baby is exposed to unusually high amounts of prenatal testosterone. The brain of an autist is *hyper-masculine*.

James DaMore is the iconic example of an autistic man who is incredibly good at logic, and incapable of cunning.

Good enough at logic to write the memo “**Google’s Ideological Echo Chamber**“, yet at the same time so bad at cunning he couldn’t predict that publishing such a memo would get him fired.

4D) Corporate Example:

In most corporations, you will find that the engineering department is filled with men who are great at logic, but terrible at charm. You will also find that the human resources (HR) department is filled with women who are great at charming people, but who suck at logic.

The men in engineering can do calculus, but they can’t effectively make conversation with a stranger.

The women in HR can barely make it through high school physics, yet they are capable of charming almost anyone.

The men working in finance and law tend to be at least decent at logic, and very cunning.

An engineer will say something factually correct, but politically incorrect, such as “IQ is real; some people actually are smarter than others”, and be at risk of getting fired for doing so.

A woman from HR will say something politically correct, and genuinely believe it is the truth, such as “IQ isn’t real. Everyone is smart in their own way!”

A banker or lawyer will say something politically correct to avoid ostracism, but on the inside know it is a lie. Outwardly they will say “IQ isn’t real. Everyone is smart in their own way!”, while on the inside knowing “IQ is real; some people actually are smarter than others”.

5) Naturally Logical, Learned Cunning:

Most people are not particularly good at logic, or at cunning.

A minority of people are good at one, but not the other.

Of those who are good at logic but who are bad at charm, almost all of them are men, and they are disproportionately autistic.

Of those who are bad at logic but who are good at charm, most of them are women.

There are people who are great at both logic and cunning; such people are exceptionally rare. Generally speaking they are men who are naturally good at logic, and who have taken the time to learn cunning.

How does one learn cunning? Reading The 48 Laws of Power is a good start.

6) Epilogue:

6A) TLDR:

Logic:

- Banish emotion; it would only bias you.
- Substance means everything, style means nothing.
- Facts and statistics are what matter, emotionally charged anecdotes are a distraction from reality.
- StraightTalk is the modality you should use.
- Logical Fallacies should be banished.
- Present the facts as accurately as possible.
- Be low on enthusiasm and agreeableness.
- Use complex language, if needed.

Charm and Persuasion:

- Play on the emotions of others, while remaining calm yourself.
- Style matters more than substance.
- Emotionally charged anecdotes trump statistical reality and fact.
- PowerTalk is the modality you should use.
- Logical fallacies are useful tools.
- Present the facts in a way that corroborates the story you are trying to sell.
- Be high on enthusiasm and agreeableness.
- Use simple language.

6B) Logic, More Than Just IQ:

To be good at logic is more than just having a high IQ score.

If a person has a high IQ, it means they have lots of cognitive processing power.

To be good at logic means to be skilled at getting an accurate view of objective reality, and prioritizing finding the truth over not offending the sensibilities of others, or your own sensibilities.

There are plenty of high IQ people who suck at logic, because they will use their immense cognitive processing power to manufacture rationalizations for lies that appeal to their sensibilities, rather than to figure out what is actually true.

There's no shortage of high IQ people who will say things like "IQ isn't real" because the fact that some people are smarter than others offends their sensibilities.

6C) Detecting Who is Good at Logic:

Is there a way to quickly decipher how good a person is at logical reasoning?

People who begin statements with the phrase “I feel that....” tend to be bad at logic, while those who begin statements with the phrase “I think that...” tend to be good at logic.

If a person asserts that the exception to the rule invalidates the existence of the rule, they have just told you “I suck at logic, and I am statistically illiterate.”

Most people suck at logic, so your baseline assumption should be that the person you are dealing with either cannot understand rigorous logical reasoning, or does not value it.

7) Recommended Reading:

Machiavellian Thinking vs Conventional Logic (Illimitable Man)

Google’s Ideological Echo Chamber (James DaMore)

8) Reflections from Illimitable Man:

Essay, ‘Machiavellian Thinking vs Conventional Logic’:

“Unlike the logician, the idiot does not become pre-occupied with their thoughts.

The intellectual on the other hand is often immersed deep in abstract thought and thus must “switch into another way of being” to be socially competent. The thought wavelength symptomatic of higher cognitive functions would appear to be incompatible with the social demands of the lower.

As such, the logician must “turn their charm on,” that is to say, subdue the honest and mechanical thinking part of their brain, instead turning on their duplicitous social brain. Idiots have little thinking brain to turn off, they’re always in social mode. Women likewise thrive in social mode as socialising is their bread and butter, that is to say, women tend to be socially focused and group-orientated as they’re more dependant on “the group” than men are. In the ancestral environment where men could hunt and survive alone, a woman would almost certainly perish without tribe acceptance.

Introverts live to think and innovate, they prioritise solitude. Extroverts live to play and consume, they prioritise company. Naturally the prior is more typical of man, and the latter, of women. The seasoned Machiavellian learns how to switch between his rational brain and his social brain so that he can interact as necessary; this is utilitarian ambiversion.

The merits and demerits of logic are so in-conflict with the merits and demerits of Machiavellian logic that the rational man’s primary mode of thought: “logical reasoning” impedes his ability to be socially effective. One cannot be socially effective without being sufficiently Machiavellian.”

Illimitable Man Twitter:

“A 140 IQ on a woman is like a 110 IQ on a man.” –IM

Given equal IQs, men tend to be better than women at rigorous logical reasoning to find the truth.

“Keeping people on the defence is how you win arguments without actually having a reasoned discussion and forming a strong and cogent argument of your own. Attack is the best defence.”

“Very few people give a shit about the facts. Most people just want their biases confirmed. This is annoying if you want an intellectual exchange, but incredibly useful for selling.”

Charm, Machiavellian Social Competency

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

1) Introduction

- 1A) Preamble
- 1B) Distrust The Likeable
- 1C) Don't Be Yourself
- 1D) Subtlety

2) Principles of Charm

- 2A) Looks, Halo Effect
- 2B) Pretense, You Like Them
- 2C) Pretense, You Are Virtuous
- 2D) Enthusiasm (Extroversion)
- 2E) Agreeableness
- 2F) Enthusiasm and Agreeableness, Conflation
- 2G) Hide Your Displeasure
- 2H) Confidence, Appear Calm
- 2I) Body Language, Mirror Them
- 2J) Speaking Style, Mirror Them
- 2K) Complements
- 2L) Similarity
- 2M) Association, Be With Positive, Not With Negative
- 2N) Law 12, Selective Generosity

3) What To Say

- 3A) Make Conversation, Minimize Your Talking
- 3B) Talk Dumb
- 3C) Topics of Conversation
- 3D) Law 38, Controversial Topics
- 3E) Happy Lies, No Ugly Truths

4) EGO

- 4A) Stroke Their Ego
- 4B) Advice, Appear Receptive
- 4C) Remember Names

5) Hate & Gossip

- 5A) Hate Bonding
- 5B) Gossip Positively

6) Charming The Powerful

- 6A) No Hero Worship
- 6B) Mentors, Appealing to Them

7) Jokes

8) Epilogue

- 8A) Law 47 and Charm
- 8B) Prioritize Who Matters
- 8C) Gender Differences

9) Further Reading

- 9A) Recommended Books

9B) Illimitable Man's Reflections

1) Introduction:

1A) Preamble:

“Charm is a formulaic manipulation.” -Illimitable Man

Charm is your ability to make people like and trust you. In any capitalist society, charm is the most critical tool in a machiavellian's toolbox.

When people like you, it makes them more inclined to help you and more hesitant to harm you. Conversely when people dislike you, it makes them less inclined to help you and more willing to harm you.

The venues where your ability to charm people can be the difference between victory and defeat are endless; office politics, job interviews, negotiation, sales/marketing, family politics, and so on.

This piece gives a boilerplate template for how to charm people. You will have to modify the specific techniques you use to charm people depending on the personalities of the specific individuals you meet; what charms one person may offend another. As such, in order to optimize your ability to charm you must be good at cold reading (accurately guessing a person's psychological profile before having extensive interaction with them).

1B) Distrust The Likeable:

“Do not take payment in politeness.” –Baltasar Gracian

While you use charm to manipulate others, be careful to ensure that the charm of others does not enable them to manipulate you.

Distrust people who are considered likeable by almost everyone.

People who naturally have a likeable personality are rare; far more common are competent machiavellians who are capable of wearing a mask that is charming.

Most people conflate charm with virtue; if a person is considered likeable, they assume the person is compassionate and morally upright. Nothing could be further from the truth.

“As a matter of prudence, the more charming, the more dangerous.” -Illimitable Man

1C) Don't Be Yourself:

“Just Be Yourself” is terrible advice. Far better advice is this; wear the mask that the day and the moment require.

In the unlikely event you naturally have a personality that most people consider to be charming, then just being yourself is a great strategy. Sadly, your actual personality probably isn't that likeable.

You will need to craft a mask that most people will find likeable, and wear it whenever you enter a venue where the stakes are high.

1D) Subtlety:

The techniques you use to charm people (or to manipulate people in any context) must be applied subtly.

If people become consciously aware of the manipulations you employ, it causes them to distrust you rather than like you.

2) Principles of Charm:

2A) Looks, Halo Effect:

Good looking people are considered to be more likeable and more trustworthy than ugly people. Most people are heavily influenced by outward appearances.

Not everyone is blessed with the genetics to be beautiful, but we can all put effort into optimizing our physical appearance.

2B) Pretense, You Like Them:

“If you dislike a man, do your best to hide it, for in ways you could not possibly foresee you may need his help, and you can hardly get it if he knows you dislike him. On many occasions I needed the help of a man who I despised, and he believing I liked him, or at least being unaware of the truth, served me readily.” - Francesco Guicciardini

In order to charm people, you must maintain the pretense that you like them. Any dislike or disdain you have for them must be concealed.

This sounds obvious, yet many subordinates fail to do this when interacting with their superiors.

2C) Pretense, You Are Virtuous:

You must always maintain the pretense that you are a kind and virtuous person, otherwise people will distrust you. Any evil you do must be concealed.

There are exceptional cases where having the appearance of ruthlessness may inspire respect and fear, rather than disdain and hatred. Such cases are rare; don't assume yours is one of them.

2D) Enthusiasm (Extroversion):

Generally speaking, extroverts are considered to be more likeable than introverts. This is because extroverts are more enthusiastic ('Enthusiasm' being a sub-trait of the Big 5 Trait 'Extroversion').

Smiling and having warmth in one's voice is typical of those who rank high on enthusiasm, far more so than it is for those who rank low on enthusiasm.

There is a limit to this; if you are *too* enthusiastic, it causes people to think you are annoying.

“If someone is unenthusiastic and seems disconnected...you don't keep talking at them in a tone that is overly positive and enthusiastic – you match their tone and build up to a level where you sound enthusiastic again.” - Jordan Belfort

When charming someone, you should mirror their level of enthusiasm and be *slightly* more enthusiastic than they are.

If they are a 7/10 on the enthusiasm scale, you should be an 8/10. If they are a 2/10, you should be a 3/10.

If you are *far* more enthusiastic than they are, they will think you're annoying. If you are less enthusiastic than they are, they will think you're boring, perhaps even unfriendly; many people mistakenly conflate a lack of enthusiasm with meanness.

If you are naturally a low enthusiasm (introverted) person, caffeine may help temporarily boost your enthusiasm levels. Be warned, caffeine tends to also increase neuroticism.

2E) Agreeableness:

Appearing to be highly agreeable will make you likeable, appearing to be disagreeable will make you dislikeable.

There is a balance to this; if you appear to be so agreeable that people perceive you are a pushover, it causes them

to lose respect for you.

People should perceive that you are generally agreeable and polite, but still have a capacity for ruthlessness.

With Extroversion, the sub-trait that is critical for charm is 'Enthusiasm' (see the previous section). With Agreeableness, the sub-trait that is critical for charm is 'Politeness'.

2F) Enthusiasm and Agreeableness, Conflation:

Most people foolishly conflate the enthusiasm of extroversion with agreeableness.

If you are highly enthusiastic and disagreeable, people will mistakenly perceive that you are compassionate and kind like an agreeable person.

If you are unenthusiastic and agreeable, people will mistakenly perceive that you are ruthless like a disagreeable person.

The point is this; for the sake of charming people, appearing high on enthusiasm (extroversion) is more important than appearing high on agreeableness. You may notice that extroverts who are disagreeable are good at charming most people, while introverts who are agreeable tend to be bad at charming people.

Ideally you should appear high on *both* enthusiasm and agreeableness, but do keep in mind that high enthusiasm tends to be the main driver of charm, rather than high agreeableness.

2G) Hide Your Displeasure:

Hide any displeasure you have.

Never complain, appear negative, or in a bad mood. Negative people are dislikeable, even if their pessimistic observations about the nature of reality are accurate.

If you are suffering, hide it; no matter how justified your complaints may be, complaining will cause people to dislike you.

Reversal, Hate Bonding:

There are times you can build rapport with a person if you complain about the same thing they are complaining about.

Hatebond with them; hate the same things they do, or hate the same people they do, and they will like you.

2H) Confidence, Appear Calm:

For the sake of charming people, you should appear confident but never arrogant.

Your confidence should be marked by the calmness of low neuroticism, not the vanity of narcissism.

Your calmness must also translate into what you say being easy to understand; your words must seem to flow naturally. If you're 'stumbling over your words', you seem nervous and lacking in credibility.

Appearing needy or nervous causes people to dislike you, or at least be annoyed by you; avoid this.

2I) Body Language, Mirror Them:

People find those who mirror their body language to be likeable, and as such you should subtly manipulate your body language to match that of the person you are trying to charm. However, don't mirror their body language if it's expressing negative emotions (such as anger). For details on 'mirroring' see *The Definitive Book of Body Language (Pease)*.

Beyond mirroring, ensure you give a strong handshake and strong eye contact; this causes people to perceive you as

trustworthy.

In general keep your body language *open* rather than *closed*. Having your arms crossed is bad, having them open is good. Open body language suggests you are welcoming and calm, closed body language suggests you are hostile or nervous.

Ensure you can fake a smile and make it look real. Real smiles show one's teeth, and have one squint their eyes slightly. Fake smiles don't show teeth, and have one's eyes remain just as wide as they were before the smile began.

2J) Speaking Style, Mirror Them:

Mirror the word choice and sentence structure of the person you are trying to charm. Mirror their vocal tonality, and the speed or slowness with which they talk.

2K) Complements:

“The secret of success is sincerity. Once you can fake that you’ve got it made.” -Jean Giraudoux

Complementing people is a good way of charming them, however do be careful with this. Complements that are direct and overt tend to be seen as disingenuous; a shallow manipulative tactic, which indeed they are.

Complements that are subtle and delivered indirectly are perceived as genuine (even if they are just a manipulative tactic).

If you seem calm when you deliver a complement, it seems genuine, whereas if you seem nervous or needy when you deliver a complement, it makes you seem fake.

People love their children and their pets; complement their children or their pets, and they will like you.

2L) Similarity:

Generally it is the case that people like those who are similar to them in some way. Appear to have something in common with the target of your charm, and they find it difficult to resist liking you.

The revealing of the thing you 2 have in common must be done subtly; if you point it out brazenly, they will perceive it as a manipulative tactic rather than a real commonality.

2M) Association, Be With Positive, Not With Negative:

It is wise to have yourself associated with positive things, rather than negative things.

People will associate you with whatever feeling you give them. Nobody will remember what you said or what you did, all they will remember are the feelings they got from you.

If you talk about positive subjects they will associate you with happy feelings, if you talk about negative subjects they will associate you with negative feelings.

Avoid speaking negatively of others or of things in general (such as a movie or a restaurant), as it tends to make you look bad. Conversely, speaking positively of other people and things causes you to look good.

The ideal way to make the principle of ‘Association’ work in your favor is to be a source of pleasure, on a visceral level. Have the target of your charm eat good great food in your presence, and it becomes difficult for them *not* to like you.

When a person is in a bad mood, avoid them lest they associate their bad mood with you.

Be the bearer of good news, and ensure that the burden of the bearer of bad news falls on someone else.

2N) Law 12, Selective Generosity:

The timely giving of the correct gift is a surefire way to make someone like you, however this must be applied carefully. Your generosity must seem natural, rather than manufactured for the purpose of making the target feel indebted.

As with complements, generosity that is done subtly is seen as genuine whereas brazen generosity is often seen as a manipulative tactic.

3) What To Say:

3A) Making Conversation, Minimize Your Talking:

The less you talk the better. Let the other person do a majority of the talking; this boosts people's ego and makes them feel good.

For the sake of charm you want the high enthusiasm typical of extroversion, but the not talking a lot typical of introversion.

You *should* talk roughly 40% of the conversation; a significant minority. Most of your speech should be dedicated towards asking open ended questions that get the other person talking, and talking a little bit about yourself.

At the beginning of the conversation you will probably have to do most of the talking to get the conversation going, but roughly 30-60 seconds in it is wise to shift towards asking the other person open ended questions to get them talking and have them do most of the talking for the rest of the conversation.

No matter what they say, **maintain the pretense that you find what they are saying to be interesting even if in reality you think it is boring.**

Conversation does not have to last very long for you to charm someone; 60 – 120 seconds is *plenty*.

Be very careful with what you say. You must carefully calculate your words, and at the same time the person you're talking to must perceive that you are NOT calculating your words; that you're just saying what you actually think.

Your speaking must appear to be completely natural and uncontrived, while in reality being very carefully calculated.

Minimizing how much you talk is critical, not only for the sake of allowing the other person to do most of the talking, but also because the less you talk the easier it is to calculate every word you say.

3B) Talk Dumb:

“When you're smart, it's very hard to speak like you're dumb...Not employing logic or using ‘big words’ is hard to do because you have the vocabulary and want to be specific. Yet he manages to speak dumb with ease. In my opinion, that's a rather counter-intuitive sign he's smart...” -Illimitable Man, commenting on Donald Trump's ability to talk at a 4th grade level.

If you are a smart person, then for the sake of charming people you will need to learn how to talk dumb. People of average intelligence (most people) don't have to learn how to talk dumb, since it's how they talk naturally.

Talking smart (complex sentence structure and big words) annoys most people, since it strains the limits of their intelligence.

Talk at a 4th grade level; use simple sentence structures and small words. Chances are you naturally talk at a 12th grade level.

If for the sake of dumbing down your speech you need to omit some nuance and complexity from what you say, then so be it.

On those rare occasions you find yourself talking to someone with an IQ of 130+, feel free to revert to your natural mode of speech; thinking and talking at a 12th grade level.

However, never add complexity to your speech unnecessarily; only add complexity to the way you talk if it is necessary for the sake of communicating all the nuance associated with the point you are trying to make. Adding unnecessary complexity will annoy any person you talk to, no matter how smart they may be.

3C) Topics of Conversation:

For the sake of charming people, make conversation about topics that interest them, *not* topics that interest you.

Most people are of roughly average intelligence and are interested in banal topics: the weather, the local football game, the Kardashians. A tiny minority of people with IQs of 130+ are interested in abstract topics: the theories of Nietzsche, international monetary policy.

This all sounds very obvious once put into words but many high IQ autistic men never realize it; they will attend a dinner party and try to make conversation about the philosophies of Nietzsche or Schopenhauer, and then be surprised that nobody is charmed by them. People who are interested in abstract topics not directly relevant to their own life are *rare*.

In general steer the conversation towards topics that are pleasant, rather than unpleasant; you want to be associated with positivity, not negativity.

If at any point the other person brings up something negative that has happened to them, appear to be sympathetic, not judgmental.

3D) Law 38, Controversial Topics:

“They just want you to validate their beliefs.” -WallStreetPlayboys

Most people are ego invested in their opinions and beliefs, so if you express any disagreement with their opinions, they will feel personally insulted.

Avoid bringing up any controversial topics. If a controversial topic *does* come up, say nothing. If you are pressed for your opinion, say something completely neutral such as “It’s an unfortunate state of affairs.”, or if you think you know what the other person’s opinion is, imply you hold the same opinion they do.

Don’t assume the other person holds the same opinions you do (this sounds obvious yet many go wrong here). Use cold reading to decipher what their opinions probably are, but be aware that it’s merely an educated guess.

If you are required to give your opinion on a controversial topic in a public venue, then either dodge the question, or pay lip service to whatever is politically correct for the time and place you live in.

3E) Happy Lies, No Ugly Truths:

“No one is hated more than he who speaks the truth.” -Plato

If you tell a person something and it offends their sensibilities, they will hate you for it, even if what you are telling them is true.

Telling people the truth is terrible for charm, since it is usually the case that the truth is ugly and unpleasant.

For the sake of charm, tell people what they want to hear; usually happy lies.

4) EGO:

4A) Stroke Their Ego:

For the sake of charming people you should stroke their ego whenever possible, and at all costs you must avoid

offending their ego.

Most people are very thin skinned; if they perceive you have insulted them they will dislike you, whether you intended it or not.

Generally speaking, if you outshine someone it will cause them to dislike you. This is especially true when dealing with superiors (see Law 1).

Make everyone think you are 80% as good as they are: 80% as rich, 80% as smart, and so on. It is best to make the target of your charm perceive you are competent enough to be respectable, but not so competent that you are a threat to them.

4B) Advice, Appear Receptive:

Whenever someone gives you advice you must appear receptive to it, and grateful for it. If you overtly reject someone's advice, they will feel insulted. This is most true when dealing with superiors.

At the same time, most advice from most people is garbage; so while you outwardly must appear receptive and grateful, inwardly you should discard it.

Avoid doling out advice to others; unsolicited advice is usually perceived as an annoyance.

Even if someone does ask you for advice, be hesitant to give any since if you give advice that offends their sensibilities they will dislike you.

That being said, whenever someone tells you about some difficulty they are having, *do* appear to be sympathetic.

4C) Remember Names:

If you forget someone's name, they will feel insulted.

You must also remember the names of their family members, particularly their spouse and children. Whenever you see them, ask how specific family members are doing.

5) Hate & Gossip:

5A) Hate Bonding:

To charm someone seem to dislike the same things they dislike. Sometimes it is effective to seem to dislike the same *people* they dislike.

Many people will be charmed if you simply hate the same people and thing things that they hate.

When using hate bonding for the sake of charming someone, be careful not to speak negatively of any one particular individual, and certainly to not do so intensely.

If you speak negatively of others when they are not present, it is likely to cause those who are present to think you will speak negatively of *them* when they are no longer present.

Charming rich Americans is often very easy; simply appear to hate taxes as much as they do.

5B) Gossip Positively:

Perhaps the most surefire way to make someone like you is to talk about them *positively* when they aren't in the room.

If someone finds out you have said positive things about them, it becomes easy for them to like you and almost impossible for them to dislike you.

6) Charming the Powerful:

6A) No Hero Worship:

When interacting with superiors, or with any immensely powerful person, they enjoy your deference to them. However, you should not be so deferent that you seem obsequious.

You should display a calm confidence when in the presence of superiors, without a hint of fear, or a hint of arrogance.

Few are capable of doing this effectively; if you are the rewards will be astronomical.

6B) Mentors, Appealing to Them:

“OGs look at me and see I’m what they used to be” -50 Cent

To appeal to a potential mentor, make them perceive that you are a younger version of themselves.

7) Jokes:

“...a little jest soon loses all zest.” -Baltasar Gracian

Telling jokes is a high risk way of charming people; you might entertain them, but you may also inadvertently offend them.

It is generally a risk not worth taking. If you do make jokes, it is wise to stick to self deprecating jokes.

Avoid any joke about someone else’s appearance or tastes, 2 highly sensitive areas (Law 24).

Laughing hard is a sign of submissiveness; hence why subordinates instinctively laugh at their superiors’ jokes, but not the other way around.

When someone else tells a joke, you should *chuckle lightly*. If you don’t laugh at all they’ll feel insulted. If you laugh too hard, they’ll view you as a sycophant. Laughing too hard causes people to lose respect for you.

8) Epilogue:

8A) Law 47 and Charm:

“In Victory Learn When to Stop” –Law 47

Once a person likes you, it is best to leave them alone; talking too much is likely to annoy them. This is particularly true when dealing with superiors.

Also know when to quit; if a person dislikes you, it is generally a waste of time to try and change their mind.

With the time it takes to get a person who dislikes you to change their mind, you could have found 5 new people who felt neutrally about you and gotten them to like you.

8B) Prioritize Who Matters:

You should not put equal effort into charming everyone; you should spend most of your energy (enthusiasm) on charming those who matter; superiors who wield power over you or people who are important for some other reason.

When someone who matters is present, you must appear polite to *everyone* in the room; if you appear polite to them, but rude to others, it causes them to see your charm as being the manipulative tactic that it is rather than something genuine.

8C) Gender Differences:

Women are on average better than men at charming people. Part of this is due to women averaging higher on extroversion (particularly enthusiasm) and agreeableness.

Beyond that, women pay lip service to what is politically correct more instinctively than men do; women more instinctively tell people what they want to hear, rather than what they actually think.

Virtually all women will choose to tell a person happy lies rather than ugly truths for the sake of not offending their sensibilities. Men also do this, but not nearly as reliably or instinctively.

9) Further Reading:

9A) Recommended Books:

Influence (Cialdini)

Win Friends and Influence People (Dale Carnegie)

The Definitive Book of Body Language (Pease)

DayBang (Roosh)

9B) Illimitable Man's Reflections:

Machiavellian Maxims:

Part 1

“Being charming is the result of happiness or success, not of virtue. It is amusing that people oft fail to make this distinction, they conflate charm with virtue. As a matter of prudence, the more charming, the more dangerous.”

“Advice that wasn't asked for is rarely appreciated, let alone followed. Don't give advice that isn't asked for, don't advise everybody who asks for your insight, only advise those you think worthy. An “I don't know” will keep things civil without forcing you to waste time.”

“The quickest way to gain people's trust is to help them.”

Part 2

“Be a gangster with the gangsters and a scholar with the academics. To “be yourself” all the time with everybody is complete folly. One should only “be themselves” with those they love and trust.”

“The lower the average intellect of a man's company, the more he must show aggression to be respected, more intelligent company demands the inverse.”

“As a Machiavellian, it is always pertinent to ascertain the intellect of one's company, and then adjust one's demeanour as relevant. A person who cannot dial-up their personality up or down is unfit to wield power.”

“Acting is necessary. Just as one key cannot open every lock to every door, a single disposition cannot unlock every favour from every person, as such, adaptability.”

“People are like safes with combinations, by correctly calibrating your traits to align with their values, you unlock their trust, desire, and respect. Incorrect calibrations create apathy and disdain.”

Part 3

“Each personality is a puzzle in which favour can be unlocked by demonstrating the traits desired by the personality, learn a personality and complement it to influence it.”

Illimitable Man Twitter

“The game:

- Say nothing political, racial or religious
- Never seem negative or in a bad mood
- Seem minorly impressed by them
- Ask for advice you don't need & take it
- Claim to be at 80% of where they're at in life
- Learn what they like & refer to it randomly
- Appear kind/generous

As an addendum...”Maintain a healthy suspicion of those most would consider likeable”

Some people are likeable because they've been humbled by life, are polite & have good self-restraint. But the majority, no, they are fake...likeability is a skill. It can be trained, because charm is a formulaic manipulation. If you know what to do and what not to, you will be liked...

The liked and favoured are held to laughably low standards, never criticised and quickly rewarded whilst the disliked and opposed are held to impossibly high standards, never accepted, nor given their due. A form of soft power, being likeable is a skill that puts you on easy mode

When one is liked, a job mediocrely performed is seen as great, but when disliked, a job greatly performed is seen as mediocre.

The capacity for human bias to render the individual one-dimensionally good or bad knows no bounds.

If it sees you as good, your flaws are ignored and your strengths are amplified, but should it see you as bad, your flaws are highlighted as your strengths are dismissed.

- Be helpful
- Don't whine
- Compliment people
- Be polite
- Be funny
- Be humble
- Be inclusive
- Show gratitude
- Show an interest in people

Overall theme: Most people are negative, so be a source of positivity. Master all of these and you have mastered the recipe for likeability.

How to make people like you:

- Agree with their opinions
- Compliment them
- Hate the same people they do

-Ask for their advice and take it

-Be positive

-You don't have to be likeable if you're useful.

-But you don't have to be useful if you're likeable.

-People survive because they're one and not the other.

-People thrive when they're both.

Half the game's literally just managing people's emotions:

-Making people feel understood

-Letting people feel like they won

-Making people laugh

-Not making people feel stupid

-Not making people feel judged

If you can do all this, well done, you have elite social skills

Employers vs Employees

machiavelllicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Balance of Power
- 3) Optimizing Dependency
- 4) Side Business, Keep it Secret

1) Preamble:

“We who toil for other people have all in some way been captured by pirates and sold into slavery.” –Law 24

It should be said plainly; employment is nothing more than the next step in the evolution of slavery. The corporation you are employed by has a psychopathic level of indifference as to whether you live or die. This is not Leftwing political rhetoric; it is a machiavellian reality you will have to contend with.

Your employer is not your ally; they are your adversary. It is in your best interest for wages to be as high as possible, while it is in your employer's best interest for wages to be as low as possible. Paradoxically, they are an adversary you must work with and an adversary who you must charm for the sake of maximizing your odds of being promoted.

When dealing with your employer, you must hide the existence of the conflict of interest between you and them as much as possible. Yes it will always exist, and you'll never have an employer so naïve that they don't realize it. However, you must never be *overtly* hostile towards your employer.

Being overtly disagreeable towards a superiors in any context will result in them using whatever power they wield over you to wreck you. In the case of an employer, it would result in instantly being fired. This may all sound obvious yet many otherwise intelligent employees have lost their jobs because they ignored this, if only for a few seconds.

2) Balance of Power:

In many relationships dependency is what governs the balance of power; whichever party needs the other less wields power over the other. Employment relationships are the epitome of this.

Generally speaking, the balance of power heavily favors the employer; most employees are desperate for their wages, whereas most employers are *not* desperate for labor, or at least they aren't desperate for the labor of any specific employee.

In most employment relationships, the employer holds immense power over the employee while the employee holds little to no power over the employer. If the employer were to suddenly fire the employee, it would be a catastrophe for the employee. If the employee were to suddenly quit their job, it would be a minor inconvenience for the employer.

If you are ever in a situation where your employer needs you more than you need them, understand that such a case is exceptional.

3) Optimizing Dependency:

As an employee, do what you can to maximize your employer's dependency on you and minimize your dependency on them.

To maximize your employer's dependency on you, be as useful to them as possible. Be so useful that if you were to suddenly die in a car crash, your superiors would actually lose sleep over it.

It is unrealistic to think you can be so deeply entangled within your employer's operations such that if you were to disappear, they would experience catastrophe. However, it is very realistic to become entangled deeply enough within their affairs such that if you were to suddenly disappear, it would mean valuable time and energy lost in finding someone to replace you.

To minimize your dependency on your employer, ensure you always have other job opportunities available; on a continuous basis you should have conversations with headhunters.

4) Side Business, Keep it Secret:

The ultimate way to minimize your dependency on your employer is this; have a side business that generates enough profit to cover all your basic living expenses.

Employers want wage slaves who are 100% dependent on them for their income. If it is known that you have a side business, you will not fall into this category. If your employer finds out you have a source of income besides them they will fire you, or at best keep you around but never promote you.

As such, you must create and maintain a side business in secret.

Office Politics, Machiavellian Venue

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Parental Training
- 3) Regulate Your Speech
- 4) Pretense, The Loyal Employee
- 5) Team Player Pretense, Zero Sum Competition Reality
- 6) Triangulate Your Critical Superiors
- 7) Critical Superiors, Prioritize Their Work
- 8) Critical Superiors, Prioritize Charming Them
- 9) Dealing With Superiors
 - 9A) Look Good
 - 9B) Hide Your Displeasure, Fake Your Contentment
 - 9C) Calm and Confident, Not Arrogant
 - 9D) Be Associated With Positivity
 - 9E) Don't Approach Superiors:
 - 9F) Attribute Your Successes to Critical Superiors
 - 9G) Criticism of Superiors, Deliver it Indirectly
 - 9H) Order Breaking
 - 9I) A Good End Gilds All
 - 9J) Law 1, Never Outshine
 - 9K) Filter Your Reports
 - 9L) Under Promise and Over Deliver
 - 9M) Quality of Work > Quantity
 - 9N) Appear Receptive to New Responsibilities
 - 9O) Minimize Your Questions
- 10) Dealing With Equals
 - 10A) Sabotaging Coworkers
 - 10B) Keep Conflicts Hidden
 - 10C) Law 10, Avoid Those with Bad Reputations
 - 10D) Incompetent Scapegoat
- 11) Dealing With Subordinates
- 12) Romance and Women
 - 12A) Women, Arbiters of Status
 - 12B) Romance
- 13) Forbidden Tactics
 - 13A) Intimidation
 - 13B) No Religion or Politics
- 14) Promotion
 - 14A) Growth
 - 14B) Vacancy
- 15) Competition, Rises at Each Level
 - 15A) Entry Level Corporate
 - 15B) Mid Level Corporate (Middle Managers)
 - 15C) High Level Corporate (VPs, C-Suite Executives)

16) Bad Political Positioning, Surrender

17) Relevant Reading

18) Reflections from Black Label Logic

1) Preamble:

"The perfect courtier thrives in a world where everything revolves around power and political dexterity. He has mastered the art of indirection; he flatters, yields to superiors, and asserts power over others in the most oblique and graceful manner." -Law 24

The purpose of this essay is to give an overview of how to manage the politics of a modern corporate office. In truth, this piece is simply an addendum to Law 24 (Play the Perfect Courtier).

The political maneuverings of medieval courtiers and the political maneuverings of modern corporate employees are uncannily similar. As a corporate employee, you are nothing more than a 21st century courtier.

In most corporate positions your actual competence will be fueled by Intelligence and Energy; if you have a high IQ and the energy to work long yours, you will be able to competently do the work.

This essay covers those things involved with getting promoted up the corporate hierarchy that have nothing to do with your actual level of competence; managing office politics and ensuring that in addition to being competent you are *perceived* as competent. It is more important to appear to be good at your work, than to actually be good at it.

Disclaimer: The wisdom contained within this piece will be sufficient for succeeding at the bottom and middle levels of the corporate hierarchy. If you make it to the highest levels of the corporate hierarchy (VP, C-Suite), the wisdom contained herein will *not* be sufficient.

2) Parental Training:

If you were raised by a tyrannical parent, you have received the best training possible for succeeding in the game of office politics.

By the age of 10, you will have learned how to monitor every word you say (use PowerTalk), how to hide your displeasure and fake your contentment, and how to manufacture convincing lies fast with zero time for preparation.

3) Regulate Your Speech:

The office you work in is a high stakes venue; if you succeed you can be promoted up the hierarchy and be awarded millions of dollars as a member of the C-Suite. If you fail you could be fired, be unemployed, have no income, and end up homeless.

Because the stakes are so high, *you must monitor every word that leaves your lips.*

Everything you say must be carefully calculated. At the same time, for the sake of charming people your words must seem to flow naturally, with an ease that makes them appear genuine rather than contrived. This is difficult, and it is something you must master; nobody ever said winning in the game of power was easy.

If you say 10,000 words per day, monitoring the entirety of your speech is impossible. However, if you speak only 1,000 words per day, it's very doable. As such, limit how much you talk (Law 4).

A common blunder otherwise intelligent people make is regulating their speech when in the presence of superiors, but failing to do so when in the presence of equals and subordinates.

You must continuously regulate your speech even when you have no superiors in the room. Why? Because anything you say in front of your subordinates is likely to be repeated in front of your superiors. Do *not* trust people to keep their lips sealed.

4) Pretense, The Loyal Employee:

You must at all times maintain the pretense that you are a loyal employee; that you are loyal to the corporation that employs you.

In reality 'corporate loyalty' is something of an oxymoron; corporations will fire their employees without hesitation if it boosts the stock price by a penny, and employees will leave their current employer without hesitation if there is higher compensation elsewhere.

While you must be aware of this reality on the inside, outwardly you must give the appearance of being an employee whose loyalty is beyond question.

If you are interviewing for positions at a company other than the one you currently work for, you must keep these interviews secret at all costs; failure to do so could easily lead to you being fired.

5) Team Player Pretense, Zero Sum Competition Reality:

You are in zero sum competition with co-workers who have the same rank as you.

You are in competition with one another for the same promotion opportunities, and for keeping your jobs when layoff season comes. On a day to day basis, your superiors will judge your performance *relative* to the performance of coworkers of your own rank.

It is objectively in your best interest for your co-workers to fail, since this increases the probability that you will be promoted rather than them, and they will be fired rather than you. Yes, the corporate world is actually this cynical.

While intense zero sum competition is the reality, you must always maintain the pretense that you are all on the same team. You must, at least in the eyes of your superiors, be a 'team player'. If you fail to maintain this pretense, your superiors will view you as a monster and fire you.

It is a paradox, and one that you must execute without a hint of discrepancy; *intense zero sum war, while maintaining the appearance of camaraderie with the enemy.*

Generally speaking promotions are pareto distributed; the top ranked employee of a certain rank will be promoted, the rest of the employees who have the same rank as them will *not* be promoted.

1st place gets a promotion, 2nd place and everyone else get's nothing. As such, the zero sum competition you are engaged in with your co-workers has a 'Hunger Games' distribution of rewards.

6) Triangulate Your Critical Superiors:

The main strategy for winning the game of office politics will be this: triangulate who your critical superiors are, and prioritize charming them over charming everyone else.

Ideally, everyone in the company you work for loves you, and they all perceive you as being highly competent. In reality accomplishing this will be impossible.

There will inevitably be times when you must prioritize work done for one person over another, or when you must make a decision between taking a course of action that will offend person X or person Y.

As such, you must **triangulate who your critical superiors are**; the people who wield power over whether you are promoted or fired.

In some office environments it will be obvious who your critical superiors are, in others it will require some investigation.

7) Critical Superiors, Prioritize Their Work

For your critical superiors you should give A+ work as fast as possible, whereas for everyone else you should give

A- work with some delays.

Don't slack too much when doing work for people who aren't your critical superiors; if you give them B- work, it could easily come back to haunt you.

8) Critical Superiors, Prioritize Charming Them:

Ideally you charm every person in the office by appearing enthusiastic or neutral in front of everyone, never unhappy or angry.

Sadly this will be impossible; there will inevitably be times when you are unhappy.

For the sake of securing promotion and avoiding firing, you must *hide your displeasure and fake your contentment and agreement* whenever in the presence of one of your critical superiors.

Appearing unhappy in the presence of people who aren't your critical superiors is bad, but acceptable. Appearing unhappy in the presence of your critical superiors is office politics suicide.

What your critical superiors think of you will make or break your career. If they perceive you as competent and likeable, the overwhelming probability is you will be promoted. If they perceive you as incompetent *or* unlikeable, the overwhelming probability is you will be fired or kept around but never promoted.

9) Dealing With Superiors:

9A) Look Good:

Most people are deceived by appearances; they never investigate to see what lies beneath the surface. Your superiors will not be the exception to this.

You must ensure your own physical appearance is good; dress well and keep your desk clean. Make any work you create look good; make the formatting pretty.

There is a reason investment bankers spend more time on the formatting of their PowerPoint slides than on ensuring the veracity of their financial projections; most people pay attention to appearances and style more than they do to reality and substance.

9B) Hide Your Displeasure, Fake Your Contentment:

“A man who knows the court is master of his gestures, of his eyes and of his face; he is profound, impenetrable; he dissimulates bad offices, smiles at his enemies, controls his irritation, disguises his passions, belies his heart, speaks and acts against his feelings.” -Jean de La Bruyère

When in the office and particularly when in the presence of your superiors, you must *hide your displeasure, and fake your contentment and agreement*.

Superiors love to promote subordinates who have a 'good attitude', and as such at all times you must appear either happy or neutral.

If your superiors do or say something you dislike or disagree with, *do not show it*. Fake your contentment and agreement. If you complain, you will be committing political suicide; this is true even if your complaints are legitimate.

When a superior reprimands you for a mistake, regardless of whether or not the mistake was actually a mistake or was your fault, you must appear to be receptive to their rebuke, and apologetic. Calmly say “I apologize; this won't happen again.”

This may sound like insanity, and indeed it is. However, to have any hope of winning the game of office politics or succeeding in any 'court' of power, it is a form of insanity you must execute without a hint of hesitation or

inconsistency.

“If you dislike a man, do your best to hide it...” -Francesco Guicciardini

You must always maintain the pretense that you like your superiors, even if in reality you despise them. This may sound obvious, yet many otherwise intelligent people have ruined their careers by failing to do this.

9C) Calm and Confident, Not Arrogant:

In the presence of your superiors you must appear calm and confident.

If you appear arrogant, they will dislike you. On the other hand, if you appear fearful they will think you are pathetic and unworthy of promotion; not strong enough to be entrusted with any responsibilities of consequence.

Your confidence should be marked by calmness, rather than the vanity of narcissism or the rudeness of arrogance.

Most people conflate confidence with competence; if you appear to be confident, people assume you are competent. Conversely, if you appear nervous people assume you are incompetent.

It is a fallacy; in reality the correlation between confidence and competence is zero in most domains. However, it is a fallacy you ought to use to your advantage.

9D) Be Associated With Positivity:

You need your superiors to associate you with good things, rather than bad things. Ensure that you are the bringer of good news, and that someone else is the bearer of bad news.

Approach your superiors when they are in a good mood, avoid them when they are in a bad mood. If at all possible, get your superiors to associate you with great food by attending events involving fine dining.

Do not be the court cynic; the one who endlessly complains. Do be a person who is slightly enthusiastic, just not so much that it is annoying.

Express admiration for the good work of others and this will paradoxically cause your superiors to view you in a better light.

When others make a brazen mistake, do *not* comment on it; the mistake is already obvious to others. If you point it out, it causes you to look bad.

9E) Don't Approach Superiors:

Generally speaking if you choose to approach one of your superiors in an easygoing casual manner, it will annoy them. They will see right through your attempt at manipulation (charm). Instead, you must **get them to approach you**.

Be physically attractive, appear confident, deliver high quality work, and occasionally contribute an intelligent question or comment in meetings, and inevitably one of your superiors will approach you.

9F) Attribute Your Successes to Critical Superiors:

Whenever you have a clearly visible success with a certain task or project, attribute your success to the advice and guidance of one of your superiors, hopefully one of your critical superiors. This is an incredibly effective way of charming them and winning promotions.

Do be subtle though; if your giving of credit to their advice is too obvious or done multiple times, they are likely to see through the manipulative tactic and distrust you.

Whether or not the success you attained was actually helped by the advice or guidance of one of your superiors is supremely irrelevant; all that matters is that their ego is stroked.

Whenever one of your superiors gives advice, appear receptive to it even if you know their advice is useless or counterproductive. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of stroking your superiors' egos, or at least not outright offending them.

9G) Criticism of Superiors, Deliver it Indirectly:

Generally speaking if you think your superiors are making a mistake, it is best not to bother with criticizing them. The benefit you would gain from correcting them is nothing compared to the risk of offending their ego and getting fired.

However, there are times when some criticism is necessary; failure to correct them would lead to catastrophe for the entire company, including you. During such times, you must deliver criticism gently and indirectly. Ideally, find someone else to deliver the criticism for you.

If such times are *common* you should probably find a new employer; if you have superiors who are chronically incompetent with matters of consequence, you are on a sinking ship.

You may encounter a superior who is perfectly willing to accept direct criticism of their methods, and who is even happy to hear useful criticism that can help them improve. Such superiors are *very rare*.

Many of your superiors will be narcissists who are so thin skinned that they may fire you for delivering any criticism at all.

Be very careful when delivering any criticism. Deliver it only if you must, and do so as gently and politely as possible.

9H) Order Breaking:

It is almost never wise to disobey one of your superior's orders. However, there may be times when following one of their order's would lead to catastrophe, or times when 2 different superiors give conflicting orders.

In the case of 2 superiors giving conflicting orders, you should *follow the orders of whichever superior wields more decision-making power over whether you are promoted or fired*.

In the case of a superior who has ordered you to do something that will lead to catastrophe...you have a difficult choice to make.

9I) A Good End Gilds All:

"A good end gilds all, no matter how unsavory the means." –Baltasar Gracian

If you deliver good results, but use methods your superiors find objectionable, you will ultimately be rewarded.

If you deliver bad results, but use only methods your superiors approve of, you will be punished.

9J) Law 1, Never Outshine:

You must ensure that your superiors never feel you are outshining them; nothing will inspire their wrath faster than a subordinate who has threatened their sense of superiority.

If a superior dislikes you and there isn't any obvious reason why, it is most likely because they feel you have not been sufficiently obsequious in your dealings with them.

There are instances where you can win the respect of one of your superiors by defying them, and delivering better results by doing so. Be warned that such instances are rare, and if you defy one of your superiors you do so at your own risk.

9K) Filter Your Reports:

One key tactic for being perceived as competent by your superiors is this; in the reports you give, report things that are going well that can directly be traced back to your actions.

This must be done with subtlety, and it requires skill.

If you brazenly hand your superiors a laundry list of your successes in an overtly self aggrandizing manner, it will cause them to be disgusted by you.

If you ever doubt whether you are being too subtle or too overt, chances are you're being too overt.

9L) Under Promise and Over Deliver:

Satisfaction is nothing more than results minus expectations.

For the sake of pleasing your superiors, you must manage their expectations; keep their expectations down to a level where you can blow them away.

Usually the simplest way to do this is with the *timing* of how long tasks will take; if you think a task will take 48 hours to complete, tell your superiors it will take 72 hours. Deliver in 48 hours; they will be pleasantly surprised.

9M) Quality of Work > Quantity:

You will be judged by the quality of work you deliver, not the quantity.

As such, keep the number of projects your superiors have you assigned to at a minimum. Doing 2 projects well will impress your superiors far more than doing 5 projects badly.

9N) Appear Receptive to New Responsibilities:

Whenever one of your superiors thrusts a new responsibility upon you, you must appear receptive to it. Failure to do so is likely to be viewed as an insult.

If your superiors are giving you additional responsibilities, this is generally a *good sign*; it means they are grooming you for a higher position.

Often when starting at a new company, your superiors will give you tasks that seem menial. *Do them well*; your superiors are testing your competence, to see if you are worthy of being entrusted with more consequential matters.

9O) Minimize Your Questions:

Minimize how many questions you ask your superiors, as it tends to annoy them.

If you ask stupid questions people will assume you are incompetent.

One way to make your superiors perceive you are competent is to ask *intelligent* questions.

10) Dealing With Equals:

10A) Sabotaging Coworkers:

The work of Satan himself.

Generally speaking sabotaging coworkers is a stupid strategy; it comes with a small potential reward, and a catastrophic level of risk.

If you succeed in backstabbing a coworker, you eliminate 1 competitor in the battle for promotion. Of course, if you get *caught* attempting to backstab a coworker your superiors will view you as a monster, summarily fire you, and probably destroy your reputation leading to you being unemployed forever.

In most cases, the potential risks associated with backstabbing far outweigh the potential rewards.

If you were foolish enough to directly tamper with one of your coworker's work as a means of sabotaging them, your blood will be on your own hands when you get caught.

That disclaimer aside, there are strategies for backstabbing coworkers that are indirect enough such that they can be executed without being traced back to you.

Neglect:

“It's subtler to deprive than to inflict...deprive to attack with the stealth of plausible deniability.” - Illimitable Man

Actively sabotaging a coworker can easily be traced back to you, but simply failing to provide a coworker with help or guidance cannot easily be traced, and can be just as devastating.

Certainly, if you have any techniques that can be used to do the work at hand more effectively *do not go out of your way to share them* with coworkers who you are competing with for promotion.

One-Upmanship Strategy (33 Strategies of War), Law 39 Offensive Application (48 Laws of Power):

If you can get a coworker to explode in anger, it causes them to look bad. Your superiors will view them as immature at best and as a loose cannon at worst; in either case, when promotions come around they will not be selected instead of you.

In order to provoke a coworker to anger, you must do so with *subtly*.

It must appear in the eyes of everyone else that your coworker's anger is unjustified. If others perceive that their anger *is* justified, it is not your coworker who will look bad, but you.

Even methods as indirect as Neglect and One-Upmanship Strategy could still be traced back to you. They should be used with caution, and as rarely as possible; ideally never.

Many in the corporate world will attempt to backstab coworkers by speaking negatively of them in front of their superiors. This strategy is effective for damaging the reputation of your coworkers, but it is dangerous; most of your superiors are intelligent enough to see what you're doing. If you use this method, it will do a small amount of damage to your coworker's reputation, and an immense amount to your own.

10B) Keep Conflicts Hidden:

It is inevitable that at some point you will have conflicts with your equals and subordinates.

Keep these conflicts as hidden as possible; if your superiors see you having petty arguments with your equals or subordinates, it causes them to view you as immature at best and blameworthy at worst.

Superiors like to have subordinates who get along with one another, or who at least appear to get along.

If 2 of your coworkers are having a conflict, and it does not directly concern you, you should probably stay out of it.

10C) Law 10, Avoid Those with Bad Reputations:

If you have a coworker whether superior, equal, or subordinate who has a bad reputation and who is disliked, it would be wise to avoid associating with them.

You don't want to have your name associated with theirs.

10D) Incompetent Scapegoat:

It is in your best interest to always keep around 1 person of your rank who is incompetent. Not so incompetent that they will cause the entire ship to sink, but incompetent enough such that in the eyes of your superiors you always look good in comparison.

11) Dealing With Subordinates:

Be nice to subordinates, including back office people and secretaries. You never know when you'll need their help.

Some tyranny may be necessary for the sake of getting your subordinates' compliance, but use intimidation as rarely as possible.

If you are unnecessarily tyrannical, it will cause all your subordinates to hate you and become uncooperative in the long run, even those who are by nature patient and kind.

12) Romance and Women:

12A) Women, Arbiters of Status:

In many groups women are the arbiters of status. The office you work in will *not* be an exception to this dynamic.

If the women of the group like you, you might have high status and you might have low status. If the women of the group dislike you, you will certainly have low status. Winning the favor of the women in the group is necessary, but not sufficient.

Generally speaking if 1 woman in the group likes you they all like you, and if 1 woman in the group dislikes you they all dislike you; women tend to be consensus forming.

If the women of your office dislike you, it is only a matter of time before you get fired.

12B) Romance:

If you are a man who is accustomed to flirting and sleeping with as many women as possible *turn that off* when you are interacting with women you work with. You must get the women of your office to like you *platonically*.

Don't become romantically involved with anyone who works for the same company as you, or even anyone within the same industry.

If you are a man and you become romantically involved with a woman you work with, you are putting your career at risk for nothing. See the 'MeToo' Movement for details

13) Forbidden Tactics

13A) Intimidation:

In any environment the use of intimidation is a high risk tactic. In a modern corporate office, it is an insanely risky tactic; failure to maintain the appearance of civility can easily lead to your superiors firing you.

Even when dealing with subordinates whom you wield immense power over and who wield no power over you, the use of intimidation is inadvisable.

Exploding in anger in the corporate office you work in, or in any court of power (see Law 24), is likely to get you instantly fired

13B) No Religion or Politics:

It is unwise to talk about religion or politics when in the office you work in, or ever.

Avoid bringing up controversial topics.

If a controversial topic does come up, say nothing. If you are pressed for your opinion, say something politically correct, or something that the most powerful people present will agree with.

If you are forced to give your opinion on a controversial topic in any venue, whether a corporate office or a local coffee shop, simply say **“It’s an unfortunate state of affairs.”** This comment is perfectly neutral, and makes sense as a response to almost any controversial question.

14) Promotion:

Growth and Vacancy, 2 Mechanisms for Promotion:

There are only 2 ways to get promoted: Growth or Vacancy

14A) Growth:

The business is growing, and your boss needs a new more senior person to handle things. Instead of hiring an outsider, your boss promotes you to fill the new position.

14B) Vacancy:

Your boss or the person ranked directly above you is eliminated and you are promoted to take their position.

They could be ‘eliminated’ by any of the following: they were promoted to a new position, they quit their job, they got fired, they retired, they died.

So far as you are concerned, how they get eliminated is irrelevant; all that matters is *that* they get eliminated.

Getting promoted via the ‘Growth’ strategy is far easier than being promoted via the ‘Vacancy’ strategy.

If ‘No Vacancy’ is preventing you from being promoted, then your ability to get promoted is largely a matter of luck. You should consider jumping to another employer where you could conceivably be promoted via ‘Growth’.

If your employer’s company isn’t growing at a fast pace, you have the wrong employer. If the industry you are in isn’t growing at a fast pace, you are in the wrong industry.

Those who are in the ‘No Vacancy’ situation may be tempted to backstab the person above them to eliminate them, and then take their place. This is an incredibly dangerous strategy; if you do such a thing, you are playing with fire.

If you are caught backstabbing them, not only will you be fired, but your reputation will be publicly ruined...leaving you unemployed forever.

15) Competition, Rises at Each Level:

As you move up the hierarchy, the level of your competition increases.

Towards the bottom of the hierarchy, you are competing against incompetent fools; you should be able to surpass them in your sleep.

Towards the top of the hierarchy, you are competing against people who are competent and hardworking; beating them won’t be easy.

15A) Entry Level Corporate:

IQs around 115 and medium industriousness. You should be able to surpass them if you put in legitimate effort.

15B) Mid Level Corporate (Middle Managers):

IQs around 120 and high industriousness. Cunning. These people are *real competitors; beating them will be difficult.*

Keep in mind, a 'Middle Manager' at a corporation might be in the middle of the micro dominance hierarchy (that specific corporation), however they are very much on the high end of the macro dominance hierarchy (society in general).

A middle manager in a corporation is at the 90th or 95th percentile of income for the general population; they are on the high end, NOT the middle.

15C) High Level Corporate (VPs, C-Suite Executives):

IQs around 130, high industriousness, high cunning.

Welcome to the Machiavellian Olympics; at this level you will encounter some real life Frank Underwoods.

If you can win at this level of competition, you can win anywhere.

Keep in mind, the people towards the top of a corporation are at the pinnacle of society; they are all at the 99th percentile of income for the general population, if not higher.

16) Bad Political Positioning, Surrender:

If for whatever reason you have bad political positioning (your critical superiors dislike you, or at least don't like you enough such that they will promote you), then it's time to find a new employer.

Don't stick around waiting to get fired or being stagnant in the same position for years with no upward promotion.

17) Relevant Reading:

Robert Greene:

Law 24, Play The Perfect Courtier (**The 48 Laws of Power**)

Chapter 28: The One-Upmanship Strategy (**The 33 Strategies of War**)

Illimitable Man:

Law 1 In Depth: "Never Outshine The Master"

WallStreetPlayboys:

<https://www.wallstreetoasis.com/forums/landed-your-first-job-extremely-important-thread-office-politics>

<https://wallstreetplayboys.com/office-politics/>

<https://wallstreetplayboys.com/office-politics-it-only-gets-worse/>

Brian DeChesare:

<https://www.mergersandinquisitions.com/how-to-win-friends-and-influence-people-in-investment-banking-by-slacking-off-and-pretending-to-work-hard/>

<https://www.mergersandinquisitions.com/investment-banking-communication-skills/>

18) Reflections from Black Label Logic:

What follows are some reflections from Black Label Logic's twitter.

"Most people in senior management roles falls into 1 of 2 categories

A) People who are the strongest in their field within the company.

B) People who are great at office politics.

The former is a pleasure to work with, the latter should be avoided.

...I got some questions regarding how to tell a politician in management from someone who is really strong in their chosen field and have received their position based on expertise.

The former is A, the latter is B (**'A' is a politician, 'B' Is really strong in their chosen field**).

You usually like A right away, they feel like someone who is one of your buddies, even a brother at times. You respect them at first too, because they seem like great leaders. However, over time you see that they leave a trail of broken bodies behind them.

B is usually hard to like at first, often direct, often seems overly curt, and even dismissive. Over time you start to see that most people who worked with them went on to do bigger and better things, and rarely if ever does anyone who has worked with them for ages hate them.

A will talk a lot in meetings, presentations and so on, they are always the center of attention at corporate events, often they own the room. However, if you carefully parse their words, you start to realize that they are saying what sounds good and makes them appear good.

B is often quiet for most of the time in public settings, but when they speak people listen. However, what sets them apart is that there always seems to be a queue of people at their door wanting to speak with them.

A will never give you honest feedback or constructive criticism, they will more or less leave you to your own devices unless they need something, at which point they will come find you.

Criticism from B is often direct, jarring and can make you feel like stabbing them in the moment, but you tend to always grow from it, and in fact agree with it once you calm the hell down.

However, the easiest way to tell, is look at their history. Both often have great results in their past, however, A leaves a trail of useful idiots behind them, B sends an army of competent, confident professionals out in from of them.

Transcending Dominance Hierarchies, Success Predictors

machiavelliacorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) TLDR
- 3) Energy
- 4) Intelligence (IQ)
- 5) Cunning (Machiavellian Intelligence)
- 6) Stress Tolerance
- 7) Ruthlessness
- 8) Looks (Halo Effect)
- 9) Family Wealth
- 10) The Ideal
- 11) Minimum Requirements
- 12) Psychopathy, Evil's Advantage
- 13) Additional Factors, Extroversion and Openness
- 14) Relevant Reading
- 15) IM's Reflections

1) Preamble:

A question as old as time is why some people end up rich while others end up poor; why do some people rise to the top of society, while others end up at the bottom?

Luck is part of it; in any macro dominance hierarchy randomness is a factor.

That aside there are certain factors that dramatically increase the probability of a person making it towards the top of a macro dominance hierarchy, rather than ending up at the bottom.

2) TLDR

There are 7 key factors driving a person's ability to transcend a macro hierarchy: Energy/Industriousness, Intelligence/IQ, Cunning, Stress Tolerance/Neuroticism, Ruthlessness/Agreeableness, Physical Attractiveness/Halo Effect, and Family Wealth.

The best case scenario is that you are high energy, high IQ, high cunning, high stress tolerance, high ruthlessness, good looking, and born into a rich family.

The worst case scenario is that you are low energy, low IQ, low cunning, low stress tolerance, low ruthlessness, ugly, and born into a poor family.

3) Energy:

In every society, it is the case that people with high energy levels stand a better chance of making it to the top than people with low energy levels. This is most obvious in capitalist societies, where many high paying positions explicitly require one to have the energy to work 60+ hours a week.

Having above average energy levels is necessary (but not sufficient) for having any chance of going from the bottom of a macro hierarchy to the top. You have competitors who will work long hours; if they do, and you don't, the probability you will be able to keep up with them is zero.

In modern capitalist societies (see America), the use of drugs for the sake of maximizing energy levels is common

in many professions.

Many working in Finance/Law/Sales use stimulants such as Adderall, Ritalin, and Modafinil. Nobody is working 70 hours a week on water alone.

4) Intelligence (IQ):

In every society intelligence is an advantage for rising to the top of the hierarchy. As technology becomes more advanced and decision-making becomes more complex, the advantage high IQ people have over low IQ people intensifies.

In a hunter gatherer tribe a smart man has only a slight advantage over a dumb man; he may be slightly better at hunting. However, in a technologically advanced society with computers and the Internet a smart man is going to be light years ahead of a dumb man; he can become a software engineer, while the dumb man is stuck as a janitor.

Part of the reason high IQ people end up at the top of hierarchies is because they are faster than everyone else. IQ to a large extent measures *speed*, and almost every domain of performance in life, certainly every domain where money can be made, is a *race*, either against time or against competitors.

As such it's no surprise that high IQ people (who are faster than most people) tend to be the one's who win.

5) Cunning (Machiavellian Intelligence):

Cunning, sometimes euphemistically called 'People Skills', is an advantage if not basic requirement for transcending dominance hierarchies. Nobody in the history of the world has ever gone from the bottom of a society to the top without an above average level of cunning.

If you are capable of charming, persuading, deceiving, and reading people's personalities accurately, the probability of you transcending any hierarchy is far better than if you are incapable of doing these things.

If a lack of cunning is dragging you down, reading The 48 Laws of Power will wake you up to the game you've been playing your entire life but were never consciously aware of.

6) Stress Tolerance:

Note: 'Stress Tolerance' and 'Neuroticism' (Big 5 Personality Trait) are inverses of one another; they correlate negatively.

Those with high stress tolerances are more likely to rise up any hierarchy than those with low stress tolerances.

Fear affects performance *negatively* and as such a high stress tolerance is an advantage in any domain of performance, including the domains one must succeed in for the sake of rising up any given hierarchy.

In capitalist societies, you will find there are many high paying professions where an above average stress tolerance is a basic job requirement. Finance, Law, Sales, and Medicine are all examples.

7) Ruthlessness:

Note: 'Ruthlessness' and 'Agreeableness' (Big 5 Personality Trait) are inverses of one another; they correlate negatively.

It is both sad and true that ruthless people are far more likely to transcend any macro hierarchy than compassionate people.

In any society, there will inevitably be opportunities for a person to advance their own position at the expense of someone else; a ruthless person is likely to jump on any such opportunity whereas a compassionate person is likely to refuse any such opportunity. In the long run, this leads to ruthless people transcending macro hierarchies more often than compassionate people.

In capitalist societies, it is the case that the Big 5 Trait 'Agreeableness' and income correlate negatively. The reason for this is rather straightforward; business involves endless zero sum competition and negotiation.

Ruthless (disagreeable) people are far more comfortable with this than compassionate (agreeable) people. In the long run this leads to ruthless people making more money, if for no other reason than because they negotiate more aggressively when it comes to the matter of their own salary.

There is a paradox. For the sake of maximizing the probability of making it to the top of the hierarchy, you must be willing to use any strategy or tactic available that will be effective, even if it is immoral or harms others. At the same time, you must conceal any evil you do; you must always maintain the pretense of being a morally good person, or at least avoid the appearance of being a morally reprehensible person.

If you appear to be a monster everyone will become hostile towards you, and this will be your undoing.

Use evil for the sake of advancing your interests, while at the same time maintaining the outward appearance of virtue.

8) Looks, Halo Effect:

As Cialdini detailed in his book 'Influence' being physically attractive gives a person a 'halo effect'.

Good looking people are assumed to be more competent, more trustworthy, and more likeable than ugly people, even though in reality the correlation between physical attractiveness and competence or trustworthiness is zero.

Good looking men are more likely to be hired for jobs than ugly men, and are more likely to be promoted up corporate hierarchies than ugly men, all else equal.

In most hierarchies most of the time, being good looking is an advantage for transcending the hierarchy.

Sadly the human race is indeed this superficial.

9) Family Wealth:

In every society that has ever existed, upward mobility has been rare; rags to riches stories are sensational precisely because they are rare.

If you were born into a rich family, you have an immense advantage when it comes to making it towards the top of the macro hierarchy; you don't have to 'make it' there since you've already been born up there. All you have to do is maintain the position that has been handed to you.

In a capitalist society, there will be high paying jobs you can get for no reason other than because your parents are well connected with potential employers.

10) The Ideal:

If you had a son and wanted to maximize the probability of him being able to make it to the top of society, what traits would you give him?

- High Energy
- High IQ
- High Cunning
- High Stress Tolerance (Low Neuroticism)
- High Ruthlessness (Low Agreeableness)
- Good Looking (Halo Effect)
- Born into a Rich Family

What would be the worst possible traits to give him?

- Low Energy

- Low IQ
- Low Cunning
- Low Stress Tolerance
- Low Ruthlessness
- Ugly (Horns Effect)
- Born into a Poor Family

11) Minimum Requirements:

In modern capitalist societies the bare minimum requirements for maintaining a position high in the hierarchy are **high IQ and high energy**.

To have any hope of competing and winning, you will need an IQ of 120+ and the energy to work 60+ hours a week.

If you lack either of these, the probability of you being able to maintain a position towards the top of the hierarchy is practically zero.

12) Psychopathy, Evil's Advantage:

Many have noticed a disturbing trend; psychopathic men making it to the top of macro hierarchies. Many political and economic hierarchies are headed by psychopaths.

Why might this be?

Psychopaths experience zero compassion, zero fear, and tend to be very cunning; they are good at manipulating people.

As is consistent with the traits detailed in previous sections (Cunning, Stress Tolerance, Ruthlessness), psychopaths have 3 advantages that help them with climbing macro hierarchies; far above average cunning, far above average stress tolerance, and far above average ruthlessness.

Notably, low IQ psychopaths don't make it to the top of society; they tend to end up in prison for starting random fist fights.

High IQ psychopaths are the one's who excel at transcending hierarchies; they make excellent financiers, lawyers, and politicians.

“Dark triad behaviour is more common at the extreme poles of society, be it at the top amongst the elite monied class, or amongst gangs at the very bottom of society. They differ in resources & intellect, but share similar predatory traits. The middle class is the least dangerous.” -Illimitable Man

Psychopathy is most common among the extremely rich, and the extremely poor.

It is rare if ever that you will encounter a middle class psychopath.

Why is this the case?

As part of their exceptionally high stress tolerances, psychopaths tend to be *risk aggressive*. They are far more willing to use high risk high reward strategies than most people, and as a result they tend to end up being extremely rich, or poor. Using high risk high reward strategies makes the probability of ending up 'middle' class almost zero.

13) Additional Factors, Extroversion and Openness:

Extroversion is *kind of* a factor in transcending macro hierarchies, in the following sense; in some domains of performance high extroversion is an advantage, and in others low extroversion is an advantage.

In domains where charming people is critical, the enthusiasm typical of extroversion is beneficial; high extroversion

is an advantage for the work in finance, law, and sales.

In domains where the ability to work for long periods of time alone in silence is critical, low extroversion is an advantage; introverts tend to be better at working in solitude. Engineering would be an example.

Creativity (measured by the Big 5 Trait 'Openness') is a high risk high reward strategy; some creative ventures are spectacularly successful, but most fail catastrophically.

A person being creative (high openness) dramatically increases the probability of them ending up rich (at the top of the macro hierarchy), and also the probability of them ending up poor (at the bottom of the macro hierarchy).

'Creative Ventures' would include becoming an artist or musician, becoming a novelist, or creating a new business model (entrepreneurship); a small chance of spectacular success, an overwhelming probability of complete failure.

14) Relevant Reading:

Personality, IQ, and Lifetime Earnings (Miriam Gensowski)

Agreeableness and Wages (Jordan Peterson)

15) IM's Reflections:

What follows are some reflections from Illimitable Man on traits that predict the ability to transcend macro hierarchies. They have been taken from his Twitter feed at random; forgive the disorganization.

"I've drilled down the capacity to make \$ to the following:

- High discipline
- Optimal hormones
- High stress tolerance
- High IQ
- High Cunning

- Be hot (Somewhat improvable)
- Be smart (Barely improvable)
- Capacity for cunning (Improvable)
- Work hard (Improvable)
- Capacity for ruthlessness (Somewhat improvable)

If you had all 5 of those it'd be practically impossible for you to not be a millionaire.

Funnily enough "work hard" is the only thing it's politically correct to say, and almost everyone attributes that solely to their success.

Just a piece in a puzzle.

Mainstream won't tell you that, as will ruin their brand. Have to keep it tame.

I missed one thing out, but it's an implicit part of "work hard" anyway. Have high energy (Improvable).

A quick thread on *THE FUNDAMENTALS OF SUCCESS* that is actually *ORIGINAL* and not rehashed unoriginal insights plagiarised from another and reworded by a random self-improvement internet guru trying to stack cash (1/x)

The 3 core pillars of success as I see them are:

- Energy/Health
- Intelligence/IQ
- Cunning/Persuasion

Energy & health is your base. You can't do much without it. You could have a 150 IQ and be a strategic

mastermind who can mingle with the best of them.

Low energy = low success

Energy is not a talent, but it is necessary to leverage your talents

Step 0 in any quest for self-improvement is energy maximisation. This is why “eat clean and exercise” is fundamental

This is also why I emphatically emphasise hormonal optimisation as a necessity for greatness

Most people bitch on the internet about the risks of messing with hormones

But if your hormones are not at optimised, you will never be at the top

Health is king

The risks are blown to fuck and pure FUD anyway

If you're not willing to take risks stay at the little boy's table

You can binge on all the self-improvement wisdom in the world and live it as some weird kind of vicarious lifestyle where you ***ABSORB WHAT TO DO***

But never actually ***DO WHAT MUST BE DONE***

If you are low energy, will you be able to execute and manifest what you've learned?

No.

Drug use is common at the elite level

Finance guys like their stimulants, eg: modafinil, adderall – this allows them to get more done

Creative and artistic types like their psychedelics, eg: LSD/shrooms this helps them connect with beauty and tackle problems in a divergent manner

Summarising health section:

There are drugs that can be used in a safe and sparing manner to boost performance

High energy is necessary for execution

If you're not high energy, becoming high energy is your main focus before anything else

Strive for elite hormone levels

Once you're high energy & can actually apply what you learn, what's next?

I will start with cunning & persuasion as anybody can learn this

Cunning or “street smarts” is not a shady evil to avoid

It is necessary to do well in life, or you will undersell yourself & be exploited

The people with the cleanest images are often some of the most cunning.

Being cunning is not tantamount to being unethical.

It is more a case of concealing your intent and methods whilst being able to understand other's intentions and methods and planning your moves accordingly

A common pairing I see is high IQ-low cunning and low IQ-high cunning

I would say the average low IQ is more cunning than the average high IQ.

Nerds are basically high IQ people who are low in cunning.

“Normies” are essentially low to average IQ people who are high in cunning.

Not all high IQ people are nerds. High IQ people who are cunning are in the most elite positions in the world – think of “people who excel in finance & law”

They are all high IQ and cunning. Many psychopath types as well within this demographic, but that’s for another discussion

High IQ people who are low cunning can become high cunning

And low IQ people who are low cunning can become high cunning

But a high cunning low IQ person cannot become high IQ.

Until we master genetic engineering, your IQ is genetically fixed within a couple of points.

So how to become more cunning?

Read books on the topic, eg: Greene & Cialdini.

Use the corporate environment as your battlefield to hone this skill

Dissect the personal qualities and components of the strategies employed by cunning people you meet.

You will suffer to improve.

Low cunning is the reason many people do not excel in office environments and lose out on favour, promotions

If you can’t play the game, you will get fucked over

If you think being able to strategise is unethical or beneath you, realise you sacrifice success to hold this belief

Energy is your fuel for conquering

Cunning is how you optimise social outcomes

So what does that leave?

Intelligence

You cannot improve this, but u can make the best of what you’ve got by leveraging ***WHAT YOU DO HAVE*** to improve your reasoning and learn from your betters.-

If you’re low IQ, you’re in for a rough life, but if you’re cunning you can at least lean on that to have a measure of success. You can probably become middle class-

As I said earlier, not all high IQs are fragile nerds.

High IQ people who are cunning will wreck you. Avoid them.

Intelligence is your ability to tackle complexity

Irrespective of your IQ level, ***BEING DRIVEN*** goes a long way to improving your mind’s quality

You should read philosophy & master logic if your IQ is high enough to support these functions

Otherwise, read non-fiction regularly

Intelligence is not only your ability to tackle complexity, but likewise the speed with which you can absorb, understand & retain new information

A low IQ can never be a doctor or a lawyer even if they study for 10, 20, 30 yrs

Don’t go into academia if you’re not actually smart

Work ethic & discipline is ***ESSENTIAL*** to success

BUT

It's entirely dependent on energy

You can't be a hard working and disciplined person when your mind is foggy and all your body wants to do is shut down

Beating fatigue might make you hard working

Which means more \$\$\$

To summarise this entire thread with bulletpoints and a plan of action

Your plan should look like this:

Step 0: Master/optimize energy levels

Step 1: Train self with good habits to cultivate discipline

Step 2: Leverage your IQ by practicing cunning

Step 3: Constantly learn

Societies, High Trust and Low Trust

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Preamble:

What follows is a list of the differences between 'High Trust' and 'Low Trust' societies.

High Trust Society:

- People at the top of the hierarchy view those at the bottom with compassion. A rich man thinks, “As one of the most powerful people in this society, I have an obligation to ensure that the poor and powerless are taken care of.”
- People at the bottom of the hierarchy view those at the top with respect.
- Businesses put doing the morally right thing above profits, and view their employees as family members who should be taken care of in both good times and bad.
- Random people walking down the street trust each other.
- Violent crime is rare.

Low Trust Society:

- People at the top of the hierarchy view those at the bottom with disdain. They exploit those below them with impunity.
- People at the bottom of the hierarchy view those at the top with resentment.
- Businesses view morality as a joke, and their employees as chattel to be worked to death then discarded.
- Random people walking down the street distrust each other.
- Violent crime is common.

Inequality Erodes Social Trust:

Generally speaking it is the case that societies with intense wealth inequality (high Gini coefficients) have low levels of social trust, while societies with gentle inequality (low Gini coefficients) have high levels of social trust. The relationship is causal; intense inequality *causes* trust to erode.

Historical Examples:

1950 America was a high trust society.

2020 America is a low trust society.

2020 Brazil is a low trust society.

Historically, low trust societies with intense inequality have been the rule, and high trust societies with gentle inequality have been the exception.

Nature of a Dominance Hierarchy

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Macro and Micro
- 3) What Wins Status
- 4) Power > Merit
- 5) Status Throughout History
- 6) Pareto Distribution
 - 6A) Lives of Quiet Desperation
 - 6B) Exponentially Increasing Inequality
- 7) Feedback Loops, Why Wealth is Pareto Distributed
- 8) Pyramid Structure
- 9) Competition Heating Up
- 10) Exploitation, Top Down
- 11) Life and Death Stakes
- 12) Biochemistry and Hierarchies
- 13) Male Ambition, Female Hypergamy
- 14) Unsatiated Ambition and Hypergamy
- 15) Envy's Evolutionary Purpose
- 16) Hierarchies are Eugenic
- 17) Status is Zero Sum
- 18) Male Reproduction is Zero Sum
- 19) Male Outcomes, Greater Variance
- 20) Wealth Inequality and Violence
 - 20A) Inequality Erodes Social Trust
 - 20B) Intense Inequality Limits Upward Mobility
 - 20C) Real World Examples
 - 20D) Historical Trends
- 21) Revolution and Political Preferences
- 22) Polygamy Drives Violence
- 23) Economic Systems, Productivity and Inequality
- 24) The Ideal Civilization
- 25) High Status Halo
- 26) Power Is Valued Over Virtue
- 27) Invisibility From Low Status
- 28) Epilogue
- 29) Relevant Reading

1) Preamble:

All animals inevitably organize themselves into hierarchies, and humans are no exception.

With simple animals such as lobsters, the hierarchy is determined by nothing more than brute strength; the most dominant lobster is whichever is best at winning wrestling matches. Chimpanzees are more complex than lobsters; a chimp hierarchy is determined to some degree by brute strength, but also by popularity and political maneuvering.

Humans are the most complex animal on the planet, and our hierarchies are determined very little by physical

strength. Yes, being tall and muscular does win a man status, but rank within human hierarchies is far more determined by things such as intelligence, competence, likeability, and worldly wealth (money, power). The most powerful men on the planet as of this writing are Jeff Bezos and Vladimir Putin, both of whom are conspicuously small.

The aim of this essay is to describe traits that are ubiquitous to all human hierarchies, whether they be American society, Russian society, a corporation, or simply the pecking order of a gang in West Baltimore.

2) Macro and Micro:

It is important to distinguish between a *macro dominance hierarchy* and a *micro dominance hierarchy*.

A macro hierarchy is a large group a person can be a part of, designated by a geographical area; everyone within the entirety of a city, or the entirety of a country. The word 'society' is a euphemism for 'macro dominance hierarchy'.

A micro hierarchy is a smaller group a person may be a member of, such as a family, or a particular corporation.

The country America is a macro hierarchy of more than 300 million people. Meanwhile, the employees of a corporation form a micro hierarchy with only a few dozen or hundred people.

3) What Wins Status:

What wins a person status varies from one hierarchy to another.

In virtually all macro hierarchies having a high level of wealth (relative to others) grants a person high status.

In virtually all micro hierarchies having a high level of competence with a task affecting the group wins a person high status.

In some hierarchies, engaging in violence wins one status (particularly if it's violence against members of the outgroup; members of an enemy tribe). On the other hand, there are hierarchies where engaging in violence instantly causes one to become low status.

If you are member of a gang in West Baltimore then engaging in a fist fight and winning may cause your status to rise. However, if you are an associate at a law firm and you decide to engage someone in a fist fight your status will instantly drop to zero; you will be summarily fired.

4) Power > Merit:

Tragically, most hierarchies are based on nothing more than arbitrary power.

Meritocracies are rare; hierarchies where status is based primarily on competence are the exception, not the rule. Competence is always a factor in determining one's status, but almost never is it the only factor. In most hierarchies, status is determined by some mixture of competence, likeability, and arbitrary power.

A person's level of status and power are not precisely the same thing, but in most cases they are so closely correlated as to be all but indistinguishable.

Status is venue dependent in the sense that a person can have high status in one venue or group, and low status in another.

5) Status Throughout History:

In hunter-gatherer societies, status competition between men usually takes the form of fist fights and physical violence. Often status is determined based on who is best at waging war against rival tribes. Sometimes it's determined by who is best at hunting wild animals and providing food for the tribe.

In capitalist societies, status competition between men usually takes the form of who has the highest income, the biggest net worth, or the most impressive job title.

6) Pareto Distribution:

In virtually every dominance hierarchy, whether macro or micro, worldly wealth is pareto distributed. This is a statistician's way of saying that a minority of people get almost everything, and most people get little or nothing.

People who are rich, powerful, and high status are the minority, while people who are poor, powerless, and low status are the majority.

Throughout human history, most societies have had 3 classes: the bottom 90% who are poor, the top 10% who are upper class, and the top 0.1% who are rich. The existence of a 'middle' class has been a historical exception; the overwhelming majority of people being poor has been the historical rule.

Universities teach you that everything of consequence is normally distributed; a bell curve distribution. Sadly this is inaccurate; in almost every human society it is the case that wealth and power are *pareto* distributed.

Every society is an oligarchy in the sense that in every society a minority of people wield virtually all the political power; a minority of people are on the winning side of the pareto distribution. It is the will of the few, not the will of the many, that rules.

6A) Lives of Quiet Desperation:

“The mass of men lead lives of quiet desperation...” -Henry David Thoreau

Tragically, it is the case that in most societies the bottom 90% of men are nothing more than cheap labor for the top 10% of men.

Quality of life is pareto distributed; most people are miserable, a minority are happy.

Quality of life correlates very closely with worldly wealth; in every society that has ever existed life for people at the top of the hierarchy has been astronomically better than life for people at the bottom.

6B) Exponentially Increasing Inequality

Because wealth is pareto distributed, a person 1 level above you will have exponentially more wealth than you, and as you move up the hierarchy the wealth gaps between one level and the next immediately above gets *bigger* rather than smaller.

Essentially, the wealth inequality between a person at the 99th percentile and the 90th percentile, is far bigger than the inequality between a person at the 90th percentile and the 80th percentile. As such, increasing one's hierarchical status doesn't have diminishing marginal returns; it has *exponentially increasing* marginal returns.

7) Feedback Loops, Why Wealth is Pareto Distributed:

The main reason wealth is pareto distributed is *feedback loops*.

A positive feedback loop is a phenomenon in which one good thing happening dramatically increases the probability that an additional good thing will happen. One good thing leads to another, and another, and another.

The reason extremely rich people exist is due to a runaway positive feedback loop that took them up into the stratosphere.

A negative feedback loop is a phenomenon in which one bad thing happening dramatically increases the probability that an additional bad thing will happen; the reason most poor people never manage to escape poverty is because they are constantly being wrecked by negative feedback loops.

Positive feedback loops cause the rich to become richer, while negative feedback loops cause the poor to become poorer, or at least stay trapped in poverty. This inevitably leads to wealth being pareto distributed.

8) Pyramid Structure:

An extension of the pareto distribution is this; society has a *pyramid shaped* hierarchy. Each level has fewer people than the one below it and more people than the one above it.

It has been said that every person on the planet is no more than 6 handshakes away from one another. With a planet of 7 billion people this claim seems exaggerated, but as you go up the pyramid of a society, it becomes more and more practical that every person at the current level could be within 2-3 handshakes of one another.

Among the poor there are many; it is impossible to get to know everyone. However among the rich there are few, and it is very practical to know everyone or almost everyone.

If you make it to the top of the profession you work in, you will know every person within your industry, even if you don't know everyone towards the top of your society.

9) Competition Heating Up:

At each level of the pyramid, it becomes exponentially more difficult to break in to the next level above.

There is the logistical matter of there simply being *fewer and fewer open spots available* as you move up the pyramid.

More importantly, as you go higher up the pyramid you are dealing with more and more competent competitors. At the bottom level, moving up requires prevailing against people who are both lazy and stupid. However if you are in the middle, moving up an additional level requires prevailing against people who are both highly motivated and competent.

10) Exploitation, Top Down:

Rules are written by those in power, for those in power. Every system is rigged in favor of the powerful and against the powerless.

Communists refer to the phenomenon of the powerful exploiting the powerless as 'Capitalist Exploitation', however in doing this communists underestimate how deeply rooted the problem is.

Exploitation isn't a consequence of capitalism; it's a consequence of human nature. In every hierarchy the powerful exploit the powerless; it happens in every society, not just capitalist societies.

In some societies the mechanisms of exploitation are overt and brazen, in others they are covert and subtle, but the existence of top down exploitation is universal to every hierarchy.

Generally speaking those towards the top of the hierarchy write rules that ensure they can stay at the top and no one else can rise; the powerful design rules that *limit* upward mobility, rather than rules that enhance it.

If you are at the bottom of the hierarchy, the probability that you will be able to make it to the top of the hierarchy without breaking any rules is practically zero.

11) Life and Death Stakes:

In every macro hierarchy one's relative rank is often a matter of life and death, if for no other reason than because the higher you are in the hierarchy the better your access to medical care will be.

If your status is extremely high, then rest assured that if you become ill you will be given the best medical care available. On the other hand, if your status is low you will get shoddy medical care with delays, or none at all.

For a billionaire, getting cancer means a few unpleasant trips to chemotherapy. For a homeless man, it means being left to die in the streets.

In every society it is the case that some people's lives are considered to be immensely important while

others' are considered to be worthless.

Being at the pinnacle of the macro hierarchy means having easy access to the best medical care on the planet and having almost zero probability of being sent to do dangerous tasks.

Being at the bottom of the macro hierarchy means having unreliable access to medical care (or none at all), and a very high probability of being sent to do dangerous tasks (see coal miners and cannon fodder).

The lower you are in the hierarchy, the higher the probability is that you will die at a young age. When people are competing for money or for hierarchal position understand that what they are really fighting over is probability of survival.

The conflict is intense because the stakes are high; the stakes are life and death.

In the game of power, the stakes have always been life and death and they probably always will be. If you were a 16th century courtier (see Machiavelli) failure in the game could lead to execution or exile. Exile of course was nothing more than a death sentence carried out in slow motion; a man banished from the kingdom would have no hope of surviving on his own.

If you live in 2020 America, failure in the game of power means not making money, not being able to pay the rent/mortgage, becoming homeless, and starving to death in the street. This is a very high probability outcome for most Americans; 80% of the population lives paycheck to paycheck. They are one error away from homelessness.

12) Biochemistry and Hierarchies:

Your brain closely tracks what your relative status is in the hierarchy you live in, and assumes that if you are low status you are in danger (causing your cortisol levels to rise) and if you are high status you are safe (causing your cortisol levels to fall).

The assumption that life at the top of the hierarchy is safe and life at the bottom of the hierarchy is dangerous is an accurate assumption in most hierarchies most of the time (see the 'Life and Death Stakes' section above).

Your brain also regulates the release of serotonin based on what it detects your relative status to be; when you are high status, your brain detects this and releases high levels of serotonin. When you are low status, your brain detects this and restricts the release of serotonin.

The biochemical state that is typical of depression, and the biochemical state that is caused by having low status in a hierarchy, are identical; low serotonin. As the 48 Laws said, "...powerlessness will make you miserable."

Notably, the part of the brain that tracks your relative status is older and more deeply engrained than the part of your brain that tells your lungs to breathe. So far as the human mind is concerned, the game of power is more important than air.

There are those who will claim they do not care about their relative status or relative level of wealth; they care only about their absolute level of wealth. Such people are worthy of laughter; they are lying, mostly to themselves. Whether you care to admit it or not, the serotonergic system in your brain cares *intensely* about your relative status.

High serotonin tends to *inhibit* emotions, both positive and negative. The practical consequence is that high status people with their high serotonin levels find it easier to restrain both their enthusiasm and their fear; they feel positive and negative emotions, but mildly enough such that they can still control themselves.

On the other hand, low status people with their low serotonin levels find it difficult to restrain their emotions; they are more likely to get carried away with enthusiasm and do something that feels good in the moment but that they later regret. They are also more likely to become overwhelmed with fear.

If you have never lived toward the bottom of a macro dominance hierarchy, then at least part of your own psychology is alien to you. You don't know what you would be like if you were at the bottom of a hierarchy and low

serotonin; hopefully you will never find out.

Some men are calm and confident when they are high status, and humble yet determined when they are low status. Such men deserve your respect.

Sadly, most men are narcissistic when they are high status and resentful when they are low status.

13) Male Ambition, Female Hypergamy:

Women have evolved to be hypergamous; this is an academic way of saying that women consider high status men to be attractive and low status men to be unattractive.

In order for a woman to consider a man attractive his status must at *minimum* be as high as her own, and ideally be as high as possible.

Women mate up and across dominance hierarchies, men mate down and across dominance hierarchies.

Female hypergamy has exerted immense evolutionary pressure on men. Specifically, it has led to ambitious men (men motivated to take the necessary action to move up a given hierarchy) reproducing more than unambitious men (men who did not bother with taking action to move up the hierarchy they lived in). Unambitious men have been culled to the point where men who are completely indifferent regarding their relative status in the hierarchy they live in are today almost non-existent.

Many people (usually women) ask questions such as “Why are men so competitive?”. The answer is simple; men are intensely motivated to attain high status *relative to other men* because all the men throughout history who didn’t bother with taking the necessary action to attain high status remained low status, were thereby unattractive to women, and were eliminated from the gene pool.

Both men and women desire to attain high status. The difference is that men desire high status *far more intensely* than women do, and with good reason; a man’s reproductive success depends on him attaining high status, a woman’s does not. If a woman is low status she can still be attractive to men, but if a man is low status he will automatically be considered unattractive by women.

From an evolutionary perspective, a male has more to gain by attaining high status than a female does. For a female attaining high status is helpful; for a male it is *absolutely necessary*.

When you see men engaging in extreme behavior for the sake of having a shot at getting rich, realize that they aren’t trying to attain wealth; they are trying to attain status. A high level of wealth on an absolute basis isn’t the motivator; it’s a high level of wealth *relative* to other men living in their society.

‘Extreme Behavior’ could mean borrowing money to start a business, risking bankruptcy, and working 80 hours a week. It could also mean risking death in combat for the sake of having a shot at becoming a ‘war hero’ (a position of immensely high status).

It’s not about wealth; it’s about status and power.

Most ambitious men are simple; they just want to win. They don’t particularly care how. Whether it’s winning high status by becoming a successful banker or lawyer, a successful entrepreneur, or a decorated war hero, what matters is that high status is attained, not the specific means by which it is attained.

You can manipulate most men into doing just about anything by telling them “Do X, and it will win you status”. Conversely, you can deter them from doing just about anything by telling them “Don’t do Y, because it will cause you to lose status.”

Obviously, for the sake of persuasion you shouldn’t use language that is so direct; it would seem awkward at best and absurd at worst. However, many rulers throughout history have subtly emphasized some actions as causing one to win status and others causing one to lose status, as a means of manipulating men into taking or not taking

certain actions.

The main way armies have recruited young men has always been by telling them something along the lines of “Soldier is a high status position; join our army, and you will win status.”

14) Unsatiated Ambition and Hypergamy:

Men are ambitious, women are hypergamous.

Most men are tortured by unsatiated ambition; their actual level of status is far beneath the level of status they desire.

Most women are tortured by unsatiated hypergamy; the actual man they are paired with is far inferior to the type of man they desire.

A man lives a fulfilled life by making something of himself, a woman lives a fulfilled life by marrying and having children with such a man.

If you are a man who attains a position of sky high status, it will be true that other men want to be you and women want to sleep with you.

15) Envy's Evolutionary Purpose:

The evolutionary purpose of envy is obvious, at least for men. Envy motivates you to surpass those who are higher status than you are. This makes you more attractive to women, and enhances your reproductive opportunities.

More sinisterly, envy may motivate you to kill the men who are higher status than you are. This indirectly improves your reproductive opportunities because it eliminates your competitors in the sexual marketplace.

Morally acceptable? No. Effective? Yes. Natural selection and sexual selection are completely amoral processes.

Envy is so built into our genetic code that we've created entire ideologies driven by it (see 'Karl Marx' and 'Communism').

16) Hierarchies are Eugenic:

Dominance hierarchies are eugenic in the following sense; men who have the traits needed to get to the top and stay at the top of the hierarchy have greater reproductive success than men who lack such traits, because women consider men towards the top of the hierarchy to be more attractive than men towards the bottom.

17) Status is Zero Sum:

“People are more motivated by the relative inequality, than by the absolute level of well being.” –Brett Weinstein

Status is an intrinsically zero sum game; you can only be 'high' status insofar as someone else is low status. This is an ugly reality that nobody wants to be true, but nonetheless it is true.

Not everyone can be a winner. Someone has to be low status; ensure that 'someone' is not you.

18) Male Reproduction is Zero Sum:

Males are in zero sum competition with one another for reproductive opportunities, females are not.

If a man impregnates a woman, that prevents any other man from having a child by her (at least for the next year or so). However, when a man impregnates a woman it does *not* in any way prevent other women from having children by him.

Male reproduction being a zero sum competition explains why men compete against other men far more intensely

than women compete against other women.

It also explains why male on male homicide is common, while female on female homicide is almost unheard of. When a man kills another man, he is eliminating one of his competitors in the sexual marketplace and thereby enhances his own reproductive opportunities; a woman killing another woman would get no such benefit.

You could blame the existence of violence on male competitiveness. To be fair, the reason males are competitive in the first place is because they want to appeal to female hypergamy.

19) Male Outcomes, Greater Variance:

Male life outcomes are more variable than female life outcomes. Among men there are more spectacular successes, and also more catastrophic failures.

Most people who make it to the pinnacle of any given macro hierarchy will be male (most billionaires are men). Most people who end up at the bottom of any given macro hierarchy will be male (most homeless people are men).

There are 2 reasons for this: IQ Variability and Risk Aggression

IQ Variability

Male IQ is more variable than female IQ; most geniuses are men, and most idiots are men. At an IQ of 130+ most people are male, and at an IQ of 70- most people are male.

In every macro hierarchy, IQ is a significant driver of success; high IQ smart people tend to rise up the hierarchy while low IQ dumb people tend to fall down the hierarchy.

Male IQ being more variable than female IQ makes it such that most people smart enough to be capable of rising to the top of the hierarchy are men, and also most people dumb enough to fall all the way down the hierarchy are men.

Risk Aggression

Men are more risk aggressive than women, and it seems to be the case that amongst men those with the highest testosterone levels are the most risk aggressive.

Men taking more risks than women leads to there being more spectacular successes among men, and also more catastrophic failures among men.

Taking lots of risks dramatically increases the probability of rising to the top of the hierarchy, and also the probability of being thrown down to the bottom.

If you are adopting a child and get to choose whether to take a boy or a girl, know this; having a daughter is a low risk low reward bet, having a son is a high risk high reward bet.

20) Wealth Inequality and Violence:

Many people assume that poverty is what drives violence, but this is incorrect.

Inequality is what drives violence. In areas where everyone is poor, violence is rare. In areas where everyone is rich, violence is rare. In areas where some people are very rich and others are very poor (relative to one another), there is endless violence.

The Gini coefficient of a given geographic location (city or country) predicts the homicide rate within that geographic location more powerfully than any other variable. Gini coefficients measure economic inequality, while homicide rates measure violence.

The violence that takes place in high Gini coefficient locations rarely takes the form of poor people banding together, killing rich people, and stealing their wealth. Yes such things have happened (see the French Revolution), but they are rare.

Usually, the violence takes the form of young men who are poor getting into arguments with one another about petty matters, the arguments escalating into fist fights, and the fist fights occasionally ending with one of the young men dead.

The explanation as to why inequality drives violence is straightforward; **as inequality rises the competition for power intensifies; so far as seizing power is concerned violence is the nuclear option.**

The most common trigger for violence is disrespect; a young man who is poor (low status) has been insulted or perceives he has been insulted, and he responds by initiating combat.

The emotional circuitry driving such a young man is simple; *to be on the losing side of inequality is humiliating. The pain of humiliation can easily be converted into anger, and excessive amounts of anger can drive a person to violence.*

20A) Inequality Erodes Social Trust

As inequality rises, social trust deteriorates.

It is generally the case that societies with high Gini coefficients are low trust societies, and societies with low Gini coefficients are high trust societies.

The inverse relationship between inequality and social trust does seem to be *causal*; it seems to be the case that intense inequality causes social trust to deteriorate.

Intuitively this makes sense; when the gap between the richest people and the poorest people is big, maintaining the pretense that “We are all in this together!” becomes impossible.

20B) Intense Inequality Limits Upward Mobility

As inequality rises, upward mobility becomes more rare.

The explanation for this is straightforward; as inequality rises the distance between one rank in the hierarchy and the one immediately above it gets bigger, and as ranks get farther and farther apart, moving up 1 rank becomes more difficult.

To be clear, even in low Gini coefficient areas where upward mobility is high, upward mobility is still *rare* (even in places where rags to riches stories are the most common, they are still outliers).

20C) Real World Examples

In a society such as South Africa where inequality is very intense (Gini coefficient around 60%), you will find that homicide is common, social trust is low, upward mobility is rare, and politics is always one inch away from escalating into a civil war.

In a society such as Denmark where inequality is very gentle (Gini coefficient around 20%), you will find that homicide is rare, social trust is high, upward mobility is common, and politics isn't all that serious.

Of the effects previously listed (Violence, Social Trust, Upward Mobility), the one most strongly correlated with inequality is violence; the male on male homicide rate.

20D) Historical Trends

In most societies throughout history, intense levels of inequality (Gini coefficients of 40%+) have been the rule, while gentle levels of inequality (Gini coefficients of 30%-) have been the exception.

Most societies have no ‘middle’ class; they only have a minority who are spectacularly rich, with the majority of people being poor.

21) Revolution and Political Preferences:

Leftwing people tend to assume all inequality is caused by crookedness; the only reason the rich have more wealth than the poor is because they exploit the poor. Rightwing people tend to assume all inequality is caused by merit; the only reason the rich have more wealth than the poor is because they are smarter and harder working. Both sides are usually correct, to some degree.

In every society, crookedness is part of what drives inequality. Merit also is, in the sense that in every society high IQ people tend to be better at attaining positions of power and making money than low IQ people.

Generally speaking it is the case that conservatives (Rightwing) stand for the interests of powerful people towards the top of the hierarchy. To be conservative is to desire to maintain the status quo, and powerful people *want* to maintain the status quo since under the status quo things are going well for them (relatively).

On the other hand, liberals (Leftwing) usually stand for the interests of powerless people towards the bottom of the hierarchy. To be liberal is to desire change, and those towards the bottom of the hierarchy desperately desire change since under the status quo their lives are terrible (at least relative to those at the top of the hierarchy).

It seems to be the case that as inequality intensifies, politics becomes more polarized; the Leftwing makes calls for revolution, while the Rightwing becomes reactionary and demands that nothing ever be changed.

As inequality rises, the probability of civil war or violent revolution increases.

Every society has a ceiling on inequality, in the sense that every society has some finite degree of inequality it can tolerate before it collapses with a violent revolution.

Many revolutionaries promise to eliminate or at least reduce inequality, but in truth *every society has elites, both before a revolution and after a revolution*. Most revolutions are nothing more than a *circulation of elites*; throwing out the old elites, and putting new elites in place (Vilfredo Pareto made this point).

Almost all violence (including violent revolutions) is carried about by young men with high testosterone levels.

To prevent violent revolution you must ensure that young men living towards the bottom of the macro hierarchy are sufficiently in love with the status quo, such that they are not willing to risk death in combat for the sake of tearing it down.

Revolution is a high risk high reward option; after the revolution, your life could be a lot better, or a lot worse. It's also possible that the revolution could result in you being thrown into prison or killed.

When you're at the bottom of the hierarchy, your life is terrible (on a relative basis) so you have little or nothing to lose; to a man with little to lose, a high risk high reward bet is appealing.

On the other hand, if you are at the top of the hierarchy your life is great (relatively speaking). You have a lot to lose, so taking a high risk high reward bet like revolution is very unappealing. The probability that revolution would result in your life getting better is low, the probability that revolution could lead to your life getting worse or you getting killed is quite high.

As such, it makes sense that those towards the bottom of hierarchies often find revolution to be appealing, while those towards the top of hierarchies almost never do.

When civilization collapses, or an existing power structure or hierarchy collapses, there is an opportunity to seize power. If your civilization and the power structures you must deal with are *completely rigid, they have no change whatsoever*, then the probability of you rising from the bottom to the top is zero.

Those towards the top of a hierarchy want stability; they want nothing to change, so that they can keep their lofty position. Those towards the bottom of a hierarchy want revolution, or at least change, which may give them the opportunity to seize power.

It sounds so obvious when it is said outloud, yet in real life people often ignore this.

They look at relatively poor young men launching revolutions, and think they are fools. In truth, they are acting rationally. They have nothing to lose except their lives, and their lives are miserable. They have everything to gain. Perhaps in the new order, they will have power.

22) Polygamy Drives Violence:

TLDR: Polygamy is pathological because it leads to a significant percentage of men being involuntarily single, and many of these men become resentful and violent.

“Western civilization was built on monogamy – one woman for every man. A winner takes all game with lopsided mate distribution is not a sustainable civilizational model. The contemporary presence of this model is indicative of civilizational decline. The west is on a downswing.” -Illimitable Man

Among monogamous societies, you will find that some are peaceful and some are violent. Among polygamous societies, *all of them* are very violent.

Just as wealth is pareto distributed, the romantic success of heterosexual men is pareto distributed; women consider a minority of men (top tier men) to be extremely attractive, and most men to be unattractive.

In monogamous societies, the distribution of wives amongst men is *not* pareto distributed; each man has 1 wife.

In polygamous societies, the distribution of wives amongst men *is* pareto distributed; a minority of men have many wives, an additional minority of men have one wife, and a huge percentage of men (perhaps a majority) have zero wives.

The reason polygamous societies are violent is rather straightforward; the men who have no wives (and who know they probably never will) have been hit with an evolutionary death sentence; zero reproductive opportunities.

These involuntarily single men tend to become resentful about their romantic failure, and since from an evolutionary perspective they have nothing to lose (zero reproductive opportunities) many of them turn to violence.

For the sake of keeping society stable, banning polygamy is critical. From a legal perspective this means making polygamy against the law. From a political perspective, it means showing people propaganda that encourages monogamy (Disney movies that make marriage between 1 man and 1 woman look both normal and desirable).

Even in monogamous societies, there will be some percentage of men who end up involuntarily single; no women want them. However, the percentage of men who fall into this category will be far lower in a monogamous society than what it would be in a polygamous society.

The most dangerous thing in the universe is a young man with high testosterone levels who is convinced he has nothing to lose; *only Satan knows the thing a man is willing to do when he has nothing to lose.*

Part of the reason single men are far more likely to engage in violence than married men is this; a wife represents *something to lose* (if you do something foolish like impulsively engaging in combat, she might leave you).

23) Economic Systems, Productivity and Inequality:

Every economic system increases the total amount of material wealth on an absolute basis, and also increases inequality; when wealth is created, it is distributed inequitably. Free Market Capitalism is no exception to this.

Productivity (wealth being created) is good, and intensifying inequality is bad (since it drives up the homicide rate). As such the uncomfortable question is this; what degree of inequality *should* a society be willing to tolerate, for the sake of getting more productivity?

Leftwing Communists tell you that the correct tolerance for inequality is zero; no inequality should be tolerated at all. Of course, this is pathological since the only societies that have managed to attain zero inequality have been

societies where everyone has nothing.

Rightwing Libertarians tell you that the correct tolerance for inequality is infinity; the free market should be allowed to create wealth, and there is no degree of inequality that ever qualifies as a 'problem'. This is also pathological, since allowing inequality to become too intense can make a society so violent that it collapses or is always on the verge of collapse.

24) The Ideal Civilization:

Fill it with high IQ people (since high IQ people are good at creating wealth, and low IQ people are incapable of creating wealth).

Have free market capitalism (since this will result in wealth being created).

Have mechanisms in place to keep economic inequality down to a tolerable level. Don't let the Gini coefficient go north of 40%. Progressive tax rates and socialized healthcare should be enough to do this, but if not, occasionally raising taxes on the richest 10% of the population should do the trick.

Enforce monogamy; ban polygamy, so that the intrasexual competition amongst men doesn't become too intense.

25) High Status Halo:

When people perceive your status is high, it gives you a kind of halo effect, in much the same way that being physically attractive gives a person a halo effect.

When you are high status people assume you are honest and competent. Being perceived as high status also makes people more willing to help you, since they assume you wield the power to repay a favor in a meaningful way. Most critically, being perceived as high status makes people *more hesitant to harm you*, since they assume you wield the power to retaliate in a meaningful way.

Every society has an unspoken rule; **crimes committed against high status people are punished far more harshly than crimes committed against low status people.**

If you murder a rich person, the probability you will be executed for it is far higher than if you murder a poor person. Equal protection under the law has never existed, and sadly it probably never will.

It is also the case that in every society crimes committed *by* high status people are punished less harshly than crimes committed by low status people.

These 2 dynamics taken together makes it such that the most harshly punished crimes are those committed by low status people against high status people, and the most leniently punished crimes are those committed by high status people against low status people, if they are even punished at all.

In every society the lives of some people are considered to be immensely important while the lives of others are considered to be worthless.

If a billionaire falls ill, he will immediately be given the best medical care on the planet. If a homeless man falls ill, he will be left to die.

If a billionaire is murdered, law enforcement will travel to the ends of the Earth to arrest and prosecute the perpetrator. If a homeless man is murdered, law enforcement will expend little to no energy on finding the perpetrator.

Predatory men target people who are low status because they perceive (correctly) that the probability of being punished is far lower if their victims are of low status rather than high status.

The point is this; making people perceive you are high status is not just an exercise in vanity for the sake of stroking your ego. There are consequential tactical benefits to people perceiving you are high status; they become

more willing to help you and more hesitant to harm you.

26) Power Is Valued Over Virtue:

A powerful man is more respected than a good man.

If people perceive you are powerful and evil, they will gladly do you favors since they assume you wield the power to repay their favors.

If people perceive you are virtuous and powerless, people will scoff at your request for a favor. Yes, there are instances in which appearing virtuous and powerless may win you sympathy and thereby win you assistance, but such cases are the exception rather than the rule.

27) Invisibility From Low Status:

When you are low status, you're invisible. People pay very little attention to you, and expend no energy into analyzing your body language, vocal tonality, word choice, and personality.

Conversely when you are high status you are highly visible; people expend an immense amount of energy into analyzing your personality.

When you are high status people put effort into charming you and fear offending you, whereas when you are low status people put zero effort into charming you.

For reasons detailed in the previous section (High Status Halo), it is generally a good idea to make people overestimate your status; it makes them more willing to help you.

However, there may be situations where it is useful to make people perceive you are low status even if you aren't; it can give you a cloak of invisibility.

For the sake of spying, it is generally wise to have a cover identity that is of low or medium status, and certainly not ultra high status; this way nobody bothers with doing rigorous investigation into your background.

If you want to get to know someone's personality well, you need to make them perceive that your status is far lower than theirs.

Why?

When people perceive your status is higher than their own, they instinctively monitor what they say (use PowerTalk rather than StraightTalk) and monitor their body language; they instinctively wear a mask that they think will charm you, and go out of their way to avoid offending you.

As such, to get to know a person's real personality (without a mask, or with as little mask as possible), you must observe them when they perceive your status is equal to or far below theirs.

28) Epilogue:

The top and the bottom of any macro dominance hierarchy are 2 separate universes; one is Heaven and the other is Hell.

If you are at the bottom, you must get to the top *no matter how high the price may be*.

As Baltasar Gracian said, "A good end gilds all, no matter how unsavory the means."

29) Relevant Reading:

War and Status:

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/out-the-ooze/201601/the-psychology-going-war>

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/out-the-ooze/201512/if-you-give-man-gun-men-evolution-mass-shootings>

TLDR: Men go to war so that they can win status via being successful at combat. Men want status because it makes them attractive to women.

Homicide Wins Status:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M3XYHPAwBzE>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jxBSKLxt3Wc>

TLDR: 25 minute mark, “The motivation for homicide isn’t money; it’s for women...”

Status is the marker for attractiveness, from women to men.

Women will marry across and up dominance hierarchies, men will marry across and down.

Part of the reason men are aggressive and they compete with each other is because they want women.” –Jordan Peterson

Depression and Hierarchies:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vKXD8ZEwAmw>

Hierarchies and Serotonin:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fAwJgoLXXBg>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vfl98_tQqDY

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1V9qbgM9bTg>

Kate Pickett on inequality:

“<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZV4cdUz3puE>

TLDR: “Disrespect is the most common trigger for violence. Issues of respect and status...become much, much more heightened in an unequal world. Where you have more inequality...status matters more.”

Richard Wilkinson on inequality:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cZ7LzE3u7Bw>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FYt08ZZm_Ao

Martin Daly on Inequality:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=snurTL813Mk>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-asltUUvcGU>

Intelligent and Awkward

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Intelligence Levels and Social Awkwardness
- 3) Drivers of Social Awkwardness
 - 3A) Low Extroversion
 - 3B) High Intellect
 - 3C) Complex Speaking Style
- 4) Optimizing Your Charm
- 5) Career Options
- 6) Relevant Reading
- 7) Further Reflections
 - 7A) Illimitable Man
 - 7B) WallStreetPlayboys

1) Preamble:

It is often the case that geniuses are socially awkward; intelligent, yet at the same time incompetent when it comes to charming other people.

Fictional TV shows have been created making fun of this dynamic (see The Big Bang Theory's main character Sheldon).

Anecdotally, we have all met at least one man intelligent enough to be capable of doing calculus in his head, but who is incapable of simply asking a woman out on a date.

2) Intelligence Levels and Social Awkwardness:

IQ of 120

Smart and socially normal. 90th percentile intelligence.

IQ of 130

Extremely smart and significantly socially awkward. Will have some difficulty charming most people. 98th percentile intelligence.

IQ of 140+

Genius, and hopelessly socially awkward. Will have difficulty charming almost everyone. 99th percentile intelligence.

At an IQ of 130 you are a bridge between geniuses and normal people; you are smart enough to understand the complex things a genius says, and also dumb enough to be capable of learning how to charm normal people.

3) Drivers of Social Awkwardness:

There is of course the question; why are exceptionally intelligent people bad at charming others?

It boils down to 3 things: low extroversion, high intellect, and complex speaking style.

3A) Low Extroversion:

It seems to be the case that IQ and extroversion correlate negatively; most high IQ people are introverted.

Many people perceive low extroversion (particularly low enthusiasm) to be a sign of unfriendliness, when in truth it just indicates a lack of dopamine fueled positive emotion.

The low enthusiasm displayed by many people with IQs of 130+ often causes people to perceive they are unfriendly.

Note: The Big 5 Personality Trait 'Extroversion' can be broken down into 2 sub-traits: Assertiveness and Enthusiasm.

It seems to be the case that IQ and Enthusiasm correlate negatively, while the correlation between IQ and Assertiveness is zero.

3B) High Intellect

IQ and Openness (particularly the sub-trait 'Intellect') correlate very strongly.

What this means is that high IQ people tend to be interested in abstract ideas, far more so than most people.

This can often cause some awkwardness when it comes to making conversation; the person with an IQ of 130+ wants to talk about abstract topics such as international monetary policy, Overton windows shifting, and Nietzsche's theories of Master and Slave Morality. Most people find conversation about such topics to be boring at best and awkward at worst.

Those of roughly average intelligence (a majority of the population) find topics about more banal topics to be interesting; the local football team, the upcoming holiday season, Kardashians.

Note that most Americans do know who Kim Kardashian is, while only a minority know who Nietzsche is.

3C) Complex Speaking Style

High IQ people tend to have a complex speaking style; they use big words and complex sentence structures. However, most members of the population with roughly average IQs talk with small words and simple sentence structures.

When a high IQ person uses big words and complex sentence structures when talking to an average IQ person (most of the population), it may annoy the average IQ person. It could also lead to miscommunication; the high IQ person said something the average IQ person either outright did not understand, or thinks they understood but actually misinterpreted.

4) Optimizing Your Charm:

Fear not; if you're an extremely high IQ person who is socially awkward, your ability to charm people can be improved. You simply need to develop 2 different modalities of interacting with others, 2 masks.

One can be your real self; low enthusiasm (introverted), makes conversation about abstract intellectual topics, and talks with complex sentence structure.

This 'real self' mask can be worn whenever you are alone, or talking to another extremely high IQ person; you naturally mirror them, and so they will be charmed by you.

You must also proactively craft a 'Social Representative' mask; this is an inauthentic version of yourself that will appeal to most people (the masses with their roughly average IQs).

This Social Representative mask should be extroverted (high enthusiasm), talk with simple sentences and small words, and be able to make conversation about the banal topics that interest most people (the weather, the

Kardashians, etc).

For the sake of dumbing down the way you talk, you will have to omit some complexity, nuance, and information from what you say; so be it.

If you are naturally introverted (low enthusiasm), one thing that helps temporarily boost enthusiasm is caffeine. Be warned, caffeine also has the negative side effect of increasing neuroticism.

5) Career Options:

If you have an IQ in the range of 120 – 129 (you are smart but not socially awkward), it would be wise to enter a profession where both technical skills and people skills matter; Finance, Law, and Sales are all examples. You have both the intelligence and social skills needed to succeed there.

If you have an IQ of 140+, you should enter a profession where technical skills are critical and people skills are as irrelevant as possible; engineering and quantitative trading (hedge funds) are examples. Don't enter a profession where great social skills are critical (Sales); you are too awkward to succeed there.

At an IQ of 130 – 139, you're somewhere in the middle.

6) Relevant Reading:

IQ and the Sexual Market (Black Label Logic)

Curse of the High IQ (Aaron Clarey)

The Inappropriately Excluded (Michael Ferguson)

TLDR: Extremely high IQ people often fail to make it into elite professions that require a high IQ, because they're socially awkward. They can't pass job interviews and play office politics.

CEOs Only Have IQ of 115 (Lion of the Blogosphere)

TLDR: The average IQ of a corporate executive is 115; they are smart but not geniuses.

7) Further Reflections:

7A) Illimitable Man:

"Being smart makes socialising harder, you have to learn how to talk like a moron (like Trump) to talk to average people, and use cunning and ego rather than logic (your primary way of thinking) in order to be psychologically attractive to women. Dumb people do this automatically."

"I know how to talk to people that don't value intelligence... Necessary life skill. If you say "smart sounding shit" to idiots, they think you're an idiot."

7B) WallStreetPlayboys

"If you're high IQ, low intelligence people will think you're crazy/stupid. Why? They cannot understand the meaning behind any of your words."

"99/100 times we will wager that someone with numeric skills (enough to become a quant or high-level engineer) has social issues. They consistently use logic to explain *emotional* behavior of humans... out of frustration they end up being outcasts, particularly when it comes to dating." -WSP, Efficiency

"No need for a Rabbi. You really just need to be certain you have strong social skills."

If you're the guy who got a 4.0, 7 internships... but you are extremely introverted... You're going to struggle and will not be in the position for a promotion. (Always exceptions). You will likely get ranked at the top performance

wise and get mediocre attitude assessments at best. Again, if you are not a likable cool person... It's going to mean more hours, more face time and likely less pay. (Pi-day sums it up pretty well, more work less pay less options)

The real person to fear within your associate/analyst class is the guy/girl who is somehow able to be part of a frat/sorority and maintains great grades and networks like a champ.

Bet on that guy/girl 100 times out of 100."

Deception and Secrets

machiavelliacorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Catastrophic Consequences
- 3) 2 Vulnerabilities
- 4) Limit Your Deceptions
- 5) Conscious Awareness of Secrets
- 6) Damage Control
- 7) Appear Transparent
- 8) Timeline for Secrets
- 9) Common Secrets
 - 9A) Politically Incorrect Opinions
 - 9B) Side Business
 - 9C) Performance Enhancing Drugs (PEDs)
- 10) You Don't Know Your Friends

1) Preamble:

“Courtiers are like magicians. They deceptively play with appearances, only letting those around them see what they want them to see. With so much deception and manipulation afoot, it is essential to keep people from seeing your tricks and glimpsing your sleight of hand. Never risk being caught in your maneuvers; never let people see your devices. If that happens you instantly pass in people’s perceptions from a courtier of great manners to a loathsome rogue. It is a delicate game you play; apply the utmost attention to covering your tracks...Our good name and reputation depend more on what is concealed than on what is revealed.” -48 Laws

Everyone has secrets, and everyone is living a double life to some degree.

The world is held up by lies; if everyone’s secrets were to all be revealed tomorrow morning, civilization might collapse.

On a micro level, every person has things that must be concealed because if they were to be revealed their reputation would be damaged; they would be disliked and at risk of ostracism.

Nobody on the planet has a reputation that would still be good if all their secrets were to be revealed. Generally speaking those who have sterling reputations for honesty and virtue are those who are most competent at concealing their sins.

2) Catastrophic Consequences:

Having one of your deceptions fall apart because one of your secrets is unveiled is a catastrophe. The catastrophe a businessman must avoid is bankruptcy; the catastrophe a machiavellian must avoid is having someone see through one of their deceptions.

It only takes one failed deception to make people distrust you; one deception falling apart is enough to destroy a lifelong reputation for honesty.

3) 2 Vulnerabilities:

There are only 2 ways a secret can be discovered; physical evidence and loose lips.

You must carefully hide or eliminate any physical evidence of your secrets; the specific actions that must be taken for the sake of this will vary from one secret to another.

For all secrets, you must keep your lips sealed and the specific action that must be taken for the sake of this is the same for every secret; *say nothing*.

Keeping one's lips sealed is a critical skill, and a surprisingly rare one. Most people feel a need to reveal their secrets to someone so that they can 'get it off their chest'. If this is you, don't bother with playing the game of power; you stand no chance of winning.

Beware of the grapevine; if you tell one person a secret, they will inevitably tell others and before you know it the whole world knows.

4) Limit Your Deceptions:

The more secrets you have the more points of vulnerability you have, since the more different ways there are that you could be discovered.

To do a thing is difficult, to do it and keep it secret is even more difficult; every secret you keep costs valuable time and energy that are spent on concealing evidence of the secret.

More secrets means more vulnerability, and less energy; as such keep the number of secrets you have down to the bare minimum that are absolutely necessary.

The more lies you tell, the greater the level of complexity your deception is, and the more difficult it is to keep up the charade. The more lies you tell, the more opportunities there are for you to get caught lying. As such keep the number of lies you tell to a minimum; never lie unnecessarily.

This may sound obvious, but it is critical; *as the number of lies you tell and secrets you have increases linearly, the complexity of the deceptions you must maintain increases exponentially, and thereby the probability of you failing to keep up the deception increases exponentially*. Concealing 3 secrets is exponentially more difficult than concealing 2.

The ideal number of secrets and lies would be zero. Sadly, for those who are contenders in the game of power this is not feasible.

Only lie if there is *real benefit* gained by lying, *and* you have good reason to believe the lie either cannot or will not be investigated.

5) Conscious Awareness of Secrets:

Most people subconsciously keep a list of secrets they must conceal, but as a contender in the game of power you must consciously keep such a list.

You must mentally map out all your secrets and the precise evidence you must either hide or destroy for the sake of concealing them.

In the highly likely event you one day attain a position of power (high status in the macro dominance hierarchy), *you will have enemies*. They will put significant effort into uncovering your secrets either to destroy your reputation, or to blackmail you into cooperating with their wishes.

6) Damage Control:

If it is inevitable that a secret will be discovered or revealed, it is probably better that you reveal it yourself. By doing this, you can make yourself seem honest and forthcoming (see Law 12).

You can also make it so that the secret is revealed at a time and place of your choosing; an environment that you can set up in advance and control. Better that, than it being revealed at a time you did not choose and in an environment that is entirely out of your control.

7) Appear Transparent:

“The secretiveness of privacy drives people mad, even if there is nothing to hide, the reluctance to reveal creates suspicion. To ensure the safety of a secret, the existence of the secret must be kept secret. As soon as somebody becomes aware of a secret they know not the nature of, they will be compelled to unearth it at any cost, thus threatening the secret.” -Illimitable Man

The degree of thoroughness required to hide or destroy all evidence that would reveal your secret is far greater than you think. Why? Because if a tiny piece of evidence is discovered that does not directly tell *what* the secret is, but it tells *that* there is a secret of some sort, the party who discovers it may have their curiosity sparked and eagerly dive into further investigation to discover precisely *what* the secret is.

Essentially, not only must your secrets be concealed, but the very fact *that* you have secrets must be concealed; if people suspect you have something to hide, it motivates them to dig deeper into your affairs to discover precisely what you are hiding.

It is both ludicrous and necessary; you must appear to have nothing to hide, while having something to hide, and while living in a world where 100% of people have something to hide.

8) Timeline for Secrets:

Some secrets need to be concealed forever, others do not.

There are those who will tell you “The truth will always come out eventually”.

They are wrong. It is possible to keep the truth a secret forever, or at least until after you are already dead and buried. Throughout history there have been millions of women who kept the true paternity of their children secret forever.

You should mentally categorize your secrets into *Forever* secrets (those that can be kept secret forever) and *Temporary* secrets (those that will inevitably be discovered, sooner or later).

You might think that having a ‘Temporary’ secret is tactical suicide; if your secret is at some point revealed, won’t this inevitably cause people to view you as dishonest, and never trust you again?

Not really. Or at least, in many cases it doesn’t matter. If you work as an employee at corporation Alpha, and are interviewing for a position at corporation Beta, you must keep the fact that you are engaged in job interviews at Beta a secret from everyone at Alpha, or you might get fired.

Maintaining this secret *forever* is both impossible and undesirable; if you get a job offer from Beta and accept it, you will intentionally announce it on your LinkedIn profile.

With every deception you enact, you must know what the timeline is. How long does this deception need to be maintained for, before the truth comes out? How long *can* this deception be maintained for; months, years, forever?

With ‘Temporary’ secrets, it is inevitable that the secret will be unveiled sooner or later; your impetus is to ensure nobody suspects a thing until it’s already too late.

9) Common Secrets:

What follows is a list of secrets that are common, at least in modern America.

9A) Politically Incorrect Opinions

If you have any opinions (or facts) in your mind that contradict the dominant ideology of the society you live in, you must keep them secret.

If you publicly say anything that goes against the dominant ideology of your society, you will be disliked and ostracized.

In the case of modern America, if you say anything that contradicts Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism, you may be fired from your job. See the fate of James DaMore (Google's Ideological Echo Chamber).

In Medieval Europe if you pointed out that believing in Jesus is as ludicrous as believing in Santa Clause, you could be imprisoned or executed (blasphemy laws).

9B) Side Business

If you have a side business, you must keep it secret from your employer.

Why?

Because employers want wage slaves who are completely financially dependent on them; if your employer knew you had income that was independent of them they would view you as a worker who does not take their corporate career seriously and fire you, or at best keep you around but never promote you up the hierarchy.

9C) Performance Enhancing Drugs (PEDs)

At the elite level of every profession, the use of performance enhancing drugs is common.

That said, any performance enhancing drugs you use must be kept secret. If it were made public knowledge that you use PEDs it could easily lead to you being fired from your job.

10) You Don't Know Your Friends:

You don't know those closest to you nearly as well as you think you do.

Think of all the things you have kept secret from those closest to you; understand that they have kept just as much secret from you.

In the words of Baltasar Gracian, **“We belong to none and none to us, entirely. Neither relationship nor friendship nor the most intimate connection is sufficient to effect this. To give one's whole confidence is quite different from giving one's regard. The closest intimacy has its exceptions, without which the laws of friendship would be broken. The friend always keeps one secret to himself, and even the son always hides something from his father. Some things are kept from one that are revealed to another and vice-versa. In this way one reveals all and conceals all, by making a distinction among the persons with whom we are connected.”**

Often a person will reveal all their secrets, but different secrets to different people. They tell a third of their secrets to their lover, a third to their friend, and a third to a stranger on a plane who they will never see again. Nobody ever reveals *all* their secrets to one person.

There is a significant difference between the version of you that your closest friend see's and the version of you that your spouse see's. There is a difference between the version of you that your spouse see's, and the version of you that your boss and subordinates see.

In the words of Frank Underwood, “There is so little she'll ever reveal to me, or I to her... ***We are nothing more or less than what we choose to reveal.***...what I am to Claire is not what I am to Zoey, just as Zoey is not to me what she is to her father.”

Relationships, Machiavellian Perspective

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Exchange of Value
- 2) High Value Narcissists
- 3) Ending Relationships
- 4) People as Tools
- 5) Know What You Want
- 6) Power Imbalances
 - 6A) Financial Dependency
- 7) Loyalty
 - 7A) Loyalty Testing, Simulate Your Downfall
- 8) Pareto Distributed Contacts
- 9) No Losers
- 10) Further Reflections
 - 10A) Illimitable Man
 - 10B) Baltasar Gracian

1) Exchange of Value:

Every relationship is nothing more than an exchange of value. In every relationship, each party gives certain benefits and inflicts certain costs upon the other.

One cost that both parties inevitably impose on the other is lost time and energy. Other possible costs include annoyance (cortisol/stress), lost money, and risk of negative events occurring. Possible benefits include money gained, information, and favors or assistance that could range from trivial to life saving. For non-psychopathic readers, enjoyment of the other person's company or affection also counts as a benefit.

With every relationship in your life, mentally map out the benefits you derive from it and the costs you incur because of it. End any relationship where the cost exceeds the benefit. Yes this sounds obvious, yet many people waste decades of their life maintaining relationships they'd be better off without.

Some people are easily satisfied; the standards you must meet and the costs you must incur for the sake of keeping them satisfied are reasonable. Others are difficult to satisfy; the standards that must be met to satisfy them are rigorous, and ever more numerous, and ever more not straightforward.

Generally speaking, those who are difficult to satisfy are more trouble than they are worth; you'd be better off without them.

Beware of exceptions; occasionally there will be someone who is difficult to satisfy, but who is worth it. The costs they impose are immense, but the benefit they give is even more immense.

You will likely find that the person who yields the most benefit to your life and the person who imposes the greatest cost upon your life are the same person.

Keep the costs you impose upon others (the time you take from them and the headache you inflict upon them) to a bare minimum. If you subject a person to unnecessary annoyance, it is inevitable that sooner or later they will end their relationship with you because they sense you are more trouble than you're worth.

If they are vengeful, their annoyance and resentment will fester. Sooner or later they will explode in rage, or even worse they will passive aggressively sabotage you. If they are calm and rational (a rare type), they will simply cease

association with you.

2) High Value Narcissists:

Very few people can handle being in a position of very high status without becoming an annoying narcissist. This is more than just a philosophical musing; the practical consequence is that the most powerful people in your contact list (your most valuable contacts) are going to disproportionately be annoying narcissists.

This minor annoyance is simply something you must tolerate; refusing to associate with any man who has narcissistic tendencies would mean giving up a majority of your most powerful contacts, an unacceptable sacrifice.

3) Ending Relationships:

When you end a relationship with someone, do so as gently and as politely as possible. If logistically doable, don't formally end the relationship; simply cease contacting them. Never end a relationship rudely or harshly; there's no reason to make enemies unnecessarily.

Beware of closing costs. When you end a relationship, there may be costs you get hit with *because* you ended the relationship. A common closing cost is ill will motivating the party you are ceasing association with to seek revenge.

Every person in your life should have a clear purpose; if they have no clear purpose, eliminate them from your schedule; as a person on the quest to seize power you can't afford to waste time on people who don't matter.

4) People as Tools:

People are like tools; you must use them for their correct purpose. If you use a tool for the wrong purpose you will experience disaster. Similarly, if you use a person for the wrong purpose you will also experience disaster.

Examples:

The correct purpose for your co-workers, bosses, subordinates, and all business contacts: making money

The wrong purpose of your business contacts: friendship and 'emotional support', romance

If you look for emotional support from your business contacts they will at best think you are awkward, and most likely think you are pathetic.

If you become romantically involved with one of your business contacts you are headed for disaster (see the 'MeToo Movement').

The correct purpose for your girlfriend/wife:

Romance

The wrong purpose for your girlfriend/wife:

Rigorous Logical Reasoning. Talking about controversial topics.

If you talk to your girlfriend/wife about controversial topics, or even an intellectual topic that isn't all that controversial, you will find that she has no interest in it and considers you bringing up the topic to be weird and annoying.

On the off chance she is smart enough to understand what you are talking about, she will be enamored with whatever the dominant ideology of your society is, and if you say anything against the dominant ideology of the society you live in she will be disgusted by you.

If you live in a society where Christianity is the dominant ideology, and you point out that believing there is a god with a son named Jesus is as delusional as believing that Santa Clause will climb down your chimney on Christmas,

she will dislike and ostracize you.

Business contacts and girlfriends/wives are used as examples for a simple reason; they are the two groups that most men will screwup with. Many foolishly go to their business contacts looking for emotional support when times are tough, causing their contacts to view them as pathetic (see the essay 'Life as a Man'). Others will attempt to engage their girlfriend/wife in deep intellectual conversation, only to find she is too dumb to understand what they're saying, or smart enough to understand what they're saying but enraged whenever they say something politically incorrect (something that contradicts the dominant ideology of the society they live in).

5) Know What You Want:

Consciously calculating what it is you want from someone, what the purpose of your relationship with them is, makes it immensely easier to know how to interact with them and what precise words to say.

6) Power Imbalances:

In most relationships, the power dynamic is governed by dependency; whichever party needs the other less is the party that wields power.

If you need them more than they need you, they wield power over you. If they need you more than you need them, you wield power over them. If you both need each other intensely, or you both have little or no need for each other, your power levels are equal.

The power dynamic being governed by dependency is true of almost all types of relationships; business, romantic, even friendship (see Law 11 for details).

Do what you can to minimize the degree to which you are dependent on others, and maximize the degree to which they are dependent on you.

6A) Financial Dependency:

Financial dependency (one party needing another for money or other financial resources) keeps together far more relationships than anyone would care to admit.

Most employees hate their employers, but continue to associate with them because they need their wages in order to survive.

Many women throughout history have despised their husbands, but continued their marriages because they were economically dependent on their husbands (in America from 1970 – 2020, this has no longer been the case since the legal system has allowed women to divorce their husbands and continue extracting money from them via alimony and child support).

Financial dependency keeps many parent-child relationships together; it seems to be the case that children who have plenty of money are far more likely to become estranged from their parents than children who are poor, because financial necessity does not compel them to continue association.

Perhaps the most bitter pill is this; the game of power never stops, and indeed there are power struggles even between those who love each other.

7) Loyalty:

“...besides your closest friends and loved one's, it's every man for himself in this world.” -Felix Dennis

Most contacts have zero loyalty to you; if they calculate that the benefits you deliver to them is less than the cost you impose upon them, they will abandon you without hesitation. They care about their own interests, not your well being.

The number of people who will stay loyal to you and continue helping you even when they have nothing to potentially gain from doing so is less than 5; if you were to carry out suicide tomorrow, there are less than 5 people on the planet who would actually care.

Be good to these people; they are worth more than any worldly wealth you might ever gain. There are many things money can buy, but real loyalty is not one of them.

You might think the only way to find out who is truly loyal to you is to experience catastrophe and see who continues to stand by you, but you would be wrong.

7A) Loyalty Testing, Simulate Your Downfall:

“Simulate your downfall to see who folds and sells you out. Loyalty is gauged in the face of failure, not success.” -Illimitable Man

It is often possible to *simulate* your downfall; make it look like everything is falling apart, when in reality everything is perfectly fine.

Do this, see who stays loyal, and who abandons you.

The appearance of catastrophe has to last for at least a few months. With most of the mercenaries surrounding you, it is unlikely that they will abandon you the day after your downfall comes; for most it will take at least a few weeks.

If a person stays loyal even after 3 months of you appearing to have been destroyed, you can safely assume their loyalty is real.

This may sound like a drastic and unnecessary exercise in deception in return for nothing. In reality, it is a deception that serves a critical purpose; finding out who the real loyalists are.

You cannot build an empire on the backs of mercenaries. History is filled with kings who were destroyed by their closest allies abandoning or outright backstabbing them.

Betrayal from your allies is far more dangerous than any attack from an enemy. In the case of backstabbing, the closer someone is to you the easier it will be for them to destroy you since they are more familiar with your vulnerabilities than anyone else. In the case of abandonment, the closer someone is to you the more you depend on them, and so it is all the more damage that their disappearance will cause.

It may be a hassle, but it is necessary; simulate your downfall to test and verify the loyalty of those closest to you. A man seeking power who doesn't know who the loyalists in his contact list are is like a man building a house without first ensuring the foundation is secure.

There is one limiting factor; the downfall you simulate must be *easily reversible*, so that you can make everything appear normal (good) after you are done with the simulation. Make sure that when initiating a simulation of your downfall, you don't inadvertently cause your *actual* downfall.

Until you have done a thorough simulation (or experience an actual downfall), assume that everyone is disloyal unless proven otherwise. Continuing association with them is perfectly fine (practical necessity will always demand it), however you must always be consciously aware of their disloyalty; don't trust them too much, and tactically prepare yourself as much as possible for the possibility of them suddenly abandoning you.

In the event you attain incredibly high status and simulating your own downfall without making it an actuality would be practically impossible, then the only people you can consider loyalists are those who were loyal to you *before* you attained high status. If you go from rags to riches, the only people you can fully trust are those who were loyal to you even when you were wearing rags.

If you have verified that a person is loyal to you then keep them around forever, even if they're completely useless.

Incredibly few people are trustworthy; if a person *is* trustworthy that alone makes them very valuable, even if they have no other notable skills or assets.

Note that when someone abandons you, they usually won't give the real reason why; instead, they will give a manufactured reason that makes them look good, or at least not as bad as a selfish mercenary. For example, if you suddenly lose your job or business, your girlfriend/wife is likely to leave you since your status in the hierarchy has dramatically dropped (you no longer appeal to her hypergamy). She won't say "I am leaving you because I am convinced I can find another man with higher status than you." Instead, she will say something like "The 'spark' isn't there anymore. I just don't think we're right for each other."

8) Pareto Distributed Importance of Contacts:

Within your contact list, there will be a pareto distribution of how useful people are. Say you have 1,000 contacts. You will find that over the course of a lifetime, 10 of them will be absolutely critical, 90 will be somewhat useful, and 900 of them will give very little benefit.

How much time you are willing to allocate to maintain a relationship with a person should be proportional to how useful they are likely to be. Obviously there is the risk of spending too little time with a person, them forgetting your existence, and then thinking it weird when you ask them for a favor. On the other hand, if you spend too much time with a person it may annoy them.

There is a delicate balance to maintain; the more powerful the person, the greater the danger is that you will annoy them by spending too much time with them.

How much energy you spend on analyzing a person's psychological profile should be proportionate to how important they are to your life. Cold reading is enough for people who are inconsequential to your life, however for your most critical contacts (say the top 10) you must do *extensive* warm reading.

For your boss or a potential spouse, spend hours listing out on paper aspects of their personality that are unusual. For the janitor who cleans the floors of your office, spend zero energy analyzing their personality; they don't matter.

9) No Losers:

As a man on a quest for power, you cannot afford to waste time maintaining relationships with people who are useless; do not allow losers to occupy space in your contact list or schedule.

The only exception is if you know a loser who is loyal to you; someone who you can trust. This alone makes them exceptionally valuable (see the 'Loyalty' section above).

Disclaimer: You are likely to drastically overestimate how much you should trust a person who has far less worldly wealth (money, power, status) than you. That 'trustworthy loser' in your contact list may put a knife in your back. They will be prone to envy you, and may actually be more likely to harm you than a stranger who knows nothing about you. Joe Orton learned this the hard way (see Law 46 for details).

10) Further Reflections:

10A) Illimitable Man:

"Give people plenty of opportunities to betray you. Extend trust they haven't earned over not so trivial but tolerable losses, and wait to see if they honor your trust, or dishonor it.

If they cut and run and betray, what you lost was the price paid to ascertain who they are."

10B) Baltasar Gracian:

"Few are the friends of a man's self, most are merely the friends of his circumstances."

The Nature of Power

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Power Imbalances
- 3) Top Down Exploitation
- 4) Commonality of Conflict
- 5) Rules, Dealing With Superiors
 - 5A) Hide Your Displeasure, Fake Your Contentment, Follow Orders
 - 5B) Charm Works, Intimidation is Suicide
 - 5C) Never Outshine (Law 1)
 - 5D) Be Calm and Confident
 - 5E) Appear Receptive to Their Advice
 - 5F) Criticize Gently and Indirectly
 - 5G) Regulate Your Speech
 - 5H) Analyze Their Personality
 - 5I) Reflections on Superiors
- 6) Rules, Dealing With Subordinates
 - 6A) Hide Your Displeasure, Fake Your Contentment
 - 6B) Necessary Tyranny Only
 - 6C) Charm Often, Intimidate Rarely
 - 6D) Regulate Your Speech
 - 6E) Don't Punish Truth-tellers
 - 6F) Don't Trust Them
- 7) Monitoring Behavior
- 8) High Status Wins Favors, Low Status Gives Invisibility
- 9) Power and Cortisol
- 10) Epilogue

1) Preamble:

“...an essence of power that has yet to be fully articulated.” -The 48 Laws of Power

Contained within this piece is wisdom that most people can feel subconsciously, but few have ever articulated consciously.

2) Power Imbalances:

A ‘superior’ is simply someone who wields more power over you than you do over them, while a ‘subordinate’ is someone whom you wield more power over than they do over you.

A power imbalance can be defined as the power the other party wields over you, minus the power you wield over them.

This begs the question *what gives one party power over another?*

Most forms of power boil down to either a *carrot* or a *stick*. A carrot is a potential reward; *do as I say or I will deny you X*. A stick is a potential harm; *do as I say or you will suffer Y*.

A steep power imbalance is one where the gap between the power of one party and the other is so big that it's

undeniably. A shallow power imbalance is one where there *is* a gap between the power of one party and the other, but the gap isn't obvious; it is quite plausible to maintain the pretense that the power of each party is equal. *Zero* power imbalance is a case where the power each party wields over the other is equal or close to equal.

In modern America, carrot power is far more common than stick power. An ancient king ruled over peasants by saying "Do what I say, or you will be killed" (extreme stick power). A modern capitalist rules over his wage slaves by saying "Do what I say, or you will be denied your wages, and starve to death" (extreme carrot power).

Thinking of carrot power as gentle and stick power as harsh is foolish. Both carrot and stick power can have deadly consequences.

In any relationship where there is a steep power imbalance, one party is a master and the other is a slave.

If you are ever in a situation where another person wields the power to destroy your life, and you wield no significant power over them, you are a slave to them. In modern America nobody is ever called a 'slave', but there are plenty of employees who are slaves in everything but name.

It should be noted that the **perceived** balance of power is what determines how people behave, not the actual balance of power.

3) Top Down Exploitation:

It is inevitable that those towards the top of a dominance hierarchy wield more power over those towards the bottom than vice versa; indeed in some sense this is what it means to be towards the 'top' of a hierarchy.

It is also inevitable that those towards the top will exploit those towards the bottom for their own gain, simply because they can.

Many communists blame this on capitalism, calling it 'Capitalist Exploitation', but this is to drastically underestimate how deeply rooted the problem is.

Top Down Exploitation is a feature of every society (macro dominance hierarchy), whether capitalist, feudalist, socialist, or communist.

The *degree* of exploitation may vary from one society to another, but the fact of its existence does not.

4) Commonality of Conflict:

If 2 people with power levels far apart encounter each other the probability of conflict or argument is very low. The less powerful person will instinctively submit to the will of the more powerful person, lest they face the wrath of the more powerful person.

Conflict is far more likely when 2 people of roughly equal power encounter one another; each person could conceivably win the conflict, so both are willing to fight.

Middle managers starting arguments with CEOs is rare, but middle managers starting arguments with other middle managers is common.

5) Rules, Dealing With Superiors:

What follows are guidelines for interacting with your superiors (those who wield more power over you than you do over them).

Most of these are things most people do instinctively, however it is useful to be consciously aware of them.

5A) Hide Your Displeasure, Fake Your Contentment, Follow Orders

"It is foolish to get angry with people whose power is so great that you can not hope to win. Even if they offend you, you must grin and bear it." -Francesco Guicciardini

When in the presence of your superiors, you must always appear to be happy or at least neutral. You must also follow every order they give you.

Never complain or express any displeasure. Never express any anger or disdain towards one of your superiors. Violate this, and it is likely to annoy one of your superiors enough such that they will use whatever power they wield over you to wreck you.

Expressing anger or displeasure towards a superior is tactical suicide; it sounds obvious, yet many have ruined their lives by doing this.

In the venue of Office Politics in particular, you must hide your displeasure and fake your contentment so that your superiors view you as being a worker with a 'good attitude'; someone worthy of promotion.

5B) Charm Works, Intimidation is Suicide

When dealing with superiors, charm and persuasion are the only tools available to you.

Attempting to use intimidation on a superior for the sake of coercing them into cooperation is tactical suicide. Your petty attempt will annoy them, possibly so much that they use the power they wield over you to wreck you.

5C) Never Outshine Them (Law 1)

If it is ever the case that you have a superior who dislikes you and there isn't an apparent reason why, it is most likely because they feel you have not been sufficiently obsequious in your dealings with them.

5D) Be Calm and Confident

There is a paradox. You must not outshine your superiors, but on the other hand if you look like a nervous wreck it makes them perceive you are someone unworthy of their respect.

Within the venue of Office Politics this is fatal since it makes your superiors perceive you are unworthy of promotion.

Your superiors should perceive you are *calm* and confident, but not arrogant.

When meeting an immensely powerful person (billionaire), *don't* give them hero worship. Express modest admiration for their accomplishments, but don't crumble at their feet the way most people do. This causes them to view you as respectable; a

worthy courtier, rather than a common peasant.

5E) Appear Receptive to Their Advice

Most advice from most people is garbage. However, when someone gives you advice you must *appear* receptive to it; if you appear unreceptive to their advice they will feel insulted.

This is all the more true when dealing with a superior.

5F) Criticize Gently and Indirectly

Generally speaking when dealing with superiors you shouldn't criticize them at all, even if they are engaging in foolishness.

The upside reward of correcting their behavior is small, whereas the downside risk of them disliking you and punishing you is catastrophic.

There may however be times when some correction is necessary, lest their foolishness lead to you suffering as collateral damage. In such cases, deliver criticism as gently and politely as possible.

5G) Regulate Your Speech

In the presence of superiors, every word that comes out of your mouth must be calculated (use PowerTalk).

The stakes are very high; say one wrong thing, one phrase that offends their sensibilities, and it could lead to them using the power they wield to wreck you.

5H) Analyze Their Personality

Whenever interacting with a superior, you should be analyzing their body language, vocal tonality, and psychological profile as deeply as possible.

You 'should' do this with every person you encounter, but especially so with your superiors; they are worth the effort expended on such analysis, because they wield immense power over your fate in life.

5I) Reflections on Superiors

These guidelines may sound obvious, yet many otherwise intelligent people destroy their lives by violating them. Many will fail to hide their displeasure, since some combination of annoyance and ego compels them to express displeasure and even anger towards a superior.

Others will fail to sufficiently filter their speech, and many put no effort into consciously analyzing the personalities of their superiors.

Of the guidelines listed above by far the most important is this: *hide your displeasure, fake your contentment, and follow orders.*

If a superior rebukes you for a mistake you must appear to be apologetic and receptive to any corrective advice they give, even if the mistake exists only in their imagination and their advice is useless. Honesty is not a good strategy; faking your contentment and agreement is.

6) Rules, Dealing With Subordinates:

“It is unwise to insult or offend the taste of people...even if they are below or equal to you. It is always beneficial to play the obliging courtier, even when you are not serving a master.” –Law 24

Dealing with subordinates is not nearly as high stakes as dealing with superiors; by definition your subordinates don't wield the power to destroy you.

Nonetheless, some general guidelines are useful.

6A) Hide Your Displeasure, Fake Your Contentment

When interacting with superiors this is mandatory, with subordinates it is optional but highly recommended. Don't express any displeasure towards your subordinates unnecessarily.

Some subordinates will hate you and desire to harm you simply due to the fact that you are their superior. However, if you express any displeasure towards them unnecessarily, you only increase the percentage of subordinates who fall into this category.

6B) Necessary Tyranny Only

Some tyranny may be necessary for the sake of enforcing order and making things run smoothly. However, if you are unnecessarily tyrannical you will cause your subordinates to hate you more than they otherwise would.

Too much tyranny breeds rebellion because your subordinates cannot tolerate living under your rule. Too little tyranny breeds disobedience since you appear weak. A balance must be struck.

6C) Charm Often, Intimidate Rarely

When interacting with superiors charm is your only weapon; intimidation is out of the question. When dealing with subordinates, charm and intimidation are both tools at your disposal.

Use charm as often as possible and intimidation as rarely as possible; you want to minimize the percentage of subordinates who hate you, and the degree to which they hate you.

6D) Regulate Your Speech

This is critical with subordinates just as with superiors.

Beware that every word you say in front of one of your subordinates may later be repeated in front of others, including one of your superiors. Operate under the assumption that your subordinates have loose lips; most of them will.

6E) Don't Punish Truthtellers

If you punish your subordinates for telling you the truth because the truth offends your sensibilities, you will in a Pavlovian manner train your subordinates to be yes men who only tell you what you want to hear. This will prevent you from getting an accurate view of reality, and have catastrophic consequences.

6F) Don't Trust Them

Your subordinates will be far nicer to you than most people. Why? They are attempting to charm you, to win your favor. Don't fall for this. They are not loyal to you; only your power.

This may sound obvious, yet there are plenty of otherwise intelligent billionaires who have had people kissing their feet for so long they have become convinced that people everywhere love them for their personality.

7) Monitoring Behavior:

People instinctively monitor their behavior (body language and speech) when in the presence of superiors, but less so when in the presence of subordinates, and not at all when alone.

One consequence of this is that a person's subordinates usually have a far more accurate view of their personality than their superiors; their superiors see a mask, whereas their subordinates see their real self, or at least a mask that is less thick.

8) High Status Wins Favors, Low Status Gives Invisibility

Generally speaking it is wise to make people perceive you are as high status as possible since it makes them more eager to do you favors and more hesitant to harm you (since they assume you wield the power to repay a favor in a meaningful way, and also the power to retaliate in a meaningful way).

That said, keep in mind that there are situations where it is advantageous to make people perceive you are low status; it gives you a cloak of invisibility.

When people perceive you are low status (low in the hierarchy), they pay very little attention to you and they monitor their behavior very little when in your presence. This can be advantageous for intelligence gathering; you are invisible, and your targets put no great effort into concealing their real selves.

9) Power and Cortisol:

Interacting with a superior is an intrinsically stress inducing experience (cortisol increasing). Why? Because even if the superior is kindhearted and means you no harm, your hindbrain gets the message "This person is dangerous; they have the power to destroy me!"

Interacting with a superior is stressful for the same reason that having a venomous snake sleeping on your chest is stressful; regardless of whether or not they intend to harm you, they have the potential to destroy you if they become so inclined.

The higher you are in the dominance hierarchy, the less often you will be interacting with superiors. The lower you are in the dominance hierarchy, the more often you will be interacting with superiors. This may explain why people located toward the top of hierarchies are far less stressed than those towards the bottom; it is less often that they are subjected to the cortisol inducing experience of interacting with superiors.

10) Epilogue:

Power is fickle; a person who is powerless today may be in a position of power tomorrow, and vice versa.

As such be careful with how you treat those below you in the hierarchy; the day may come when the tables are turned, and people remember past harms for a long time.

Law 43, Maximize Your Allies

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Law 43 Addendums
- 3) Charm > Intimidation
- 4) Maintain The Pretense You Like Them
- 5) Grant Graciously, Decline Politely

1) Preamble:

What follows are some reflections on Law 43, “Work on the Hearts and Minds of Others”. Most of this wisdom will sound obvious, yet in real life you will notice that many fail to apply it particularly when there is cortisol rushing through their veins.

2) Law 43 Addendums:

In the long term it is in your best interest to have as many allies as possible and as few enemies as possible.

Never make enemies unnecessarily, and make allies as often as possible.

3) Charm > Intimidation

Use charm as often as possible, use intimidation as rarely as possible.

When you use charm you win an ally, regardless of whether or not you succeed in getting their immediate cooperation. When you use intimidation you get another enemy, regardless of whether or not you succeed in getting their immediate cooperation.

Always try charm before resorting to intimidation. If charm works, then you’ve won. If charm fails, then you must decide whether or not the matter at hand is worth the risk of gaining an additional enemy by using intimidation.

Starting with charm and then switching to intimidation can work very effectively; you can go from being charming to being terrifying in a nanosecond.

The reverse is not true; starting with intimidation, and then attempting to switch to charm, is ludicrous. Once you attempt to use intimidation, the target will inevitably dislike you; trying to charm them at that point is a lost cause.

Charm can be used effectively on both superiors and subordinates; on those who wield power over you, and those who you wield power over.

Intimidation can only be used on subordinates and equals, not superiors. If you attempt to use intimidation on a superior you are committing tactical suicide; they will be annoyed by you, and use whatever power they wield over you to wreck you.

Whether someone is a ‘superior’ or a ‘subordinate’ in terms of tactical consequences is not a matter of what official rank they hold, but rather how much power they wield over you minus how much power you wield over them.

4) Maintain The Pretense You Like Them

“If you dislike a man, do your best to hide it. In ways you could not possibly foresee you may need his help, and you can hardly get it if he knows you dislike him.

On many occasions I needed the help of a man who I despised, and he believing that I liked him, or at least

being unaware of the truth, served me readily.” -Francesco Guicciardini

A critical part of charm is this; maintain the pretense that you like every person you meet. If you dislike someone, *hide it*.

Never express a dislike of someone or anger towards someone, unless you have something to gain by doing so.

Stroking your ego or venting your anger does not qualify as ‘something to gain’.

5) Grant Graciously, Decline Politely

Whenever possible, do someone a favor. If someone asks you for a favor and it will cost you very little to oblige, then do so. In ways you cannot possibly foresee you may need a favor from them, and they’re unlikely to grant it if you previously denied a favor they requested.

Whenever you refuse to do a favor or you reject an offer of any kind, *do so as gently and as politely as possible*. Never reject an offer harshly or with an insult.

If you do someone a favor, but you do it grudgingly and with grumbling, they will not feel grateful; they will feel annoyed. As such, either grant the favor graciously or politely refuse.

Never grant a favor grudgingly, or refuse harshly.

Life as a Man

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) SPEZ
 - 2A) Success Object
 - 2B) Pareto Distribution
 - 2C) Expendable
 - 2D) Zero Sum
- 3) Capitalism As Status Competition
- 4) Epilogue

1) Preamble:

There are certain conditions adult men face that adult women and children do not. These conditions can be summarized by the acronym SPEZ

2) SPEZ:

2A) Success Object

“As a man, there is no price too high to pay for success, for failure is death emotionally, spiritually, metaphysically and reproductively. You are a success object. Never forget it. Accept you are powerless to change it, for nature has designated it.” -Illimitable Man

Women and children are loved unconditionally, men are loved under the condition that they are successful. If you are a man who is unsuccessful, nobody will care whether you live or die.

Generally speaking success is measured in worldly wealth: money, power, status.

There are many women who make the choice to pursue success.. Men have no choice.

2B) Pareto Distribution

Among men you will find that success is pareto distributed; a minority of men are winners living towards the top of the macro dominance hierarchy (relatively rich, high status, powerful), while a majority of men are losers living towards the bottom of the macro dominance hierarchy (relatively poor, low status, powerless).

The overwhelming statistical probability is that you will lose, but in the unlikely event that you win you will win big. Your life is in some sense a very long version of ‘The Hunger Games’.

Do you ever get the feeling that the Gods are laughing at you, and are placing bets on how long it will take for you to realize that you’re doomed?

Men living towards the bottom of dominance hierarchies have this feeling every minute of their lives.

2C) Expendable

As an adult male, your life is expendable.

The lives of females are reproductively critical, while the lives of males are reproductively expendable.

If you are suffering for whatever reason, you will be granted far less compassion and assistance than a woman or child would be, and this will be the case regardless of whether you are successful or unsuccessful.

Women have an instinct to protect children. Men have an instinct to protect women and children. Nobody has an instinct to protect men; as a man you must look out for yourself because nobody else will bother with saving you.

There is a point in your life, probably around the age of 16, when people will stop viewing you as a boy and start viewing you as a man. This transformation is often quite painful, since as a boy your life was viewed as critical but as a man your life is viewed as expendable.

“Men remember being boys. Man has a lucid perspective in comparing the diminished affection of his adulthood to the greater bounty of his childhood. Women do not experience such a significant loss of affection.” -Illimitable Man

2D) Zero Sum

Success is an intrinsically zero sum game in that a man is only considered ‘successful’ if he is *more* successful than other men.

A billionaire has high status because most men are *not* billionaires; if we created a society where everyone was a billionaire, a billionaire would have only mediocre status.

In the pursuit of success (worldly wealth) other men are not your allies; they are your competitors.

There are those who will claim to not care about their relative level of wealth, status, or power; they claim to only care about their absolute level of wealth.

They are lying, mostly to themselves. Whether you admit it or not you *do* care intensely about your relative status. There is a counter in your brain that tracks your relative status in the hierarchy you live in. The human species evolved to have this counter before it evolved the ability to breath; tracking your status is more natural to your mind than breathing.

Win or lose your life will be a relentless war; if you are low status you will be spiritually tortured by your failure, if you are high status you will have to endlessly fight to maintain your position.

The competition for status (the game of power) will continue until death; until then, perform well to live well.

3) Capitalism As Status Competition:

One underappreciated virtue of capitalism is this; it gives men a venue where they can compete for power and status that is productive rather than destructive.

For most of human history, the way men competed for status was warfare; whoever was the best at killing people was the winner.

Capitalism, a competition where whoever can make the most money is the winner, is certainly a better way of running civilization than endless combat.

4) Conclusion:

If you are a man, never go looking for sympathy. It is unlikely to win you assistance; for more likely is that it will win you scorn. Women and children who are weak are helped, men who are weak are scorned.

If as a man you are the beneficiary of some form of altruism, be eternally grateful to the person who helped you; such people are extraordinarily rare.

Ideal Psychological Profiles, Different Professions

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Universal Success Predictors
- 3) Typical Psychological Profiles
 - 3A) Typical Personalities in Engineering
 - 3B) Typical Personalities in Finance/Law/Sales
- 4) IQ and Social Awkwardness
- 5) Ideal Psychological Profiles
 - 5A) Ideal Personality for Engineering
 - 5B) Ideal Personality for Finance/Law/Sales
- 6) Genius and Insanity
- 7) Drugs (Performance Enhancing)
- 8) Addendum, Quant Funds
- 9) Relevant Reading

1) Preamble:

“Analyze what high performers do, and adapt it, copy it, or reverse engineer it.” -Illimitable Man

A question as old as time; why do some succeed while others fail? There is no surefire recipe for success in every domain of performance, but for specific domains of performance there are some factors that reliably increase the probability of success (henceforth referred to as ‘success predictors’).

Within this essay the psychological profiles that are *typical* for people working in Engineering and Finance/Law/Sales will be covered, and the psychological profiles that are *ideal* for succeeding in these professions will also be covered.

You will find that many people at the top of these professions have psychological profiles very close or identical to the ‘ideal’ detailed within this essay; that’s why they were able to make it to the top.

Finance, Law, and Sales (abbreviated as F/L/S) are grouped together because the traits needed to succeed in these professions are very similar; if you are a great banker, chances are you could have also become a great lawyer or a great salesman.

2) Universal Success Predictors:

There are certain success predictors that affect performance in every profession, from banking to farming. They include Energy/Industriousness, Stress Tolerance/Neuroticism, and Physical Attractiveness.

For every profession the ideal for performance is to have incredibly high energy levels so you can work 100 hours a week, a high stress tolerance (low neuroticism) so that you’re calm even when there are bullets flying, and to be as good looking as George Clooney so that you benefit from the ‘halo effect’ (good looking men are more likely to be hired, promoted, and win clients than ugly men).

The probability of meeting this ideal is zero, but get as close as you can.

Do what is within your power to maximize your energy levels, maximize your stress tolerance (minimize your neuroticism), and maximize your physical appearance. No matter what profession you work in, optimizing these variables will increase your chances of success.

3) Typical Psychological Profiles:

Spend some time in the corporate world and you will notice that there are certain personalities typical of different professions.

3A) Typical Personalities in Engineering

Most engineers have a psychological profile that looks something like:

IQ of 120 – 135: Very smart, but not quite a genius

Low Cunning: Somewhat socially awkward. Bad at charming people. Bad at reading body language and vocal tonality.

Low Extroversion: Engineers tend to be more introverted than average. They aren't nervous or fearful of social interaction, but they are annoyed by it; they don't enjoy vapid conversation about inconsequential matters the way an extroverted person would.

Low Agreeableness: For some reason engineers tend to be less agreeable than most people. They aren't psychopathic, but they are somewhat callous and blunt.

Ugly: For some reason those working in engineering tend to not be very physically attractive. I sense it comes from them not putting effort into keeping up their physical appearance. Perhaps it is an extension of their lack of cunning to not care about such superficialities.

As part of low cunning and low agreeableness being in the same person, engineers tend to be *blunt* with their speech. They use StraightTalk, not PowerTalk. They say what they actually think without filter, even when they know it is likely to offend others.

3B) Typical Personalities in Finance/Law/Sales

Those who work in Finance, Law, and Sales have notably similar personalities:

IQ of 110 – 120: Bright, but not nearly as smart as engineers.

High Cunning: People working in F/L/S have good social skills; they are good at charming people, persuading people, reading body language and vocal tonality, lying, and detecting when someone else is lying. Their basic job duties require an above average level of cunning.

Low Agreeableness: The work in F/L/S involves endless zero sum competition and zero sum negotiation. Highly agreeable people cannot tolerate this (they find it to be demoralizing) and get washed out of these professions.

Low Neuroticism: The work in F/L/S is stressful; cortisol inducing. People who rank high on neuroticism can't tolerate this, and are washed out of these professions.

Good Looking: Those working in F/L/S tend to be good looking. This comes from them putting conscious effort into keeping up their physical appearance; they know they have to look good to charm people effectively.

4) IQ and Social Awkwardness:

You might think that smarter is always better, but this is wrong.

There are ways having an extremely high IQ can affect performance negatively. Most notably, people with off the chart IQ scores tend to be hopelessly socially awkward.

Many works of fiction have been created making fun of this dynamic; the TV show 'The Big Bang Theory' is an iconic example. Anecdotally, we have all encountered people (usually men) who are intelligent enough to be great engineers yet who are also incapable of charming people.

In an article entitled '**The Inappropriately Excluded**' The Polymath tells us that the ideal IQ for maximizing _____

income is somewhere in the range of 130-135, and at an IQ of 140+ both income and the probability of attaining professional success dramatically decrease.

At an IQ of 120 a person is smart and socially normal (90th percentile intelligence). At 130, a person is extremely smart and substantially socially awkward (98th percentile intelligence). At 140+ a person is a genius and is also hopelessly socially awkward (99.9th percentile intelligence).

In a profession where technical skills mean everything and people skills mean nothing, more IQ points is always a good thing. 130 is better than 120, and 140 is better than 130. Software engineering is a notable example.

In a profession where *both* technical skills and people skills matter, a stratospheric IQ is a disadvantage; to have an IQ of 140+ is a liability. An ideal IQ would be in the range of 120-129; smart, but not to the point of being a socially awkward nerd. Finance, Law, and Sales are all examples of such professions.

5) Ideal Psychological Profiles:

5A) Ideal Personality for Engineering

Ultra High IQ (140+): The smarter the better. If having a stratospheric IQ causes one to be hopelessly socially awkward, then so be it. In engineering technical skills are what matter, not people skills.

High Openness: Rigorous engineering work (R&D to design new technology) involves real creativity, not simply following pre-ordained rules.

Low Extroversion: Introverted, comfortable working alone in silence for long periods of time.

Cunning and Agreeableness: Should be irrelevant to the ability to do engineering work effectively, however, high cunning is an advantage for succeeding in job interviews and office politics (venues involved in every profession), and low agreeableness means higher wages in any profession (since disagreeable people negotiate more aggressively when it comes to salary than agreeable people do).

High Energy, Low Neuroticism, Good Looking: Traits that help with success in any profession.

5B) Ideal Personality for Finance/Law/Sales

IQ of 120 – 125: Smart, but not to the point of being socially awkward and incapable of charm.

Ultra High Cunning: A machiavellian mastermind capable of manipulating people the way Mozart manipulated piano keys.

High Extroversion: Helpful for charming people, including clients.

Low Agreeableness: The work in F/L/S involves endless zero sum competition and negotiation; being low on agreeableness makes a person comfortable with this.

High Energy, Low Neuroticism, Good Looking: Traits that help with success in any profession.

6) Genius and Insanity:

“There is no great genius without some touch of insanity.” -Aristotle

“Psychopaths make good soldiers, traders, bankers – anyone with a detached modality and high stress tolerance. Grandiose narcissists make good salesmen, high energy, persuasive, outgoing, they believe in the product. Autists make good engineers due to their intense systematising.” -Illimitable Man

To be exceptional you must by definition be unusual. People who are psychologically normal do not accomplish great things, since to be great is to be an outlier.

Autism and Psychopathy are both considered to be psychiatric disorders, yet interestingly enough they also seem to

improve performance within Engineering and Finance/Law/Sales, respectively.

If you are a highly functional autistic with a high IQ, consider going into Engineering; you could excel there.

If you are a highly functional psychopath with a high IQ, consider going into Finance/Law/Sales.

The thinking of autists is marked by intense systemizing and this seems to be what enables them to be over-represented at the highest levels of engineering talent.

Psychopaths experience zero compassion, zero fear, and are unusually good at manipulating people. In the language of this publication they are extremely low on agreeableness and neuroticism, and are high cunning. These 3 separate traits associated with the disorder known as 'Psychopathy' all improve performance in Finance, Law, and Sales.

Mark Zuckerberg and Jeff Bezos are highly functional autists who excelled in Engineering.

Steve Cohen and Jordan Belfort are highly functional psychopaths who excelled in Finance.

7) Drugs (Performance Enhancing):

Disclaimer: Under no circumstances should you use any drug without the approval and supervision of a doctor.

At the highest levels of any profession use of performance enhancing drugs is the rule, not the exception.

In order to compete and win at the highest levels, use of drugs is necessary (though not sufficient). Why? Because you have competitors who *will* use performance enhancing drugs, and if you don't the probability you will be able to keep up with them is practically zero.

In Engineering many micro-dose LSD. This helps facilitate divergent thinking; it boosts their creativity.

In Finance/Law/Sales the use of stimulants is common (Modafinil, Ritalin, Adderall). Some use testosterone (TRT/Cypionate Injections).

Most of the work in F/L/S is *not* very creative, so micro-dosing LSD wouldn't directly enhance performance. However, the hours are long and require one to be completely alert the entire time; a moment's inattention could result in mistakes with disastrous consequences. For this reason the use of stimulants is helpful.

Some in F/L/S find testosterone injections enhance their performance since more testosterone means less neuroticism (the exact biochemical mechanism being that testosterone suppresses the stress hormone cortisol) and in this way TRT may enhance performance.

Within Finance in particular the work requires a high degree of willingness to take risks; in some sense financiers have the full time job of taking calculated risks. Many men in finance find TRT to be helpful since having increased testosterone levels enhances their comfort with risk taking.

It is by no means impossible that stimulants would be helpful in engineering or that micro-dosing LSD might be helpful in F/L/S. I have simply observed that as a general trend when engineers are looking for a means of performance enhancement they gravitate towards psychedelics such as LSD, whereas financiers, lawyers, and salesmen gravitate towards stimulants.

8) Addendum, Quantitative Hedge Funds:

The traits typical of quant traders and the ideal psychological profile for succeeding as a quant trader directly mirror the typical and ideal psychological profiles of engineers.

Like successful engineers, successful quant traders tend to be ultra high IQ (140+) and very socially awkward.

9) Relevant Reading:

Understanding Psychopathy (Illimitable Man)

Systemizing in ASC (ARC)

CEOs only have IQ of 115 (Lion of the Blogosphere)

Lucrative Professions

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Universal Requirements: IQ and Energy
- 3) Profession Specific Requirements, Wages
 - 3A) Medicine
 - 3B) Engineering
 - 3C) Finance/Law/Sales
- 4) Risk Profiles
- 5) Entrepreneurship
- 6) Pareto Distribution

1) Preamble:

For the past thousand years there have been only 5 professions that reliably give high wages: Engineering/STEM, Medicine, Finance, Law, Sales.

This will continue to be the case for the next thousand years.

The demand for the work done by these professions will always be high; we will always need engineers to build new technology, doctors to treat the sick, financiers to manage business transactions, lawyers to rob people with lawsuits, and salesmen to push new products.

Beyond these professions, if you want to make a ton of money the only remaining option is entrepreneurship; creating your own business.

2) Universal Requirements: IQ and Energy

For each of these professions (and also entrepreneurship) having a high IQ is necessary but not sufficient for having a shot at success.

If you have an IQ below 120, don't bother; you are flatly not intelligent enough to compete in these professions. You will have competitors with IQs of 120+ and 130+ who will crush you.

Every lucrative profession also requires energy levels that are significantly above average; you must be able to work 60 hours a week, consistently. This is necessary because you will have competitors who will put in long hours; if they slog for 60 hours a week and you maintain a pace of 40 hours a week, the probability you will be able to keep up with them is zero.

Sadly, to have *both* an above average IQ and above average energy levels you have to be an outlier; most people are excluded from having a shot of success within any lucrative profession.

Both your IQ and energy levels are heavily determined by your genetics; life isn't fair.

3) Profession Specific Requirements, Wages:

The wages of every profession are determined by nothing more than the demand for labor and the supply of labor.

In each of the 5 listed professions, the demand for labor is high. Where things get interesting is the *supply* of labor; for each aforementioned profession the percentage of people in the general population who are capable of doing the work is very low.

A high demand for labor and a low supply of people capable of doing the labor inevitably means high wages.

Note: The precise numbers used to calculate the percentage of people in the general population who are capable of doing certain types of labor don't matter. What does matter is that regardless of the precise numbers used, the supply of labor is low in the sense that the percentage of people capable of doing the given type of labor is well below 50%

Addendum: Please note that 'Ruthlessness' is the inverse of 'Agreeableness', and 'Stress Tolerance' is the inverse of 'Neuroticism'.

To be high on 'Ruthlessness' and 'Stress Tolerance' is to be low on 'Agreeableness' and 'Neuroticism'.

Agreeableness and Neuroticism are both part of the Big 5 Personality Traits.

3A) Medicine

The supply of doctors is restricted by the traits needed to be an effective doctor; high IQ, high energy/industriousness, and a high stress tolerance.

For the sake argument, it can be said that the minimum IQ needed to be an effective doctor is 120. The energy to work 60 hours a week is required.

A high stress tolerance is also required, since a doctor must remain calm while making decisions with life and death consequences.

It can be guesstimated that 10% of people have the required IQ, 20% have the required energy, and 50% have the required stress tolerance.

These estimates are very optimistic; in reality the percentages are probably far less than 10%, 20%, and 50%.

With all of these estimates taken together, the percentage of people with the traits needed to be an effective doctor is somewhere around 1%

$(10\% \times 20\% \times 50\% = 1\%)$

3B) Engineering

The main thing restricting the supply of labor in Engineering is IQ.

To do rigorous engineering work (R&D to create new technology) a person needs to have an IQ of 130+. This alone narrows the supply of labor down to roughly 2% of the population.

Some engineering positions require above average energy levels and stress tolerance (since the hours are long and stressful). This narrows the supply of labor down even more.

3C) Finance/Law/Sales

Many people find it objectionable that bankers, lawyers, and salesmen are paid immense amounts of money.

Viewed from the perspective of "Does this work make the world a better place?", the wages in Finance/Law/Sales seem outrageous.

Viewed from the perspective of "What is the supply of labor?", the wages seem quite reasonable.

In Finance/Law/Sales (F/L/S) the supply of labor is extremely low because the percentage of people who have the intelligence, and the energy, and the cunning, and the stress tolerance, and the ruthlessness needed to do the work effectively is extremely low.

Intelligence: The IQ demands of the work are not very high; a person with an IQ of 110+ can be effective in F/L/S. Keep in mind, an IQ of 110+ excludes 75% of the population.

Energy: In every lucrative F/L/S position, the hours are rough. Nobody is working less than 60 hours per week. Optimistically we can say 20% of the population has the energy to sustain such a work pace.

Cunning: Doing the work in F/L/S effectively requires an above average level of manipulative ability. For details on this, see the essay “Machiavellianism in Different Professions”

Stress Tolerance: The work in F/L/S is stressful. Not nearly as stressful as being a doctor making life and death decisions, but stressful enough to eliminate a significant percentage of people from the labor supply. Anyone who ranks high on neuroticism can't do the work.

Ruthlessness: The work involves endless zero sum competition and negotiation (often over the price something is bought or sold for). A person doesn't have to be as cold hearted as Vladimir Putin to be comfortable with this, but they do need a degree of ruthlessness that goes beyond what is average (they need to be below average on agreeableness).

Putting these requirements together, it can be said that to do the work in F/L/S effectively a person must at minimum be at the 75th percentile of intelligence, 80th percentile of energy, 50th percentile of cunning, 50th percentile of stress tolerance, and 50th percentile of ruthlessness.

Taken together, less than 1% of the population is capable of doing the work in F/L/S effectively ($25\% \times 20\% \times 50\% \times 50\% \times 50\% = \text{less than } 1\%$).

Note that on any one of the 5 traits restricting the supply of labor in F/L/S, a person doesn't need to be an extreme outlier. However, being *slightly* above average on 5 separate traits that correlate with each other at zero makes a person an extremely rare outlier overall.

4) Risk Profiles:

The 5 aforementioned professions all come with different levels of risk and potential reward attached to them.

Engineering is the lowest risk option, and comes with the lowest potential rewards. If you become an engineer the probability of you becoming a multimillionaire is practically zero, and so is the probability of you going broke and becoming homeless. Medicine falls in the same category as engineering.

Sales is a medium risk-medium reward career; there is some chance of you becoming a multimillionaire, and some chance of you going broke.

Finance and Law are both highest risk highest reward career paths; there is a significant chance you will be promoted from the associate level to the partner level (Law) or the vice president level (Finance), however you probably won't; odds are you will wash out at the associate level. This isn't terrible; you'll probably get a boring back office position making six figures, so you'll survive, you just won't become a multimillionaire.

5) Entrepreneurship Risk Profile:

Entrepreneurship is the highest risk option, but this is a bit of an understatement; becoming an entrepreneur is *exponentially* more risky than working in Finance or Law.

As a banker or lawyer, you have a small chance of being promoted to the senior levels of the corporate hierarchy (partner/vice president), and an overwhelming probability of getting a mediocre position where you achieve nothing impressive but still make a decent living.

If you become an entrepreneur, you deserve to know truth; you are on a suicide mission. There is a small chance you will end up spectacularly rich, the overwhelming probability is you will end up broke and homeless. Good luck!

Most entrepreneurs are not a special breed who are willing to risk death (homelessness) for the sake of having a shot at becoming rich; they are kids from rich families who have their parents' wealth as a safety net.

If you come from a rich family and become an entrepreneur, you are risking some social humiliation and foregone income. If you come from a poor family and become an entrepreneur, you are risking homelessness and death.

The odds of getting rich as an entrepreneur are not one in a thousand; they are more like 1/10, optimistically 1/5. Those odds are bad, but by no means 'hopeless'.

If you want to get rich (hit the top 0.1% of income distribution for the society you live in) entrepreneurship is the only option that gives a reasonably high chance of this happening.

6) Pareto Distribution:

It should be noted that amongst those who enter Finance, Law, Sales, and Entrepreneurship...financial rewards are pareto distributed.

Most make a little or a moderate amount of money, and a tiny minority become spectacularly rich.

Financial outcomes are more equitable in Engineering/STEM and Medicine; financial rewards have a bell curve distribution, rather than a pareto distribution.

Machiavellianism in Different Professions

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Sales
- 3) Law
- 4) Finance
 - 4A) Mortgage/Commercial Banking
 - 4B) Investment Banking
 - 4C) Private Equity/Venture Capital
- 5) Entrepreneurship
- 6) Politics
- 7) Journalism

1) Preamble:

There are professions where cunning is a core part of the job function. Sales, Law, Finance, Politics, and Journalism are all examples.

To succeed in these professions you don't need to be a master level machiavellian executer like the fictional Frank Underwood, but you will need a level of manipulative ability that is above average.

The aim of this essay is to delve into the specific manipulations involved in each of these professions. Finance will be covered most thoroughly, since it is the profession with which I have the greatest familiarity.

2) Sales:

It has been said that a con-man is just a salesmen without a product, but this is a lie; *a salesman is just a con-man with a product*. Your job is to persuade people to buy product, regardless of whether or not it is in their best interest to do so.

Charm and Persuasion are your tools. Keep in mind that Charm fuels Persuasion, in the sense that many people will buy from you simply because they like you, not necessarily because they are in love with the product itself.

Zero sum negotiation (an intrinsically machiavellian domain of performance) is a key job function within sales; you will have to negotiate price and deal terms.

Notably, zero sum negotiation is also common within Law and Finance.

How complex the manipulations you must engage in for the sake of persuading a target to buy product will vary from one industry to another. As a door to door magazine salesmen, simply being good looking and hyping up the product by being extroverted may be enough. As a pharmaceutical salesmen, you will need to persuade multiple doctors to prescribe drugs. This could be as simple as explaining the benefits of the drug, or it could be as complex as overstating the benefits of the drug, understating the risks and side effects of the drug, and outright bribing doctors (giving them kickbacks) to prescribe the drug even to patients who don't really need it (see the 'Opioid Crisis' in America).

3) Law:

If ever there was a profession for those who love manipulation, it's law. In the words of my own lawyer, "God cannot change the past, but a decent lawyer can."

To succeed in law you will need to be capable of charming your clients so they choose to use your services rather than those of the nearly identical law firm across the street; in some sense, every lawyer is a salesman.

You will also need to be good at manipulating the various parties involved in any legal dispute; judges, juries, and other lawyers.

4) Finance:

Different aspects of the financial industry involve different manipulative strategies and tactics. In all of them you will need to be good at winning zero sum negotiations and charming people.

Many positions within the finance industry are sales positions in everything but name.

4A) Mortgage/Commercial Banking

If you are a mortgage or commercial banker your official job duty is to decide who does and does not get to borrow money from the bank. As a mortgage banker you are dealing with people who want to borrow money to buy a house, as a commercial banker you are dealing with people who want to borrow money to start a business or expand an already existing business.

You will endlessly be engaged in zero sum negotiations; you must get deal terms that are as favorable for your financial institution as possible (charge interest rates as high as possible).

Charming potential borrowers is critical; they must like you enough such that they choose to get a loan from you, rather than from the nearly identical bank across the street.

Should you discover that one of the loans you have originated is likely to go bad (there is a high chance the borrower will default or outright go bankrupt), you must sell the loan off the balance sheet of your own financial institution, and onto the books of some other financial institution. Get the bad loan you originated as far away from yourself as possible, as if it were radioactive material.

If the loan goes bad, that's fine so long as it's off of your books and onto someone else's before it detonates.

4B) Investment Banking

Officially, your job as an investment banker is to advise clients on capital raising activities (equity and debt issuances) and M&A deals. Unofficially, investment bankers are salesmen in everything but name.

The bank that employs you is paid fees for providing certain financial services to clients; your job is to charm and persuade clients such that they will use the services of your bank, rather than those of the nearly identical bank across the street.

Your bank will only be paid a fee (and by extension your annual bonus will only be good) if the transactions your clients are involved in *close*; you must gently persuade your clients to go through with all deals they are involved in that your bank is advising on.

Is it actually in the best interest of your clients to go through with each of these deals? That is a question of supreme irrelevance; your bonus depends on them going through with the deal, the consequences be damned.

On behalf of your clients, you will regularly engage in zero sum negotiation; if a client is selling their company you must get them as high a price as possible, if you are advising a client on an acquisition you must aid them in getting as low a price as possible.

Beyond your clients, you will need to persuade the counterparty in various transactions to go through with the deal. If you are advising a client on an equity or debt issuance, you will need to convince investors in the public markets that your client's company is one worth investing in. If you are advising a client on the sale of their company (sell side M&A), you need to convince potential buyers that your client's company is one worth having.

4C) Private Equity, Venture Capital

Your official job responsibility is to find investment opportunities. Your unofficial job responsibility is to be a master level Machiavellian executer.

In Private Equity (PE) your strategy is to acquire entire companies (often using an irresponsibly high amount of debt financing), fix them up, and then sell them for a higher price. Some individuals flip houses; private equity firms flip companies.

You need to be a master of zero sum negotiation; buying at low prices, and selling at high prices. You also need to be pretty good at persuasion (so you can convince lenders to give you debt financing for your 'LBO').

Venture capital work is similar to private equity work at least so far as the cunning that is involved. You need to be good at zero sum negotiation (buying equity in startup companies for as low a price as possible and at a later date selling the equity for as high a price as possible).

For the sake of getting good investment returns, *buying low* is the critical part since *selling high* is often impossible. In the words of the venture capitalist who backed a biotech startup that saved my life, "The money needs to be made the day you buy it. If you buy too high, you are doomed."

5) Entrepreneurship:

An entrepreneur is simply a person who creates a new business.

The specific manipulative tactics involved in this will vary from one industry to another and one business model to another, but below I have detailed those common across all industries.

The life of Felix Dennis (a young magazine publisher in 1970s England) can be used as an example.

He must...

- Persuade bankers to lend him money so that he has the capital needed to get his business off the ground.

- Do sales/marketing, manipulating consumers into handing over money for his product (his product being nothing more than images printed on paper).

- Hire employees and profit off the work they do. Often he must hire people who have talents he himself lacks, thereby indirectly expanding his own capabilities. This is an extension of Law 7; have others do the work, but ensure you yourself take the profits.

If you want details on the manipulative strategies Dennis used to go from rags to riches, see his book 'How To Get Rich'. He was called 'The Billionaire Prince' for a reason.

6) Politics:

If you are a politician in a democracy your job is to manipulate as many people as possible into voting for you. You have the full time job of charming and persuading the masses.

You must be willing to say (and do) just about anything for the sake of winning votes.

7) Journalism:

Your official job is to 'report' the news. Your unofficial job is to manufacture propaganda.

Bear in mind you must only manufacture propaganda that the owners of the news outlet you work for approve of, otherwise you will be fired.

You wield more power over public opinion than you realize; in the words of George Orwell, "The people will believe whatever the media tells them."

Law 23, How to Get Rich

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Pareto Distribution
- 3) Consequences of Pareto
- 4) Varying Inequality by Profession
- 5) Law 23, Full Focus to be the Best
- 6) Only One Hit Needed

1) Preamble:

A question haunting many ambitious men: how to get rich? There is a rather simple formula; enter a field where money can be made, and be extremely good at what you do.

What follows is a more in depth explanation of that formula.

2) Pareto Distribution:

In every society wealth is pareto distributed. Within every field and profession where money can be made, the financial rewards are pareto distributed.

What this means is that a tiny minority of people at the top get the overwhelming majority of the financial rewards, and most people get little or nothing.

The 'Pareto' distribution is sometimes conceptualized as the '80/20 Rule': the richest 20% of people own 80% of the wealth. Do keep in mind that the breakdown does not have to be '80 and 20', and the two numbers don't have to add up to 100.

Because financial rewards are pareto distributed, **it is exponentially more lucrative to be at the top rather than in the middle.**

Even within the people at the top, it is usually the case that rewards are pareto distributed; 1st place has exponentially more wealth than 2nd place, and 2nd has exponentially more wealth than 3rd.

In a macro economy a man at the 99th percentile of wealth has exponentially more than a man at the 90th percentile, and a man at the 99.9th percentile has exponentially more than a man at the 99th.

When it comes to transcending a hierarchy (getting to 2nd rather than 3rd, and 1st rather than 2nd), you won't see *diminishing* marginal returns; you will see *exponentially increasing* marginal returns.

3) Consequences of Pareto:

The fact that rewards are pareto distributed makes the following statements true:

-“It never pays to be average.” -WallStreetPlayboys

-You don't have the option of being average and getting a decent quality of life; shoot for the stars or drown.

-The overwhelming statistical probability is that you will fail, but in the unlikely event that you succeed, you will succeed spectacularly.

Failure is the rule, success is the exception.

4) Varying Inequality by Profession:

It should be noted that while the financial rewards of every profession are pareto distributed, the degree of inequality is not the same in every profession.

In Finance, Law, and Sales you will find that the top 20% of people make 80% of the money.

Among entrepreneurs you will find that most fail and make zero money (say around 90%), while 10% succeed and make an immense amount of money.

In Art, Music, and Athletics you will find that the top 0.1% of people make almost 100% of the money. Financial rewards are distributed on a lottery basis; a tiny chance of spectacular success, an overwhelming probability of zero.

Within Finance, the 80/20 distribution looks something like this: 20% of analysts/associates will be promoted to the VP level or higher, and the VP level and higher is where giant compensation packages are.

Within Sales 20% of sales reps generate 80% of revenue, and are given roughly 80% of wages.

Within Law, the 80/20 distribution is expressed by roughly 20% of associates being promoted up to the partner level, where the giant compensation packages are.

5) Law 23, Full Focus to be The Best:

The recipe for getting rich is rather straightforward; enter a field where money can be made, and be the best at what you do so that you are on the winning side of the pareto distribution.

How does one become the 'best' at what they do?

This varies from one field to another; the traits needed to become a world famous singer and the traits needed to become an elite level investment banker are very different.

Within any field, *long hours* will be a minimum requirement. Working 70 hours a week is necessary for a simple reason; you have competitors. If you work 50 hours a week, and your competitors work 70 hours a week, then after 3 years (156 weeks) they will be more than 3,000 hours ahead of you; you will never catch up.

You can work in a profession, put in only 40-50 hours a week, and make a decent amount of money. You will *never* be the best at what you do; people willing to put in 60-80 hours a week will inevitably surpass you. Long hours are necessary (but not sufficient) for the sake of having a shot at being the best in any field.

Do keep in mind that you are in zero sum competition with your competitors; it is objectively in your best interest for them to fail. Only one person can make it to 1st place; you must ensure that person is you.

6) Only One Hit Needed:

“You gain more by finding a rich mine and mining it deeper, than from flitting from one shallow mine to another...It is enough to strike oil once. Your wealth and power are assured for a lifetime.” –Law 23

In the event that you find a strategy for making money that works, simply continue doing that for as long as possible. You don't need a dozen different careers or business models for making money; you only need 1.

Principles of Machiavellianism

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Morally Neutral
- 3) Conceal Your Cunning
- 4) Variance of Skill
- 5) Levels of Difficulty
- 6) Everyone At The Top Is Cunning
- 7) Psychology vs Machiavellianism
- 8) Mastery
- 9) Prioritization

1) Preamble:

Historically machiavellianism has been an art studied and practiced only by elites as a means of maintaining their positions of power. In our own day and age *The 48 Laws of Power* has done much to wake the masses up to this reality.

What follows are a list of principles to keep in mind when mastering machiavellianism. The words ‘cunning’ and ‘machiavellianism’ will be used interchangeably.

2) Cunning is Morally Neutral:

Many conflate cunning with evil, but this is foolish. Cunning can be used for good or for evil, or for purposes that are inconsequential.

A psychiatrist who persuades a suicidal patient to step down from the ledge is using cunning for good. A con man who persuades poor people to hand him their life savings is using cunning for evil.

Being unskilled with machiavellianism doesn’t make you good; it just makes you incompetent.

3) Conceal Your Cunning:

People foolishly conflating cunning with evil has some practical consequences. If people perceive that you are cunning; that you read body language, vocal tonality, and personalities accurately, and put conscious effort into charming people, they will view you as evil. At best they will distrust you, at worst they will both dislike and distrust you.

As such you must be cunning, while at the same time appear to be just as naïve as the average person.

Never out-loud give an in depth analysis of a social situation, or someone’s personality. It causes people to perceive that you are cunning and evil, rather than impressive. This may sound obvious, yet many otherwise intelligent men shoot themselves in the foot by doing this, thinking it will cause people to view them as competent.

The game is to be sold, not to be told. If you practice cunning you will succeed, if you talk about cunning you will fail.

Use manipulative tactics to charm and persuade people, but *never* talk about the tactics you use; doing so causes people to view you as a monster.

Use manipulative tactics to seduce women, but *never* talk about the psychology surrounding seduction with women; doing so causes the women too dumb to understand what you’re saying to think you are weird, while the minority of

women who are smart enough to understand what you're saying view you as evil.

4) Variance of Skill:

Cunning exists on a spectrum. Every human on the planet is cunning to some degree, in the sense that every person can read body language, vocal tonality, charm, persuade, and use manipulative tactics to some degree.

This does not qualify everyone for the title of 'Machiavellian', in the same way that everyone being able to run from one side of a field to another does not make everyone an elite sprinter.

The cunning of the average man is executed with only subconscious awareness, and the cunning of the average woman is executed with semi-conscious awareness.

A 'Machiavellian' is someone who regularly makes conscious calculations regarding social interactions and relationships, and who executes manipulative tactics with careful planning beforehand, conscious effort in the moment, and thorough analysis afterwards of what went well and what went badly.

In terms of skill you may notice that the average woman is more cunning than the average man; women are on average better at reading body language and vocal tonality, charming people, persuading people, lying, and detecting when someone else is lying.

The reason women evolved to have greater cunning than men (on average) is rather straightforward; in our hunter-gatherer tribe past, men could acquire and maintain power through sheer brute force. Women did not have this option, since most women were hopelessly outmatched against most men in terms of the ability to win a fist fight. As such, women had to develop an alternative way of acquiring and maintaining power; cunning provided this.

Averages aside, *variance* of cunning is far greater among men than among women, to the point that among the most cunning people on the planet almost all of them are men, and among the least cunning people almost all of them are men.

The least cunning people are autists; they are hopelessly incapable of reading social cues or manipulating people. Most autists are men.

The most cunning people are dark triad men (psychopaths, narcissists), and neurotypical men who have dedicated time to training themselves in the art of cunning (they spend time reading *The 48 Laws*, a publication such as this, and practicing in the real world).

If you are a Machiavellian (and if you took the time to read a piece like this, you probably are), you are likely to make the mistake of assuming everyone else is just as cunning as you are. This could be considered *solipsistic cold reading*; assuming everyone else is just as X as you are.

Know this; when you read people's body language and personalities with razor sharp accuracy, most people cannot do the same. If you encounter someone who *can* do the same, they are an outlier.

5) Levels of Difficulty:

Different venues and situations pose different levels of difficulty in terms of how skilled a machiavellian must be to attain victory. A person who is cunning enough to succeed with an easy task or in an easy venue is not necessarily skilled enough to succeed in a hard venue.

Being a teenage boy who convinces a teenage girl to show up for a date counts as easy (assuming the boy in question is not ugly). Selling a piece of software to a corporation for \$100k counts as being a task of medium difficulty. Being the CEO of a software startup who persuades venture capitalists to hand over millions of dollars of capital for the sake of expanding the business counts as hard.

Even the CEO's task counts as nothing in terms of difficulty, compared to what is involved with winning a war.

6) Everyone At The Top Is Cunning:

Every person who has ever maintained a position of power has an above average level of cunning. If ever you meet a powerful person who appears to have an average level of cunning, or who appears to be brazenly naïve, they are wearing a mask.

Power may be attained with zero cunning (in rare cases where a person simply gets lucky), but it is *never* successfully maintained without at least an above average level of cunning.

When dealing with average people (the masses) who are only subconsciously or semi-consciously cunning, it is possible to effectively manipulate them with very little effort and calculation. However, when dealing with powerful people, they are all consciously cunning; to manipulate them effectively involves real difficulty.

The higher you go up a macro dominance hierarchy (euphemistically called 'society') the more cunning and competent the people you deal with will be.

Manipulating investment bankers is far harder than manipulating school teachers, just as manipulating noblemen is far harder than manipulating peasants.

7) Psychology vs Machiavellianism:

Mathematics is theoretical and evergreen; it never changes. The laws of mathematics haven't changed since the dawn of time and they never will. Engineering on the other hand is not theoretical; it is practical. It's also ephemeral; engineering changes all the time as technology changes.

Mathematics is the theoretical topic that fuels engineering progress.

The relationship between psychology and machiavellianism is analogous to the relationship between mathematics and engineering. Psychology is theoretical and evergreen; human psychology hasn't changed in thousands of years, and it won't change in your lifetime. Machiavellianism is the application of psychology to the real world; strategies and tactics being used to execute the real world manipulation of other human beings.

As a machiavellian the venues you face will change, the specific individuals you must deal with will change, and the strategies and tactics you use must change as you adapt to the new venues and individuals you face. The one thing that stays the same is basic human psychology.

8) Mastery:

Machiavellianism is a topic of infinite complexity; you cannot possibly get to the point where you know everything. However you can get to the point where you have mastered the venues and strategies that will be most relevant to your life.

As a general guideline, keep the strategies and tactics you use as simple as possible. As the complexity of your strategies and tactics increases linearly, the probability of something going wrong increases exponentially.

Mastery will require far more than simply reading; practice and experience in the real world are required. 10% of your time should be spent reading books on psychology and strategy, and 90% of your time should be spent interacting with people in the real world.

For the sake of practice you ought to start in low stakes venues (think highschool). Failure in such a venue will mean nothing, at least for the long term.

Eventually you will be in high stakes venues (say Office Politics) whether you want to or not. In such venues success means getting rich and failure means poverty. Good luck; you will need it.

9) Prioritization:

You don't have 10,000 hours to spend on mastering machiavellianism and as such you must prioritize the facets of

cunning and venues where cunning might be applied that are most relevant to your life.

For most Americans in the early 21st century, the most important facets of cunning will be *Charm* and developing an *Analytical Mind*. If you can read people's psychologies and social situations accurately, and make people view you as likeable and trustworthy, you will excel. Botch either of these, and you will almost certainly fail.

The most important venues for early 21st century Americans are *Office Politics*, *Job Interviews*, and *Sales/Marketing*. Why? Because these are the venues where money can be made or lost. Succeed in these venues and you will be rich, fail in these venues and you will be poor.

From books on psychology and machiavellianism, you will find 10,000 different strategies and tactics. They will have a pareto distribution of usefulness; 9,900 of them will have no application to your life. 90 will have some application to your life. 10 will be directly relevant to your life, and you will use them every day until you die.

Venues for Machiavellianism

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Cold Reading and Charm, Key Facets of Cunning
- 3) School
- 4) Family Politics
- 5) Job Interviews
- 6) Office Politics
- 7) Sales/Marketing
- 8) Negotiation (Zero Sum)

1) Preamble:

'Machiavellianism' or 'Cunning' (euphemistically referred to as 'people skills' or 'social skills') is applicable to every area of life imaginable. Human psychology never changes, however the specific strategies and tactics that are useful do change, and the venues change.

Psychology is evergreen but strategies, tactics, and venues, are ephemeral. Sun Tzu faced warfare on the plains of ancient China. Machiavelli faced the politics of the aristocratic court. In our world today, we face the corporate office and client meetings.

What follows is a list of the venues you are likely to face in 21st century America, and the machiavellianism involved. The venues with the highest stakes are *Job Interviews*, *Office Politics*, and *Sales/Marketing*, because these are the venues where money can be made or lost.

In your own life some venues will be immensely important and others will be inconsequential. For those immensely important venues, take the time to map them out; list out every person in the venue from the most to the least powerful. Recognize the powerful individuals whose favor you must win for the sake of succeeding in the venue. Do thorough analysis of these individual's psychologies; know their tastes, so that you can best guess what will and will not appeal to them.

2) Cold Reading and Charm, Key Facets of Cunning:

For our modern world and the venues you are likely to face the most important competencies you must master are Cold Reading and Charm. If you can accurately read people's psychologies and make them like you, you will win. If you can't read people's psychologies and people find you to be dislikeable, you will lose.

All the other facets of cunning (Persuasion, Mask Wearing, Intimidation) are of secondary importance.

3) School:

The primary drivers of your grades in school will be your IQ and Conscientiousness. Smart people who work hard tend to succeed in school, while dumb people who are lazy tend to fail in school. However, your ability to charm your teachers also matters. If your teachers and professors like you, you will notice that the grades on your essays magically improve.

Law 38 is critical; appear to agree with whatever your professors' opinions are. If your professor is a bleeding heart liberal, your essays should imply Donald Trump is Satan. If your professor is an old fashioned conservative, your essays should have a Rightwing bent to them.

4) Family Politics:

If you come from a poor family, then family politics is a venue where the stakes are low; your family members have no significant amount of money or valuable connections (networking) to offer you, so even if they hate and ostracize you it doesn't matter.

However, if you come from a rich family then family politics is a high stakes venue. If your family members like you, they will give you immense financial support and access to valuable connections. On the other hand if they dislike or ostracize you, you will miss out on these assets.

As such, if you come from a rich family *do* take the time to thoroughly analyze the psychologies of each of your family members, and the social interactions between them. Getting your family members to like you (particularly the one's who have direct control over financial resources and networking connections) is critical.

5) Job Interviews:

In theory job interviews are done for the sake of finding the most competent candidate and hiring them. In reality job interviews don't select candidates who are competent; they select candidates who are likeable.

If in a job interview you can successfully charm those who wield decision-making power over who gets an offer and who does not, you will be given an offer. In some interview processes technical skills may be assessed, but ultimately the make or break factor will be "Which candidate do I *like* the most?"

6) Office Politics:

Office Politics is the venue that will make or break your career, no matter what your profession is. As a corporate employee, you are a 21st century courtier; read Law 24. That chapter of The 48 Laws will serve as a beginners guide to succeeding in the game of office politics.

You are in zero sum competition with coworkers who have the same rank as you for seizing the same promotion opportunities, and for keeping your jobs when layoff season inevitably arrives.

While being in intense zero sum conflict with them, you must always maintain the pretense that you are all on the same team. Fail to maintain this pretense, and your superiors will view you as a monster; they will fire you. It is a paradox; intense conflict whilst at the same time maintaining the appearances of friendliness and teamwork.

The corporation that employs you could not care less whether you live or die, and would gladly get you killed if it would boost quarterly profits. Yet at the same time you must always maintain the pretense that you are a loyal employee, and that you enjoy being a corporate employee. ***Hide your displeasure, fake your contentment.***

At minimum you must hide your displeasure; fail to do this, and your superiors will view you as having a 'bad attitude' and fire you. At best they will keep you around but never promote you up the hierarchy. It is yet another paradox; maintain the pretense you are loyal to the corporation that employs you and happy, even though in reality you are loyal only to your own interests (or at least you should be) and are possibly very unhappy.

The main strategy for succeeding within office politics will be this: triangulate who your critical superiors are, those people who wield decision-making power over whether you are promoted or fired. In some office environments, it will be obvious who these people are; in others it will require some investigation.

At all costs you must ensure that your critical superiors view you as both likeable and competent. For the sake of making them perceive you as competent, prioritize their work over everyone else's. Give A+ work to your critical superiors, and A- or B+ work to everyone else.

This strategy may sound obvious, yet the corporate world is full of employees who will never bother with trying it, or who will try it but botch the execution.

7) Sales/Marketing:

The venue for machiavellianism that can take you from rags to riches. Your goal is to manipulate people into buying product, and your main tool for this is charm; the single biggest reason people will buy from a salesman is because they like him.

Whether or not it is actually in the target's best interest to buy product is supremely irrelevant; you must persuade them to buy product, the consequences be damned.

8) Negotiation:

Negotiation is an intrinsically machiavellian activity; strategy, manipulation, and persuasion are involved.

One useful strategy is this: charm the other party. They may give you a better price or deal terms simply because they like you. At the same time, ensure they do not get away with using this strategy on you; in the words of Baltasar Gracian "Do not take payment in politeness".

At no point in negotiation should you ever insult the other party; if they feel offended in any way, they may refuse to do business with you even if it would objectively be in their best interest to.

Blue Pill Lies, Red Pill Truths

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

1) Preamble

1A) Warning

2) Religion

3) Blank Slate Theory (Cultural Marxism)

4) Gender

5) IQ, Class, Race

6) Gender Discrimination

7) Racial Discrimination

8) Science and Political Correctness

8A) Leftwing Science Denialism

8B) Rightwing Science Denialism

9) Finding Red Pill Truths

10) Relevant Reading

1) Preamble:

A blue pill lie is an idea that is false, but that is popular in the society you are currently living in. A red pill truth is an idea that is true, but that is unpopular in the society you are currently living in.

If you publicly express red pill truths, it will cause people to dislike and ostracize you.

In totalitarian societies, expressing red pill truths can lead to you being imprisoned or executed.

On the inside you should be aware of red pill truths (so that you have an accurate view of reality), but outwardly you should pay lip service to blue pill lies.

In 17th Century Italy, the main blue pill lie was that there was a god living in the sky with a son named Jesus. Telling the red pill truth, that this god was entirely fabricated out of nothing, could result in one being prosecuted for heresy, imprisoned, and possibly executed.

In 1950s Russia, the main blue pill lie was that Communism was a great economic system, and that Free Market Capitalism would never work well. Telling the red pill truth, that Free Market Capitalism works better than Communism, could result in being thrown into a Gulag.

The purpose of this piece is to outline the blue pill lies that are dominant in modern America (1990 – 2020), and the corresponding red pill truths.

1A) Warning:

The truth is a dangerous thing.

Most will instinctively reject it because it is too painful. Of the minority who accept it, many will be driven to insanity.

Destroying delusions represents a form of progress that is often *irreversible*. Once you see the truth, you can never unsee it, even if you wanted to.

Discovering the truth is unlikely to make you happy. Reality is a nightmare compared to the delusions most people have in their heads.

2) Religion:

“The only difference between a cult and a religion is the amount of real estate they own” -Frank Zappa

Blue Pill Lie:

“There is a god (or gods) living in the sky, who rules over us.”

Red Pill Truth:

“Every god the human species has ever conceptualized is as fabricated as Santa Clause and the Tooth Fairy.”

Blue Pill Lie:

“There is nothing wrong with being religious, and believing in a god or gods.”

Red Pill Truth:

“Religious people believe things that are insane, and would be recognized as insane if not veneered by the respectability of religion.

A Christian who believes there is a god in the sky with a son named Jesus, and a Muslim who believes there is a god in the sky with a prophet named Mohammad, are as insane as a man who believes in Santa Clause or the Tooth Fairy.”

Blue Pill Lie:

“All religions are equal. They are all equally wise, or they are all equally foolish.

Islam is a religion of peace.”

Red Pill Truth:

“Religions are not equal, and certainly they are not all equally prone to advocating for violence.

Islam is a religion that is violent to the core; indeed it was founded by a very successful warlord named Muhammad.

Jainism is a religion that is peaceful to the core. “

Religion, Further Reading:

The End of Faith

Islam Is Not a Religion of Peace

3) Blank Slate Theory (Cultural Marxism):

Blue Pill Lie:

“All people are created equal, and all people are created the same.

There are no psychological differences between individuals driven by genetics.

All psychological differences between people are the result of environmental factors. Humans are born a blank slate.”

Red Pill Truth:

“People are not created equal, and certainly they are not created the same.

Humans are not born as blank slates.

Virtually every aspect of a person’s psychology, from intelligence (IQ), to personality, to a propensity for any mental illness, is heavily driven by genetics.”

4) Gender:

Blue Pill Lie:

“Men and women are psychologically identical.

Any psychological differences between men and women are trivial, and they are the result of cultural training (gender is a social construct).

Red Pill Truth:

“Men and women are profoundly psychologically different.

The psychological differences are driven by genetics and biology, not just cultural training.

Men evolved to be good at hunting for wild animals, women evolved to be good at taking care of babies and young children.”

Gender Differences, Further Reading:

Why Men Don't Listen, Women Can't Read Maps (Pease)

Google's Ideological Echo Chamber (James Damore)

<https://illimitablemen.com/> (Illimitable Man)

5) IQ, Class, Race:

“In multiracial societies, they attribute achievement disparities rooted in IQ differences to racism. In monoracial societies, they attribute achievement disparities rooted in IQ differences to classism. IQ differences are the root cause of all social inequality.” -Illimitable Man

Blue Pill Lie:

“IQ means nothing. IQ isn't a legitimate measurement of intelligence. Everyone is equally smart.

Even if IQ is real, there could not possibly be racial/ethnic disparities in IQ, or a gender difference in IQ.”

Red Pill Truth:

“Intelligence is a thing that exists, some people have more or less of it than others, and IQ tests measure it. Not everyone is equally smart.

IQ matters a great deal since it is the single best predictor of long term life success, including *income*. High IQ people tend to be good at making money, while low IQ people tend to be bad at making money.

IQ differences between individuals are caused by some balance of both genetics and environmental factors.

There is a gender difference in IQ; male IQ is more variable than female IQ. Most geniuses (IQ 130+) are men, and also most idiots (IQ 70-) are men.

There are racial disparities in average IQ; East Asians have higher IQs than whites, and whites have higher IQs than blacks.

Blue Pill Lie:

“The only explanation for why rich people have more money than poor people is class based exploitation.

The rich have more wealth than the poor, because they stole it from the poor.”

Red Pill Truth:

“Part of the reason rich people are better at making money than poor people is that they have higher IQs; the rich are better at making money because they are smarter.

In every society the correlation between IQ and income is positive, and the relationship is *causal*; having a high IQ *causes* a person's income to be higher."

Blue Pill Lie:

"The primary reason children born into rich families make more money than children born into poor families is because of their parent's connections."

Red Pill Truth:

"Parental wealth is a factor in how much money a child will make during their lifetime. However, **IQ is a far more important factor.**

A child born at the 50th percentile of family wealth and the 95th percentile of IQ will make more money during their adult life than a child born at the 95th percentile of family wealth and the 50th percentile of IQ.

The primary reason children from rich families are better at making money than children from poor families, is because they on average have higher IQs."

Blue Pill Lie:

"Racial/Ethnic groups vary in how rich or poor they are. Whites on average make more money than blacks. The only explanation for this is racism; whites oppress blacks, and discriminate against blacks when it comes to hiring for jobs and promotions."

Red Pill Truth:

"Racial disparities in IQ explain racial disparities in income.

White men have higher incomes than black men, on average. If you adjust for IQ, they don't.

Notably, East Asian men have higher incomes than white men. Again, if you adjust for IQ they don't. "

Historical Class Inequality:

Monoracial societies where wealth inequality is blamed on class based exploitation (classism), when IQ differences between individuals are the real culprit:

France, 18th Century (French Revolution)

Maoist China

Historical Racial Inequality:

Multiracial societies where wealth inequality is blamed on racially based exploitation (racism), when IQ differences between racial groups are the real culprit:

America (1990 – 2020)

Rhodesia/Zimbabwe

South Africa

IQ/Class/Race, Further Reading:

The Bell Curve (Charles Murray)

Forbidden Knowledge (Sam Harris, Charles Murray)

6) Gender Discrimination:

Blue Pill Lie:

"The only possible explanation for why men perform better than women on average in certain domains is that _____

women are being discriminated against. Patriarchy!”

Red Pill Truth:

“Men and women evolved to have psychological and behavioral differences.

As a result, in our modern environment there will be certain activities where men perform better on average, and other activities where women perform better on average.”

Blue Pill Lie:

“There are more men who make it to the pinnacle of society than women (most CEOs and billionaires are men).

The only explanation for this is that men are privileged and women are oppressed.”

Red Pill Truth:

“Male IQ is more variable than female IQ. There are more male geniuses than female geniuses, and this in large part explains why most people who make it to the pinnacle of society are men.

Men also take more risks than women; this leads to there being more spectacular successes among men than among women.

On the negative side, most idiots (extremely low IQ) are men and consequently most high school dropouts are men.

Because men are more risk aggressive than women, there are more catastrophic failures among men than among women.

Having a son is a high risk high reward option, having a daughter is a low risk low reward option.”

Blue Pill Lie:

“The Wage Gap. Women are paid 77% as much money as men are. Women are oppressed!”

Red Pill Truth:

“It is factually correct to say that in America, female income is 77% of what male income is.

If you adjust for the fact that men and women work in different professions, and also the fact that within every profession *men work longer hours and are therefore more likely to be promoted up the hierarchy*, the wage gap virtually disappears.”

7) Racial Discrimination:

Blue Pill Lie:

“The only explanation for why whites have greater career success and higher incomes than blacks is that blacks are being discriminated against.

Racism is the only possible explanation.”

Red Pill Truth:

“It is correct to say that on average whites have greater career success and higher incomes than blacks. If you adjust for IQ, they don’t.

Notably, East Asians on average have greater career success than whites. Again, if you adjust for IQ they don’t.

Racial IQ disparities explain achievement gaps and income inequality between racial groups.“

Blue Pill Lie:

“The purpose of Affirmative Action is to foster diversity.”

Red Pill Truth:

“Affirmative Action is a euphemism for rejecting more qualified men in favor of less qualified women, and more qualified East Asians and whites in favor of less qualified Latinos and blacks.

Affirmative Action is discrimination on the basis of race and gender that the Leftwing approves of.”

8) Science and Political Correctness:

That which is scientifically correct, and that which is politically correct, are often not the same.

8A) Leftwing Science Denialism:

Leftwing Americans will deny the scientific facts surrounding gender differences and the degree to which psychological differences between men and women are driven by biology and genetics.

Leftwing Americans will deny the scientific facts surrounding IQ; some individuals are smarter than others, there are racial disparities in intelligence, male intelligence is more variable than female intelligence, and intelligence is heavily driven by genetics, not just the environment.

8B) Rightwing Science Denialism:

Rightwing Americans will deny the scientific facts linking wealth inequality to violence (the gini coefficient drives the homicide rate), because they don't want to believe that there is any degree of inequality that qualifies as being a problem.

Rightwing Americans will deny the scientific facts surrounding climate change, because those facts offend their desire to believe that burning fossil fuels is not a problem.

9) Finding Red Pill Truths:

There is a simple strategy for finding red pill truths. **What are the ideas you would be punished for expressing? Very often, forbidden ideas are true.**

Not always; ideas can be forbidden and also false. However, far more often than most people would care to admit, the truth is forbidden.

What ideas are popular in the society you live in? Those are the blue pill lies.

Never in the history of the world has there been a society where the truth was popular.

In 1950 America, it was forbidden to say that “God and Jesus are entirely fabricated, just as Santa Clause and the Tooth Fairy were.” This turned out to be true.

In 1950 Russia and 1970 China, it was forbidden to say “Capitalism is a viable economic system, and Communism is not. Capitalism leads to 3 meals a day, Communism leads to mass starvation.” This turned out to be true.

In 1990 – 2020 America, it is forbidden to say “There are psychological differences between men and women driven by genetics/biology, not just cultural training”, and this is true.

If an idea is popular, it is certainly false.

If an idea is unpopular, then perhaps it is true and perhaps it is false; further investigation is needed.

10) Relevant Reading:

Religion:

The End of Faith

Islam Is Not a Religion of Peace

Gender Differences:

Why Men Don't Listen, Women Can't Read Maps (Pease)

Google's Ideological Echo Chamber (James Damore)

<https://illimitablemen.com/> (Illimitable Man)

IQ, Class, Race:

The Bell Curve (Charles Murray)

Forbidden Knowledge (Sam Harris, Charles Murray)

Overton Windows, Dominant Ideologies

machiavellicorporate · 22 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism
 - 2A) Gender
 - 2B) Race
 - 2C) Intelligence Isn't Real, Everyone Is Equally Competent
 - 2D) Reality Check
- 3) Sheep, Martyrs, Undercover Red Pillers
 - 3A) Sheep
 - 3B) Martyrs
 - 3C) Undercover Red Pillers
- 4) Overton Shift
- 5) Punishments for Political Incorrectness
- 6) Gender Differences With Overton Windows
- 7) Autists Are Martyrs
- 8) Public Opinion is an Effect, not a Cause
- 9) Ubiquity, Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism
- 10) Forbidden Ideas Are Often True
- 11) Intellectual Discourse, Constrained By Political Correctness
- 12) Law 38, Don't Be A Martyr
- 13) Relevant Reading
- 14) Further Reflections
 - 14A) Critical Thinkers Are Rare
 - 14B) Mainstream Is Always Wrong
 - 14C) Facts vs Narratives
 - 14D) Science Denialism, Leftwing and Rightwing
 - 14E) Leftwing DoubleThink
 - 14F) Winning Streak, American Leftwing
- 15) Illimitable Man's Reflections
 - 15A) Critical Thinking, Citations Needed Fallacy
 - 15B) Womanly Duplicity and Its Constituent Parts
 - 15C) Twitter
- 16) Roosh
- 17) Noam Chomsky

1) Preamble:

“Insanity in individuals is rare, but in groups, parties, nations, and epochs it is the rule.” -Nietzsche

In every society there is an Overton Window; a limited range of ideas that are acceptable to hold and express.

Ideas inside the Overton Window are politically correct, ideas outside the Overton Window are politically incorrect.

In any society, the expression of politically incorrect ideas leads to one being punished.

What varies from one society to another is not the existence of an Overton Window (in every society, some ideas are considered acceptable to express while others are unacceptable to express), but rather *which* ideas are inside the

Overton Window and which ideas are outside the Overton Window.

What is considered politically correct in one society may be politically incorrect in another, and vice versa.

Societies also vary in how harshly they punish those who express ideas they consider politically incorrect.

Many Rightwing Americans bemoan the existence of political correctness, and think it is a Leftwing phenomenon unique to modern America (1990 – 2020), but this false. **Political correctness is a phenomenon as old as time;** in every human society some ideas are inside the Overton Window and others are outside the Overton Window.

In every society there is a dominant ideology, and this dominant ideology will restrict the bounds of that society's Overton Window. Ideas that corroborate the tenets of the dominant ideology are inside the Overton Window, while ideas that contradict the tenets of the dominant ideology are outside the Overton Window.

In 2020 Saudi Arabia, the dominant ideology is Islam; there is no god but Allah and Muhammad is his prophet. Any person in the country who says something that goes against this dominant ideology (for example, someone who says "There is no god; the atheists are correct") will be at risk of imprisonment and execution.

In 1950 Russia, the dominant ideology was Communism; the notion that a command economy run by the government was the best way of running society. Any person in the country who spoke against this ideology, or who simply criticized the way the current government was running the economy, would be thrown into a gulag.

In 1950 America, the dominant ideology was Christianity; there is a god living in the sky with a son named Jesus. Anyone who spoke against this ideology was at risk of being socially ostracized, and perhaps denied job opportunities.

In 1990 – 2020 America, the dominant ideology among Leftwing Americans has thus far been Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism (sometimes called 'Cultural Marxism'). Among Rightwing Americans, Christianity is still popular.

2) Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism:

The tenets of Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism are detailed below:

2A) Gender:

Gender is a social construct.

All psychological differences between men and women are the result of cultural training, never biology or genetics.

There are no significant differences between men and women beyond how they conceive children.

The only explanation for why men do better than women in certain domains is that women are discriminated against; it is impossible that men are on average better at certain activities while women are on average better at others.

2B) Race:

Race is a social construct.

The only meaningful difference between racial groups is skin color.

There are no psychological differences between racial groups, and even if there are, they are certainly the result of cultural training, not biology or genetics.

The only explanation for why some racial groups attain higher status in macro dominance hierarchies than others is racism. The only possible explanation for why whites have higher incomes than blacks on average is racial discrimination.

2C) Intelligence Isn't Real, Everyone Is Equally Competent:

Every individual is equally intelligent.

IQ isn't real. Nobody is smarter than anyone else.

Even if we admit IQ is real, there certainly are not racial disparities in IQ, or a gender difference.

2D) Reality Check:

Of course, each of the tenets listed above is precisely the *opposite* of reality.

In reality, men and women have profound psychological differences and many of these differences are the result of men and women facing different evolutionary pressures.

Biology and genetics do drive psychological differences between men and women, to some significant degree.

In reality there are differences between racial/ethnic groups beyond skin color, and many of these differences are driven by evolutionary pressures and genetics, not cultural training.

In reality, intelligence is real and some individuals have more of it than others. IQ tests do a good job of measuring intelligence.

IQ differences between individuals are the result of genetics, not just the environment.

There are racial/ethnic disparities in IQ, and these are the result of genetics, not just the environment.

There is a gender difference in IQ; male IQ is more variable than female IQ (most geniuses are men, and most idiots are men). This is almost certainly due to the fact that there is greater variability in what a Y-chromosome holds than in what an X-chromosome holds.

3) Sheep, Martyrs, Undercover Red Pillers:

In any society, people will relate to the dominant ideology in one of 3 ways; they will be Sheep, Martyrs, or Undercover Red Pillers.

A) Sheep:

“The people will believe whatever the media tells them.” –George Orwell

Most people are sheep; they will accept the dominant ideology of their society without question.

B) Martyrs:

“No one is hated more than he who speaks the truth.” -Plato

Martyrs are people who are intelligent enough to be capable of recognizing the parts of the dominant ideology of their society that are false, or if the entirety of the ideology that is currently dominant is false, they will reject it in its entirety.

Not only do they inwardly reject it, but **they also publicly speak out against it.**

Martyrs living in modern Saudi Arabia would be those who publicly point out that believing there is a god in the sky named Allah is as insane as believing in Santa Clause and the Tooth Fairy.

Martyrs living in modern America would be those who publicly point out that gender is *not* just a social construct; that there are psychological differences between men and women driven by genetics, not just cultural training.

Regardless of what society they live in, Martyrs are invariably punished.

In some societies, the punishment is as gentle as social ostracism or perhaps being fired from one's job (see modern

America). In others, the punishment could be as harsh as imprisonment or execution (see modern Saudi Arabia).

C) Undercover Red Pillers:

Undercover Red Pillers are those who recognize the falsehoods contained within the dominant ideology of the society they are living in, and who inwardly reject it.

However, **in public they pay lip service to the tenets of the dominant ideology, in order to avoid punishment.**

Inwardly they match the martyrs, while outwardly they match the sheep.

These are essentially people who effectively apply Law 38 (Think As You Like But Behave Like Others).

An Undercover Red Pillar living in 2020 Saudi Arabia would be an atheist in private, but a Muslim in public, or at least not actively say anything against Islam.

4) Overton Shift:

The Overton Window is rarely static; it's usually moving, if only slowly.

The goalposts of political correctness are always moving; what is politically correct today may be politically incorrect next week, and what is politically incorrect today may be politically correct next week.

Paying lip service to what is politically correct is easy; it is a minor inconvenience.

The difficult part is keeping track of what is currently politically correct.

5) Punishments for Political Incorrectness:

'Free Speech' does not exist, it never did, and sadly it probably never will; in every human society people must self censor and filter what they say in order to avoid punishment.

Societies do vary in how harshly they punish speech outside the current Overton Window, but the existence of punishment for the expression of certain ideas is something universal across all societies.

6) Gender Differences With Overton Windows:

"It was always the women, and above all the young ones, who were the most bigoted adherents of the Party, the swallows of slogans, the amateur spies and nosers-out of unorthodoxy." -George Orwell, 1984

Women tend towards submitting to the dominant ideology of the society they live in far more intensely than men do.

In 2020 America, you will find that women in Leftwing communities submit to Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism more intensely than the men, and you will find that women in Rightwing communities submit to Christianity more intensely than the men.

The evolutionary reason for this is straightforward; women tend towards agreement with the group consensus as a means of avoiding ostracism.

For a man in a hunter gatherer tribe, ostracism would have damaged his odds of survival, but he could conceivably survive on his own for some period of time, at least long enough to find a new tribe.

A woman on the other hand would have no hope of surviving without the aid of her tribe for any significant amount of time, particularly if she was burdened by pregnancy.

For a man ostracism was bad but survivable, whereas for a woman it would have been a death sentence. As such women evolved to be more concerned with avoiding ostracism, and by extension more submissive to whatever ideology was currently dominant.

Not only do women submit themselves to the dominant ideology of their society, but they also desire that others submit. **Women tend to police the speech and thinking of others far more intensely than men do; women are more likely than men to desire that those who express ideas outside the current Overton Window (ideas that are politically incorrect) be punished.**

Being a zealous supporter of the Thought Police is a female dominated activity.

ThoughtCrime is the holding of ideas outside the current Overton Window and SpeechCrime is the public expression of such ideas.

Men are far more likely than women to commit ThoughtCrime and SpeechCrime.

Women are far more likely than men to desire that those who engage in ThoughtCrime and SpeechCrime be punished.

It also seems to be the case that women are on average better than men at keeping track of what is currently politically correct; keeping track of where the bounds of the current Overton Window are.

7) Autists Are Martyrs:

Autistic men represent an extreme among men. Not only do they instinctively say what they actually think (StraightTalk) rather than pay lip service to what is currently politically correct (PowerTalk), they seem *completely incapable* of keeping track of what is and is not politically correct.

Autists are incapable of keeping track of where the current Overton Window is.

You will find that almost 100% of women are Sheep and 90% of men are Sheep. 9% of men are Undercover Red Pillers. 1% of men or less are Martyrs.

Autistic men are disproportionately likely to be Martyrs.

8) Public Opinion is an Effect, not a Cause:

“...all states are ruled by elites who subdue their subjects with illusions...Public opinion is an effect, not a cause. Told the same story, most people will have the same opinion. Story drives opinion; opinion drives action. -Curtis Yarvin, The ClearPill

There is of course the matter of how an ideology becomes dominant within a society, and how it maintains its dominance.

In most societies, the mainstream media and education system (academia) are nothing more than mass distribution networks for propaganda. They are used to distribute propaganda that persuades the masses to buy into the ideology that the controllers of the media and academia want to sell.

The purpose of the mainstream media (or any media outlet) is not to tell the truth, but rather to manipulate public opinion as the controllers of the media see fit. The news is not reported; it is manufactured. To any competent machiavellian this sounds obvious, yet you will find that most people walking around the streets of any given society don't realize it.

In any given society it is impossible to overestimate the ubiquity of its dominant ideology; the dominant ideology will be ubiquitous within the media, education system, and even in the country's laws.

9) Ubiquity, Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism:

In modern America Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism has infected every corner of society, including Academia.

There are scientists who have to go out of their way to avoid publishing data that shows psychological differences between men and women, or psychological differences between racial/ethnic groups, that are likely driven by

genetics.

If they were to publish such data, they would be at risk of being called 'sexist' or 'racist' and fired.

It is true to say that **factual correctness and political correctness are mutually exclusive**. It is politically correct to say that IQ isn't real; everyone is equally smart. It is factually correct to say that IQ is real; some people are smarter than others, and genetics plays a significant role in it.

10) Forbidden Ideas Are Often True:

"Reality is not politically correct." -Illimitable Man

It is ~~often~~ always the case that the truth lays outside the current Overton Window.

Sadly, few people are capable of real critical thinking; exploring ideas that lay outside the Overton Window of the society they were born into.

In 2020 Saudi Arabia, it is politically correct to say there is a god living in the sky named Allah. The truth is that Allah is as real as Santa Clause.

In 2020 America, it is politically correct to say gender is a social construct; that all psychological differences between men and women are the result of cultural training, and not at all genetics. The truth is that there are many psychological differences between men and women that are the result of biology/genetics, not merely cultural training.

There is a 100% chance that you were born into a society where there is a dominant ideology, and there is a 100% chance that the dominant ideology is wrong, at least in some ways. Many of the things you were taught are true from the day you were born, you will find are false.

At as young an age as possible, take note of what the dominant ideology of your society is, and figure out what lies it is telling. Perhaps it's 100% lies, perhaps it's only partially false.

For the rest of your life, apply Law 38: outwardly pay lip service to the dominant ideology, while inwardly being aware of the truth.

What are the ideas that you are required to believe, and that you would be punished if you criticized? There is a very high probability that those ideas are lies.

What are the questions you would be punished for asking? There is a very high probability that those questions will lead you to the truth.

11) Intellectual Discourse, Constrained By Political Correctness:

Politicians, journalists, and academics can never engage in real intellectual discourse because if they say anything outside the current Overton Window they will be at risk of getting fired.

The only time people have real 'free speech' is when they are anonymous.

Whenever someone speaks without the shield of anonymity, they must self censor and filter what they say to avoid expressing any unpopular ideas that would result in reputational damage, ostracism, job loss, imprisonment, execution, or some other form of punishment.

12) Law 38, Don't Be A Martyr:

Finding the truth is irreversible.

Once you see the truth you can never unsee it, even if you want to.

If you find any truths that are politically incorrect in the time and place where you live, never express them

publicly, lest you be punished.

Be an Undercover Red Pill, not a Martyr.

Apply Law 38 like your life depends on it; it does.

You will need to apply Law 38 even when in conversation only with close friends and family members; it's very possible one of those close to you would reveal to the public or those in power that you have politically incorrect beliefs, and thereby bring harm upon you.

Most people in the general population are Sheep brainwashed by whatever ideology is currently dominant; odds are, your close friends and family members will not be exceptions to this.

Law 4 + Law 38 works like a charm; say nothing and most people will automatically assume you hold the same opinions they do, or at least that your opinions are politically correct.

Avoid talking about controversial topics.

If someone else brings up a controversial topic, say nothing.

If you are pressed for your opinion, say something politically correct, or that implies you agree with the opinion of the other person. A neutral comment that will be politically correct for almost any controversial topic is this; "It's an unfortunate state of affairs."

13) Relevant Reading:

Critical Thinking and Citations Needed Fallacy (Illimitable Man)

What You Can't Say (Paul Graham)

Novelty and Heresy (Paul Graham)

Law 38 (The 48 Laws of Power)

Forbidden Knowledge (Sam Harris, Charles Murray)

Google's Ideological Echo Chamber (James Damore)

14) Further Reflections:

14A) Critical Thinkers Are Rare:

Most people do not think for themselves, should not think for themselves, and cannot be expected to think for themselves.

Public opinion is determined by whoever controls the mainstream media.

People who automatically accept the dominant ideology of the society they are living in are common. People who engage in real critical thinking are rare.

14B) Mainstream Is Always Wrong:

One thing is certain: **the mainstream always lies, the masses are always wrong.**

If what you actually believe is something that the masses would agree with, you are certainly wrong.

If the masses disagree with your actual beliefs, then perhaps you are right, and perhaps you are wrong. Further investigation is needed.

14C) Facts vs Narratives:

When the facts contradict the narrative those in power are trying to push, the facts will be dismissed, and whoever dares to present them will be hit with an ad hominem attack.

It is the purview of the monied elite to control public opinion, to control the Overton Window, and ensure that their interests are secured.

In 2020 America, the mainstream narrative is that the reason whites have higher incomes than blacks is because of racial discrimination and white supremacy.

An inconvenient fact is that whites on average have higher IQs than blacks, and if you adjust for IQ you find that white men and black men have equal incomes over the course of a lifetime. Anyone who publicly presents this fact will be called a 'Racist' and dismissed. See the fate of Charles Murray (author of **The Bell Curve**).

'Racist' is an ad hominem used against those who tell the truth about racial disparities in IQ (and that racial disparities in IQ explain racial disparities in income).

'Sexist' is an ad hominem used against those who tell the truth about behavioral and psychological differences between men and women, and the degree to which these differences are driven by biology/genetics rather than cultural training.

14D) Science Denialism, Leftwing and Rightwing

Individuals and entire societies will deny scientific facts if those facts contradict their ideology.

Leftwing Americans deny the scientific facts surrounding IQ, male IQ being more variable than female IQ, and racial disparities in IQ, because these facts contradict their ideology of Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism.

Rightwing Americans deny the scientific facts surrounding Climate Change because these facts contradict their desire to believe that burning fossil fuels isn't a problem.

14E) Leftwing DoubleThink:

Leftwing Americans of 2020 have the following form of doublethink:

1: Evolution is real. Natural selection is what drives evolution. We should teach evolution in school. Christian Creationists are ridiculous.

2: There are no psychological differences between men and women driven by evolution. There are no psychological differences between different racial/ethnic groups driven by evolution, besides skin color.

Essentially, Leftwing Americans would have us believe that evolution stops at the neck; that evolution has no impacts on psychology.

14F) Winning Streak, American Leftwing:

From 1860 – 2020, the American Leftwing has had a 160 year long winning streak.

The Overton Window of America has been shifting Leftward for at least 160 years.

When you walk onto a university campus in America, you will witness what the Overton Window will look like in America 20 years in the future; universities tend to be more left leaning than the general population.

The Overton Window found on an American university campus in 2000, is the same as the Overton Window of America as an entire country in the year 2020.

'Political Correctness' is a euphemism for 'Speech Control'.

15) Illimitable Man's Reflections:

15A) Critical Thinking, Citations Needed Fallacy:

“Ideological frameworks are belief systems that fill the vacuum left by an absence of religiosity, for whether one wishes to believe in God or not, humans have a propensity to seek a single unifying framework with which to make sense of the world. And so if one is to abandon religion due to a loss of faith, they will invariably act to fill their answerless identitarian void by adopting a completely new ideological system altogether.

In devoutly religious societies, the ruling religion embeds its ideological hegemony into the very essence of the nation by codifying its values into the architecture of its institutions: academia, the media, and law being the most prominent. In Saudi Arabia, this ideology would be Wahhabi Islam, under the Third Reich it was Nazism, and in the contemporary west, its the oppression Olympics more commonly known as political correctness but more accurately termed cultural Marxism.

As was stated in Robert Greene's 48 Laws of Power, humans have an insatiable need to believe in something, and that something can be anything, but they have to believe in something, and it need not even be positive – only concretised as a suitable explanation for everything in the mind of the adherent. And although the word ‘belief’ has an overwhelmingly positive connotation attached to it, even a nihilist believes. The nihilist may believe “everything is pointless because it is the product of randomness rather than purposefulness”, and yet this is a belief nonetheless.

The intelligent have a propensity to self-develop hybrid systems of belief consisting of aspects from many different ideologies, religions and philosophies, whereas the masses adopt pre-existing ideology wholesale, leaving vast opportunity to mislead and control them via brainwashing, groupthink and social engineering...”

15B) Womanly Duplicity and Its Constituent Parts:

“Where men adopt their own principles, women adopt the principles of the most powerful people in their lives.

Where men fight enemy tribes and die in war, women fall in love with their captors using their innate capacity for cunning to completely remould themselves and even thrive – a feat even the most objectively talented man would be hard pressed to perform.”

15C) Twitter:

“In countries with no freedom of press, the authoritarian government controls the media arm, and pushes narratives which promote national unity to make effective governance easier.

In democracies, they're a cluster fuck of competing special interest groups vying for profit & power.

The primary goal and purpose of the media is not to inform the public, but to influence the population's perspective on a wide range of issues to facilitate the political and economic interests of the media controllers.

Informing the public is always a loose secondary objective.

“It's about winning hearts and minds”.

Literally, and I mean quite literally no one, cares about facts or truth once the narrative popularises & reaches a widely agreed upon consensus.

At this point, you're post-truth and the big lie has prevailed.

These are the times we live in.

Never put it beyond a propagandist to fabricate, smear, gaslight, deny, spin or otherwise outright make bullshit up.

Remember, they don't care about the truth, all they care about is achieving their aims.

It's an information war, and your mind is the battleground.

Know when you're being manipulated. Don't be a pawn in someone else's game

A good propaganda campaign highlights supporting evidence, and neglects, dismisses or outright ignores variables which impair its message.

It cannot be fair and balanced in its weighing of truth, for to do so would be to reduce its persuasiveness – undermining the intended goal.

Truth is the first casualty in the creation of narrative, when you need to ignore inconvenient facts to make it work, or cherry pick your gripes to form a skewed perception.”

“Feelings don't care about your facts. Which is why they are to be manipulated, not reasoned with.”

“Most men are afraid to say what they really think about things around women, and so tone down, filter and censor themselves around them as not to upset them.”

“Women rarely go against crowd consensus. Men do this shit all the time. There are evolutionary reasons for this, but I cannot be bothered to explain them right now.”

16) Roosh:

“Discovering a lie is almost always the tip of an iceberg that there have been additional lies which—at the minimum—relate to the initial lie.” -Roosh

17) Noam Chomsky:

“The smart way to keep people passive and obedient is to strictly limit the spectrum of acceptable opinion, but allow very lively debate within that spectrum – even encourage the more critical and dissident views.

That gives people the sense that there's free thinking going on, while all the time the presuppositions of the system are being reinforced by the limits put on the range of the debate.”

Machiavellian Reflections (Part 4)

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

149: “People are more motivated by the relative inequality, than by the absolute level of well being.” –Brett Weinstein

People are more motivated by their level of relative wealth, than by their absolute level of wealth.

Why?

Because it isn't about money or wealth.

It's about status and power.

150: Men who engage in extreme behavior for the sake of having a shot at getting rich usually aren't motivated by the prospect of having a high level of absolute wealth.

They are motivated by attaining high status, and power.

'Extreme Behavior' would mean 80 hour workweeks, borrowing money to start a business and thereby risking bankruptcy, or breaking laws for the sake of making money.

151: The higher a person's testosterone levels are, the more they will care about attaining high status.

Men have more testosterone than women, and young men have more testosterone than old men.

Consequently, men care more about attaining status than women do, and young men care more than old men.

152: Power is worth any price.

When you are playing The Game of Power, it is impossible to overestimate how high the stakes are.

153: When evil people die, the world becomes a better place.

154: Being evil and being widely respected are not mutually exclusive.

The most evil people on the planet, are respectable.

155: Power will give any man respectability, no matter how heinous his actions may be.

Virtue almost never wins a man respect.

Power always does.

156: Lives are not valued equally.

Some people's lives are considered to be immensely important, other people's lives are considered to be worthless.

157: How you rank in the macro dominance hierarchy is a matter of life and death.

If for no other reason, in every society it has been the case that the higher your status in the hierarchy the better your access to medical care.

If you are a billionaire and you get sick, you will get instant access to the best medical care on the planet. Your odds of survival are good.

If you are homeless and you get sick, you will get delayed access to shoddy medical care, or no medical care at all. Your odds of survival are bad.

158: It is astronomically better to be powerful, than to be powerless.

A billionaire does not have slightly more wealth than a homeless man; he has astronomically more wealth.

159: Atrocities committed directly are punished more harshly than atrocities committed indirectly.

If you kill 1 man with your own hands, you will be thrown into prison for decades.

If you kill 1,000 men by hiring 1 million to work in your factories, and 1 thousand die in workplace accidents, you will receive no punishment at all.

160: Every society is 1 incompetent leader away from collapse.

161: In most groups, women are the arbiters of status.

If the women of the group like you, then perhaps your status in the group will be high and perhaps your status in the group will be low.

However if the women of the group *dislike* you, then your status in the group will certainly be low.

162: Note that women are *not* independently minded. They will default towards agreeing with whatever the opinion of other women is.

If one woman in a group likes you, and all the others haven't met you yet, the other women will be inclined to also like you.

If one woman in the group dislikes you, and all the others haven't met you yet, the other women will be inclined to also dislike you.

Whatever one woman in a group thinks of you, is probably what all the women in the group think of you.

163: In some groups, engaging in violence will cause you to win status. In others, engaging in violence will cause you to lose status.

If you are a member of a gang in West Baltimore, then engaging in violence is mandatory for attaining high status within the group.

If you are an employee at a law firm, then engaging in violence will instantly cause you to be low status; you will be fired within 24 hours.

164: In groups of high IQ men engaging in violence will cause you to lose status, whereas in groups of low IQ men engaging in violence will cause you to win status.

Exceptions may apply.

165: The reason men engage in violence is because they know that doing so can win them status, or at least power.

166: In order for violence to win a person status, it must be carried out against the right people and for the right reasons.

Violence against outgroup members (people from an enemy tribe) is far more likely to win a man status than violence against ingroup members.

167: A major reason men agree to risk their lives by going to war is because they subconsciously understand that engaging in violence against members of an enemy tribe can win them high status.

Men want status, because having high status makes them more sexually attractive to women.

168: The wages in Finance, Law, and Sales are high because the supply of people who have the intelligence, ruthlessness, stress tolerance, and cunning that is needed to do the work effectively is very low.

A low supply of labor inevitably means high wages.

169: The greatest politicians don't work in government, they work in banking.

170: Machiavellians are individuals capable of doing the things that psychology professors at university's *wish* they

could do: charm people, persuade people, deceive people, and read body language effectively.

Lawyers, bankers, and salesmen have a far deeper and more accurate understanding of human psychology than most psychology professors.

171: A man is more likely to make it to the pinnacle of any macro dominance hierarchy than a woman, for many reasons.

Male IQ is more variable than female IQ; most geniuses are men, and genius level intelligence is an immense advantage for transcending dominance hierarchies.

Men are more risk aggressive than women; a willingness to take risks increases the odds of someone making it to the pinnacle of the hierarchy (and also the probability of them ending up at the very bottom).

172: In every profession, at the elite level use of performance enhancing drugs is the rule not the exception.

In Finance, Law, and Sales use of stimulants (Modafinil) is common. Nobody is working 60 hours a week on caffeine alone.

Creative types such as artists and engineers often use psychedelics (micro-dosing LSD); it helps facilitate divergent thinking.

IM once said this.

173: Highly functional autists tend to excel in engineering and science.

Autistic Billionaires:

Mark Zuckerberg

Bill Gates

Jeff Bezos

174: Highly functional psychopaths tend to excel in finance, law, and politics.

Psychopathic Billionaires:

Steve Cohen

Paul Singer

Vladimir Putin

175: Rhetoric is using words that are emotionally impactful, but that have no specific meaning.

Rightwing Rhetoric uses words such as 'Freedom' and 'Greatness'.

Leftwing Rhetoric uses words such as 'Equality' and 'Justice'.

The masses are foolish enough to fall for rhetoric.

176: Politics has life and death consequences.

"I'm not interested in politics" is a luxury for those who live in times of peace.

"I don't care about politics" is a euphemism for "I don't care about the fate of my civilization."

177: The politics of your country is like the weather of your country; it is out of your control, and it affects you.

178: To be born at a time when your civilization is declining is obviously a curse, but it can also be a blessing.

After a civilization crumbles, a new order will inevitably emerge. Power abhors a vacuum.

If you were born at a time when your civilization is collapsing, you were born at precisely the right time to

seize power.

179: “Insanity is rare in individuals. In groups, it is the rule.” -Nietzsche

Christians believe there is a god in the sky with a son named Jesus.

Muslims believe there is a god in the sky named Allah, with a prophet named Muhammad.

Hindus believe that after they die, they will be reincarnated.

Communists believe that free market capitalism will never work, and a command economy will.

Cultural Marxists (Blank Slate Theory Egalitarians, Leftwing Americans from 1990 – 2020), believe that IQ isn't real, gender is a social construct, and race is a social construct.

All are delusional.

180: In every society, there is a dominant ideology.

Every dominant ideology that has ever existed has been wrong about at least some things.

181: Most people are sheep who will accept the dominant ideology of their society without question.

182: Few people are willing to commit atrocities with their own hands, but they will support a regime that carries out atrocities so long as they don't have to personally do the dirty work.

183: Euphemistic language is the mechanism by which outwardly respectable people conceal their sins.

“I am against universalized healthcare” is a euphemism for “If poor people die because they can't buy medical care, I don't care.”

“I am for affirmative action” is a euphemism for “I am for discriminating on the basis of racial group, so long as the victims are whites rather than blacks.”

184: You can get the masses to accept atrocities, so long as you make them feel normal.

Throwing children into gas chambers (Nazis)?

Slavery (Confederates)?

Collectivizing farms and causing mass starvation (Communism)?

Selling medical care for extortionate prices, and leaving poor people who fall sick to die (American Medical System)?

The masses can be made to accept all of these things without a fight, so long as you make them feel normal.

185: The Leftwing pathology is being concerned about inequality, and putting mechanisms in place to alleviate inequality that are ultimately counterproductive.

See ‘Communism’ and ‘Affirmative Action’.

186: The Rightwing pathology is callous indifference regarding the suffering of those at the bottom of the dominance hierarchy.

187: In the Leftwing you will find insanity. In the Rightwing you will find cruelty.

188: Those who are in power are almost always conservative. Those who are powerless are almost always liberal.

Those in power are happy with their current position and have a lot to lose, so they want nothing to change.

Those who are powerless are miserable in their current position and have little to lose, so change appeals to them.

There are times in history when the Leftwing has stood for the interests of the rich and powerful while the

Rightwing has stood for the interests of the poor and powerless, but this has been the exception rather than the rule.

189: When it comes to decision-making, throw ideology and principles out the window.

All that matters are realistic options and real world consequences.

If a person insists on doing things a certain way because their ideology demands it, and the method they are insisting on will lead to sub-optimal results, they must be ignored.

Indeed, if they make decisions on the basis of ideology or principles rather than consequences they shouldn't be entrusted with decision-making in the first place.

190: The personal is political. The political is personal.

191: Politics is nothing more than propaganda wars.

192: The masses are foolish enough to fall for propaganda.

Most people's opinions are not the result of rigorous logical reasoning; they are pre-packaged opinions delivered to their mind via propaganda.

193: Most people are sheep; they don't engage in any critical thinking.

They formulate their opinions and make decisions based on *Social Proof* and *Authority*.

Social Proof: "What is everyone else doing?"

Authority: "What do the people in power tell me to do?"

194: Nobody has ever won an election by telling the truth.

195: If the people at the top of the macro dominance hierarchy are more concerned with enhancing their own power and wealth than they are with the well being of their society, that civilization is doomed.

196: 'Rights' are a joke.

There are no 'Rights'.

There are temporary privileges that will be rescinded the moment it becomes inconvenient for those who wield power to uphold them.

197: "You must train yourself to see *circumstances*, never 'good' or 'evil'." –The 48 Laws

If you view the world in terms of good vs evil, nothing makes sense.

If you view the world in terms of amoral competition for power, with people's interests often being in zero sum competition with one another's...everything makes sense.

198: Conflicts between good and evil are rare.

Conflicts between interests that are in zero sum competition with one another are common.

Rarely is it about morality; usually it's just about power.

199: The interests of the rich and the interests of the poor are almost always in zero sum competition with one another.

A rich person who says "We're all in this together" is lying.

In a capitalist society, it is in the best interest of the rich for wages to be low; to them wages represent labor costs.

On the other hand, it is in the best interest of the poor for wages to be high; to them wages represent income.

It is in the best interest of the poor for there to be a 'universal basic income' that is funded by taxes on the rich

being increased.

It is in the best interest of the rich for there to be no 'universal basic income' or wealth redistribution of any kind, so that they don't have to pay taxes to fund it.

200: As inequality rises, the competition for power intensifies.

More intense inequality means more violence; a higher gini coefficient means a higher homicide rate.

Intensifying inequality also means a higher probability of violent revolution.

201: Often some degree of wealth redistribution is necessary for the sake of ensuring the inequality in a society does not become so intense that it sparks violent revolution.

Communism has historically led to mass starvation.

However, placing high taxes on the rich and distributing wealth to the entire population in the form of government services (infrastructure and welfare) is a mechanism by which inequality can be suppressed without causing mass starvation.

Placing high taxes on the rich and giving free stuff (universal basic income) to the masses is not equivalent to 'Communism', just as drinking caffeine is not the same as doing lines of cocaine until you die.

202: If a government gives free stuff to the masses and funds the free stuff by borrowing money, it will lead to economic catastrophe.

Sooner or later the government will either go bankrupt or print money to pay off its debts and thereby cause hyperinflation.

See Venezuela from 1990 – 2020.

203: If a government gives free stuff to the masses and funds the free stuff by raising taxes on the rich, it can be functional.

See Denmark from 1990 – 2020.

204: Wealth redistribution is like caffeine; it can be beneficial so long as it is used in small controlled amounts.

205: America from 1990 – 2020 has thus far looked like Venezuela, not Denmark.

206: Women tend to be more disturbed by intense levels of wealth inequality than men.

207: Women tend to vote for socialism; women are more in favor of wealth redistribution than men.

Giving women the vote increases the probability that a government will do wealth redistribution, and the degree of redistribution that is done.

This is not intrinsically good or bad, it's simply a factor one should be aware.

208: There is only one solution to wealth inequality; ensure you are on the winning side.

209: If a person is impulsive and narcissistic, this alone makes them unworthy of a leadership position.

Do not entrust them with any decision-making responsibilities.

Their impulsivity will lead to them making decisions that feel good in the moment but that have disastrous long-term consequences.

Their narcissism will drive them to make decisions that stroke their ego, but that are strategically counterproductive.

This may sound obvious, but there are many narcissistic men with low impulse control who the masses find to be charismatic; they consequently attain leadership positions.

210: If the leader of a society is both narcissistic and impulsive, that society is doomed.

211: Every ideology agrees that killing innocent people is wrong.

What they disagree about is who qualifies as 'innocent'.

Communists don't think rich people are innocent.

Islam doesn't think infidels are innocent.

Nazis don't think that Jewish people are innocent.

212: People will intentionally misrepresent what you said, to make you look bad.

213: If a person is trying to obscure or hide information the probability they are trustworthy is zero.

Don't trust those who attempt to prevent transparency.

214: Emotional people are the majority. Logical people are a tiny minority.

Emotional people prioritize their feelings over facts, their sensibilities over finding reality, and make decisions on the basis of what their emotions and instincts tell them to do.

Logical people prioritize facts over feelings, and finding reality over not having their sensibilities offended. They make decisions based on careful calculation.

Emotional people: 100% of women, 99% of men

Logical People: 1% of men. Autistic men. High IQ men with high testosterone levels.

215: When trying to understand the behavior or actions of others, most logical men start from the baseline assumption that people have good reason to engage in the actions they have taken.

This assumption is wrong; most people take actions and make decisions based on what their emotions and instincts urge them to do.

Essentially, logical men project their own logical nature onto others, when in reality most others are *not* logical.

For the sake of having an accurate understanding of why people take the actions they take, don't start from the premise that their actions are the result of careful calculation.

Instead, start from the premise that they most likely took actions that *felt good* and were driven by instinct and emotion, rather than logic.

216: Actions that are driven by careful logical reasoning are rare.

Actions that are driven by emotion and instinct are common.

217: Politicians and judges are like houses; they can be bought, and most appreciate in value over time.

Machiavellian Reflections (Part 3)

machiavelllicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

100: If they talk a lot and say nothing, they are either hiding something (Politicians and Lawyers) or they are so dumb that they can't articulate a clear point (masses).

In either case, don't trust that they will take actions that advance your interests.

101: God cannot change the past. A decent lawyer can.

102: Laws are invented and enforced in an entirely arbitrary manner.

What laws exist, and what laws are enforced, depend entirely on the whims of whoever is currently in power.

103: Different people are held to different standards.

Double standards are the rule, not the exception.

104: The lower your status is, the more likely you are to be ostracized.

People's aversion to being perceived as low status is tied to their fear of ostracism.

105: How someone responds to the realization that the future is hopeless tells you a lot about them.

Some become depressed and suicidal.

Some blindly work harder, as if more effort will somehow save them.

Some start executing every high risk high reward strategy available, with the logic that they have nothing to lose and everything to gain.

106: Quality of Life is Pareto distributed.

Most people have terrible lives, a tiny minority have spectacular lives.

Worldly wealth is Pareto distributed; a tiny minority are rich and high status, most are poor and low status.

Quality of Life and Worldly Wealth correlate very strongly.

107: A venture delayed is a venture foregone.

108: People who succeed overestimate the role of their own talent and underestimate the role of good luck.

People who fail overestimate the role of bad luck and underestimate the role of their own foolishness.

109: Secrets should go with you to the grave. Wisdom should not.

110: Narcissistic men judge you by your net worth.

If you want to win the respect of a narcissistic man, be rich and powerful.

111: Autistic men judge you by the wisdom you provide.

If you want to win the respect of a high IQ autistic man, express wisdom that he considers valuable.

112: If a society is strong militarily, a direct attack against it is hopeless. If you attempt to destroy it by military invasion from the outside you will lose.

However, destroying it from the inside out is still a viable method of attack.

Covert subversion can still work.

113: Very few powerful empires are brought down by invasions from the outside.

Usually, they are brought down from the inside out; by the foolishness of their own citizens and leaders.

114: The leaders of a society are a reflection of the people of the society.

If the leaders are crooked, chances are the people are crooked.

115: To be a great analyzer, and to be a great executer, are 2 separate abilities.

Robert Greene is the greatest machiavellian analyzer on the planet.

Is he the best executer? Certainly not.

That title belongs to Vladimir Putin, or perhaps Barrack Obama.

116: To be far richer than others is good, but to appear far richer than others is dangerous; it makes you a target for envy.

By all outward appearances, seem to be just one more middle class average Joe.

This way you can enjoy your wealth in peace without being a target for backstabbing...or lawsuits.

This sounds obvious, yet the world is full of narcissistic men who will go out of their way to flaunt their wealth.

117: There are people who will dislike you simply for being richer than them, but most will not

Most people will only dislike you for being richer than them if you display narcissism; if you go out of your way to display your superiority.

118: Generally speaking defense wins and offense loses.

Defense is easier than offense because it is easier to hold territory than it is to take territory.

In order for offense to win, *speed* and the element of surprise are critical.

An offensive strategy must be carried out so fast that the defender does not realize what is happening, until it's already too late.

119: When you are on offense, you need things to move as fast as possible.

When you are on defense, you need things to move as slowly as possible; delay however possible.

120: Speed matters.

If you and your competitors are equally good at every task, but they are 1% faster than you, you will lose every single time.

A large part of the reason a high IQ is an advantage in life is this: almost everything in life is a race.

Almost every activity where money can be made is a race, either against time or against competitors.

Part of having a high IQ is that you are *faster* than other people.

121: The telltale sign a man is narcissistic is this: he is insolent, yet also thin skinned.

Narcissistic men are quick to offend others, yet they themselves are easily offended.

They are arrogant on the outside and neurotic on the inside.

Narcissists do not have calmness; they have insecurity masquerading as confidence.

122: The litmus test for whether a man is confident or narcissistic is this; insult him.

If he explodes in rage, this indicates narcissism.

If he remains perfectly calm, this indicates confidence.

123: Narcissistic men are unstable, yet also predictable.

To predict their behavior, simply ask yourself “What would the stereotypical high school bully do?”

124: If you find narcissistic men to be distasteful, know that you are an outlier.

Most people (the masses) find narcissistic men to be charismatic.

Donald Trump and Jordan Belfort show that there will always be a significant faction of the population that finds narcissistic men to be charming, no matter how clearly pathological their psyche may be.

125: Many narcissists make great salesmen, con men, and politicians

126: There is one narcissistic man, with many faces.

Once you know one narcissistic man well, you will notice that all the other narcissistic men you encounter have identical personalities to the first one you became well acquainted with.

127: Ruthlessness is being indifferent to the well being of others. Willingness to harm others, only if there is a practical reason to do so. This is typical of psychopathic men.

Anger, Hatred, or Sadism is having an active desire to harm others, even when there is nothing practical to be gained from doing so. Actively taking pleasure in seeing others suffer. This is typical of narcissistic men.

128: Ruthlessness is a tactical asset; it enables you to harm others for your own gain when there is an actual gain to be had.

Anger and Sadism are tactical liabilities; they motivate you to harm others even when there is no real gain from doing so, and even when you may experience a significant loss from doing so.

129: “To hate is to self induce torture and misery – things that as someone who competes for power are devices that you cannot allow to possess you as they will divorce you from your ambitions.” -Illimitable man, The Feminine Conundrum

Ruthlessness is psychologically healthy.

Anger, Hatred, and Sadism, are psychologically unhealthy. People filled with Hatred are tortured by it.

Harboring Anger in your heart is like drinking poison and hoping someone else will die. Buddha once said this.

130: Confidence is a tactical asset.

Ego is a tactical liability.

Ego drags you into doing things that are tactically counterproductive because they stroke your ego, and prevents you from doing things that would be tactically beneficial since they offend your ego.

131: Beware of those who try to manipulate you into doing something by appealing to your ego.

A man with an ego is easy to manipulate.

Simply imply he's a 'coward' or 'weakling' or 'not a real man' for refusing to do something, and he'll do it.

Whenever someone says “Real men do X”, what they mean is “I am trying to manipulate you into doing X, by appealing to your ego.”

132: Never let your ego get in the way of doing what is tactically in your best interest.

Your ego doesn't matter. Only outcomes do.

Narcissists never realize this.

133: The course of action that strokes your ego will almost never be the course of action that is most tactically effective.

134: The difference between 'Ego' and 'Honor' is that narcissistic men have plenty of the former, and none of the latter.

135: Men, particularly young men, will do anything to attain high status.

They evolved to be this way because having high status is something that makes men sexually attractive to women.

Men who were indifferent about winning status never did so, they were thus unattractive to women, and they failed to reproduce.

136: You can manipulate men into doing just about anything by telling them "Do X, and it will give you status."

137: You can convince young men to join your army and risk death in combat, fighting wars that benefit you and yield zero material benefit to them, by simply propagandizing them into seeing military membership as something that grants high status.

Slogans like 'Support the Troops' and 'Thank You For Your Service' have done this in America.

138: **"When people who dislike you ask questions, it's not because they care about the truth. It's a trap. An attempt, to humiliate you. Legitimate questions are asked in order to understand a thing, illegitimate questions are fodder for reputation smearing and perception control."** –Illimitable Man

Beware of ADAAQs: Accusations Disguised As A Question

139: When someone accuses you of something, don't lend legitimacy to the accusation by answering it directly.

Ignore the accusation against you, and launch counter accusations at your adversary.

140: Conditional loyalty is not loyalty. It is mercenarism.

141: In your entire life, there will be at most 5 people who are loyal to you in both good times and bad.

Be kind to these people; they are the most valuable asset you shall ever have.

142: Betrayal from a friend is far more dangerous than attack from an enemy.

The closer someone is to you, the more quickly and extensively they can damage you.

Few powerful men are destroyed by their enemies.

Far more common are powerful men destroyed by their supposed allies.

143: It's shocking how little people know about those closest to them.

Take a moment to appreciate all the things about you those closest to you are utterly unaware of.

Now realize; there's probably just as many things about them that you are utterly unaware of.

144: If you can sense that someone resents you, or that they hold a grudge against you...get rid of them.

If you keep them around, you are doing nothing more than waiting for a knife to appear in your back.

They are a betrayal waiting to happen.

145: Resentment is usually revealed subtly, by small offhand comments or jokes that are played off as being insignificant.

146: Nobody has ever gone from the bottom of a hierarchy to the top by following the rules.

Why?

Because rules are made by the powerful, for the powerful.

In most hierarchies, the rules aren't designed to facilitate upward mobility. They are designed to *prevent* upward mobility.

The powerful design rules that ensure the people who are already at the top (themselves) stay at the top, and that those beneath them cannot rise.

147: “A good end gilds all, no matter how unsavory the means.” –Baltasar Gracian

If you play fair and lose, nobody will care that you played fair; you will be punished for losing.

If you cheat and win, nobody will care that you cheated; all anyone will remember is that you won and you shall be rewarded as such.

148: Following the rules and doing the morally right thing is often the mask of winners, and the very real handicap of losers.

Machiavellian Reflections (Part 2)

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

50: Men who have sterling reputations are simply masters of advertising their greatest moments and hiding their worst moments.

“Many men seem great, until you get to know them personally.” –Baltasar Gracian

Men who are viewed as great by the public, are usually viewed as mediocre by their families.

Why?

The public only see's their best moments. Their families see both their best and worst moments.

51: If someone feels you have wronged them, then apologize and make the apology seem genuine.

Whether or not you are actually sorry is irrelevant. Don't apologize because you are sorry. Apologize to increase the probability of them forgiving you.

Forgiveness can often be bought with nothing more than mere words. Don't let your ego get in the way of buying forgiveness free of charge.

52: He who apologizes timidly is severely punished.

He who apologizes with a demeanor of confidence, is forgiven.

53: A 'superior' is anyone who wields more power over you than you do over them.

When interacting with superiors, you should appear to be deferential.

However, if you are too obsequious it causes superiors to lose respect for you, and they can never promote someone who they do not respect.

There is a delicate balance you must maintain; appear calm, but not arrogant. Appear confident, but still polite.

54: One key tactic for charming superiors is this: make them believe that your success is a result of advice that they gave.

Whenever someone gives you advice, appear grateful, and appear to agree.

Whether or not their advice is actually good is supremely irrelevant.

55: The more unequal a society is, the more violent it will be.

Poverty does not drive violence; inequality does.

As inequality rises the competition for power intensifies, and so far as seizing power is concerned violence is the nuclear option.

56: A man wants to be powerful enough such that he can take care of himself, and take care of the people he loves.

A woman wants to be loved by a man who is powerful enough to be capable of taking care of her.

57: Within books on psychology and machiavellianism you will find ten thousand different strategies and tactics.

Of those ten thousand, only 100 will be relevant to your life.

Only 10 will be relevant to your life on a regular basis.

Essentially, there is a pareto distribution of how relevant various strategies and tactics are.

58: In your network you will have around 1,000 contacts.

900 of them give very little use to you, 90 of them give significant use, and 10 of them are critical.

Essentially, in your contact list there will be a pareto distribution of how useful each person is to you.

How much time and energy you are willing to expend in order to maintain a relationship with and keep them happy should be proportionate to how useful they are to you currently, and how useful they are likely to be in the future.

59: If a thing is revealed brazenly, it seems fake; contrived.

If a thing is revealed subtly, it seems real; genuine.

This is certainly true of compliments.

A direct compliment is likely to be perceived as disingenuous; desperate flattery.

An indirect compliment is likely to be perceived as sincere.

60: If you can deal with narcissistic men who are intelligent and borderline personality disorder women who are intelligent, you can deal with anyone.

High IQ NPD men and high IQ BPD women are the most difficult people on the planet to deal with.

What they have in common is that they are both neurotic and thin skinned. They are both fragile.

Ironically, **the most fragile people in the world and the most dangerous people in the world...are the same people.**

61: When someone asks you for a favor you should do it if possible.

There is a very high probability that at some point in the future, in a way you could not possibly foresee, you will need a favor from them; if you refuse to help them during their hour of need, they will remember this, and refuse to help you during your hour of need.

62: If someone refuses to do you a favor because they see no way they benefit by helping you, tell them, "At some point in the future, in a way that neither of us could possibly foresee, you will need my help with something. If you don't help me now, I will not help you then."

This tactic may sound extreme; it is.

It comes at the cost of guaranteeing the person will dislike you, *and* there is a very high probability that it won't work.

Only use this technique if the matter at hand is important enough to warrant it.

63: Never complain, particularly in front of others.

People have their own problems to worry about; hearing about yours only annoys them.

Caveat: You can charm a person by complaining about the same thing they are complaining about. Hatebond with them; hate the same things, and the same people, who they hate.

64: Behavior that seems insane to you may be perfectly rational for the person engaging in it.

It is likely that given your circumstances such behavior would be insane, but given their circumstances such behavior would be completely rational.

65: If you are in a position where you have a lot to lose, taking high risk high reward bets seems like insanity.

However, for a man with nothing to lose taking high risk high reward bets is completely rational; relatively speaking such a man has little to lose and a lot to gain.

People who are genuinely insane are very rare.

66: If during an ally's darkest hour you refuse to help them, the worthlessness of your loyalty shall be remembered forever.

They will never trust you again, and they will most likely refuse to ever help you again.

Indeed, they may be so enraged by your disloyalty that they actively plot revenge.

On the other hand if during an ally's darkest hour you are there to help them, they will remember your loyalty forever and be very willing to help you in the future.

When your ally is in their darkest hour, you have a very important choice to make.

67: If they are willing to do it to someone else, they are willing to do it to you.

68: A man who is useless is more likely to face ostracism than a woman who is useless.

Uselessness is more socially acceptable in a woman, than in a man.

This is because men are success objects and women are not.

69: Sadness and depression are bad for your health. Anger and narcissism are also bad for your health.

However, sadness and depression will destroy your performance, and while anger and narcissism are not ideal for performance they are an immense improvement over sadness and depression.

If your life is terrible, do what you can to convert your suffering into anger and narcissism.

As unhealthy as these mental states can be, they may give you the energy needed to drive ahead.

70: An adviser can be valuable for many reasons. Most obviously, they may have valuable insights that you don't.

More importantly, you are inevitably emotionally involved in the situations you face. You lack the mental clarity needed to do careful analysis of the situations you face. An advisor on the other hand is completely emotionally detached from the situations you face.

71: Impulsive and egotistical people cannot be entrusted with leadership positions.

As such, narcissistic men cannot be entrusted with leadership positions.

This sounds obvious, yet incredibly often many people find a narcissistic man to be charismatic and consequently they attain a position of power.

72: Be distrustful of gossips.

If a person speaks negatively of others when they aren't around, chances are they will speak negatively of you when you aren't around.

In the same spirit, be hesitant to speak negatively of others.

Speaking negatively of others makes you look bad, speaking positively of others makes you look good.

73: It is rare if ever that a woman has the power to harm a man directly.

Almost always the only power a woman has to harm a man comes indirectly, by appropriating the power of other men against him.

74: Men control civilization. Women control men.

The man behind the curtain is a woman.

75: High stress complex problem solving while in zero sum competition against adversaries who are intelligent and cunning.

Where will you find this?

-War

-Politics

-Business

76: When ending a relationship of any kind, do so as gently and as politely as possible.

You want to minimize the chance of the other party feeling so insulted that they go out of their way to seek vengeance.

This sounds obvious, yet many ignore it at their peril.

77: If you continuously treat someone like trash, sooner or later one of the following will happen:

-If they are the vengeful and vindictive type, they will take revenge.

-If they are the calm and rational type, they will simply cease their dealings with you. They will decide that associating with you is more trouble than it is worth.

This sounds obvious, yet it is often ignored.

78: The person who is the most competent, and the person who is the most likeable, are almost never the same person.

Competence and likeability/charm are 2 entirely separate things; I'd say the correlation between them is about zero.

79: If you are both competent and charming, you thrive.

If you are incompetent and charming, you survive.

If you are offensive or boring, and competent, you survive.

If you are neither competent nor charming, you die.

80: Hitler never killed anyone with his own hands. Words were his only weapons.

Words are the most dangerous weapon in the universe, because they determine who becomes the target of physical weapons.

81: Both men and women do evil. However, women are viewed as being more virtuous than men.

This is because the evil of men tends to be overt, while the evil of women tends to be covert.

82: Resentment has a critical purpose; it tells you to fight back against your oppressors.

Of course, resentment that lasts a long time or resentment that is directed at someone who has done no harm to you is pathological.

Humans have the bias of resenting anyone above them in the dominance hierarchy; assuming that their superiors are oppressing them, even if in reality they are not.

If you took this pathology and turned it into an ideology, it would be *The Communist Manifesto* by Karl Marx.

83: For the sake of winning, you will need to use some strategies and tactics that others would consider immoral.

Yet at the same time, you must appear to be a paragon of virtue, or at least a person who isn't heinous.

If people perceive that you are evil, they will be far less inclined to do you favors and may outright ostracize you.

The duplicity you must execute is this: utilize whatever methods are most effective, while at the same time

concealing the use of any that would be considered immoral.

84: When interests and incentives align, managing a relationship is effortless.

When interests and incentives do not align, managing a relationship is an endless war.

85: A dedicated minority can dominate a complacent majority.

86: To establish a relationship with a powerful person, it may be necessary for you to approach them to initiate conversation.

Avoid this if possible. Ideally, have them approach you.

How can you gain their attention (in a positive way), and make them interested in having a conversation with you?

Be exceptionally good at whatever work you do, and look good; literally be physically attractive.

87: Most people engage in zero critical thinking or rigorous logical reasoning. They operate off instinct and emotion.

Don't overestimate your competitors, or the targets of your manipulations.

88: Never put your enemy into a position where they have nothing to lose.

If they find themselves in such a position, they may decide to burn down everything; including you.

89: A man filled with both ambition and despair will engage in extreme risk taking.

He desires to ascend and he has nothing to lose, so using high risk high reward strategies is perfectly rational.

It's incredible what a man is capable of once he has given up hope.

90: If you are a loser and you are on track for this to continue in the future, you should be willing to take risks.

You have nothing to lose in the sense that you have a life not worth living.

Continue to execute high risk high reward strategies until you either win, or die.

Death is nothing, but to live and be a loser is to die every day.

91: Power struggles are ubiquitous.

There are power struggles even between people who love each other.

92: Micro-machiavellianism is the manipulation of one other person, or manipulation within the context of a small group.

Macro-machiavellianism is the manipulation of a large group.

93: The average woman is more cunning than the average man.

However, the cunning of most women is limited to the micro.

When it comes to succeeding in job interviews, office politics, and family politics, women excel.

When it comes to macro-machiavellianism, say recognizing the lies contained within a political narrative or mass distributed propaganda, women are generally incompetent.

Women are easily persuaded by political and religious propaganda.

94: Women have high attack, but low defense.

They are good at manipulating others, but they themselves are easily manipulated

95: Nothing will unite people faster than a common enemy.

For the sake of uniting people, it may be necessary to manufacture an enemy.

96: When psychologically normal men engage in violence, they are fueled by rage or fear.

When psychopathic men engage in violence they are cold and detached, as if deciding which suit to wear.

The hallmark of psychopathy is this: to be cold and detached when inflicting harm upon others.

97: Controlling the flow of information is critical, since perception trumps reality.

What is unseen counts for nothing, what is seen is all that counts.

98: When powerful people speak in public, they never use straighttalk; they always use powertalk.

They aren't saying what they actually think.

The masses don't realize this.

99: Insults should have zero impact on your psychological state.

Becoming angry when insulted is not a sign of strength; it's a sign of weakness.

Machiavellian Reflections (Part 1)

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Preamble:

What follows are the reflections of a machiavellian somewhere in the corporate world.

The order is arbitrary; stream of consciousness style.

Reflections:

1: Most people think of 'Honor' and 'Cunning' as being mutually exclusive, but they are not. The greatest men have both.

Honorable men are rare. Cunning men are rare. A man who is cunning and who also has a sense of honor is truly exceptional.

2: Saying what you actually think is almost always the tactically wrong move.

Psychopathic men know this instinctively. Autistic men never realize this.

3: Men engage in evil to make money because they understand that a rich man is granted more respect than a good man.

4: Powerless people are the majority, powerful people are a minority.

Power is pareto distributed, so are wealth and status.

In most societies there is no 'middle' class.

If you are average, your life will be terrible; shoot for the stars or drown.

5: Psychopathy is most common at the top of society and at the bottom.

Among the rich you will find intelligent psychopaths, among the poor you will find dumb psychopaths.

To avoid psychopaths, spend your time with the middle class.

6: Cold reading and Charm are the most important social competencies in any machiavellian's toolbox.

Cold Reading is making accurate deductions regarding the psychologies of other people.

Charm means getting people to like and trust you.

The seemingly banal encounters of everyday life should be used to hone these skills.

7: Machiavellianism 101:

-Be a politician

-Don't say what you actually think

-Calculate what you say, while still making it seem that your words flow naturally

-Tell them what they want to hear

-If a controversial topic comes up, say nothing. If you are pressed for your opinion, say something that is politically correct for the time and place you live in (Law 38).

-Imply you hold the same opinion they do (Law 38) -Hide your displeasure, fake your contentment and agreement

-Maintain the pretense that you like them, even if in reality you despise them

-Your ego is irrelevant, outcomes are all that matter. Don't do what your ego tells you to do; do what is most tactically useful.

8: It is in your best interest to have as many allies as possible, and as few enemies as possible. Never make enemies unnecessarily.

It is in your best interest to have as many people as possible like you, and as few people as possible dislike you. As such, it is wise to hide your displeasure, and fake your contentment and agreement.

Use charm as often as possible. Use intimidation as rarely as possible.

9: Make your superiors perceive that you are competent enough to be respectable and worthy of promotion, but not so competent that they feel you are outshining them (see Law 1).

Your superiors should perceive that you are 80% as competent as they are, 80% as smart as they are, 80% as rich as they are.

10: When dealing with someone who wields more power over you than you do over them (a superior), follow every order they give you, hide your displeasure, fake your contentment.

Fail to do this, and they will be annoyed, motivating them to use whatever power they wield over you to wreck you.

11: The road to power is paved with Cunning and Boldness.

The 48 Laws of Power will teach you Cunning.

Testosterone Cypionate will give you Boldness.

12: The most effective deceptions are those that weave together truth and lies until one is indistinguishable from the other.

13: Euphemistic language is the means by which powerful people conceal their sins.

14: As a matter of habit, you should hide your displeasure and fake your contentment.

For the sake of charming people, this is mandatory.

When interacting with superiors, this is mandatory.

When interacting with equals or subordinates, this is highly recommended, although not mandatory.

15: Your anger and resentment may be justified, but even so these emotions are counterproductive.

They cloud your judgment, and bias you towards displaying your displeasure when you should hide it.

You must let go of anger and resentment, not for the sake of being virtuous, but for the sake of keeping your sanity intact.

16: A key skill in the game of power is this: when you witness or experience an injustice, feel no anger, and certainly show no anger.

You should have zero emotional reaction to injustice.

17: Being raised by a tyrannical parent is excellent training for the game of power.

By the age of 10, you will have learned how to:

-Hide your displeasure, fake your contentment and agreement, particularly when interacting with a superior

-Manufacture convincing lies fast, with zero time for preparation in advance

-Ensure that the lies you tell are consistent over an extended period of time (no contradiction in what you say over the span of several years)

18: It is inevitable that some percentage of your subordinates will resent you simply because you wield more power over them than they do over you.

It may be necessary that you use some intimidation (some tyranny) for the sake of inducing your subordinates into getting certain things done.

However, never be tyrannical unnecessarily.

If you are unnecessarily tyrannical, it will cause all of your subordinates to resent you, even those who are by nature calm and forgiving.

19: If you have a contact who has standards that must be met for the sake of keeping them satisfied that are ever more numerous and complicated, chances are that contact is more trouble than they are worth.

In the long term, you'd be better off without them.

Exceptions apply for contacts who deliver immense value.

20: Unconditional love is like a risk free investment; it doesn't exist.

21: If you argue with a fool, you are the fool; you are wasting your time.

Attempting to change someone's opinion is a waste of time. The probability of succeeding in persuading them is low, the probability of failing and causing them to dislike you is high.

Most people are ego invested in their opinions; if you express any disagreement with their opinion, they take it as an insult.

Simply appear to agree (nod your head) and move on.

Only attempt to change a person's opinion if it is absolutely critical.

22: Most people (99% of men and 100% of women) are bad at logic.

They will prioritize feelings over facts, and style over substance.

They care more about the tone with which something is said, than the content of what is said.

If a statement offends their sensibilities, they will assume the statement is false, and dislike the person who said it.

Of course there are many things that are both true and that will offend one's sensibilities, but most are too foolish to realize this.

The point is this: don't tell people the truth if it will offend their sensibilities.

Tell people what they want to hear; lies that appeal to their sensibilities

Truth is for the few, delusion is for the many.

23: Emotional people cannot be reasoned with; they can be manipulated.

24: Real freedom of speech, the ability to say whatever you want without any fear of negative consequences, only exists with anonymity.

25: Avoid talking about controversial topics.

If a controversial topic does come up, say nothing.

If you are pressed for an opinion, say "It's an unfortunate state of affairs."

This response is applicable to almost every controversial topic imaginable.

26: When having a disagreement with someone, you should remain perfectly calm.

The other person may become angry, but you should not.

Remaining calm does a few things.

To any bystanders, you appear to be the reasonable one. Appearing calm makes people perceive that you are credible, which causes them to instinctively side with you.

More importantly, it causes the person you have a disagreement with to perceive you as credible, and makes them more willing to listen to what you have to say.

Remaining calm while the other person is exploding in rage isn't a skill most people are born with.

Learn the skill.

27: It is wise to make people perceive that you are higher status and more powerful than you really are.

Why?

When people perceive you are high status and powerful, they are more willing to do you favors (since they assume you have the power to repay a favor in a meaningful way) and are less willing to harm you (since they assume you have the power to retaliate in a meaningful way).

Conversely, when people perceive you are low status and powerless, they are less willing to do you favors (since they assume you lack the power to repay them in a meaningful way), and are more willing to harm you (since they assume you lack the power to retaliate in a meaningful way).

28: If you are physically attractive (halo effect) and perceived as high status, getting people to do you favors is laughably easy.

If you are physically ugly (horns effect) and perceived as low status, getting people to do you favors is practically impossible.

29: When people perceive you are high status you are highly visible.

When people perceive you are low status you are almost invisible to them; they barely notice you, because you are assumed to not be important enough to be worth noticing.

Being invisible has benefits.

30: It is wise to make people perceive you are happier than you are.

Hide your displeasure, fake your contentment. At least hide your displeasure.

When people perceive you are happy they view you as likeable, when people perceive you are unhappy they view you as dislikable.

Making people perceive you as likeable is critical since it makes them more inclined to help you and less inclined to harm you.

31: When faced with a limiting regulation, you must evaluate the benefit of breaking the regulation, the probability of getting caught, and the punishment if you do get caught.

Do a quick risk-reward analysis, and if it is in your best interest to break the rule do so.

Break as many regulations as you want, just don't do anything that can result in jail time.

32: To win the respect of dumb people, display a high stress tolerance and a capacity for ruthlessness.

To win the respect of smart people, display intelligence and wisdom.

33: If you already know the truth about a matter, but it's likely a certain person will lie about the matter, ask them questions you already know the answer to so that you can see whether or not they lie.

Once you know the truth, it's easy to spot who the liars are.

34: Beware of the one who claims to be neutral.

Nobody is neutral.

35: A competent enemy is far less dangerous than an incompetent ally.

You are far more likely to be destroyed by the incompetence of one of your allies than by the genius of your enemy.

36: Chaos represents opportunity.

The best time to seize power is during the chaos of revolution.

37: If you dive into a venture that you are well prepared for, the overwhelming probability is you will succeed.

If you dive into a venture you are poorly prepared for, the overwhelming probability is you will fail.

With most battles, the result is determined before the battle even starts.

38: Appearing needy makes you appear unattractive, so appear calm rather than desperate.

This is useful for seducing women, selling product to clients, and for persuading bankers and investors to give you capital.

39: Virtuous people are rare.

Evil people who have a reputation for being virtuous are common; they skillfully conceal their sins while outwardly virtue signaling.

40: Virtue requires sacrifice, is done for the benefit of others, and can be done in private.

Virtue Signaling requires no real sacrifice, is done for the benefit of one's own reputation, and requires an audience.

41: The most effective strategy for 'networking' is this: spend zero time trying to build relationships with losers (average and below average people who will never attain significant status or power), and spend your time building relationships with winners (far above average people who are likely to one day wield significant power).

Is this psychopathic? Yes

Is this the most effective strategy? Yes

You will see the necessity of this strategy once you are working 60+ hours a week and there are losers going nowhere who still take up your time by 'hanging out'.

42: If you have a contact who is worthless in the sense that they are an objectively average loser with zero ambition, however they are trustworthy...keep them around forever.

Being trustworthy is an outlier trait; in your entire life the number of people who you can trust will be counted on one hand.

43: If you do someone a favor, but you do it grudgingly or with complaining, they won't feel that you have done them a favor. They will feel annoyed.

Either grant the favor graciously or refuse as politely as possible.

Granting a favor grudgingly, or refusing rudely, is foolishness; you are making enemies unnecessarily.

44: A sky high verbal IQ fuels cunning, whereas a sky high visuospatial IQ doesn't.

For the sake of manipulating people, skill with manipulating language is far more important than skill with manipulating numbers.

The numerical manipulations involved with persuasion are easy; the verbal manipulations are often difficult.

45: Belief drives action.

If you can get a man to believe anything, you can get him to do anything.

As Voltaire said: those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities.

46: If you are perceived as too disagreeable, everyone will dislike you. This makes people less willing to cooperate with you, less willing to help you, more willing to harm you, and puts you at risk of ostracism.

On the other hand if you are perceived as too agreeable you may be viewed as spineless, in which case people will mercilessly take advantage of you.

There is a delicate balance; you should be perceived as and actually be a person who is agreeable most of the time, but who still has the capacity for ruthlessness when it is needed.

47: Where there are problems, autistic men with high IQs will work to solve them.

Where there are no problems, neurotypical women and narcissistic men will manufacture them out of nothing so that they can relish the drama.

If you have a disagreement with a neurotypical man or an autistic man, it will likely be over a *real issue*; there is a real thing for there to be conflict over.

If you have a disagreement with a neurotypical woman or a narcissistic man, it will likely be over a *manufactured grievance created out of nothing*. There is nothing real to fight over, besides ego or hurt feelings.

48: Envy is the most common motivation for backstabbing.

So long as you don't arouse envy, the probability of you being targeted is low.

49: If you appear to be calm and confident, most people will automatically assume you are trustworthy and competent.

If you appear nervous and unsure of yourself, most people will automatically assume you are untrustworthy, or perhaps just incompetent.

Leftwing Communists and Rightwing Libertarians

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Preamble:

Wise men make decisions and form policies on the basis of realistic options and real world consequences.

Fools make decisions and form policies on the basis of what their ideology tells them *should* work in theory.

Communists and Libertarians are on opposite ends of the political spectrum, at least so far as economic matters are concerned.

Communists represent the extreme Leftwing, while Libertarians represent the extreme Rightwing,

What both have in common is that they are ideologues; they blindly assume that if their respective ideologies were implemented, utopia would be created.

They desire for their ideologies to be implemented, the real world consequences be damned.

Leftwing Communists:

Karl Marx is Communism's head ideologue.

Communism is a simple ideology; it demands that the entirety of the economy be managed by the government (a command economy). Communists hold that every problem can be solved by government control, while no problems can be solved by the free market.

Communists also demand *zero* inequality of outcome; they hold that the only conceivable reason some people end up with more wealth than others is that those with greater wealth have stolen from those who have less wealth.

In reality there are many problems (perhaps most) that are best solved by the free market, rather than government intervention.

There are also many reasons some people end up richer or poorer than others besides crookedness. Sometimes the reason your neighbor is richer than you is because he is smarter than you. Sometimes it's because he works harder than you, and sometimes it's a result of sheer blind luck.

Crookedness does drive inequality to some degree, but it is not the only driving force behind unequal outcomes.

Communism demands equality of outcome, and this is why it is pathological.

Why is equality of outcome pathological? Because historically the only way equality of outcome has been achieved has been by destroying everything, so that everyone has nothing; the result being mass starvation.

Rightwing Libertarians:

Ayn Rand is Libertarianism's head ideologue.

Libertarianism is a simple ideology; have the government do nothing, let the free market do everything, and somehow utopia will appear.

In reality there are many problems that are better solved by government intervention rather than the free market. Examples would include preventing an invasion (winning World War 2), containing a pandemic (see COVID-19), and building infrastructure for an entire country.

Libertarians have *infinite* tolerance for inequality. They assert that intense inequality (a high gini coefficient) is not a problem.

This is delusional; intense inequality delivers a host of negative effects including higher homicide rates and a higher probability of violent revolution.

Rightwing Libertarians assert that under no circumstances should a government do wealth redistribution (take from the rich to give to the poor). They will refuse to modestly increase taxes on billionaires for the sake of giving poor people access to life saving medical care (universalized healthcare).

There are many creative rationalizations Libertarians give for this, but their real motivation is simple; they have callous indifference regarding the suffering of the poor.

Wealth Inequality:

Wealth Inequality is a serious problem.

The solution Communists offer ends in catastrophe; they demand zero inequality, and the only way to achieve this is when everyone has nothing; the practical result is mass starvation.

Libertarians offer no solution at all to wealth inequality; their solution is to pretend the problem does not exist.

Ideal Economic Structure:

The ideal economic structure is this; have the free market tackle most problems, and for those problems that free markets cannot solve effectively use government intervention.

Communists insist we always use government intervention, while Libertarians insist we never use government intervention; both are wrong.

TLDR:

Leftwing Communists demand that everything be socialized (done by the government, the public sector).

Rightwing Libertarians demand that everything be privatized (done by the free market, the private sector).

Both are pathological because in reality some problems are best handled by the public sector and others are best handled by the private sector; some problems are best solved by the free market, others require government intervention.

Communists demand zero inequality of outcome. Libertarians assert we should accept any degree of inequality of outcome, no matter how intense. Both are pathological.

A state that instituted Communism would be The Soviet Union; see Russia in the 1950s.

The perfect Libertarian state would be Somalia in the year 2020; there is no government intervention for anything, since there is no government.

Transformation of America

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) 1960 America
 - 1A) Economic Environment
 - 1B) Romantic Environment
 - 1C) Family Structures
 - 1D) Dominant Ideology, Christianity
- 2) 1990 America
 - 2A) Economic Environment
 - 2B) Romantic Environment
 - 2C) Family Structures
- 3) 2010 America
 - 3A) Economic Environment
 - 3B) Romantic Environment
 - 3C) Family Structures
 - 3D) Dominant Ideology, Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism
- 4) Middle Class Elimination
- 5) Generational Differences

Preamble:

America changed drastically from 1960 to 2010.

3 very different societies are detailed: America in 1960, America in 1990, and America in 2010.

1) 1960 America:

1A) Economic Environment:

Gentle Inequality. Low Gini Coefficient.

There is a large middle class, a minority of people are rich, and a minority of people are poor.

The middle class exists due to an abundance of high paying manufacturing jobs easily accessible to most of the population.

A man at the 50th percentile of income can get a job in the local factory and is paid enough money to buy a house in the suburbs, support a wife, and children.

1B) Romantic Environment:

Monogamous society. Most adults are married.

The price of sex is high; the only reliable way for a man to convince a woman to sleep with him is if he first agrees to marry her.

Getting divorced is legally and logistically difficult; most marriages last until death.

1C) Family Structures:

Most children are raised by their mother and father; 2 parent households are the rule.

1D) Dominant Ideology, Christianity:

In 1950 America, the dominant ideology is Christianity; there is a God living in the sky with a son named Jesus who died for our sins.

2) 1990 America:

2A) Economic Environment:

Intensifying inequality. Rising Gini Coefficient.

The middle class is being hollowed out.

Wages in real terms have been going down for most of the population in recent years, since high paying manufacturing jobs have been eliminated (shipped off to china, automated by technology).

The elimination of manufacturing jobs decreased the demand for labor on a macro level, and by extension decreased wages for most people.

A man at the 50th percentile of income is not paid enough money to buy a house and support a family. He can still buy a house, but his wife must also work to make money; a dual income is necessary for a household to survive.

2B) Romantic Environment:

Mostly monogamous society. Most adults are married.

The price of sex has dropped dramatically. Pre-marital sex is common; a man doesn't have to sign a marriage contract to convince a woman to sleep with him.

One night stands exist and are rare. A man can convince a woman to sleep with him, simply by making her his girlfriend.

Divorce has become common; the divorce rate is around 50%.

2C) Family Structures:

Dysfunctional family structures. Many children are raised by single mothers; their fathers aren't in the home.

Alimony subsidizes women who choose to divorce their husbands.

Child Support and Welfare subsidize single motherhood.

As such, women divorcing their husbands and becoming single mothers has become common.

3) 2010 America:

3A) Economic Environment:

Intense inequality. Gini Coefficient around 50%.

The middle class is gone. The manufacturing jobs that once fueled the middle class have been eliminated.

There are 3 classes: Rich (Top 0.1%), Upper Class (Top 10%), Poor (Bottom 90%).

A man at the 50th percentile of income can never buy a house; hopefully he can live in his parents' basement to save on rent.

If he is very lucky, he will be able to rent a small apartment.

3B) Romantic Environment:

Pseudo polygamous society.

Most young adults are *not* married. The price of sex is very low; women do not demand commitment from men before consenting to sex.

As a man you can get women to sleep with you by simply being good looking and somewhat charming. One night stands are common.

A minority of young men are having one night stands with a majority of young women, while most young men get zero attention from the ladies; there is a pareto distribution of male romantic success.

3C) Family Structures:

Most children are raised by single mothers; most children are raised without their father around.

3D) Dominant Ideology, Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism:

In 2010 America, the dominant ideology among Rightwing Americans is still Christianity.

Among Leftwing Americans there is a new dominant ideology: Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism.

Tenets include that gender is a social construct, race is a social construct, and all psychological differences between individuals, men and women, and racial/ethnic groups are the result of social training or other environmental factors, never genetics.

4) Middle Class Elimination:

America had a middle class from 1946 – 1979 because there was an abundance of high paying manufacturing jobs easily accessible to most of the population.

From 1980 – 2010, these manufacturing jobs were eliminated (some were outsourced to other countries, some were automated by technology); this eliminated the American middle class.

5) Generational Differences

If you were a baby boomer, you had the option of being average and getting a decent quality of life.

Millennials do not have that option; young Americans today have to **shoot for the stars or drown**.

A baby boomer at the 50th percentile of income could get a job in the local factory, buy a house in the suburbs, and support a family.

A millennial at the 50th percentile of income will be lucky if they can rent a studio apartment; buying a house is a pipe dream.

Get rich or be poor; there is no 'middle' class.

Maxims and Reflections (Francesco Guicciardini)

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Preamble:

What follows are notes on Francesco Guicciardini's *Maxims and Reflections*.

Quotes from the book are in **bold**, my own commentary is in Normal Text.

Wisdom from Francesco Guicciardini:

“Unless necessity requires it, avoid saying anything which if repeated would displease others. In ways you could not possibly foresee, what you say will be repeated in ways that do you harm.”

“Do not believe those who say they have voluntarily left positions of power for love of leisure and peace. Nearly always, they left by necessity or by force. As soon as they are offered the chance to return to their previous position, they will seize it with the intensity that a fire seizes dry wood.”

“People underestimate how good the favors you have done for them are, and overestimate how bad the harms you have inflicted upon them are. As such, avoid doing someone a favor if doing it requires you inflict harm upon someone else; the former person will be less grateful than the latter person is angry.”

“Always deny what you want people to believe is false, and affirm what you want people to believe is true. Though there may be definitive evidence to the contrary, a fervent affirmation or denial will often create at least some doubt in the mind of your listener.”

“Speculation as to how much power you wield inspires more fear and obedience than accurate knowledge of your power.”

“Revolution is pointless if it does nothing to address your grievances, but simply changes the faces of those who wield power.”

Every society has elites; a tiny minority of people who wield almost all the power. Revolution does not change this fact. What revolution does do is change who is in the category of ‘elite’.

“The true test of a man’s spirit comes when he is attacked by an unexpected danger.”

You know nothing about a man until you see how he responds to an unforeseen catastrophe.

“Revenge is a waste of time, but deterrence is not. Harming someone to set an example so that others are deterred from attacking you in the future is perfectly rational.”

“Hide your failures and exaggerate your successes. Give the impression that things are going well.”

When people perceive you are powerful and high status, it makes them more inclined to do you favors and more hesitant to harm you. As such, it is tactically advantageous to make people overestimate how well things are going for you.

Conversely, when people perceive you are powerless and low status it makes them less inclined to do you favors and more willing to harm you. As such, if things are going badly for you hide it.

“Keep yourself in view of the Prince (master) you serve. Often matters will arise out of nowhere, and he will send someone who is physically present to attend to them; be present and visible, so that he entrusts you with such responsibilities. If you are not present, he will entrust responsibility and power to another who is.”

“It is the few, not the many, who determine the affairs of the world...the interests of the few are almost

always different than the interests of the many.”

Power is pareto distributed. A minority of people are immensely powerful, most people are powerless.

“If you dislike a man, do your best to hide it. In ways you cannot possibly foresee you may need his help, and you can hardly get it if he knows you despise him.”

“If you have offended or harmed a man, do not trust or confide in him even regarding a business deal that would be profitable for him. Many men will prioritize avenging an offense over doing what is objectively in their own best interest.”

Many men will foolishly prioritize their ego, over doing what is most tactically effective. They will prioritize their ego over their bank account.

“When predicting someone’s behavior, don’t do so on the basis of ‘What would a rational man do, given such circumstances?’ Rather, predict their behavior based on how their emotions and ego are biasing them.”

“You would think a master would know his subordinates better than anyone, but very often a master knows less about his subordinates’ true personalities than anyone else. When dealing with most people subordinates are frank and straightforward, but when dealing with their master subordinates wear a mask.”

People closely monitor their words and behavior when in the presence of superiors (those more powerful than themselves), but monitor their words and behavior very little when only in the presence of equals and subordinates.

“All regimes are mortal. A man living in the final stage of his society’s existence should not feel as sorry for his country as he should for himself. What happened to his country was inevitable, but to be born at a time when his civilization was collapsing was his own bad luck.”

“Never speak badly of someone whether present or absent, unless you gain something by doing so. Making enemies pointlessly is foolishness. This sounds obvious, yet many go wrong here.”

“All political power is rooted in violence.”

“Nothing offends a superior more than feeling he has not been granted the reverence he believes is due.”

If a superior dislikes you and you don’t know why, it’s most likely because they feel you have not been sufficiently obsequious in your dealings with them.

“If you are about to be attacked, use any measure that may bring delay. Often delaying another day or just another hour will bring some accident of chance that saves you.”

The world is an uncertain place.

Even if defeat is inevitable, delay it as long as possible. The longer you delay, the more opportunity there is for a random event to occur that saves you.

Conversely, even when victory seems inevitable you must seize it as fast as possible; the more that victory is delayed, the more opportunity there is for a random event to occur that destroys you.

The Art of Worldly Wisdom (Baltasar Gracian)

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Preamble:

What follows are notes on Baltasar Gracian's book *The Art of Worldly Wisdom*.

Direct quotes from Gracian are in **bold**, commentary is in normal text.

Notes on The Art of Worldly Wisdom:

xix: Arouse no Exaggerated Expectations on Entering

Expectations can rise to infinity, but results cannot. To keep people satisfied you must keep their expectations down.

xlili: Think With the Few, Speak With the Many...Truth is for the few, falsehood is for the many.

Law 38 addendum: In public, pay lip service to whatever is currently politically correct. Do rigorous intellectual exploration in private, either alone or with those who can tolerate hearing ugly truths without hating you for speaking them.

lxvi: See that Things End Well...A good end gilds all, no matter how unsavory the means may be.

If you use methods people disapprove of and succeed, you will be rewarded. If you use methods people approve of and fail, you will be punished. It pays to win; it does not pay to play fair.

lxxx:...We live by information, not by sight...The truth is generally seen, rarely heard

The truth is rarely given. Usually it is discovered.

xciv: Keep the Extent of Your Abilities Unknown...The wise man does not allow his knowledge and abilities to be sounded to the bottom...No one must know the extent of his abilities, lest they be disappointed...guesses about the extent of his talents arouse more admiration and fear than accurate knowledge of them, be they ever so great.

Show enough skill and power to impress people, but never let people see you hit the edge of your limits. Speculation as to your limits arouses far greater admiration than accurate knowledge of your limits.

You do have limits; your intelligence, cunning, energy, and stress tolerance are not infinite. Never hit the edge of your limits in the presence of other people; do so only in private.

xcix: Reality and Appearance...Things pass for what they seem, not for what they are.

Perception trumps reality.

cx: Do Not Wait Till You Are a Sinking Sun...the sun even at its brightest often retires behind a cloud so as not to be seen sinking, and to leave in doubt whether he has sunk or not...A beauty should break her mirror early, before she does so later with her face.

Quit while you're ahead; retire when you are at your peak. Don't stay in the game to experience your decline.

Better to die while you are still who you want to be, than to stay alive and become something you don't want to be. The greatest day of your life and the last day of your life should be the same day.

cxxvi:...Reputation depends more on what is concealed than on what is revealed. If a man does not live honorably, he must live cautiously.

People with sterling reputations are not any more virtuous than others; they are simply better at concealing their

sins.

Euphemistic language is the means by which powerful people conceal their sins.

cxlvi: ...Lies always come first...Truth always lags last.

clvi: Select Your Friends...Though this is the most important thing in life, it is the one least cared for. Intelligence brings friends to some, chance to most. Yet a man is judged by his friends, for there was never agreement between wise men and fools...Few are the friends of a man's self, most those of his circumstances.

Who you have as your friends is the most important thing in life.

Real friends, those who will be loyal to you in both good times and bad, are incredibly rare.

Most friends are fair weather friends; friends in name, mercenaries in reality.

clxxii: Never Compete Against a Man Who Has Nothing to Lose. Thereby you would enter into an unequal conflict. The other man enters without fear; having lost everything including shame, he has no further loss to fear. You do.

Having nothing to lose is a miserable position to be in. It is also a position of immense power.

xlxxxi: The Truth, but not the Whole Truth. Nothing demands more caution than the truth. It requires as much to tell the truth as it does to conceal it. A single lie destroys a whole reputation for honesty. The deceit is regarded as treason, and the deceiver as a traitor...Yet not all truths can be spoken, some for our own sake, some for the sake of others.

There is nothing more dangerous than the truth. It must be treated like a weaponized virus; it must be contained, and released only at the right time, in the right place, upon the right people, and in the right way.

The world is held up by lies.

If all secrets and truths were to be revealed tomorrow, the world would come crashing down.

clxxxii: ...You must moderate your opinion of others so that you do not think so highly of them as to fear them...Many men seem great until you get to know them personally...everyone has weaknesses, either in their heart or their head.

Powerful men usually seem far greater than they really are. They have mastered the art of displaying their strengths and concealing their weaknesses.

To be a God is impossible. Making people perceive you are a God is possible.

cxci: Do Not Take Payment in Politeness. It is a kind of fraud.

Do not take rewards in the form of pleasant words, or in people charming you. Demand money, or favors.

If you are an employee, do not work at a corporation because it has a 'great company culture!'. Work there if they offer the most money.

cci: The world is full of fools, and yet there is not even one man who thinks he is a fool, or who suspects it might be a possibility.

Fools are common, wise men are rare.

Do not concern yourself with the opinions of the masses.

ccxvii: Neither Love nor Hate Forever. Trust the friends of today as if they will be the enemies of tomorrow, and that of the worst kind. This happens in reality, so let it happen in your calculations. Do not put weapons in the hands of friends who may one day use them against you. On the other hand, leave the

door of reconciliation open for enemies.

Your allies today may be your enemies tomorrow, and your enemies today may be your allies tomorrow.

Be careful not to give your allies tools they may one day use against you.

On the other hand, always be open to the possibility of cooperating with an enemy for mutual benefit.

ccc: A man's greatness is to be measured by his virtue, not by his fortune.

Life is not about what you get. Life is about what you become.

Peterson Content Worth Having

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 0) Introduction to Peterson
- 1) Hierarchies and Serotonin
- 2) Pareto Distribution, Wealth and Productivity
- 3) Pareto Distribution, Male Reproductive Success
- 4) Big 5 Personality Traits
- 5) Agreeableness
- 6) Conscientiousness
- 7) Extroversion
- 8) Neuroticism
- 9) Creativity, Openness
- 10) Intelligence, IQ
- 11) Performance Predictors
- 12) Victimhood and Genocide
- 13) Miscellaneous

Preamble:

On YouTube you will find thousands of hours worth of content Jordan Peterson has created.

Below I have listed out content Peterson has created that is the most valuable.

Note: I have included URLs of the videos rather than hyperlinks, for fear of hyperlinks becoming dysfunctional.

0) Introduction to Peterson:

Hierarchies, Inequality, Big 5

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8sSe6FSrylc&feature=youtu.be>

Money, Risk Taking, and Finance

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OgqcrwIVgvM>

1) Hierarchies and Serotonin:

Living at the bottom of the hierarchy is like being depressed

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=izfEQq5S7Ws>

Are You Depressed? Or Low In The Dominance

Hierarchy?<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vKXD8ZEwAmw>

Dominance Hierarchies & Serotonin

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fAwJgoLXXBg>

Why you are sensitive to negative emotions

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3K-iJ-thfwU&app=desktop>

The Evolution of Dominance Hierarchies

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2eATDp2e-3k&app=desktop>

“These hierarchies that I have been talking about, those things are older than trees”

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aS1Pg8XqOz0>

Serotonin and Dominance Hierarchies

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DWZ9T5_LjM4

The dominance hierarchy as a distributed computational device

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kvCsZ_6qRAs

Sexual Selection and the Dominance Hierarchy

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NdLnOgB-gOQ>

Posture & The Dominance Hierarchy

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X7wHxTP22vc>

Serotonin, cortisol, your health, status, and what you can do about

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vfl98_tQqDY

Why Losers And Low Status Men Are Rejected

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0pnDlTMDrAY>

Female Hypergamy and its Impact on Human Evolution

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N7LN14IpVy0>

Chimpanzees and Dominance Hierarchies

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Kyu0ip4RAn0>

2) Pareto Distribution, Wealth and Productivity:

The Pareto Distribution

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rkJii1mTFHA>

Marxism, Pareto Principle

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i0iL0ixoZY0>

Jordan Peterson on Wealth Inequality and Capitalism

Inequality of Wealth Productivity

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Q0PCDEJWek>

Inequality of wealth | Communism is not the solution

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JVejj2qbDo0>

Jordan Peterson & Russell Brand – Solving Income Inequality

Universal Basic Income

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v7gKGq_MYpU

Gini Coefficient Drives Crime

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M3XYHPAwBzE>

Pareto Distribution, the 1%, End Game of Marxism

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Wod2-Ybyyro>

All Systems Produce Disparities, The Pareto Distribution

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=njqST5GIH6w>

Pareto Distribution and Price's Law

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BZMBdRfbk6A>

Prof. Jordan Peterson Explains Pareto Distribution

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-k_FfS1kHfY

“These horrible people do everything” – Jordan Peterson on Price’s Law

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UmUdcWk6Vfw>

Jordan Peterson on Wealth Concentration & Normal vs Pareto Distributions

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CsRLVZTYpGo>

The awful truth behind economic inequality

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ds4qMMWkmkU>

Economic Inequality

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4LICNDqmF2A>

Birth of The Criminal Mind

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UuPvdGmXb3o&app=desktop>

3) Pareto Distribution, Male Reproductive Success

Dr Jordan Peterson drops some Red Pills

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=riFc2S8MxPk>

Jordan Peterson on Casual Sex, #MeToo, and the Pareto Principle

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=puuEYzK3Mlo>

4) Big 5 Personality Traits:

Understanding Myself (Big 5 Personality Test)

<https://www.understandmyself.com/>

The Big 5 Personality Traits

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Lfi4BEONsng>

2017 Personality 14: Introduction to Traits/Psychometrics/The Big 5

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pCceO_D4AIY

Jordan Peterson tells you why Social Scientists are terrified of factor analysis

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wEdBgRWkF-I>

Jordan Peterson The Big Five Personality Types

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=esPqw13Hu7M>

5) Agreeableness:

2015 Personality Lecture 17: Agreeableness – Aggression & Empathy

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UgRaLmCOwYU>

2017 Personality 17: Biology and Traits: Agreeableness

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G1eHJ9DdoEA>

Jordan Peterson tells you why disagreeable people get more raises

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FsdHdGUHeIs>

Agreeable and Disagreeable People

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dMIZNKjQpMo>

6) Conscientiousness:

2015 Personality Lecture 20: Conscientiousness – Industriousness, Orderliness & Disgust

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=35e5i6FQuMw>

2016 Personality Lecture 12: Conscientiousness: Industriousness and Orderliness

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q15eTySnWxc>

Industrious People

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lG8pr_o1ePw

Orderly People

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5-tfx81rdP0&app=desktop>

Jordan Peterson on Conscientious People

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CQJ5Y6ljDT0>

7) Extroversion:

Introverts and Extroverts

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ljrJ_nDC46o

Extroverts vs Introverts – Jordan Peterson on Frame of Reference

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IVNQYPJ6GY8>

2014 Personality Lecture 16: Extraversion & Neuroticism (Biology & Traits)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dYTAv7eQ-vg>

8) Neuroticism:

2017 Personality 16: Biology/Traits: Incentive Reward/Neuroticism

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ewU7Vb9ToXg>

9) Creativity, Openness:

The Curse of Creativity

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ocDli45faiw>

Entrepreneurship, Creativity and the Pareto Distributio

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pGax4DsAadk>

Exploring The Psychology of Creativity

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KxGPeljD-qY>

How Creative Are You

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pKZYS3fFTc8>

The Distribution of Productivity and Creativity

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1Lz-yhjh1kw>

2015 Personality Lecture 18: Openness – Creativity & Intelligence

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P6rm0LrO9vU>

2016 Personality Lecture 13: Openness and Intelligence?<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qRFxulvRC7I>

2017 Personality 18: Biology & Traits: Openness/Intelligence/Creativity

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D7Kn5p7TP_Y

2017 Personality 19: Biology & Traits: Openness/Intelligence/Creativity II

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fjtBDa4aSGM>

Men vs Women On Openness

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ip31oOqXfhQ>

10) Intelligence, IQ:

Controversial Facts about IQ

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jSo5v5t4OQM>

IQ and Employment

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0ZUk9f2Ag_w

What Kind of Job Fits You?

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pu__97bVyOc

“Lawyers are disappearing like mad”

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jlG_Cwxnpx0

Dangerous IQ Debate

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=APneKDezEWI>

Important Information on Gap between High and Low IQ people – Jordan Peterson

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oj62Uy25uBs>

Jordan Peterson | The Most Terrifying IQ Statistic

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5-Ur71ZnNVk>

People don't like the idea of IQ

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OCUhES_3-LE

The Mystery of High IQ and Industriousness

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1C0zS2RAzII>

“Viciously powerful predictor of long term life success” Jordan Peterson

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M0qbCt0g7Mw>

“It's actually illegal to use IQ testing” Jordan Peterson on general cognitive ability tests

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hf2SZHL0zdM>

11) Performance Predictors:

Workplace Performance, Politics, Faulty Myers Briggs

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GXHj7eZ23gk>

“65% of managers add zero or negative net value to the company”

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hf0W977ifqY>

2014 Personality Lecture 21: Performance Prediction (Biology & Traits)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hzMWpfHNYf0>

2015 Personality Lecture 21: Performance Prediction

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5p5YEvi8CHQ>

2017 Personality 21: Biology & Traits: Performance Prediction

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q7GKmznaqsQ>

Jordan Peterson: What To Do To Be Successful

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CPcQ5ZojGw8>

12) Victimhood and Genocide:

When Victimhood Leads to Genocide – Prof. Jordan Peterson on Dekulakization

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DeYRK16PIIA>

13) Miscellaneous:

How Jobs Are Categorized

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jRHcvy30IBI>

Does your job match your personality? | Jordan Peterson | Big Think

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WEvqMN75sCI>

Good Predictors of Having a Personality Disorder

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nSEXadeVTms>

Jordan Peterson – Women in High Paying Jobs

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Nv2yvI4Id9Q>

2017 Maps of Meaning 01: Context and Background

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I8Xc2_FtpHI

2016 Lecture 06 Maps of Meaning: Part I: The primordial narrative

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mJI0hVV-5Vs>

2016 Lecture 06 Maps of Meaning: Part II: The Primordial Narrative continued

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Q_GIHDpuZw

Are Men Expendable?

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aMBGLAgni7Y>

Jordan Peterson on Why Companies Collapse

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dWR7skzGMqs>

“What happens in a period of hyper-inflation?” Jordan Peterson talks 1920’s Germany

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tfo0uhPI76g>

“The base line for rejection is 98%” Jordan Peterson

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z3ZfaN54DOQ>

Men And Women Are Different

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Risk Tolerance
- 3) Neuroticism (Stress Tolerance)
- 4) Agreeableness (Ruthlessness)
- 5) Greater Male Variance, Intelligence
- 6) Female Hypergamy, Male Ambition
- 7) Confidence, Attractive On Men Only
- 8) Reproductive Success, More Variable Among Men
- 9) Relevant Reading

1) Preamble:

What follows are a list of gender differences you ought to be aware of.

They are all driven by biology and genetics, not cultural training.

Gender is not just a social construct; behavioral and psychological differences between men and women exist due to different evolutionary pressures being put on male and female humans.

Men and women reproduce differently; all psychological differences between them are a secondary consequence of this fact.

2) Risk Tolerance:

Women are on average more risk averse than men.

The difference at the average is tiny; the average woman is only slightly more risk averse than the average man. However, this tiny difference at the average leads to immense differences at the extremes, and *the extremes are what matter since the extremes are where all the action is*.

Among the most risk averse people, almost all of them are women.

Among the most risk aggressive people, you will find that almost all of them are men. This explains why almost everyone who voluntarily becomes an entrepreneur or who takes a risky role in the financial industry is male.

Testosterone fuels willingness to take risks; men are more risk aggressive than women because they have more testosterone, and among men you will find that those with higher testosterone levels are more willing to take risks.

3) Neuroticism (Stress Tolerance):

Men average lower on neuroticism than women; the average man has a slightly higher stress tolerance than the average woman. Again, this tiny difference at the average leads to immense differences at the extremes, and the extremes are where all the action is.

Among the people who are extremely neurotic (very low stress tolerances), most of them are women.

Among the people who are extremely calm (very high stress tolerances), most of them are men.

Testosterone suppresses neuroticism, the specific biological mechanism being that testosterone suppresses the stress hormone cortisol. The reason men average lower on neuroticism than women is because they have more testosterone.

4) Agreeableness (Ruthlessness):

Men average lower on agreeableness than women. Yet again, the difference at the average is tiny but it leads to immense differences at the extremes.

At the extreme high end of agreeableness, almost all the people are women. This would explain why most people who voluntarily do charity work are women.

At the extreme low end of agreeableness, almost all the people are men. This would explain why most people who engage in violent crime are men.

5) Greater Male Variance, Intelligence:

Male variance is greater than female variance. This can be seen most consequentially with intelligence.

At the extreme high end of intelligence (IQs of 130+), most people are men.

At the extreme low end of intelligence (IQs of 70-), most people are men.

As a result of male IQ being more variable than female IQ, most people smart enough to become engineers are men, and most people dumb enough to become highschool dropouts are men.

6) Female Hypergamy, Male Ambition:

Women are hypergamous, and men are ambitious because they desire to appeal to female hypergamy.

Women being hypergamous means that they desire to mate *up* whatever dominance hierarchy they happen to be living in; they want to sleep with men who have as high status as possible, and at minimum who are higher status than themselves.

Men being ambitious means they desire to attain as high status as possible in whatever dominance hierarchy they happen to be living in.

Men evolved to be ambitious because all the men who were indifferent about attaining high status failed to put in the necessary effort to do so, and were therefore deemed unattractive by hypergamous women.

Unambitious men have been all but eliminated from the gene pool, because in our evolutionary past they failed to reproduce.

Many men are tortured by unsatiated ambition; their actual level of status is far beneath the level of status they desire.

Many women are tortured by unsatiated hypergamy; the man they are with is far inferior to the man they desire to be with.

Attaining high status in the macro dominance hierarchy makes a man more attractive to women, however it does *not* make a woman more attractive to men.

Going from rags to riches dramatically increases a man's attractiveness, but it does nothing for a woman's attractiveness.

Indeed, as a woman's status in the macro hierarchy increases her pool of viable suitors gets smaller; the higher her rank is, the fewer men there are who outrank her and who thereby appeal to her hypergamy.

Ironically if a woman goes from rags to riches her viable mating options become fewer in number, not greater.

7) Confidence, Attractive On Men Only:

Women consider men who are confident to be more attractive than men who are timid (more precisely, the lower a man ranks on neuroticism the more attractive women will consider him to be).

The reverse is *not* true. Men do *not* consider women who are confident to be more attractive than women who are timid.

A woman who is low status in the macro hierarchy and timid will be considered attractive by men, however, a man who is low status in the macro hierarchy and timid will *not* be considered attractive by women.

For men, attaining high status and being confident are basic requirements for success in the dating market. For women they are not.

8) Reproductive Success, More Variable Among Men:

Male reproductive success is more variable than female reproductive success.

A man is more likely to die having conceived many offspring than a woman, and a man is also more likely to die having conceived zero offspring than a woman.

The upper limit of how many offspring a human can conceive is greater for males than for females, for obvious reasons; having a child is easier for a man than for a woman. For a woman the cost of having a child is 9 months of her time, possibly a year. For a man the cost of having a child is 10-15 minutes of his time.

On the other hand, the probability of having zero offspring is greater for males than for females. It is far more likely for a man to die at a very young age before having the chance to conceive a child than it is for a woman to die at such a young age.

It is also far more likely for a man to fail to reproduce because there are no women who consider him attractive enough to sleep with, than it is for a woman to fail to reproduce because there are no men who consider her attractive enough to sleep with.

Women are more picky about their sexual partners than men are, and with good reason; sex is far more dangerous for a woman than it is for a man. In our evolutionary past, when a man consented to sex he was agreeing to sacrifice 10-15 minutes of his time. However, when a woman consented to sex she was agreeing to sacrificing the next *year* of her life (pregnancy and breastfeeding).

9) Relevant Reading:

Illimitable Men

The Rational Male (Rollo Tomassi)

Why Men Don't Listen and Women Can't Read Maps (Allan & Barbara Pease)

Mask Wearing, Facet of Cunning

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Masks You Will Need
 - 2A) Social Representative Mask
 - 2B) Intimidator Mask
- 3) Make Masks Close To Your Real Self
- 4) Emotions Break Down Masks
- 5) Time Takes Masks Off
- 6) Fakeability of Traits
- 7) Further Reflections
 - 7A) Illimitable Man's Reflections

1) Preamble:

“We live in a time where the average man and woman will greet you with an inauthentic version of themselves, their fabled social representative.” -Illimitable Man

Few people show you their real self; most have a social representative mask that they wear whenever they are not alone.

2) Masks You Will Need:

“Just Be Yourself” is terrible advice. Far better advice is this; wear the mask that the day and the moment require.

You don't need 100 different masks. Most likely you will only need 2: your 'Real Self' and your 'Social Representative'.

The Social Representative Mask you manufacture must be one that most people will find charming.

Showing your 'Real Self' for the sake of charming people is foolish because odds are your actual personality is not particularly likeable (if it is you are an outlier; count yourself lucky).

With most people most of the time charm is the tool you should be using. As such most of the time your 'Social Representative' Mask is the mask you should be wearing.

There will be rare occasions when intimidation is the appropriate tool. As such, you must also craft an 'Intimidator' Mask; one that most people will find intimidating.

As a worst case scenario, you will need 3 masks; your 'Real Self', your 'Social Representative' and your 'Intimidator' masks.

Many narcissistic men, psychopathic men, and neurotypical men with high testosterone levels (who consequently rank low on agreeableness and neuroticism) can simply reveal their real self for purposes of intimidation; they don't need to manufacture an 'Intimidator' mask. If you are cynical enough to have taken the time to read a piece like this, it's very likely you are a man who falls into one of these categories.

If your real self is a personality most people will find charming, you don't need to manufacture a 'Social Representative' mask; simply be yourself for the sake of charming people, and manufacture an 'Intimidator' mask for the sake of those rare occasions when intimidation is the appropriate tool.

If your real self is a personality most people will find intimidating, you don't need to manufacture an 'Intimidator'

mask; simply be yourself on those rare occasions when intimidation is the appropriate tool. You will however need to manufacture a 'Social Representative' mask for the sake of charming people.

If your real self is a personality that most people will not find charming, and also one that most people will not find intimidating, you will need to craft a 'Social Representative' mask *and* an 'Intimidator' mask. **Odds are you fall into this category.**

2A) Social Representative Mask:

What should a 'Social Representative' mask look like?

High enthusiasm (extroversion), and high agreeableness (particularly the sub-trait 'politeness') are valuable.

Note that for most people faking high politeness is easy, while faking high enthusiasm is difficult (it takes quite a bit of energy).

As such, the social representative mask you craft for yourself should emphasize politeness rather than enthusiasm. If you are an unusually extroverted person and high enthusiasm comes naturally to you, then feel free to craft a social representative mask that emphasizes enthusiasm instead of politeness.

2B) Intimidator Mask:

An 'Intimidator' mask should be low on agreeableness and low on neuroticism.

The 'neuroticism' aspect is critical. If people perceive you are low on agreeableness and *high* on neuroticism, you don't inspire fear; you inspire laughter.

A man who is low on agreeableness and high on neuroticism is reminiscent of an immature teenager or a whiney child. A man who is low on agreeableness and low on neuroticism is reminiscent of a cold blooded killer. The difference is subtle, but critical. You must appear to be cold and ruthless, not angry and out of control.

The specifics of the 'Social Representative' and 'Intimidator' masks you craft for yourself are up to you; I have simply provided general guidelines.

3) Make Masks Close To Your Real Self:

The masks you wear should be as close to your real self as possible.

The closer a mask is to your real self, the easier it will be for you to wear it convincingly and the less likely you are to inadvertently allow it to slip off.

4) Emotions Break Down Masks:

The more emotional a person is, the more likely it is that they will inadvertently allow the mask they are wearing to slip off and thereby reveal their real self.

Offensively, by making other people more emotional you can get them to reveal their real selves; their real thoughts, feelings, and motivations.

Anger in particular is an emotion most people find difficult to control. By provoking someone to anger, you can get them to reveal their real self.

Alcohol often causes people's masks to slip off. As Alcaeus said, "In vino veritas".

Exhaustion makes it more difficult for a person to wear a mask effectively; if you want to make someone's mask slip off, work them to the point of collapse. This is tactically easier to implement with subordinates than superiors; generally speaking you cannot increase the workload of your superiors with impunity.

Defensively, you must be as emotionally detached as possible so that you do not inadvertently allow your own mask

to slip off.

5) Time Takes Masks Off:

The longer you know someone for the harder it will be for them to hide their real self behind a mask.

If you know someone for 10 minutes, the probability you'll get a glimpse of their real self is practically zero. If you know someone for 10 years, the probability you will see their real self (or at least get brief glimpses of it) is almost 100%.

In the same way, the longer someone knows you the harder it will be for you to conceal your real self behind a mask.

Beware of those who want to rush things; they are most likely hiding something significant and want the deal to be closed before you have time to discover it.

The faster things move, the easier it is to deceive others and the harder it is to avoid being deceived yourself.

In this sense, speed makes offense easier and defense harder, while slowness makes offense harder and defense easier. **The faster things move, the easier it is to deceive others, but at the same time the more likely it is you will end up being deceived yourself.**

6) Fakeability of Traits:

Some traits are easy to fake, others are difficult or impossible to fake.

Kindness (high agreeableness) is easy to fake; anyone with the heart of a serpent can pose as having a heart of gold with a few well placed acts of virtue and generosity. Virtue Signaling was invented for this very purpose.

Intelligence is something that is impossible to fake, but dumbness is something that is easy to fake. Smart people can play dumb, but dumb people cannot play smart.

High stress tolerance (low neuroticism, calmness) is something that is impossible to fake.

You learn a lot about a person by how they handle a crisis or an unexpected problem. Do they remain calm and handle the situation as best they can, or do they panic either by becoming overwhelmed with fear or exploding in anger?

Panic and anger can be faked, but calmness cannot.

7) Further Reflections:

"Everyone sees what you appear to be, few experience what you really are." -Machiavelli

"Society is a masked ball where everyone hides his real character..." -Ralph Waldo Emerson

"When you meet someone for the first time, you're not meeting them; you're meeting their representative." -Chris Rock

"After all, we are nothing more or less than what we choose to reveal. What I am to Claire is not what I am to Zoey, just as Zoey is not to me what she is to her father." -Frank Underwood

"Many men seem great, until you get to know them personally." -Baltasar Gracian

For most people the social representative mask they present to the world is far superior to who they actually are.

It is far easier to seem great than to be great.

Being a God is impossible.

Making people perceive you have godlike power is surprisingly easy.

If you know a person who is well liked by the general public, but despised by their own family, don't trust them.

The public see's their mask and likes it, their family see's their real self and despises them.

The correlation between a person's reputation and who they actually are is close to zero.

Reputation is determined by the mask a person wears in public, and their actions that are visible to the public.

Who they actually are and what they have actually done often has little connection to this.

If a person seems to change a lot in a short period of time, chances are who they actually are hasn't changed at all; they've simply had their mask slip off.

Changes to a person's psychology can take years, even decades. Changes to one's mask can happen within seconds.

7A) Illimitable Man's Reflections:

"Fakery lies in the tactical micro, not the strategic whole. You are still what you are, but you are trying to appear as if you are something else. This is called wearing a mask. You can fake specific actions, opinions etc – but this comes at great personal cost to you.

That personal cost is the suppression of your true nature. This is draining & unenjoyable for you. You're not in touch with your gifts, because everything must be planned, considered, restrained – you have no freedom "to be". This is the cost of trying to get what you don't deserve.

This is why cons of all kinds (be they online hustlers, or degenerate thots posing as good women) like to operate on quick time scales. Because the ruse cannot be kept up forever. Cracks will appear in the mask, as the vigilance needed to maintain it wears them down over time.

So, you quite literally cannot fake your character. You can fake your actions, you can be misleading, you can say things you don't believe. But a discerning person will test you, and unless you absolutely betray yourself to the core of your identity repeatedly, you will fail.

A person, no matter how bad they are, no matter how much they wish to trick you into getting something they do not deserve from you, cannot sell their soul over and over again. This is simply too taxing to their true nature and identity. They will break, and manifest themselves.

This is why if you take things slowly and test repeatedly, you need not fear anything. The true self has a way of asserting itself. They will at one point or another do or not do something which is not congruent with what they wish to portray. That's your gotcha moment.

This is also why you should be inherently suspicious of anybody who tries to rush you into anything. Why the hurry? Honest people will take the time to build a meaningful relationship. There is no rush. You have a lifetime to cultivate something quite wonderful.

When you're on borrowed time, when you need that deal signed, when the clock is ticking, when you don't know how long you can keep up the sham for – that's when you want to hurry. Hurrying is never a good thing. If you hurry art, you get ugliness. Our personalities are art too.

And so your character is built over a lifetime of collective experiences, of a morality developed on your philosophical and theological research, but too based on your life's experiences, both with suffering and your inner evil. Your spirit is always there, growing, unwavering.

It is your hubris to think because you adorn a mask, people cannot see who you are. Like a baby that believes because it cannot see you, you cannot see it. On the contrary, you can never mask your character, only your actions and your views. And the house of cards is fragile."

Analytical Mind, Facet of Cunning

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Required Reading:

Before diving into this piece, read the following passage taken from Illimitable Man's essay '**Understanding Psychopathy**'. It gives a good overview of 'Cold Reading'.

"The powers of observation – The ability to understand, discern, correlate or simply "connect the dots" based on non-verbal cues.

The powers of observation are not psychopathic per se, but anyone who has formal training in psychology based roles such as psychiatry tend to have heightened powers of observation; a critical mind that can observe and deduce to create fairly accurate deductive analysis. Manipulation does not know stupidity and psychopaths are always manipulative, and it is analysis which plays the part of providing data that the psychopath can use in decision-making. This is why the job of a shrink requires them to be able to comprehend psychopaths in some kind of tangible manner. In order that they can create some kind of evaluative report. Even if the report isn't completely correct, they have to medicalise how fucked up the dark triad individual in question is and somehow rationalise an explanation for their deviant behaviour.

OK, to the gritty now, cold reading is essentially what you're after. Cold reading is the ability to create deductions based upon non-verbal observations and the nuances in verbal communication, so nonverbally we're talking posture, body language: what direction do they face, their hand placement, their eye movement speed, are they fidgeting or controlled, do they scratch or needlessly touch areas of themselves for no obvious reason (eg: putting your hand on your neck, bringing hands together to make hand gestures etc.), non-verbal but auditory cues include sighing, breathing heavily and making noise with the air in the nose, such as snorting. What direction do they gaze in, can they hold eye contact – yes or no? Who looks away first? The last one is a hugely important one, it signifies confidence and dominance.

Verbally we're talking tonality, with word choice do they self-censor? Do they use Ebonics? Do they swear? What idiolectal mannerisms do they adopt? In the UK accent often gives away one's social class and economic standing, with the better educated trying to hide their natural regional accents (you see this a lot in places like Scotland/Newcastle) by consciously changing their pronunciation of vowel sounds to sound more southern, whereas the lower class give no fucks and pronounce many things incorrectly, staying true to the local dialect/accent.

There's overall articulatory (to indicate speed of thought, knowledge base, intelligence, wit, charisma etc.) and then there's vocabulary, do they use simple words or complex ones? When they use complex language is that natural or a redundant effort to impress present company involved?

Clothing, make-up and overall presentation. What do they wear? Why do they wear it? What image are they trying to convey to the world around them? Is it a rocker full of tattoos and piercings? That types want to communicate they're rebellious and don't give a fuck, they don't respect boundaries and demand respect. Is it a man in a suit? He wants to communicate he's socially and economically successful. Black guy in a jersey wearing abundant, opulent and excessive jewellery? He's peacocking to welcome attention and wants to command respect by implying he's a force to be reckoned with both physically and economically.

Make-up is a bigger one in and of itself; it demonstrates vanity and a preoccupation with the perception of one's physical presentation. Makeup is worn by most women; their looks are both their strength and their weakness as it's their major and preferred tool for self-empowerment. Women who wear little to zero make-up and don't look like candle wax just melted are the natural genetic beauties. Women who wear abundant amounts are insecure of their natural beauty and trying to deceive you by employing illusion to

convince you they are more sexually desirable than their genetics naturally signify. Every time they see a naturally pretty girl, they get jealous because women actively compare their own to beauty to other women's.

Through cold reading you will fine-tune your intuition to a point where you form heuristics that allow you to know things about a person without really being able to reason why you think these things, despite the high degree of accuracy said heuristic grants your perception. Once competent, your “intuition” or “gut” will be right the majority of the time about your deductions. The great thing about cold reading is it's called cold because its covert, you can ascertain all this information, a plethora of it, via mere observation. You need not have any meaningful or probing conversation with the person in question (which would be overt/hot) – it's a great way to reconnoiter a person psychologically before having to deal with them head-on. You can then use this knowledge to make rational assumptions about a person and employ it as you see fit in your future interactions with them. This will aid in decision-making, protecting yourself, or if you should choose to, influence or befriend the person in question.

I recommend you sit around in public places, say coffee shops and just observe people. Listen to people earnestly. Look at them closely. Eavesdrop profusely, don't stare just glance around, use your peripheral vision to “look, but not look at people.” If you have sunglasses, great – you will conceal your line of sight, can be more overt but still conceal your intent. Observing how different types of people behave will only attune your ability to read people and discern things about them based on externalities. The more you do it, the better you'll get. Like anything, you will have to put the time in, but desensitising yourself emotionally and improving your powers of observation are capabilities which both fall within the realm of possibility.

=====

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Cold Reading and Warm Reading
- 3) Heuristics
- 4) Judge People By What They Look Like
- 5) Knowing Someone Better Than They Know Themselves
- 6) Reading People, How Much Should You Bother?
- 7) Conceal How Observant You Are
- 8) Avoid Solipsistic Cold Reading
- 9) Metrics to Search For
- 10) Big 5 Personality Traits
 - 10A) Extroversion, Neuroticism, Agreeableness
 - 10B) Conscientiousness and Openness
- 11) Intelligence
 - 11A) Education and Profession
 - 11B) Speaking Style
 - 11C) Extroversion and Intelligence
 - 11D) Openness and Intelligence
- 12) Body Language
 - 12A) Closed vs Open
 - 12B) Microexpressions
 - 12C) Eyes
 - 12D) Smiles, Real and Fake
- 13) Hormones, Physical Traits and Personality
 - 13A) High Testosterone Traits

13B) High Estrogen Traits

13C) Physical Traits Correlate With Psychological Traits

14) Personality Archetypes

14A) Common Personality Archetypes, Modern America

15) Relevant Reading

1) Preamble:

You must master the ‘Analytical Mind’ facet of cunning.

This facet is distinct from having a high IQ. To have a high IQ is to have immense cognitive processing power, whereas mastering the ‘Analytical Mind’ facet of cunning is to be capable of reading social interactions, body language, and vocal tonality with razor sharp accuracy.

There are many men with high IQs who are capable of mastering calculus but who are hopelessly incapable of accurately analyzing social interactions or reading body language. Highly functional autistic men are an iconic example of this.

Meanwhile few women are intelligent enough to be capable of understanding calculus, however most of them *can* accurately analyze social interactions and read body language.

This piece will detail information you ought to be aware of when analyzing social interactions and the personalities of others.

Including all information that could conceivably help you master the ‘Analytical Mind’ facet of cunning is impossible, but the content herein should help enhance your general level of awareness.

2) Cold Reading and Warm Reading:

Cold reading is analyzing a person’s psychological profile based on nothing more than their physical appearance. Warm reading is doing such analysis after having spent time interacting with them and observing their behavior.

Inevitably your warm reads will be more accurate than your cold reads, however with skill and practice you can get to the point where your cold reads are accurate more than 80% of the time.

When it comes to reading the psychological profiles of others, it’s like mathematics; **there are right answers and there are wrong answers.**

Your reads will never perfectly align with what a person’s actual psychological profile is, but they don’t need to; you just need reads that are *reasonably close* to the reality of their psychology.

Perfectly accurate knowledge of a person’s psychology is not needed for the sake of predicting their behavior with a high degree of accuracy, just as perfectly accurate knowledge of physics is not needed for the sake of being able to predict that being punched in the face will hurt.

3) Heuristics:

“Stereotypes are just culturally codified observations of behavioral correlates. The correlation has been noticed so many times by so many people, that it enters the cultural consciousness as it’s deemed judgmentally representative enough to form a heuristic basis for evaluation...Stereotypes are observations so commonplace even stupid people realise them. They are not imagined. Stereotypes are representativeness heuristics.” –Illimitable Man

For the sake of reading people you should use heuristics to make accurate guesses. A heuristic is a rule of thumb; something that is usually true, but not in every single case.

For example, the statement “Men are lower on neuroticism than women” is a heuristic, which more specifically

means “Men are on average lower on neuroticism than women. There may be exceptions; highly neurotic men, or extremely calm women.”

A ‘Stereotype’ is a heuristic that is accurate but that offends people’s sensibilities.

4) Judge People By What They Look Like:

You *should* judge people by what they look like.

Based on a person’s physical appearance alone you can know a significant amount about their psychological profile. Your cold reads will not be perfectly accurate, but they will be far better than random guessing.

For example, suppose you see a man wearing a military uniform. You also notice he has a wedding ring, and a face with a square jawline and thin eye ridges.

The military uniform tells you his profession. The fact that he is in the military suggests he is probably significantly above average on conscientiousness; he is more hardworking than the average person. His square jawline and thin eye ridges suggest high testosterone levels, which suggests he ranks significantly below average on both agreeableness and neuroticism (high testosterone suppresses both agreeableness and neuroticism).

Most military members lean Rightwing, and married men are more likely to be Rightwing than single men; his uniform and wedding ring tell you his political preferences are most likely ‘Right’ of center.

How a person ranks on conscientiousness, agreeableness, and neuroticism, as well as their marital status and likely political preferences, is quite a bit of information to get from physical appearance alone.

5) Knowing Someone Better Than They Know Themselves:

“You have a self-limiting conception of yourself, because you don’t know what you’re capable of if you haven’t visited the edge. You’re not properly acquainted with yourself. Few are. That’s why you surprise yourself in do-or-die situations. Part of you’s completely alien to you.” -Illimitable Man

Knowing a person better than they know themselves is a very low bar, since most people have very little self awareness. With cold reading alone, you can know most people better than they know themselves.

Self awareness varies from one trait to another.

Most smart people do realize they’re smart, but most dumb people don’t realize they’re dumb; most people with IQs of 130+ realize they are smarter than a majority of the population, but most people with IQs of 90- don’t realize they are dumber than a majority of the population.

Most women don’t realize they’re hypergamous.

Most narcissistic men don’t realize they are narcissistic

6) Reading People, How Much Should You Bother?

How much time you dedicate to analyzing a person’s psychological profile should be proportionate to how important that person is to your life.

If they have profound power over your fate in life you should dedicate significant time to consciously analyzing their psychology. Bosses, coworkers, parents, and potential spouses would all fall into this category.

For such people use physical sheets of paper to write down everything you possibly can about their personalities.

In your network you will have around 1,000 contacts. Chances are around 900 of them are trivial; they have little impact on your life. 90 of them will be significant. 10 of them will be absolutely critical.

For your roughly 10 critical contacts, no amount of time spent analyzing their psychologies is superfluous.

7) Conceal How Observant You Are:

“Too much perception can niggle a person’s paranoia, perceptiveness is threatening to those aware of their ill-nature.

In suspicious company, appear less perceptive...Too much perception is threatening, even intimidating, people distrust you when they realise you are as perceptive as you are, even if you mean them no ill will. When people know you have the potential to destroy them, like nuclear material, they quarantine you.” - Illimitable Man

There is a paradox.

On one hand you must closely observe people’s body language, vocal tonality, word choice, and behavior so that you can accurately understand their psychological profile and the subtext behind what they say overtly.

At the same time, if people realize you are closely observing them it causes them to distrust you. Your perceptiveness doesn’t make them view you as intelligent; it makes them view you as cunning, and most people conflate cunning with evil.

Be very observant, but don’t appear to be very observant; appear to have the same level of awareness as the average person.

Only show off how perceptive you are on those rare occasions when you need to use intimidation rather than charm.

8) Avoid Solipsistic Cold Reading:

“The most common means by which people give away who they really are is projection.” -Illimitable Man

Many people engage in ‘Solipsistic Cold Reading’; they assume everyone else thinks the same way they do. They project their own psychological profile onto others.

A 150 IQ nerd thinks “Calculus is easy for me. It must be just as easy for everyone else as it is for me.”

Psychopaths often assume everyone else is as ruthless and untrustworthy as they are. Agreeable people often assume everyone else is just as kind and compassionate as they are.

Essentially, many people who are outliers don’t realize they are outliers; they think they are roughly average and everyone else (or most other people) are similar to the way they are.

Ensure you yourself aren’t engaging in Solipsistic Cold Reading.

You need to be able to read people’s psychologies accurately; assuming everyone is the same as you is problematic because it gives an inaccurate read.

9) Metrics to Search For:

When reading people there are several metrics that can be used as a general framework for understanding a person’s psychological profile.

- Gender
- Racial/Ethnic Group
- Religious Beliefs
- Political Beliefs
- Intelligence/IQ
- Cunning Level (Machiavellian Intelligence)
- Big 5 Personality Traits
- Education Level
- Profession

-Income Level. Status in the macro dominance hierarchy.

Metrics and heuristics will never give you a perfectly accurate view of a person's psychology, however they can be used to give you a *general profile* of what a person's mind is like.

Very often, a generally accurate view of a person's psychology is sufficient for all practical purposes.

10) Big 5 Personality Traits:

The Big 5 Personality Traits are good heuristics for understanding an individual's personality.

10A) Extroversion, Neuroticism, Agreeableness

3 of the Big 5 Traits can easily be detected through a brief and casual interaction with a person: Extroversion, Agreeableness, Neuroticism.

Extroversion:

People who smile and laugh a lot are extroverted. Meanwhile, those who smile and laugh little if at all are introverted.

To be extroverted is to have immense enthusiasm, to be introverted is to lack enthusiasm.

Neuroticism:

Those who appear fearful (shaking voice, twitching or abnormally fast body movements) are high on neuroticism. Also, those who are prone to bursts of anger are high on neuroticism.

Those who appear calm (slow movements) are low on neuroticism.

Agreeableness:

Those with feminine facial features (big eyes, soft jawline) tend to be agreeable, while those with masculinized facial features (thin eye ridges, sharp jawline) tend to be disagreeable.

5 Minutes Needed:

After just 5 minutes of conversation with a person, you should be able to judge how extroverted, agreeable, and neurotic they are.

Of course, you don't know what they are like most of the time; you will only know how they appeared to be during the singular interaction you had with them. They could very well be wearing a mask that's very different than their real self.

10B) Conscientiousness and Openness:

Conscientiousness and Openness are 2 of the Big 5 traits that *cannot* be easily gauged after a brief casual conversation. To know how a person ranks on Conscientiousness and Openness you will most likely need to spend a significant amount of time with them.

Certain professional choices correlate with Conscientiousness, and others with Openness.

Those working in finance, law, or medicine tend to be very high on conscientiousness, while people who choose to become artists, actors, musicians, or entrepreneurs are almost always high on openness.

You can accurately guess a person's political preferences based on how they rank on Conscientiousness and Openness.

High conscientiousness and low openness cause people to be politically conservative, while low conscientiousness and high openness cause people to be politically liberal.

11) Intelligence:

Judging someone's level of intelligence is easier than you might think.

Cold reading and casual conversation alone won't be enough to get a precise calculation as to what their IQ score is, but you can quickly detect if a person is significantly smarter or dumber than average.

11A) Education and Profession:

Intelligence, educational attainment, and socioeconomic status (income level) are 3 separate things, but they all correlate positively.

If a person has a college degree and works in a lucrative profession, they are probably smarter than average. If a person has only a high school diploma and works low end jobs, they are probably dumb or of average intelligence.

11B) Speaking Style:

Speaking style is a decent indicator of intelligence level.

If a person uses complex sentence structure and big words, it indicates a significantly above average IQ.

Of course there is the question; is the complexity of their language natural and something they use for the sake of communicating information as precisely as possible, or is it complexity they manufacture for the sake of trying to show off how smart they are?

If the former, they probably have an IQ of 130+. If the latter, they probably have an IQ in the range of 110 – 120.

11C) Extroversion and Intelligence:

Extroversion and IQ correlate *negatively*; most extremely high IQ people (130+) are introverted, while most people who are dumb or of average intelligence are extroverted.

If you detect that a person is significantly less enthusiastic than average (introverted), they are probably smart. If a person is significantly more enthusiastic than average (extroverted), they are probably dumb.

11D) Openness and Intelligence:

Openness and IQ correlate positively.

Caveat: Among low and average IQ people, they are all low on openness. Among high IQ people, some are high on openness while others are low on openness.

If a person is very interested in abstract ideas and creative endeavors (things typical of those who rank high on openness), they are probably high IQ.

People who rank high on IQ but low on openness make great accountants; accounting is a profession that requires one to be *intelligent, but not creative*.

12) Body Language:

Entire books have been written on the subject of reading body language (see the 'Relevant Reading' section at the end).

12A) Closed vs Open

As a general guideline, open body language indicates positive emotion (or at least a lack of negative emotion) while closed body language indicates negative emotion.

If a person has their arms folded and is hunched over, it indicates fear or sadness, or both.

If a person stands with their arms at their side and with upright posture, it indicates that they are calm or at least not experiencing any overwhelming negative emotion at the moment.

12B) Microexpressions:

The microexpressions a person shows on their face are critical, because they are difficult to fake.

Generally speaking when a person receives surprising news (whether good or bad) they will for half a second have an expression on their face (a microexpression), before becoming consciously aware of it and effort-fully putting on a new expression that is either neutral, or deceptively positive, or deceptively negative.

Microexpressions are the most difficult part of body language to read effectively (since they only appear for a nanosecond), and they are also the most important part of a person's body language to read (since they are the most difficult part of a person's body language to fake).

12C) Eyes:

“Eyes are portals to alien metaphysics. If you judge a person on anything, judge them by their eyes. The eyes do not lie, and reveal all.” -Illimitable Man

Besides microexpressions, the second most important part of body language is the eyes.

Most people can easily fake gestures with their torso, arms, legs, and even face. However, most people find it difficult or impossible to fake emotion with their eyes.

Stare into a person's eyes and you will see what they are really feeling.

The best liars are those who can 'lie with their eyes'; they can intentionally modulate how their eyes look to display an emotional state other than the one they really have.

People who can lie with their eyes are exceptionally rare; if you want to be a contender in the game of power, you must be one of them.

At minimum, learn how to manufacture a smile that looks real.

12D) Smiles, Real and Fake:

The difference between a fake smile and a real smile is in the eyes; a real smile involves slightly squinting the eyes at the moment the smile starts, a fake smile causes no change in the eyes.

If a person is smiling with their mouth, but their eyes are just as wide as a normal person's eyes would be even when not smiling, their smile is fake.

There are people who can make their fake smiles look real by intentionally squinting their eyes when they initiate the fake smile, but such people are rare; ensure that you are one of them.

13) Hormones, Physical Traits and Personality:

There are certain physical and psychological traits that correlate with having high testosterone levels and low estrogen levels, and others that correlate with having low testosterone levels and high estrogen levels. You will find that the former are typical of men while the latter are typical of women.

There are feminized men who embody high estrogen traits, and there are masculinized women who embody high testosterone traits; such people are outliers.

13A) High Testosterone Traits:

- Low Agreeableness
- Low Neuroticism

- Thin Eye Ridges, Small eyes, Hunter eyes
- Sharp jawline
- Deep voice
- Uninterested in babies and small children
- High sex drive, wants sex often, once a day

13B) High Estrogen Traits:

- High Agreeableness
- High Neuroticism
- Large eyes, neotonous eyes like a child
- Soft jawline, soft facial features
- High voice
- Thinks babies and small children are cute
- Low sex drive, wants sex rarely (once a week or once a month)

13C) Physical Traits Correlate With Psychological Traits

If you notice that a person has high testosterone physical features (sharp jawline and thin eye ridges, deep voice), they probably rank low on agreeableness and neuroticism, and have a high sex drive.

If you notice that a person has high estrogen physical features (soft facial features and big eyes, high voice), they probably rank high on agreeableness and neuroticism, and have a low sex drive.

Kellyanne Conway would be an example of a woman who is an outlier; she is a female who embodies high testosterone traits: rugged facial features, low agreeableness, low neuroticism, and very likely has a high sex drive.

14) Personality Archetypes:

“I’m of the opinion most personalities conform to a number of preset templates, differences are mainly in idiosyncrasies, aesthetics (looks) and details (names, places).

What is most significant is least varied, and what is most varied is least significant.

When you get wise enough, and can match the patterns in front of you with the patterns you hold in your head, you know most people before you even meet them. And you know them better than they know themselves. See, once you’ve met enough people. You’ve met almost everybody.” -Illimitable Man

Most people’s personalities are not unique; there is a list of archetypes (personality templates) that 99% of people will have their personality be encapsulated within.

There are individuals who are truly unique; their personalities do *not* neatly fit into any previously defined archetype. However such people are rare; you will encounter only a few of them in your life.

14A) Common Personality Archetypes, Modern America:

Below are some common personalities you will encounter in modern America.

Feminine Woman:

A woman who embodies high estrogen traits: she’s high on agreeableness and neuroticism, and thinks babies are cute.

Such women often become stay at home mothers. If they are in the workforce, they tend towards non-profit work, being a schoolteacher, or if they are in the private sector they’re usually working in the human resources department.

They are kind, and they are also *very politically correct*; if you say anything politically incorrect in their presence they will despise you.

Spoiled Upper Class Woman:

A woman who grew up in a rich or upper class family, went to college, and then got married and now lives off her husband's money.

During childhood she lived off her father's money, in college she majored in one of the easiest subjects (women's studies, social sciences), and in adulthood she lives off her husband's wealth.

Feminism has convinced her that she is oppressed because she is a woman.

Fraternity Boy:

Men who rank high on extroversion, low on agreeableness, and low on neuroticism.

They are often found in fraternities at university, but not always. They usually have IQs in the range of 110 – 120; they are bright, but certainly not geniuses.

Don't underestimate them; they are smart enough to do most work in the corporate world effectively, and they aren't so smart that they're socially awkward nerds who will fail at office politics. Their high extroversion, low agreeableness, and low neuroticism also help them succeed in the corporate world.

The hobby they all have in common is binge drinking alcohol at parties with loud music.

Warrior:

Men who have high testosterone traits (low agreeableness, low neuroticism), and who also rank high on conscientiousness. They are ruthless, have a high stress tolerance, and are ambitious.

You will find them in the military, and also in finance and law.

Most are *not* psychopathic or narcissistic; they are disagreeable, but still psychologically healthy.

This is the type of man everybody wants their daughter to marry.

Autist, Highly Functional:

Men who are autistic, but still functional enough to work a normal job.

They are incredibly intelligent (great at logical reasoning), yet hopelessly socially awkward.

You will find them in the engineering departments of many corporations.

There are women who fit this archetype, but note that most autists are men.

15) Relevant Reading:

The Definitive Book of Body Language (Allan & Barbara Pease)

What Every Body Is Saying (Joe Navarro)

Amy Cuddy, Ted Talk

Understanding Psychopathy (Illimitable Man)

Risk Taking Psychology

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Types of Bets
- 2) Calculate Risk Fast
- 3) How Much Do You Have to Lose?
 - 3A) A Lot to Lose? Be Risk Averse
 - 3B) Little to Lose? Be Risk Aggressive
- 4) Death Opens a World of Opportunity
- 5) Fools and Cowards
- 6) Enter With Boldness
- 7) Fight and Win, or Don't Fight
- 8) Relevant Reading
- 9) Further Reflections
 - 9A) Ambition and Hopelessness Drive Risk Taking
 - 9B) Baltasar Gracian's Advice
 - 9C) Brave Men Want Security For Their Children
 - 9D) Creativity is Risky

Preamble:

A life with zero risk is neither possible nor desirable.

Risk can be managed. It can be moved from one place to another. It can be increased or decreased in amount, but it can never be eliminated.

1) Types of Bets:

There are different types of opportunities or 'bets' that will appear in life.

Smart Bets are those with big upside and small downside; they are low risk high reward bets. Stupid Bets are those with small upside and big downside; they are high risk low reward bets. Everyone should seize Smart Bets and reject Stupid Bets.

Tragically, Smart Bets are incredibly rare while Stupid Bets are common. In the game of life, it is rare that you can win smartly but there are endless opportunities to lose foolishly.

Ambivalent Bets are those where it's difficult to tell which is bigger; the upside or the downside? A bet with big upside and big downside is a high risk high reward bet, while a bet with small upside and small downside is a low risk low reward bet.

2) Calculate Risk Fast:

"Life is a game of calculated risk taking." –WallStreetPlayboys

A critical skill is the ability to quickly calculate risk and reward.

Whenever an opportunity appears, quickly categorize it into which type of Bet it is: 'Smart' 'Stupid' 'High Risk-High Reward' or 'Low Risk-Low Reward'

This calculation will sometimes have to be done in a matter of minutes; sometimes in a matter of seconds.

In the real world it is impossible to calculate risk and reward with mathematical certainty. However, opportunities

can certainly be *ranked* relative to each other in regards to how risky they are.

We cannot say there is X% chance that if you start a business you will become a multimillionaire, but we can certainly say that starting your own business is a higher risk and higher reward path than being a corporate employee.

3) How Much Do You Have to Lose?

3A) A Lot to Lose? Be Risk Averse:

If your life is going well (you have high status within the macro hierarchy), then you have a lot to lose. Being risk averse is rational.

If any high risk high reward opportunities appear you should reject them, and instead tend towards a path that is low risk and low reward.

3B) Little to Lose? Be Risk Aggressive:

“All courses of action are risky, so prudence is not in avoiding danger (it is impossible), but in calculating risk and acting decisively.” –Niccolo Machiavelli

If your life is going badly (you have low status in the macro hierarchy and this is likely to continue into the future), then you have little to lose and a lot to gain; being risk aggressive is rational.

If a high risk high reward opportunity appears, you should seize it without hesitation.

If your life is on track for failure, you have to escalate your tactics. Any fear you have is irrelevant; if there are high risk high reward strategies that you have been afraid to use up to this point, it's time to execute them.

Continue executing high risk high reward strategies until you either win or die. Better to die than to live defeated.

4) Death Opens a World of Opportunity:

“Life has more meaning in the face of death.” -33 Strategies of War

Only Satan knows the things you'd be willing to do if you had nothing to lose.

There are plenty of young men in perfect health who think they have 'nothing' to lose, when in truth they have everything to lose; they have another 50 years of life ahead of them.

The only people who truly have nothing to lose are those diagnosed with terminal illnesses or those who are determined to carry out suicide.

Having nothing to lose is a miserable position to be in, but it is also a position of immense power.

You are enabled to use high risk strategies that nobody else is; everyone else is understandably afraid of the consequences, however you need not fear consequences since there is nothing you have that can be taken away.

Should you be informed you have a terminal illness or should you choose to carry out suicide, **do not slowly fade away; go out in a blaze of glory.**

Before death arrives, execute every high risk high reward strategy available.

5) Fools and Cowards:

Fools tell you to always be risk aggressive. Cowards tell you to always be risk averse.

Wisdom lies in knowing when to be risk aggressive and when to be risk averse.

You will encounter many fools going down high risk paths because they think they have ‘nothing to lose’, when in truth they have a lot to lose.

You will also encounter many cowards whose lives are on track for failure and who in truth have little or nothing to lose, who refuse to use high risk strategies because their fear is biasing them.

6) Enter With Boldness:

“If you are unsure of a course of action, *do not attempt it*; your doubts and hesitations will infect your execution...Going halfway with half a heart digs a deeper grave.” -Law 28

Take as much time as you need to carefully consider whether or not you want to embark on a high risk course of action, or continue being risk averse.

However, when you embark on a high risk course of action you must do so with total confidence.

During the analysis that takes place *before* action, consider every doubt and hesitation conceivable.

In the moment of action, banish all doubts and fears; launch with boldness.

7) Fight and Win, or Don't Fight:

There are those who will tell you it is better to try and fail than to not try at all. When the stakes are low (as is the case with low risk low reward strategies) this is true. However when the stakes are high this is wrong; dead wrong.

When the stakes are high or when considering a high risk strategy, it is far better to have *not* tried than to have tried and failed.

Better to have *not* tried, when a little foresight and a little caution could have spared you from so much unnecessary suffering.

8) Relevant Reading:

Martin Daly:

Risk Taking, Inequality, Homicide

Evolutionary Psychology Pioneer

Felix Dennis:

How to Get Rich

88 The Narrow Road

9) Further Reflections:

9A) Ambition and Hopelessness Drive Risk Taking

Ambition + Hopelessness = Extreme Risk Taking

High Testosterone + Low Serotonin = Extreme Risk Taking

Testosterone fuels ambition. Who has high testosterone? Men

Low serotonin induces feelings of hopelessness. Who has low serotonin? People (both men and women) at the bottom of dominance hierarchies.

Men at the bottom of dominance hierarchies have high testosterone levels and low serotonin levels; they are filled with both ambition and hopelessness.

They are the one's who engage in extreme risk taking; risks that look insane to most people but that are perfectly sane if you have nothing to lose and everything to gain.

9B) Baltasar Gracian's Advice:

"Never compete against a man who has nothing to lose." –The Art of Worldly Wisdom

Never put an adversary into the position of having nothing to lose.

If your adversary has nothing to lose, he may be willing to burn down everything and everyone including himself and including you.

9C) Brave Men Want Security For Their Children:

Most people are risk averse, period. With every decision they make they will search for a low risk option.

Among extremely risk aggressive men they may be willing to take risks when it comes to decisions affecting their own lives, but they are risk averse when it comes to their childrens' lives.

Risk aggressive men want glory for themselves, but for their loved ones they want security.

9D) Creativity is Risky:

Creativity is a high risk high reward strategy. Most new ideas are useless, but a tiny minority are spectacular.

In creative professions you will find that most people make little or no money, but a tiny minority are spectacularly rich.

'Creative' professions would include entrepreneurship, art, music, and writing.

Feedback Loops, Positive & Negative

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Status and Networking Feedback Loop
- 2) Revenue Generation, Social Proof Feedback Loop
- 3) Feedback Loops for Modern Americans
 - 3A) Upper Class Americans, Positive Feedback Loops
 - 3B) Poor Americans, Negative Feedback Loops
- 4) Pareto Distribution, Driven by Feedback Loops
- 5) Wealth Redistribution Creates a New Pareto Distribution

Preamble:

“To the one who has much, more will be given, and he will have an abundance, but from the one who has little, even what he has will be taken away.” -Jesus

The world is filled with feedback loops.

A ‘Positive Feedback Loop’ is when one good thing leads to another, and another, and another...spiraling upwards.

A ‘Negative Feedback Loop’ is when one bad thing leads to another, and another, and another...spiraling downwards.

Generally speaking, successful people do not rise linearly; they rise exponentially. A runaway positive feedback loop takes them up into the stratosphere.

Conversely, those who experience downfalls rarely deteriorate linearly; they deteriorate exponentially.

1) Status and Networking Feedback Loop:

When you are high status, people are eager to do you favors and be in your contact list. The favors they do you help you attain more success, which boosts your status even higher. With even higher status, people become even more eager to do you favors. Easier access to favors and contacts makes it even easier to attain more success, and boost your status even higher yet again.

This feedback loop can go on and on, throwing your status up into the stratosphere.

Conversely, when you are low status nobody is going to bother doing you any favors and nobody wants you in their contact list. The inability to access favors and contacts makes it difficult or impossible to attain improve your situation. Your lack of success ensures that your status stays low, which ensures that you still can't access favors or contacts, which ensures that you will continue to lack success, which will continue to ensure that your status stays low.

The positive manifestation of the Status/Networking Feedback Loop may alone explain why billionaires exist.

The negative manifestation may alone explain why many people never escape poverty.

The reason people perceiving you are high status makes them eager to do you favors is because it makes them assume you wield the power to repay a favor in a meaningful way.

Conversely, the reason people perceiving you are low status makes them unwilling to do you favors is because it makes them assume you *lack* the power to repay a favor in a meaningful way.

Given this information, it is wise to make others perceive that your status in the macro hierarchy is as high as

possible. Maximizing the status others perceive you as having is a matter of tactical necessity, not just stroking your ego.

Most people subconsciously understand this, and so they will try to portray themselves as being of higher status than they really are.

2) Revenue Generation, Social Proof Feedback Loop:

“One deal leads to another.” -Francesco Guicciardini

The hardest customer to get is your first.

Going from customer 100 to customer 1,000 is easy. Going from zero customers to having just 1 customer is the difficult part.

Why?

Because every potential prospect will ask “Who are your current clients?” If your answer is “We have none; you would be our first!”, they will reject you since you have no social proof.

As such, revenue tends to grow exponentially rather than linearly.

The positive feedback loop that can shoot revenue into the stratosphere is that as you gain more customers, gaining *additional* customers becomes exponentially easier since with each new customer you gain you have more and more social proof.

For details on the phenomenon of ‘Social Proof’ see Robert Cialdini’s book **Influence**

3) Feedback Loops for Modern Americans:

What follows are some feedback loops that are likely to affect the lives of many Americans.

3A) Upper Class Americans, Positive Feedback Loops:

Stress Levels:

You have plenty of money, so you don’t have any ‘real problems’. You don’t have to worry about whether or not you can pay the rent on time.

As a result, your stress levels are low (lower neuroticism). This is great for productivity; your low stress levels enable you to do the rigorous work necessary to make even more money.

Looks:

You have money, so you can afford to buy nice clothes, a haircut, and high quality food. This makes you look physically attractive. Your physical attractiveness allows you to benefit from the halo effect.

Because you benefit from the halo effect it’s easier for you to get hired for a job, it’s easier for you to get promoted, and you will likely be paid more money than a coworker who is equally qualified but less physically attractive.

Having money makes it easier to be good looking, and being good looking makes it easier to make money.

Status/Networking:

You are high status, so people are eager to do you favors and hesitant to harm you.

This makes it easier for you to make money, regardless of whether you are simply searching for a good job, or trying to raise capital to start a business.

Having money gives you high status, and having high status makes it easier to seize new opportunities to make money.

Energy, Health:

Because you have money, you can buy top tier medical care. You can get TRT (testosterone injections). This gives you high energy levels, which in turn makes it easier to make more money.

Having lots of money allows you to buy good health, and having good health makes it easier to make money.

Shelter:

Because you have money, you can get a studio apartment all to yourself. You don't have to waste time and energy dealing with the annoyance that is roommates.

This boosts your productivity (more time and energy), which in turn allows you to make more money.

3B) Poor Americans, Negative Feedback Loops:

Stress Levels:

When you are poor, you have *real problems*; there is a very real risk that you won't have enough money to pay the rent on time. This drives up your stress levels, which inhibits productivity, and deters your ability to make money...further trapping you in poverty.

Looks:

Because you don't have money, you can't afford to buy nice clothes, or get a good haircut, or buy high quality food. This causes you to be physically unattractive.

Your ugliness makes you suffer from the 'Horns Effect'. This makes it harder to get hired for a good job, harder to get promoted, and you are likely to be paid less money than an equally qualified coworker who is more physically attractive than you.

Your lack of money causes you to become ugly, and your ugliness in turn makes it difficult to make money.

Status/Networking:

Because you are relatively poor, you are low status. Your low status makes people less eager to do you favors and more willing to harm you. This makes it harder for you to make money, whether it be getting hired for a good job or raising capital to start a business.

Your lack of money gives you low status, and your low status makes it difficult to make money.

Energy, Health:

Because you don't have money, you can't buy medical care. This damages your health and decreases your energy levels.

Your low energy levels make it harder for you to make money, thereby keeping you poor, and ensuring you will never be able to afford medical care.

Shelter:

Because you are poor, you need to have roommates to keep rent expense down. This forces you to waste valuable time and energy dealing with roommates rather than being productive and making money.

Your poverty forces you to have roommates, and your roommates take up your energy thereby preventing you from being productive enough to escape poverty.

4) Pareto Distribution, Driven by Feedback Loops:

In every human society, wealth is pareto distributed; a minority of people have a majority of the wealth, and most

people have little or nothing.

This is commonly referred to as the '80/20' rule. In most societies, the richest 20% of people own roughly 80% of the wealth.

Leftwing people look at the fact that wealth is pareto distributed and think "This is a sign that the economic system is crooked; the rich are robbing everyone else."

Rightwing people look at the fact that wealth is pareto distributed and think "This is a sign that most people are stupid and lazy. That's why they can't create or acquire any wealth."

Both are wrong.

In reality, **feedback loops are what cause wealth to be pareto distributed.**

The rich are constantly being helped by positive feedback loops which leads to them becoming richer, while the poor are constantly being wrecked by negative feedback loops which leads to them becoming poorer or at best remaining stagnant; the end result is that a tiny minority of rich people have the overwhelming majority of the wealth.

5) Wealth Redistribution Creates a New Pareto Distribution

Every society has elites; a minority of people who are on the winning side of the pareto distribution.

Revolution does not end the existence of a pareto distribution or the existence of elites; it simply eliminates the current elites, and replaces them with new elites.

Vilfredo Pareto himself referred to revolution as a 'Circulation' of elites.

It has been said that if all the wealth in a country were to be confiscated and then redistributed equally among every citizen, within 2 years those who were rich before the redistribution would be rich again.

This is a half truth.

Within 2 years, there would indeed be a pareto distribution with a tiny minority of people owning the overwhelming majority of the wealth. However, those who were on the winning side of the pareto distribution *before* the redistribution, and those who are on the winning side of the pareto distribution 2 years *after* the redistribution, would be different people.

There may be overlap in who the old elites were before redistribution and who the new elites are after redistribution, but they will not be precisely the same group of people.

Battle of Credibility:

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Appear Calm
- 2) Don't Appear Bitter or Angry
- 3) Don't Justify Yourself or What You Say
- 4) Shift Blame
- 5) Don't Say Anything Verifiably False
- 6) Be Good Looking
- 7) Be a Woman
- 8) Relevant Reading
- 9) Illimitable Man's Reflections

Preamble:

A Battle of Credibility (BOC) is any case where it is one person's word against the word of another, and the winner will be whoever appears to be more credible.

Should you find yourself in a BOC, your goal is to make yourself appear as credible as possible, while reducing the perceived credibility of your opponent as much as possible.

Many people naively think that so long as they are telling the truth, other people will perceive them as credible; they assume that if they tell the truth, they will be believed.

Tragically, this is not the case.

The correlation between whether a person is telling the truth or lying, and whether a person appears credible or uncredible, is about zero.

Humans are embarrassingly bad at figuring out who is lying and who is telling the truth.

The aim of this piece is to outline the things you can do to maximize the degree to which others perceive that you are credible.

1) Appear Calm:

Most people conflate calmness with credibility.

If when you speak you appear calm and confident, people assume you are credible; that you are both honest and competent.

If when you speak you appear neurotic, whether nervously exhibiting fear, or uncontrollably exhibiting anger, people perceive you are uncredible; either dishonest or incompetent.

The lower you rank on neuroticism, the more credible people will perceive you to be.

Of course, conflating calmness with credibility is a fallacy since in reality the correlation between confidence and credibility is about zero. It is a fallacy that you should use to your advantage.

The offensive application of the conflation of calmness with credibility is this; get your opponent to become neurotic, and it destroys their credibility. If you can intimidate them into fear, or provoke them into anger, their neuroticism will cause others to perceive they are not credible.

Confident people have open body language, and speak slowly. Their body language and their voices are relaxed.

Neurotic people have closed body language and talk fast.

2) Don't Appear Bitter or Angry:

If you exhibit any negative emotion at all, it causes people to perceive you aren't credible.

In particular, if you show bitterness or anger people assume you lack credibility. This could be called 'Bitterness Fallacy'; the assumption that if someone is bitter, it indicates they are not credible.

In reality it is often the case that a bitter person is bitter with good reason and their experience can serve as a valuable cautionary tale.

So far as winning battles of credibility is concerned, the actionable information is this; when you speak, exhibit no bitterness and no anger. Conceal any displeasure you may have.

Offensively, the phrase "They're just bitter" is incredibly effective for damaging someone else's credibility.

3) Don't Justify Yourself or What You Say

"If you are explaining, you are losing." -Ronald Reagan

"Justification is a Machiavellian Fallacy" -Illimitable Man

The more you justify yourself (explain yourself), the more people perceive that you are guilty or dishonest in some way.

Ironically, giving logical explanations for your opinion or your past actions causes people to perceive you aren't credible, even if every word you speak is true.

Justify yourself as little as possible, if at all.

When giving an explanation or justification for your opinion or your actions, use as few words as possible. The best justification is none at all, the second best is a brief one.

This is all fallacious; in reality the correlation between how much justification someone gives and how truthful they are is zero, but it is a fallacy you must use to your advantage.

4) Shift Blame:

"Do not defend against your attackers, attack them; justification is a Machiavellian fallacy. Do not justify, stipulate." -Illimitable Man

"Admit nothing, deny everything, make counter accusations." -Roger Stone Jr.

Attempting to make someone else look blameworthy is a high risk high reward tactic; if it works it can make them look guilty and you look innocent. However, if it fails it can easily make you look like a monster; someone who should never be trusted again.

Generally speaking, you should only resort to using this tactic if you are accused of something.

Deny whatever you have been accused of, and change the subject by accusing your opponent of something unrelated.

Making direct accusations is dangerous. It is much safer to accuse indirectly, by asking a question rather than making a statement. Use an ADAAQ: Accusation Disguised As A Question.

As an example if you are accusing a coworker of speaking badly of you because they resent that you are more competent than they are, it would be unwise to say "The reason that he doesn't like me is because I'm better at the job than he is." Far more safe would be to say "Could it be that the reason he doesn't like me is because his own performance hasn't been so great?"

Even when an accusation you throw is delivered as gently and indirectly as possible, throwing accusations is always dangerous; if people perceive the accusation you are throwing is fabricated, it is likely to cause them to distrust you forever.

Use this tactic at your own risk.

5) Don't Say Anything Verifiably False:

Nothing will destroy your credibility faster than saying things that can easily be verified as false.

If you say something and other people can verify it is false, or if they *think* it is false, they will assume you are either a liar or a fool; in either case not someone who is credible.

6) Be Good Looking:

Good looking people are perceived as more credible and trustworthy than ugly people.

Maximize your physical attractiveness and it will improve the degree to which people perceive you are credible.

It's a fallacy; in reality the correlation between physical attractiveness and trustworthiness is zero. It is a fallacy you should use to your advantage.

7) Be a Woman:

Women have a halo effect, men have a horns effect.

Women are perceived as more trustworthy and honest than men. This effect is more powerful during the age of feminism than any other time in history.

It's a fallacy; in reality men and women lie equally often. The difference is women are better at not getting caught lying.

If you are a woman, using this fallacy to your advantage is easy; simply speak.

If you are a man you can still use this fallacy to your advantage; get a woman to speak on your behalf.

8) Relevant Reading:

Machiavellian Thinking vs Conventional Logic (Illimitable Man)

9) Illimitable Man's Reflections:

Machiavellian Maxims (Part 1)

"Justification can only exist in respectful exchanges. When you are disliked, justifications are deemed excuses, your guilt, pre-determined...Do not defend against your attackers, attack them; justification is a Machiavellian fallacy. Do not justify, stipulate."

Machiavellian Thinking vs Conventional Logic

"Justification is a Machiavellian Fallacy:

"Justification is for the weak, **in the game of power** nobody respects he who justifies himself. Within a social fabric where the lowest common denominator prevails; where feelings triumph over logic, and likewise grandiosity over humility, honesty is but a virtue bastardised. You see, it is the transparency of justification that makes it powerless. Regardless, many an intellectual man's instinctual adherence to logical authoritarianism renders him incapable of determining this. Therefore, when he is tested, questioned, scrutinised and cross-examined, his most visceral instinct is to justify himself to his haranguing attacker; woe befalls him.

Little does he know his challenger's agenda is malicious, and their enquiry, insincere. Such a man haphazardly scrambles to explain himself by demonstrating his thought process. It is in this moment the **Machiavellian** knows they have won. With widening smile, such a rational yet foolish man can be gamed, intimidated, humiliated and berated. He will be kept on the defence with his own words, for it is they which will be weaponised against him. The more he speaks, the deeper his grave.

As Queen Gertrude said in Hamlet "The lady doth protest too much, methinks." Likewise, he who opts to prove, demonstrate and qualify himself with merely and solely the spoken word is perceived to be dishonest, pathetic. The justification is not seen as transparent or helpful, but rather as persuasive, deceptive, false – even when it isn't. People have a propensity to distrust that which doesn't embody an element of **effortlessness**.

With both the playful Machiavellian and the dimwit, a sentiment is shared; the more one protests, the more their guilt is assumed. It is thought if one were not guilty they would feel no need to justify their position. Why? Well because their position would "be obvious" of course; oh the subjective horror! To the idiot and the Machiavellian alike, truth is self-evident; it is organic and therefore shows in one's actions. The need to have to say anything about an aspect of one's self robs it of its naturalness, and therefore to the devout Machiavellian, its charismatic credibility.

Honesty destroys mystery, and with it, the attraction of curiosity. The Machiavellian hates the duplicitous more than most, and yet, respectfully appreciates only the cunning. As such, Machiavellians tend to be in a constant flux of love-hate with their peers. When you are understood, you are unattractive. When you try to help people understand you, they lose respect for you, you're making it too easy. People only value what they work for, be it wages or relationships. Of course the man of reason is oft deficient in the social realm, and therefore he does not fully comprehend the games that people play."

IM Twitter Feed:

"Keeping people on the defence is how you win arguments without actually having a reasoned discussion and forming a strong and cogent argument of your own.

Attack is the best defence...

Very few people give a shit about the facts. Most people just want their biases confirmed. This is annoying if you want an intellectual exchange, but incredibly useful for selling."

Seduction, Machiavellian Venue

[machivellicorporate](#) · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Hypergamy vs Feminism
- 2) Pairbonding Capacity is a Finite Resource
- 3) Affection, Give The Right Amount
 - 3A) Ruthlessness, Have The Right Amount
- 4) Be A Rock
- 5) Law 10, Avoid Insane Women
- 6) Top Tier Men Only
- 7) Sexual Harassment
- 8) Good Relationships Are Effortless
- 9) Marriage, Avoid It
- 10) Relevant Reading
- 11) Illimitable Man's Reflections

Preamble:

Women select men almost entirely on the basis of physical attractiveness, status in the dominance hierarchy, and confidence.

If you are a man who is good looking, high status in the hierarchy that is currently in place, and low on neuroticism (confident), there will be an endless supply of women who want to be with you.

Meanwhile, men select women almost entirely on the basis of physical attractiveness.

The rest of this piece will deal with the psychological aspects of seduction that go beyond the shallow matters listed above.

1) Hypergamy vs Feminism:

Women are hypergamous; a woman wants a man who is higher status than she is in the hierarchy, and ideally as high status as possible.

Feminism and hypergamy are antithetical; feminist ideology demands equality, hypergamy demands superiority.

When dealing with a woman who is a feminist, understand that on a conscious level her ideology demands that she be paired with a man who she considers an equal partner, while on a subconscious level her hindbrain desires a man she considers to be her superior.

She wants a man who is taller than her, richer than her, higher status than her, and more confident than her.

For the sake of maintaining a stable relationship outwardly appear to agree with whatever feminist propaganda she speaks, but inwardly be aware of the truth and take action to ensure you are superior to her in every way imaginable.

2) Pairbonding Capacity is a Finite Resource:

The fewer sexual partners a woman has had in the past the more intensely she will pairbond with a new sexual partner.

If a woman has slept with many men before you, getting her to become emotionally attached to you and maintaining a relationship with her will be difficult or impossible.

If a woman has slept with few men before you, getting her to become emotionally attached to you and maintaining a relationship with her will be easy.

The ideal number of previous sexual partners for her is zero.

3) Affection, Give The Right Amount:

“The less emotionally available you are, the more emotionally available she is – the inverse is also true.” - Illimitable Man

Maintaining a long term romantic relationship requires that you give her *the correct amount* of affection.

Give her too much affection and she will perceive you as needy. She must at all times perceive that she is more emotionally attached to you than you are to her. If she detects that you are more emotionally invested in her than she is in you, she will view you as being beneath her; you will no longer appeal to her hypergamy and her attraction to you will vanish.

On the other hand, if you give her too little affection she will view you as unloving and seek out another man who does give her sufficient affection.

Striking the right balance is difficult, but **when in doubt give her less affection, not more.**

Men who give too much affection are common, men who give too little affection are rare.

3A) Ruthlessness, Have The Right Amount:

A woman doesn't want a man who is so disagreeable that he'll abuse her and the children. However, she does want a man who has a **capacity for ruthlessness** so that he can serve as a competent protector.

The key word is 'capacity'. So far as making a woman fall in love with you is concerned, you should be polite and compassionate most of the time, but occasionally exhibit ruthlessness.

Your ruthlessness should be marked by cold detachment, rather than anger or hatred; you should appear to be low on agreeableness and low on neuroticism, rather than low on agreeableness and *high* on neuroticism

If you are a sheep who is highly agreeable and naïve, women won't want you.

If you are narcissistic and incredibly disagreeable often for no reason, some women may be attracted to you, but the probability you will be able to maintain a healthy and functional relationship over the long term is zero.

You must strike the right balance; be polite and compassionate most of the time, but still wielding a capacity for ruthlessness.

Very few men on the planet can strike this balance effectively; ruthless, but not angry or sadistic. Psychologically comfortable with conflict, but not predatory.

A man in public view who perfectly strikes this balance would be **Jocko Willink**

4) Be A Rock:

“You are an oak tree. You will not be manipulated by crying, yelling, lying, sexual withdrawal, jealousy ploys, shit tests, disappearing acts or guilt trips. She will rain and thunder all around you and you will shelter her until her storm passes.” -Roissy

Ideally you have a stress tolerance of infinity and never display any anger, fear, or sadness at all. Of course, this is an impossible ideal.

As much as possible, the women you are romantically involved with should perceive you are calm (low on neuroticism).

The less negative emotion you exhibit, and the less often, the better.

5) Law 10, Avoid Insane Women:

Do not become romantically involved with insane women.

Should you encounter a woman who is suffering from some psychiatric disorder, you will likely feel the instinct to take care of her. Don't do it. Run away as fast as you can.

Why?

Psychologically healthy women don't manufacture false accusations of violence; psychologically ill women do. Not always, but far too often for comfort.

This advice may sound obvious, yet many otherwise intelligent men destroy their lives by ignoring it.

They make the mistake of allowing their instinct to offer affection and protection to a woman who is suffering to override their knowledge that such a woman may be dangerous.

Women suffering from psychiatric disorders are victims of bad luck who deserve all the sympathy and aid that we can give them. However, you must prioritize the survival of your own reputation over giving her assistance; avoid her.

How many false accusations does it take to destroy a man's reputation? Only 1

6) Top Tier Men Only:

One consequence of hypergamy is that women only want top tier men.

If you are a man in the top 20% of sexual market value (looks, status in the dominance hierarchy, confidence) women will consider you attractive. If you are in the bottom 80% of men, women will consider you unattractive.

In polygamous societies, you will find that a minority of men marry and monopolize a majority of the women, or at least a disproportionate percentage of the women, while a significant percentage of men (perhaps a majority) get zero women.

In monogamous societies where young men and young women are shuffled into marriages with 1 man and 1 woman each, you will find that women around the 50th percentile of sexual market value *grudgingly* marry men around the 50th percentile of sexual market value. Many such women have affairs with men in the top 20% of sexual market value.

7) Sexual Harassment:

"Sexual Harassment" is a legal offense that has definitions so vague that they are all but meaningless.

The practical definition of sexual harassment is this; incompetent attempts at seduction carried out by ugly men with low status in the hierarchy are considered 'Sexual Harassment', while competent attempts at seduction carried out by good looking men with high status in the hierarchy are considered 'Flirting'.

8) Good Relationships Are Effortless:

A good relationship is effortless, a bad relationship is endless headache.

If you have a woman who thinks you should 'work' on your relationship, leave her.

You are looking for a subordinate (see 'Hypergamy') who will be a complement to your life, not an equal partner, and certainly not someone who will waste your time with manufactured drama.

9) Marriage, Avoid It:

Disclaimer: The following section applies to modern America, not necessarily other societies.

Every man in America from 1970 forward who signed a marriage contract was a fool for doing so.

A man has nothing to gain from getting married and everything to lose, while a woman has nothing to lose by getting married and everything to gain.

The reason for this is rather straightforward; the probability of divorce is roughly 50%, and in the event of divorce family courts will transfer wealth out of the hands of the husband and into the hands of the wife (via alimony and child support).

A marriage contract is nothing more than a business contract, and from 1970 forward it has been a business contract rigged in favor of wives and against husbands.

This may sound obvious, yet America is still a country filled with men cunning enough to become elite level investment bankers and lawyers, yet naïve enough to sign marriage contracts.

10) Relevant Reading:

Illimitable Man:

Fifty Shades of Red

Dominance and Submission

The Red Pill Constitution

Roosh:

DayBang

11) Illimitable Man's Reflections:

“If you want the truth, make her cry until she's lost self-control, then accuse her of bad things and keep asking her questions – everything she tells you in this highly stressed & emotional state will be the truth.

Women love to lie, you have to play dirty to uncover the dirty...Vetting isn't pretty. If you're not willing to get your hands dirty on ethical grounds, then you're not serious about determining the content of the other person's character, and are willing to gamble your future away on blind hope, rather than trusting through verification.

Making a girl cry is a small price to pay to learn the truth about who she really is.

By the way, if she becomes violent when you try this, run.

By violent I don't mean agitated and slightly disrespectful either, I mean full on bullying and threatening. If you see this, get out.

If she tries to flip the dynamic by doing to you what you're doing to her, she's somewhere on the cluster B spectrum, or at the very least extremely, extremely cunning and egotistical. Good to uncover all of this ugly ASAP, before you're too heavily invested and attached.

If you don't play her like this, she will hide the demon and play cutesy with you, wasting a lot of your time, energy and resources, allowing you to become attached to her without being fully aware of what or who she really is.

Skip all that bullshit, make her cry.”

Tactical Implications of Male Expendability

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Favor Asking
- 2) Risk Calculations
- 3) Punishment Avoidance
- 4) Distribute Risk to Men, Not Women
- 5) Victim Signaling, Strength Signaling
 - 5A) Seeking Help
 - 5B) Crying

Preamble:

“It’s hard for a child to understand the existential pressures of being an adult...the same is true of women with men.” -Illimitable Man

If you are a man, you have to look out for yourself because chances are nobody else will.

Society considers the lives of women and children to be critical, and the lives of men to be expendable.

If you are a man who is powerful (high status in the macro dominance hierarchy), then people will care about you and grant you assistance. Beware; their help is conditional. If you experience a downfall and become low status, their assistance will vanish and nobody will care whether you live or die.

The purpose of this piece is not to complain about how hard life is as a man, but rather to investigate how awareness of society considering men to be expendable can be used to make better tactical decisions.

1) Favor Asking:

People are more likely to grant a favor if it is asked for by a woman than if it is asked for by a man. This is particularly true when the person deciding whether or not to grant the favor, is a woman.

Men view women slightly more favorably than they view other men, and women view other women *far* more favorably than they view men.

As such if you are a woman and you need a favor, ask for it yourself. On the other hand if you are a man and you need a favor, it would be wise to get a woman to ask for it on your behalf.

Utilize this tactic and you will be surprised by how much more often people say ‘Yes’ when you make a request.

Better yet, get a good looking woman (rather than an ugly woman) to ask on your behalf; this way you have the ‘halo effect’ working for you rather than against you.

2) Risk Calculations:

If you are a man you need to be aware that society will give you little to no assistance should you become low status. When doing risk analysis, you must factor this into the calculation; your calculations should be made with the assumption that should things go badly, the rest of society will give you little to nothing in the way of rescue.

Your risk-reward calculations must include the assumption that society has no safety net for you.

3) Punishment Avoidance:

Crimes that are inflicted upon women are punished more harshly than crimes that are inflicted upon men.

As such if you must inflict harm upon someone (for whatever reason) it would be wise to choose a target who is male rather than a target who is female, if such a choice exists.

4) Distribute Risk to Men, Not Women:

If there is a dangerous task that must be done (where the doer is likely to suffer serious harm and possibly death), send a man to do it.

For example if you are sending employees to do a job that could very well get them killed (say coal mining), send male employees rather than female employees.

Why?

Because if you get a bunch of male employees killed, there will be public outrage and people might boycott your business. However, the outrage directed at you for slaughtering male employees won't be nearly as intense as it would have been had you slaughtered female employees.

5) Victim Signaling, Strength Signaling:

“Weak men get laughed at and blamed for being incompetent. Weak women get massive emotional support from their social network who will lash out at whoever she points her finger at...Men overplay their strengths and understate their vulnerabilities. Women overstate their vulnerabilities and downplay their strengths. Appearing strong is an asset to men (even when they're not). Appearing vulnerable is an asset to women (even when they're not).” -Illimitable Man

“Victim Signaling” is appearing weaker than you really are in the hope of winning sympathy and assistance.

“Strength Signaling” is appearing stronger than you really are with the hope that by appearing strong people will view you as high status and powerful, and thereby be more inclined to help you since they assume you wield the power to repay a favor in a meaningful way.

Women and children tend towards Victim Signaling, and with good reason; as a woman or child winning sympathy is easy.

Men tends towards Strength Signaling, and with good reason; as a man winning sympathy is difficult, but winning respect is easy, or at least doable.

A man who engages in Victim Signaling is usually committing tactical suicide; the appearance of weakness won't win him sympathy, it will win him disdain.

A woman or child maximizes the probability they will receive assistance by appearing as weak as possible. A man maximizes the probability he will receive assistance by appearing as strong as possible.

5A) Seeking Help

“Women seek help over the most tenuous things, sometimes just for attention, because they like the comfort and support that comes from sharing their plight.

If you see a man seeking help, you can be rest assured he is almost certainly desperate, and does so with great discomfort.” –Illimitable Man

Women and children intuitively understand that if they engage in Victim Signaling they will most likely be given compassion. Meanwhile, men intuitively understand that if they engage in Victim Signaling they will most likely be given scorn.

As such, women and children are far more willing to seek help than men; if a man seeks your help know that he is desperate and **you are probably his last resort.**

That last bolded phrase may sound obvious, yet countless suicides could have been prevented had it been heeded.

5B) Crying:

Women and children cry far more often than men. More importantly, women and children often cry in front of others, whereas men virtually *never* cry in front of others.

Men avoid crying in front of others since they know that doing so will not win them compassion; it will win them scorn and disdain.

Women and children on the other hand know that crying in front of others is likely to win them sympathy and support.

As such, if a man cries in front of you (which will happen rarely or never) be assured that his tears are real.

However, **when a woman or child cries in front of you, you must question whether their tears are real or whether they have been manufactured for the sake of winning your sympathy and compliance.**

Women are expert at manipulating men via manufacturing tears.

A woman's fake tears are taken seriously, a man's real tears are laughed at.

Male Expendability and its Consequences

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Males, Greater Variance in Genotype
 - 1A) Intelligence
 - 1B) Neurological Structure, Autism and Psychopathy
- 2) Males, More Risk Aggressive
- 3) Compassion, Hierarchy of Love
- 4) Professional Choices
 - 4A) Geniuses Needed? Most Are Men
 - 4B) Risk Taking Required? Most Volunteers Are Men
- 5) Relevant Reading

Preamble:

Males are the reproductively expendable sex, females are the reproductively critical sex.

A tribe with 100 women and only 50 men can create babies without any difficulty, but a tribe with 50 women and 100 men will be limited in how many babies it can produce. The number of females who are alive and healthy is the limiting factor in a species' ability to reproduce.

We have twice as many female ancestors as male ancestors; in our evolutionary past, 80% of women reproduced while only 40% of men reproduced.

Fewer men than women reproduced partly because males were more likely to die off at a very young age (natural selection pressure was harsher on males than females), and because women are more picky about their sexual partners than men are (sexual selection pressure was harsher on males than females).

It was more likely for a man to be in the situation that no woman was willing to sleep with him, than it was for a woman to be in the situation of no man being willing to sleep with her.

The aim of this essay is to explore the modern day consequences of men being the expendable gender.

1) Males, Greater Variance in Genotype:

“Men are the experiment (higher genetic variability, may not reproduce). Women are the control group (lower genetic variability, likelier to reproduce). Nature appears to test more extreme gene combinations in males (more +3 SD men than women, more male psychopaths than female etc).” -Illimitable Man

Nature rolls the genetic dice more with males than it does with females; male genotypes are more variable than female genotypes. There is more variability in the content of a Y-chromosome than there is in the content of an X chromosome.

High variance in the genotypes and phenotypes of males won't put a species at risk of being wiped out because males are reproductively expendable; if some males end up with phenotypes that are poorly suited for survival in the immediate environment and they get killed off at a young age, it won't prevent the species from reproducing effectively.

Male phenotypes being more variable than female phenotypes can be seen with both intelligence (IQ), and psychiatric disorders (Autism, Psychopathy).

1A) Intelligence:

Male IQ is more variable than female IQ. Most geniuses are men, and most idiots are men.

At an IQ of 130+ most of the people are men, and at an IQ of 70- most of the people are men.

Not coincidentally, most people who end up with degrees in engineering are men, and most people who are highschool dropouts are men.

1B) Neurological Structure, Autism and Psychopathy:

It is the case that most men and most women are neurotypical. However, the percentage of men who are *not* neurotypical is higher than the percentage of women who are *not* neurotypical.

Most autists are men, and it seems to be the case that all psychopaths are men.

2) Males, More Risk Aggressive:

“As a man, win or lose you have to take risks; being complacent and passive is a female privilege – men have the burden of performance. Taking risks is core to the personality of masculinity, when nature gave you XY chromosomes, this was ordained. Meek and lazy men get nothing.” -Illimitable Man

Men are more risk aggressive than women. Put more simply, women are on average more risk averse than men.

Part of the reason males evolved to be more risk aggressive is that they are reproductively expendable; if some males take risks and end up getting themselves killed, the species won't lose its ability to reproduce effectively. The same would *not* be true if females were to take risks and some of them were to end up getting themselves killed.

Beyond expendability, a major reason men evolved to be more risk aggressive is that **males have the ability to reproduce even after death**; a man can take risks tomorrow and get himself killed, but still successfully reproduce so long as he sleeps with a woman tonight.

Females do not have this ability; successfully reproducing as a female requires staying alive, at minimum for the duration of pregnancy and hopefully also for the duration of breastfeeding. As such, women evolved to tend towards risk aversion; for the sake of successfully reproducing, they can't afford to risk getting killed off early.

3) Compassion, Hierarchy of Love:

Children > Women > Men

“Men must become powerful to be loved; women and children need only exist...Men remember being boys. Man has a lucid perspective in comparing the diminished affection of his adulthood to the greater bounty of his childhood. Women do not experience such a significant loss of affection. As such, man is forced to realise he will never again be loved so profusely, for the boy gets his fill, but man loves the most to be loved the least.” -Illimitable Man

Women have an instinct to protect children. Men have an instinct to protect women and children. Nobody has an instinct to protect men.

Humans instinctively value the lives of children more than the lives of adults, and the lives of women more than the lives of men.

We evolved to be this way because so far as the continuation of the species is concerned, children are sacred, women are reproductively critical, and men are reproductively expendable.

When a ship is sinking or a building is burning, saving the lives of children is prioritized over saving the lives of women, and saving the lives of women is prioritized over saving the lives of men.

Crimes committed by children are punished less harshly than crimes committed by women, and crimes committed

by women are punished less harshly than crimes committed by men.

If you are a woman or a child and you are suffering, people will care.

If you are a man who is suffering, nobody will care whether you live or die; indeed it would be wise to conceal your suffering since if people find out that you are doing badly they will assume it is because you are weak and incompetent.

4) Professional Choices:

Male IQ being more variable than female IQ, and men being more risk aggressive than women, profoundly affects the professional lives of both men and women.

4A) Geniuses Needed? Most Are Men:

In any profession where an extremely high IQ is needed most people who excel within the profession will be men, because at the extreme high end of IQ (130+) most people are male.

Most of the people who excel in science and engineering (STEM) are men, because most of the people who have the genius level IQ (130+) needed to excel in such fields are men.

4B) Risk Taking Required? Most Volunteers Are Men:

In any profession where risk taking is required, most of the people who voluntarily enter and stay in the profession will be men; there are more men who have a high risk tolerance than there are women who have a high risk tolerance.

Finance, Sales, and Entrepreneurship would be examples of such professions.

5) Relevant Reading:

Illimitable Man:

The Hierarchy of Love (Illimitable Man)

Fifty Shades of Red (Illimitable Man)

Fifty More Shades of Red (Illimitable Man)

University of Michigan:

Gender Disparities in Federal Criminal Cases

Life Is A Lottery

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Country of Birth
- 2) Health
- 3) Intelligence
- 4) Family Wealth
- 5) Looks
- 6) Psychiatric Disorders

Preamble:

Life is a lottery.

Those who succeed in the game of life tend to dramatically underestimate the degree to which they have been helped by luck, while overestimating the degree to which their success was driven by their own hard work.

There are 6 lotteries that will be covered in this piece: Country of Birth, Health, Intelligence, Family Wealth, Looks, Psychiatric Disorders

1) Country of Birth:

What country you are born in and *when* you are born is immensely important for determining whether you will have a great life or a terrible life.

If you were born in America in the year 1950, you won. If you were born in Germany in the year 1920, you lost.

2) Health:

Whether you are born with the genetics to have perfect health until age 80, or the genetics to get cancer at age 16, is immensely important.

This is entirely a matter of luck.

3) Intelligence:

Whether you were born with the genetics to have a high IQ or a low IQ is immensely important, since IQ is the single most powerful predictor of long term life success.

IQ is the single best predictor of an individual's *income*.

If you have a high IQ, the overwhelming probability is you will end up towards the top of the macro dominance hierarchy (rich). If you have a low IQ, the overwhelming probability is you will end up towards the bottom of the macro dominance hierarchy (poor).

4) Family Wealth:

Whether you are born into a rich family or a poor family is immensely important for determining your quality of life, particularly during childhood.

5) Looks:

Whether you were born with the genetics to be good looking or ugly is immensely important.

If you are good looking, succeeding in job interviews and office politics will be easy (since you benefit from the halo effect). Being good looking certainly helps with success in the dating market.

If you are ugly, your life is going to be way harder than it otherwise would have been.

6) Psychiatric Disorders:

Whether you are psychologically healthy or insane is largely driven by genetics, and in this sense it is largely driven by luck.

If you are psychologically healthy, you won this lottery. If you are a paranoid schizophrenic, you lost this lottery.

Epilogue:

The purpose of this piece is to remind you to not automatically pass harsh judgment upon those who are suffering.

In all likelihood they are suffering due to factors entirely out of their control.

Trust Destruction, Mainstream Media

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Charles Murray, The Bell Curve
- 3) James Damore, Google's Ideological Echo Chamber
- 4) Jordan Peterson, Socially Enforced Monogamy

1) Preamble:

From 1990 – 2020, trust in America's mainstream media has deteriorated.

Why? After all, who's more trustworthy than The New York Times?

The reason is rather simple; the mainstream media routinely says things that can easily be verified as false.

If you were to meet a new contact and within the first 10 minutes of conversation they made multiple claims that you could easily verify are false, would you trust them? Of course not.

You would think they're either a fool who genuinely believes that what they say is true, or a liar who is being intentionally deceptive.

In either case, they would be someone whose words should not be trusted.

Charles Murray, James Damore, and Jordan Peterson are examples of men whose views the mainstream media has misrepresented.

Because the mainstream media misrepresented the views of these people, it suggests there are probably many other things the mainstream media is misrepresenting.

2) Charles Murray, The Bell Curve:

The mainstream media tells us that Murray is a racist who hates black people.

Of course anyone who has taken the time to read Murray's work (The Bell Curve), knows that he's simply a man who is honest about IQ/Intelligence being the driving force behind income and socioeconomic status, and also a man who is deeply concerned that IQ gaps between rich and poor will lead to an intolerable degree of wealth inequality.

He is also honest about the existence of racial disparities in IQ.

The media's brazen misrepresentation of Murray's views has caused trust in the media to deteriorate.

Mainstream Media saying Murray is an Evil Racist:

<https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/mar/02/the-unwelcome-revival-of-race-science>

<https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2018/3/27/15695060/sam-harris-charles-murray-race-iq-forbidden-knowledge-podcast-bell-curve>

<https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/individual/charles-murray>

Murray's Actual Writings:

The Bell Curve

<https://samharris.org/podcasts/forbidden-knowledge/>—

Note: The experience of Murray tells us that anyone who is honest about the existence of racial disparities in IQ and the degree to which they drive racial disparities in income, will be hit with the ad hominem ‘Racist’.

3) James Damore, Google’s Ideological Echo Chamber:

Damore was an engineer at Google who published a memo detailing how differences between men and women that are driven by biology/genetics (rather than social training) may explain why Google has more male engineers than female engineers.

Specifically, he asserted that because male IQ is more variable than female IQ, there are more men with the genius level intelligence (IQs of 130+) needed to do rigorous engineering work.

What Damore said was true; it is indeed factually correct to say that male IQ is more variable than female IQ.

However, because what he said was politically incorrect (it is politically correct to say there are no psychological differences between men and women), Google fired him, and the mainstream media painted him as a misogynist.

The mainstream media calling James Damore a misogynist, when anyone who has taken an hour to read his actual writings knows he’s simply a man who is honest about the existence of gender differences that are driven by biology/genetics, has caused trust in the mainstream media to deteriorate.

The Mainstream Media saying Damore is a Misogynist:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HFaghE2a8OA—>

<https://www.wired.com/story/the-pernicious-science-of-james-damores-google-memo/>

Damore’s Actual Writings:

<https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/3914586/Googles-Ideological-Echo-Chamber.pdf>

Note: The experience of Damore tells us that anyone who is honest about the existence of psychological differences between men and women, and the degree to which they are driven by biology/genetics rather than cultural training, will be hit with the ad hominem ‘Misogynist’ and ‘Sexist’.

4) Jordan Peterson, Socially Enforced Monogamy:

Peterson asserted that ‘enforced monogamy’ is a good model for civilization, as opposed to polygamy.

He asserts that polygamy is pathological since it leads to a minority of men having multiple wives, while a significant percentage of men (perhaps a majority) are left with 0 wives. The men who have complete failure from a romantic perspective tend to become resentful, and many become violent.

Monogamy is a better model for civilization, because it leads to there being 1 woman per man, thereby preventing large swaths of the heterosexual male population from being left with zero romantic success and a desire to engage in violence.

The mainstream media painted Peterson as having said that the government should force women to sleep with unattractive men to ensure that no man is left with zero romantic success (essentially, that the government should enforce rape).

Of course, anyone familiar with the anthropological literature behind the phrase ‘enforced monogamy’ or Peterson’s own writings knows that this is not what Peterson meant.

‘Enforced Monogamy’ would more accurately be called *encouraged* monogamy; make polygamy illegal, and make monogamy *seem normal* via propaganda (this has already been done via decades of Disney movies).

Mainstream media, asserting that Peterson advocates for government enforced rape:

<https://www.theguardian.com/fashion/2018/may/23/jordan-peterson-public-intellectual-isnt-clever-violent-men-monogamy>

<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/18/style/jordan-peterson-12-rules-for-life.html>

Peterson's own writings:

<https://www.jordanbpeterson.com/media/on-the-new-york-times-and-enforced-monogamy/>

Note: The experience of Peterson tells us that mainstream media outlets (New York Times) will brazenly misrepresent what you say, for the sake of damaging your reputation.

Societal Engineering

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) IQ, Maximize It
- 3) Wealth Creation, Free Market Capitalism
- 4) Inequality, Minimize It
- 5) Polygamy, Ban It

1) Preamble:

Not all cultures are equal.

Not all models for running civilization are equal.

There is a recipe for creating a society that is peaceful and prosperous:

- fill it with high IQ people
- have free market capitalism to build wealth
- have mechanisms in place to keep economic inequality down
- ban polygamy

The rest of this piece will be explaining *why* each of these things is critical for the building and maintenance of civilization.

2) IQ, Maximize It:

If you fill a place with high IQ people, it will be peaceful and prosperous.

If you fill a place with low IQ people, it will be poor and violent.

Why?

Because high IQ people are capable of creating wealth (largely by doing rigorous engineering work), whereas low IQ people are *not*.

Low IQ people can serve as menial labor, but the economic productivity a high IQ person can contribute is far greater than the economic productivity a low IQ person can contribute. GDP *per capita* will be higher in a place filled with high IQ people rather than a place filled with low IQ people.

Places filled with high IQ people are less violent than places filled with low IQ people, because high IQ men are far more hesitant to engage in violence than low IQ men.

Why high IQ men are more hesitant to engage in violence is open for debate, but it does stand to reason that they are deterred from combat because they can more readily foresee the potential negative consequences than their low IQ counterparts. 'Negative consequences' would include the risk of injury or death in combat, as well as jail time or other legal punishment.

How does one maximize the average IQ of people in their society?

Optimizing the environment for young children is critical. Eliminating early childhood malnutrition is a good start.

Immigration policies should select on the basis of IQ; make it easy for high IQ people to gain entry to the country, and difficult or impossible for low IQ people to gain entry to the country.

Dysgenic breeding must be prevented.

In America from 1960 – 2020, it seems to have been the case that low IQ people were outbreeding high IQ people, and since IQ is heavily determined by genetics, this is a catastrophe.

The movie 'Idiocracy' is a parody of the phenomenon that is dysgenic breeding, but it is a very real problem.

More specifically, it seems to be the case that high IQ women have fewer babies than low IQ women, and with high IQ women mostly sleeping with high IQ men and low IQ women mostly sleeping with low IQ men...dumb people are outbreeding smart people.

There are many postulations as to *why* high IQ women have fewer babies than low IQ women. The most likely explanation is that high IQ women are more competent in the use of contraception than low IQ women.

3) Wealth Creation, Free Market Capitalism:

As of now the only mechanism the human race has ever discovered for dramatically increasing the total amount of wealth in a society is free market capitalism.

Use the free market for as many things as possible.

Do keep in mind that there are some things that are better handled by the government rather than the free market; some things are better handled by the public sector rather than the private sector. Such things would include infrastructure (roads and bridges), as well as medical care.

Rightwing Libertarians will tell you the private sector should do everything and the public sector should do nothing, but they are wrong. There are some categories of technology the free market cannot handle well, for various reasons.

The free market cannot handle life saving medical care because it is the only category of product for which the demand is infinity; free market medical care leads to medical care being sold for extortionate prices (see America from 1990 – 2020). Many poor people will die because they cannot afford extortionate prices.

Infrastructure (roads and bridges, electrical systems) is something that free markets cannot handle well since *privatizing* them (selling services to some of the population, but not others in the population) is logistically impossible or at least very difficult.

During the 20th century, the American Government did an excellent job of handling its nation's infrastructure.

4) Inequality, Minimize It:

The great thing about free market capitalism is that it can make everyone richer on an absolute basis. The unfortunate thing is that **as more wealth is created, it gets distributed inequitably. The societal price of more wealth being created is that inequality rises.**

Intense levels of wealth inequality have many pernicious effects, including lower social trust, higher homicide rates, and a higher probability of violent revolution. Inequality is a destabilizing force; it makes civilization less stable.

The more unequal you allow your society to become, the more violent it will be. Greater economic inequality means a higher homicide rate.

Mechanisms must be put in place to ensure the wealth inequality in your society does not become too intense, lest you wake up to a revolution.

Progressive tax rates with both income taxes and capital gains taxes are wise; the rich should pay a higher tax rate than the poor.

Money the government collects via taxes can be used to provide universalized healthcare and infrastructure. This alleviates inequality to a significant degree; everyone pays taxes to fund government services (but disproportionately it is the rich who pay taxes), and everyone can access these government services, but disproportionately it is the

poor who benefit from them, since they are the one's who could not afford to buy healthcare or access to infrastructure if they were privatized.

The 'Gini Coefficient' is a decent way of measuring inequality. Any time the Gini Coefficient of your society hits 40%+, you have intense levels of inequality; it would be wise to raise taxes on the rich immediately.

5) Polygamy, Ban It:

So far as the maintenance of civilization is concerned, monogamy is good and polygamy is bad.

In polygamous societies a minority of men marry a majority of the women, and a significant percentage of men (perhaps a majority) are single for their entire lives; they are INCELS (involuntarily celibate).

INCELS tend to become frustrated and angry due to their romantic failure, and from an evolutionary perspective such men have *nothing to lose*; they are on track to die having captured *zero* reproductive opportunities.

Such men often become violent.

If your society is polygamous, it will certainly be violent, because a significant percentage of the men in your society will be INCELS, and a significant percentage of them will turn to violence.

If your society is monogamous (filled with marriages that have 1 man and 1 woman), then perhaps it will be peaceful, and perhaps it will be violent.

Banning polygamy and encouraging monogamy is *necessary* but not sufficient for keeping the homicide rate down to a reasonable level.

Just as intense levels of wealth inequality drive violence, intense levels of romantic inequality between men (as is seen in polygamous societies) also drive violence.

How does one go about banning polygamy? Laws. Make polygamy illegal.

How does one go about encouraging monogamy? Propaganda. Disney movies do an excellent job of this; show children entertainment that emphasizes monogamous heterosexual couples.

Academia is a Disgrace

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) The Specifics of Modern Political Correctness
- 3) Gender is a Social Construct
 - 3A) Harvard, Larry Summers
 - 3B) Google, James Damore
- 4) Race is a Social Construct
 - 4A) Richard Lynn, Ulster University
- 5) Internet Surpasses Academia
- 6) Academic Research is Untrustworthy
- 7) Relevant Reading

1) Preamble:

It may have at one point been the case that Academia was a place where real intellectual exploration was done. Tragically, in modern America (1990 – 2020) this has not been the case.

In our society, Academia is a place constricted by political correctness. Academics who publish opinions (or *facts*) that are politically incorrect are at risk of being fired.

This deters rigorous intellectual exploration; the probability that the truth regarding many important matters is politically correct is zero. As Illimitable Man once said, “Reality is not politically correct.”

2) The Specifics of Modern Political Correctness:

The ideology that constrains Academia and society at large in our time is Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism (sometimes called ‘Cultural Marxism’).

This ideology insists that all psychological and behavioral differences between individuals are the result of environmental factors, never genetics; it’s always nurture, never nature. It also insists that there are no psychological or behavioral differences between the 2 genders (men and women), or between racial groups.

To assert that there are psychological differences between individuals driven by genetics is heresy.

To assert that there are psychological differences between men and women driven by genetics is even worse heresy.

The worst heresy is to assert that there are psychological (or intelligence) differences between racial/ethnic groups driven by genetics.

Everyone in Academia must meticulously avoid mentioning any of these 3 heresies. Any Academic who dares to assert any of these 3 heresies is at risk of losing their career.

Tragically, these 3 aforementioned heresies are all *factually correct*.

It is factually correct to say that psychological differences between individuals are heavily driven by genetics, there are psychological differences between men and women driven by genetics, and there are psychological (IQ) differences between racial groups driven by genetics.

Factual correctness and political correctness are mutually exclusive.

3) Gender is a Social Construct:

TLDR: It is not an opinion that male IQ is more variable than female IQ (most geniuses are male, most idiots are male). It is a fact.

Unfortunately it is a fact that is politically incorrect, and that Larry Summers and James Damore were fired for mentioning.

In our time, it is politically correct to say that gender is a social construct; all psychological differences between men and women are trivial, and they are always the result of environmental factors (cultural training), never genetics or biology.

It is factually correct to say that there are psychological differences between men and women that are driven by genetics. Anyone who points out this fact will be hit with the ad hominem 'Sexist' or 'Misogynist'.

3A) Harvard, Larry Summers

Larry Summers (President of Harvard) learned this the hard way.

He asserted that male IQ is more variable than female IQ (there are more men who are geniuses than women who are geniuses, and more men who are idiots than women who are idiots), and that this may explain why there are more men who excel in STEM fields than women.

What he said was true; it is factually correct to say that male IQ is more variable than female IQ, and it is very likely true that this (most geniuses being male) explains why most people who attain eminence within STEM are men.

However, his assertion violates the ideology that is currently dominant (Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism). For his heresy, Summers was fired from Harvard.

A secondary consequence of his firing is this; every person doing psychological research within Academia has received the message "If you point out a psychological difference between men and women, or if your data shows that there is such a difference, you might get fired."

Certainly, this deters many young academics from bothering to investigate whether or not there are psychological differences between men and women driven by genetics, and what these specific differences might be.

3B) Google, James Damore

An engineer at Google named James Damore had a similar experience as what Summers had.

Damore pointed out that male IQ being more variable than female IQ (most people who have IQs of 130+ being men) may explain why most of the people who make it into the engineering department at Google are men; most of the people with the genius level IQ required to do rigorous engineering work are men.

What Damore asserted is almost certainly true at least to some degree (it is true that male IQ is more variable than female IQ, most people with extremely high IQs are men, and an extremely high IQ is a basic requirement for doing elite level engineering work). However, it was considered blasphemy by those currently in power, and so he was fired.

4) Race is a Social Construct:

TLDR: It is not an opinion that some racial/ethnic groups on average have higher IQs than others. It is a fact.

However, it is a fact that is politically incorrect and that academics can get fired for mentioning.

In our time it is politically correct to say that race is a social construct; all psychological differences between racial or ethnic groups are trivial, and they are always the result of environmental factors (cultural training), never

genetics or biology.

It is also politically correct to say “IQ isn’t real”; no individual is more intelligent than any other, and certainly no group is on average more intelligent than any other.

It is factually correct to say that IQ is real; some individuals are actually more intelligent than others. It is also factually correct to say that there are racial disparities in IQ; some racial (or ethnic) groups are on average smarter or dumber than others.

To what degree racial disparities in IQ are driven by genetics or environmental factors is yet to be determined, however, among the few who acknowledge that the disparities exist it is politically correct to say the disparities are driven entirely by environmental factors, and not at all by genetics.

Anyone who points out the fact that there are psychological (IQ) differences between racial or ethnic groups will be hit with the ad hominem ‘Racist’.

There is nothing the field of psychology has ever produced for which there is more concrete evidence than IQ. As such if we deny the legitimacy of IQ as a measurement of intelligence, we may as well burn every psychology book ever written.

4A) Richard Lynn, Ulster University:

Richard Lynn is an academic who lost his ‘Emeritus’ title from Ulster University for daring to tell the truth about the existence of racial disparities in IQ.

Fortunately, there are still academics investigating IQ as well as racial disparities in IQ. However, they have all received notice that they may be fired if the results of the research they conduct do not conform to the ever changing bounds of political correctness.

5) Internet Surpasses Academia:

It is both sad and true that an intelligent person will learn more from 4 years of being left alone with a computer that has an internet connection, than they will from 4 years spent in a university.

Most people with bachelors degrees in psychology have never heard of IQ.

Most people with bachelors degrees in sociology are unaware of racial disparities in IQ.

Most people with bachelors degrees in political science don’t know what machiavellianism is.

Most people with business degrees don’t know how to form an LLC.

This is as insane as having physics majors who don’t know what gravity is, or math majors who don’t know what algebra is.

You would learn more about psychology from 4 hours spent reading **The 48 Laws of Power**, than from 4 years spent getting a psychology degree.

You would learn more about how society is structured from 4 hours spent reading **The Bell Curve (Charles Murray)**, than from 4 years spent getting a sociology degree.

You would learn more about how politics works from 4 hours spent reading **The 33 Strategies of War**, than from 4 years spent getting a political science degree.

You would learn more about how business works in the real world from 4 hours of reading **Felix Dennis’ book ‘How to Get Rich’**, than from 4 years getting a business degree.

You would learn more about how the financial industry is structured from 4 hours of reading **Mergers & Inquisitions (Brian DeChesare)** than from 4 years spent getting a finance degree.

Academia is to 'education' what McDonalds is to food.

A psychologist who is unaware of IQ and its predictive validity is as much of a joke as a physicist who is unaware of gravity.

A sociologist who is unaware of racial IQ disparities is as much of a joke as a chemist who doesn't know what the periodic table is.

These jokes fill the social science departments of America's universities.

6) Academic Research is Untrustworthy:

Academic studies are heavily politicized. The conclusions of them aren't based on objective evidence. They're based on what the people running the study want to believe is true.

Every academic is aware that if they publish data or research that is politically incorrect, they will be at risk of getting fired, and consequently many of them are intentionally obscuring or outright hiding data they have collected or research they have conducted.

At best, Academia is lying by omission.

7) Relevant Reading:

WallStreetPlayboys, College Guide

Larry Summers Fired By Harvard

James Damore, Google's Ideological Echo Chamber

Richard Lynn, Emeritus Title Rescinded

Nightmares, Leftwing & Rightwing

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Leftwing Attitude
- 3) Rightwing Attitude
- 4) Leftwing Nightmares
 - 4A) Communism
 - 4B) Socialism, Deficit Spending
 - 4C) Affirmative Action, Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism
- 5) Rightwing Nightmare
 - 5A) Holocaust, Nazis
 - 5B) Slavery, Confederate South
 - 5C) Medical Extortion, Capitalist Medicine
- 6) Historical Pattern, Kill The Rich and Take Their Stuff
 - 6A) Wealth Creation, Inequality Rises
 - 6B) Envy and Violent Revolution
 - 6C) Mass Starvation
 - 6D) Historical Examples
- 7) American Education, Leftwing Neglect
- 8) Epilogue

1) Preamble:

If either side of the political spectrum wields too much power, your society can end up in Hell.

However, the particular versions of Hell created by the Leftwing and Rightwing do differ.

2) Leftwing Attitude:

Leftwing people are concerned about inequality; they consider large gaps between the rich and the poor to be a bad thing.

They are correct to have this concern; intense levels of inequality have pernicious effects, including higher homicide rates and a heightened probability of violent revolution.

So far as the maintenance of civilization is concerned, intense wealth inequality is a destabilizing factor.

The tragedy is that many of the solutions Leftwingers offer for alleviating inequality are foolish; they do more harm than good.

3) Rightwing Attitude:

Rightwing people tend to be unconcerned with inequality, mostly because they assume that the rich deserve their relative wealth and the poor deserve their relative poverty.

They are unlikely to implement policies to alleviate inequality, and thereby are unlikely to foolishly implement policies that make things worse.

The pathology of Rightwingers is that they often have a callous indifference regarding the suffering of those at the bottom of the dominance hierarchy; many Rightwingers view the poor with disdain.

4) Leftwing Nightmares:

Catastrophes driven by the actions of Leftwingers usually take the form of the Leftwing implementing a policy in an attempt to eliminate or reduce inequality, but the policy having unintended side effects with disastrous consequences.

4A) Communism:

Communists are Leftwingers who demand zero wealth inequality; they demand equality of outcome when wealth is built.

This is pathological for a simple reason; the only way for zero wealth inequality to exist (so far as we have yet discovered) is for everyone to have nothing.

The Communist regimes of the 20th century have done a spectacular job of attaining equality of outcome; in countries run by communists, the gaps between the rich and the poor are very small because everyone has little or nothing.

Historical examples of Communism being implemented include Ukraine from 1930 – 1940 (The Holodomor), and China from 1950 – 1980 (Mao Zedong's regime).

In both cases, enforcing equality of outcome led to mass starvation.

4B) Socialism, Deficit Spending:

Socialism is less authoritarian than communism in the sense that socialist regimes allow free market capitalism to run (people can freely engage in trade as they see fit), but the rich are taxed, and the money gathered via taxation is distributed to the poor or to the entire population in the form of the government spending money on infrastructure, or brazenly giving out free stuff.

Socialism *can work* if the government spending is kept down to a reasonable level, and it is funded via taxation.

However, when government spending rises to an unsustainable level, and it is funded via the *government borrowing money rather than via taxation*, it's a catastrophe waiting to happen. Sooner or later, the government's debts will become so immense that they cannot possibly be paid off.

The government will either declare bankruptcy, or print money to pay off its debts (thereby causing hyperinflation). In either case, the given society will experience economic disaster.

Everyone will suffer, but none more than the poor. For the rich an economic downturn is a minor inconvenience. For the poor it is a desperate struggle to survive.

Denmark (1990 – 2020) is a modern example of socialism working well.

Venezuela (1990 – 2020) is a modern example of socialism leading to mass starvation.

4C) Affirmative Action, Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism:

Blank Slate Theory asserts that all psychological differences between individuals and groups are the result of environmental factors, never genetics; all humans are born with a mind that is a blank slate.

For good or for bad, Blank Slate Theory is *factually incorrect*; it is factually correct to say that every thing that psychologists have ever discovered is significantly driven by genetics.

Individuals and groups differ significantly in their psychological makeup, and for every facet of a person's psychological makeup, genetics plays at least some role.

Affirmative Action is a policy designed by Leftwing Americans that attempts to enforce equality of outcome between racial groups, and between the 2 genders (men and women).

The Leftwingers who desire Affirmative Action assume that in any case where men do better than women (on average), and in any case where one racial group does better than another (on average), the only explanation is discrimination.

In light of the assumption that inequitable outcomes are the result of discrimination, affirmative action seems reasonable as a bulwark against the effects of discrimination.

However, in reality inequitable outcomes between genders and racial groups are often driven by differentials in the average level of competence with certain tasks between genders or racial groups.

In many cases, the reason men make it to the top of a profession more often than women is because men are on average better performers within the given domain.

In many cases, the reason one racial group makes it to the top of a profession more often than another, is because that racial group is on average better at performing within that domain than the other.

In America from 1970 – 2020, Affirmative Action in university admissions has meant holding women to lower standards than men, and blacks to lower standards than East Asians and whites.

In effect Affirmative Action has meant discriminating against more competent men in favor of less competent women, and more competent East Asians and whites in favor of less competent blacks.

It is gender discrimination and racial discrimination that the Leftwing approves of.

5) Rightwing Nightmares:

Catastrophes driven by the Rightwing are marked by callous indifference regarding the suffering of those towards the bottom of the dominance hierarchy, or even worse, a sadistic desire to see the powerless suffer.

5A) Nazis, Holocaust:

The German Nazis were Rightwingers who wanted to rid the world of anyone they consider undesirable; Jews, homosexuals, and seriously ill people.

The violence the Nazis carried out seems to have been driven by **high orderliness and disgust sensitivity**. The Nazis didn't fear the Jews, or hate them; they were disgusted by them.

High orderliness drives disgust sensitivity, and high orderliness is also what drives Rightwing political preference.

It seems to be the case that pathologically high levels of orderliness made the Nazis extremely Rightwing and also drove their desire to kill anyone who made them feel disgust.

5B) Slavery, Confederate South:

The Confederates enslaved millions of people, and justified it by asserting that the people they enslaved (blacks) were their racial inferiors.

Is it morally acceptable to enslave people, force them to work for you, and give them miserable lives? This is one of the easiest moral questions in the history of the world, and tragically it is also one of the most consequential.

The Confederates got this question wrong because they had the Rightwing bias of assuming those at the bottom of the hierarchy deserve to suffer.

5C) Medical Extortion, Capitalist Medicine:

In modern America (1990 – 2020) medical care is largely handled by the free market. This has led to life saving medical care being sold for extortionate prices.

Medical care is a product ripe for extortion because it is the only category of product for which **the demand is**

infinity. People are willing to pay an infinite amount of money in order to not die.

The result has been that many (perhaps millions) of Americans have died, simply because they did not have enough money to buy the medical care that would have saved their life; diabetics routinely die because they don't have enough money to buy insulin.

The response from Rightwing Americans has been 'Who cares?'

The horror is not the reality of people dying unnecessarily, but the seemingly psychopathic indifference of the Rightwing regarding those who die.

Notably, the phenomenon of poor people dying because they can't buy medical care sold at extortionate prices is unheard of in most other industrialized countries who have socialized healthcare rather than capitalist healthcare (Canada, Australia, and The United Kingdom).

6) Historical Pattern, Kill The Rich and Take Their Stuff

"The discourse that precedes genocide...the enhancement of a sense of victimization...on the group that's going to commit the genocide. Their sense of being victims is much heightened by the demagogues who are trying to stir up this sort of hatred. They say 'Look, you've been oppressed in a variety of ways, and these are the people who did it, and they're not going to stop doing it, and this time we're going to get them before they get us.'" –Jordan Peterson (When Victimhood Leads to Genocide)

The following is a historical pattern that has killed untold millions of people, perhaps billions. Usually it is a pattern where the violence is instigated by Leftwing Revolutionaries, rather than Rightwing Reactionaries.

The 3 steps in the pattern are as follows:

Wealth Creation, Inequality Rises

Envy and Violent Revolution

Mass Starvation

6A) Wealth Creation, Inequality Rises:

High IQ people find a way to build wealth. Wealth being created is good for everyone, since everyone gets richer on an absolute basis.

Unfortunately, as wealth is created it is distributed inequitably; a tiny minority of people get most of the spoils (pareto distribution).

6B) Envy and Violent Revolution:

Low IQ people are bad at building wealth, and end up far poorer than the high IQ people who are rich. The poor low IQ people envy the rich high IQ people.

Leftwing Revolutionaries tell the poor people "The only reason the rich have so much more than you, is because they stole it from you. Kill them, and take their stuff!"

The poor people proceed to do this.

6C) Mass Starvation:

With the high IQ rich people killed off or exiled, the people who are most capable of creating wealth are eliminated. As such, little to no wealth is created, and everyone ends up poor.

This is very likely to result in mass starvation especially if the rich people killed off were those who were highly competent at *farming*.

6D) Historical examples:

- Ukraine from 1930 – 1940 (Dekulakization, The Holodomor)
- Rhodesia/Zimbabwe from 1960 – 2020 (Robert Mugabe's Regime)

7) American Education, Leftwing Neglect:

The American education system does an excellent job of informing students about the existence of Rightwing atrocities; the slavery that took place in the Confederate South and the genocide that took place in Nazi Germany are covered extensively.

However, **Leftwing atrocities such as Communism are never mentioned.**

So far as American educators are concerned, the atrocities of the Rightwing must never be forgotten, and the atrocities of the Leftwing must never be mentioned.

8) Epilogue:

The Leftwing will tell you that those at the bottom of the hierarchy are oppressed, and that something ought to be done to alleviate their suffering. This is true.

However, be cautious; most of the ideas Leftwing regimes provide to alleviate the suffering of those at the bottom make things *worse* in the long term rather than better.

Communists always think they're one revolution away from creating a utopia.

The pathologies in the minds of Leftwing people are numerous and complex. The pathology of Rightwing people is singular and simple; callous indifference regarding the suffering of those at the bottom of the dominance hierarchy.

In the Leftwing, you will find insanity.

In the Rightwing, you will find cruelty.

Delusions, Leftwing and Rightwing

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Leftwing Delusions
 - 2A) Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism (Cultural Marxism)
 - 2B) Communism
 - 2C) Socialism, Infinite Resources
 - 2D) Crookedness Drives All Inequality
- 3) Rightwing Delusions
 - 3A) Inequality Doesn't Matter
 - 3B) Meritocracy Drives All Inequality
 - 3C) Religion (Christianity)
 - 3D) Industriousness Solves Everything
- 4) Personality, Political Preferences
 - 4A) Openness
 - 4B) Orderliness
- 5) Professions, Political Preferences
 - 5A) Leftwing Professions
 - 5B) Rightwing Professions

1) Preamble:

Both sides of the political spectrum are prone to delusion, but the specific delusions that blind each side are different.

2) Leftwing Delusions:

Below are the delusions that plague many Leftwing people.

2A) Blank Slate Theory Egalitarianism (Cultural Marxism):

The core of blank slate theory is that all psychological differences between individuals and groups are the result of environmental factors, never genetics.

This is *factually incorrect*, yet it is still a delusion that plagues many Leftwingers.

Gender, Blank Slate: All psychological differences between men and women are the result of environmental factors (cultural training), never biology (genetics).

Race, Blank Slate: There are no psychological differences between racial groups. Any that do exist are the result of environmental factors, never genetics.

IQ Denialism: IQ isn't real. No individual is smarter than any other. Everyone is equally smart.

2B) Communism:

Many Leftwingers think communism is a viable economic system and that equality of outcome is a good thing to advocate for.

This is insanity; communist economic policies have been implemented in many different countries and every single time it ended with mass starvation.

Equality of outcome is pathological because the only way to get equality of outcome is when everyone has nothing.

2C) Socialism, Infinite Resources:

Many Leftwingers think that wealth redistribution can be used to eliminate poverty, and to a large degree this is correct; some redistributive (socialist) policies can reduce the prevalence of absolute poverty.

However, many Leftwingers seem to be *financially illiterate*; they demand more and more wealth redistribution and government spending, without ever explaining how the spending will be paid for.

Some push for wealth redistribution that the government funds by borrowing money; the long term result is that the government's debts increase to an insane level, and sooner or later the country goes bankrupt. Venezuela (1990 – 2020) provides a modern example.

2D) Crookedness Drives All Inequality:

Many Leftwingers think that all economic inequality is driven by crookedness; the only conceivable explanation for why the rich have more wealth than the poor is because they stole it from the poor.

It is a half truth.

There are some rich people who have their wealth because they are crooked; they acquired wealth by stealing it from others.

However, there are things that drive inequality besides crookedness.

Every society is to some significant degree a meritocracy, because in every society high IQ people are more likely to end up rich than low IQ people; in every society it is the case that a major reason rich people make more money than most is because they are smarter than most.

3) Rightwing Delusions:

3A) Inequality Doesn't Matter:

Rightwingers tend to think of intense levels of inequality as not being a problem.

With American Rightwingers in particular, it seems to be the case that there is no degree of inequality which would make them say "This is a problem."

This is insanity. Intense inequality has all sorts of negative effects; it erodes social trust, drives up the homicide rate, and increases the probability of violent revolution.

The more unequal you allow your society to become, the more violent it will be.

3B) Meritocracy Drives All Inequality:

Rightwingers tend to assume the hierarchy they live in is a meritocracy and that the only explanation for why some people end up richer than others is that they are smarter and more hardworking.

There is some truth to this; people who have high IQs and who rank high on conscientiousness are more likely to make it to the top of dominance hierarchies.

However, it's only a half truth; in every hierarchy crookedness will be part of what drives unequal outcomes, as will sheer blind luck.

3C) Religion (Christianity):

Rightwingers in America are more likely to fall for the delusions religion provides (Christianity in particular); that there is a god living in the sky.

This most likely does *not* extend to all societies; in most societies it seems to be the case that the Leftwing and Rightwing are equally prone to religiosity.

3D) Industriousness Solves Everything:

Rightwingers tend to think that industriousness solves every problem; they think hard work solves everything.

Sadly they are wrong. There are many problems that more effort will do nothing to solve.

People who have extremely low IQs (say 70- or 80-) are incapable of working because every job available is too cognitively complex for them to be capable of doing it.

Their problem is a lack of intelligence, not a lack of effort.

4) Personality, Political Preferences

Most people's political opinions are not the result of careful calculation based on facts and reality.

Instead they are driven by their *temperament*; how they rank on The Big 5 Personality Traits 'Openness' and 'Conscientiousness' (specifically 'orderliness').

4A) Openness:

People who rank high on 'Openness' are creative and interested in abstract ideas. They are capable of divergent thinking; real creativity.

High Openness drives Leftwing political beliefs.

4B) Orderliness:

People who rank high on 'Orderliness' like things to be neat and orderly; they value *order*. High Orderliness drives Rightwing political beliefs.

People who have bedrooms that are neat and organized tend to be politically conservative.

5) Professions, Political Preferences:

5A) Leftwing Professions:

You will find that most academics and journalists lean Leftwing.

This is for a simple reason; people who rank high on openness are more likely to be interested in journalism and the research done in academia than most people, and high openness is also what drives Leftwing political preference.

You may also notice that artists and musicians tend to be Leftwing; high openness is what drives interest in art and music and is also what drives Leftwing political preference.

5B) Rightwing Professions:

Most people who work in the military or in finance/law lean Rightwing.

The reason is simple; high conscientiousness drives success in the military as well as in finance/law. High conscientiousness correlates strongly with its sub-trait orderliness, and high orderliness is what drives Rightwing political preference.

Realism Principles:

machiavellicorporate · 23 October 2020 · Archived copy · Original

Contents:

- 1) Preamble
- 2) Objective Reality Exists
- 3) Beliefs, Ego Investment
- 4) Offensiveness Conflated With Falsehood
- 5) Deception, Weaving Truth and Lies
- 6) Distrust Narratives
- 7) Distrust Those Who Suppress Speech
 - 7A) Censorship
 - 7B) Forbidden Ideas
- 8) Authority & Social Proof
- 9) Distrust The Mainstream
- 10) Credibility Testing
- 11) Examine All Evidence Before Passing Judgment
- 12) Confirmation Bias
 - 12A) Communism
- 13) Scientific Studies, Real World Experience
- 14) Outlier Fallacy
 - 14A) Apex Fallacy
 - 14B) Nadir Fallacy
- 15) Obscurantists
- 16) Euphemistic Language
- 17) Religious Mindset
- 18) Distrust Unjustified Certainty
- 19) Further Reflections
- 20) Illimitable Man's Reflections
- 21) Additional Reflections
 - 21A) George Orwell
 - 21B) Gustave Le Bon
 - 21C) Ed Latimore
 - 21D) WallStreetPlayboys

1) Preamble:

What follows are some general guidelines to keep in mind when doing rigorous logical reasoning for the sake of finding the truth. Consider them to be 'Realism Principles'.

Realism and IQ are 2 entirely separate things.

IQ measures cognitive processing power. Realism is a person's propensity to look at objective reality as it is, rather than as their emotions or sensibilities color it.

You will encounter plenty of people with high IQs who will say things like "IQ isn't real", because the fact that some individuals are smarter than others offends their egalitarian sensibilities. Their deficit is not a lack of IQ points; it's a lack of realism.

People with high IQs and *low* realism are the most foolish people on the planet. They have immense cognitive

processing power, and instead of using it to find the truth, they use it to rationalize lies that appeal to their sensibilities.

Instead of using their genius to find objective reality, they use it to rationalize garbage.

2) Objective Reality Exists:

“Reality is that which, when you stop believing in it, doesn’t go away.” -Phillip Dick

There is an objective reality that does exist. There are many different perceptions of reality, but there is only one version of reality actually in existence.

For almost all questions, there is a *correct* answer. Very few questions are really a matter of preference/opinion. There is a right answer, and there may be one or many wrong answers.

Those who say “It’s just a matter of opinion” are almost always fools.

3) Beliefs, Ego Investment:

Most people are ego invested in their opinions and beliefs being true. As such, if you express any disagreement with the opinion they currently hold they will feel personally insulted.

Ensure that you yourself are not cursed by this; you should not be ego invested in any opinions or beliefs you hold.

If evidence is presented that contradicts the opinion you currently hold, you should not feel offended or insulted; you should be willing to change your opinion at a moment’s notice.

4) Offensiveness Conflated with Falsehood:

“No one is hated more than he who speaks the truth.” –Plato

Most people will assume that if a statement offends their sensibilities it indicates that the statement is false, and that if a statement makes them feel good it indicates that the statement is true.

Essentially, people have a bias of believing things that make them happy and disbelieving things that make them unhappy, the objective amount of evidence supporting the thing being all but irrelevant.

Of course, this is insanity; there are many things that are true that will offend your sensibilities. Indeed, **it is almost always the case that the truth regarding an important matter is offensive and unpleasant.**

As such, in your search for truth you should not reject statements or pieces of information simply because they offend your sensibilities. Indeed, if the conclusion you ultimately reach *doesn’t* offend your sensibilities, it indicates that your conclusion is probably wrong.

Thinkers are rare, feelers are common.

In dealing with others, you will find that virtually all women and almost all men prioritize feelings over facts and their sensibilities over finding reality. They will reject a statement if it offends their sensibilities, without bothering to investigate the veracity of the statement.

Logical people, those who prioritize facts over feelings and finding reality over not having their sensibilities offended, are rare. There’s a tiny minority of men who fall into this category. Generally, they are high IQ and high testosterone. Many are at least somewhat autistic.

5) Deception, Weaving Truth and Lies:

The most effective deceptions are those that weave truth and lies together until one is indistinguishable from the other.

It becomes difficult to know where the fact ends and the fiction begins.

Don't assume that just because part of what a person said has been verified as true, that all of it was true.

Very often the first 80% of the story they sell will be true, but the last 20% will be false; what the deceiver counts on is that by the time the 80% mark is hit, you will have stopped bothering with paying attention or investigating the veracity of their claims.

6) Distrust Narratives:

You should be distrustful of narratives. Why? Because reality is complicated and rarely fits neatly into a simple narrative.

When those in power are selling a narrative, they will dismiss any facts that don't fit the narrative, and desire that anyone who presents facts that contradict the narrative be punished.

When people believe a narrative, they tend to pay close attention to facts that support the narrative, while dismissing facts that contradict the narrative.

Journalism is the reporting of objective facts. Propaganda is the pushing of a certain narrative.

Journalism is rare. Propaganda is common. Most 'journalists' would more accurately be called 'propagandists'.

7) Distrust Those Who Suppress Speech:

"For every forbidden question, there's something its gatekeepers value more than the truth." -James Damore

7A) Censorship

If you see a person or a group of people suppressing speech or trying to shut down inquiry, or who forbid certain questions being asked, distrust them; they do not want the truth to be discovered.

The side that is telling the truth is rarely for censorship, if ever.

The Catholic Church prosecuted Galileo for saying that the Earth orbits the Sun; they insisted that the Sun orbits the Earth.

Stalin and Mao imprisoned and executed people for saying free market capitalism is a better economic system than communism.

Google fired James Damore for saying that men and women are psychologically different, due to their biology and genetics.

In hindsight, it is clear that the Earth does in fact orbit the Sun, free market capitalism is far better at creating wealth than communism, and men and women are indeed psychologically different due to their biology and genetics.

In every case those who were for censorship were wrong, those who were censored were correct.

7B) Forbidden Ideas:

Forbidden ideas are not always true, but **the truth is always forbidden**, or almost always forbidden.

It is almost always the case that the truth is outside the current Overton Window.

What are things polite society will ostracize or punish you for saying?

Write out all the ideas polite society cherishes. Then list out their opposites, the things mainstream society considers blasphemy.

Look there; that's often where the truth will be found.

8) Authority & Social Proof:

**“You have been lied to...all your life, disregard what you think you know because it’s probably wrong. Ignore the top-down preaching that society espouses, reconstruct your understanding from the bottom-up.”
-Illimitable Man**

Most people are sheep who engage in zero independent critical thinking. They decide what to believe on the basis of Authority and Social Proof (both are detailed by Robert Cialdini in his book **‘Influence’**).

Essentially, most people believe whatever those in power tell them is true, and assume that if others (the masses) believe a thing is true, then it must be true.

Tragically, both of these heuristics for finding the truth will ~~very often~~ almost always lead you to conclusions that do not reflect reality.

What those in power tell you is true is not the truth, and what the masses believe is true is not the truth. Those in power will lie to you, and the masses are delusional.

If those in power and the masses tell you one thing, and your real world experiences tell you another, listen to what your real world experiences indicate.

9) Distrust The Mainstream:

“In individuals, insanity is rare...in groups, parties, nations and epochs it is the rule” – Nietzsche

In the search for truth, distrust the mainstream of whatever society you are living in. The mainstream is always wrong.

If the masses agree with your beliefs about the nature of reality, you are certainly wrong. If the masses disagree with your beliefs about the nature of reality, then perhaps you are right and perhaps you are wrong.

Need proof that the masses are always wrong?

In ancient Egypt, the masses believed the Pharaoh was the Sun God.

In modern Saudi Arabia, the population thinks there is a god in the sky named ‘Allah’.

In modern America, the Rightwing half of the population thinks there is a god in the sky with a son named Jesus. The Leftwing half of the population thinks there are no psychological differences between men and women driven by genetics.

In every case, the beliefs of the masses have zero evidence to support them.

If you start from the baseline assumption that everything the masses and the mainstream have ever told you is false, you are off to a good start.

10) Credibility Testing:

If a source says things that you can easily verify are false, you know they are not a trustworthy source of information.

When using someone or something as a source of information, do credibility testing.

Ask questions that you already know the correct answer to, and if they give answers that are incorrect, you know they are an untrustworthy source of information; either they are intentionally lying to you, or they are simply a fool.

By way of example, in modern America the mainstream media tells you that Charles Murray is an evil racist and that racial disparities in IQ don’t exist, and also that James Damore is a misogynist and that there are no psychological differences between men and women driven by genetics.

Even a cursory read through the research done on IQ will tell you that racial disparities *do* exist. A cursory read ____

through the research showing the impacts of testosterone and estrogen on psychology will tell you that there *are* psychological differences between men and women driven by biology/genetics.

As such, one can easily verify that the mainstream media is not a trustworthy source of information.

11) Examine All Evidence Before Passing Judgment:

“Anyone who has made up their mind before they’ve even heard the issue, is a fool.” -Chris Rock

Be sure to examine all the available evidence before passing judgment. This sounds obvious, yet people routinely ignore this.

Many will pass judgment having only seen part of the evidence, or before having seen any evidence at all.

Most people are fools; they will formulate an opinion, and then look at the facts, and cherry pick facts that support their preconceived notion, while ignoring any facts that contradict it.

The wise man examines all evidence, and formulates an opinion on the basis of the evidence; pre-conceived opinions are given no real estate within his mind.

12) Confirmation Bias:

Confirmation bias is when a person pays very close attention to evidence that supports the conclusion they desire to believe is true, but little or no attention to evidence that would contradict such a conclusion.

Another way of conceptualizing confirmation bias is this; a person applies **different burdens of evidence to different claims**.

For the claims they desire to believe are true, they require little or no supporting evidence to believe they are true.

For the claims they do not desire to believe are true, they require immense supporting evidence to believe they are true, or perhaps they will *never* believe they are true no matter how much evidence is presented to support the claims.

Communists can be used as an example of people suffering from confirmation bias.

12A) Communism:

Communists believe that communism is a viable economic system; that it can generate wealth and make everyone richer on an absolute basis.

There are hundreds of millions of bodies from the 20th century that contradict this conclusion; the major countries that instituted communist economies experienced mass starvation (see Stalin’s Russia and Mao’s China).

Modern communists ignore this evidence; the catastrophes produced by communism in the 20th century don’t change their belief that communism is a viable economic system, at all.

There is no evidence that can be provided to a communist, to convince them that communism doesn’t work.

They have an intense confirmation bias; any thoughts and evidence supporting the conclusion “Communism can work” are paid attention to, while they dismiss or ignore any evidence supporting the conclusion “Communism cannot work”.

13) Scientific Studies, Real World Experience:

In terms of finding reality, scientific studies are systemically behind the curve.

Why?

In order for a scientific study to be published, it must be conducted and peer reviewed; this could take months or

even years.

On the other hand, observations made based on experience in the real world can be done instantly. So far as *speed* is concerned in the search for truth, real world experience certainly surpasses scientific studies.

Besides the matter of speed, **scientific research is only as trustworthy as the people conducting the research; many people involved with conducting studies have motives besides the search for objective reality. Many will conceal, obscure, or outright fabricate data for the sake of being able to sell a certain narrative.**

The samples that make up the data used in scientific research are often inaccurate in that they are gathered and observed in the setting of a laboratory; the real world is not a laboratory. In a lab, conditions can be controlled; the reality of life is an environment that is unstable and uncontrollable. How the people used in a sample behave when in a laboratory is not necessarily the same as how they will behave when in the real world.

There are entire topics science will never delve into because the substance of such topics cannot be objectively measured. Science will only deal with things that can be concretely measured; things that can have numbers attached to them. This is not a flaw with science; it is a feature.

Scientific studies are valuable for giving an accurate view of reality, but they are not infallible, and they certainly are not comprehensive.

Generally speaking, if scientific studies tell you one thing, and your real world experiences tell you another, you should listen to your real world experiences.

Real world experience won't give a perfect view of reality, but it will give an accurate view of the aspects of reality *you* will need to deal with in the foreseeable future.

14) Outlier Fallacy:

Outlier fallacy is when someone presents an outlier as if it is average, normal, or common.

Often this takes the form of a person asserting that the exception to a rule invalidates the existence of the rule.

The classic example would be someone who responds to the statement "Men are on average taller than women" by saying "I know a very tall woman, and I also know a very short man, therefore your statement is false."

It is important to be aware of the existence of outliers, however the existence of outliers does not in any way negate the existence of the average; the exception to the rule does not invalidate the existence of the rule.

Usually those who commit outlier fallacy are not doing so maliciously; they are not intentionally trying to deceive you or lead you to a false conclusion. The problem is that they are statistically illiterate; they fail to understand what a heuristic is, or what an average is.

They are foolish, not intentionally deceptive.

14A) Apex Fallacy:

Apex Fallacy is outlier fallacy, using a positive outlier.

For example, if you were to say "As a rule, being a musician is not lucrative", and someone else were to say "Yes, but 50 Cent became a millionaire as a musician", they are guilty of Apex Fallacy.

14B) Nadir Fallacy:

Nadir Fallacy is outlier fallacy, using a negative outlier.

If you were to say "As a rule, children raised by their mother and father do better at life than children raised by their mother but who have no father around", and someone else were to say "I know someone who was raised by both their mother and father, but who became addicted to cocaine and died at 16", they are guilty of Nadir Fallacy.

15) Obscurantists:

“They muddy the water, to make it seem deep.” -Nietzsche

A simpleton is someone who portrays a situation as being far simpler than it really is; they omit complexity and nuance. This is often a problem since it can mean critical information being omitted.

An obscurantists on the other hand is someone who makes things seem more complicated than they really are, for the sake of deception. They don't want the truth to be found, so they make things unnecessarily complicated to prevent other people from having a clear understanding of the matter at hand.

Alternatively, they may assert that there is uncertainty regarding a matter, when in truth there is no uncertainty.

They may portray things that are a matter of fact as being a matter of opinion.

Obscurantists have a habit of talking a lot and saying nothing. If you hear someone use language that is vague and emotionally charged, words such as ‘Justice’ or ‘Freedom’, this is the type you are dealing with. Lawyers and politicians are classic examples.

16) Euphemistic Language:

Be distrustful of euphemistic language.

Euphemisms are the mechanism by which powerful people conceal their sins.

17) Religious Mindset

The religious mindset is as follows:

- There's a certain set of things you must believe are true.

- There is no concrete evidence they are true.

- Saying anything against these beliefs is blasphemy. If you say anything against these beliefs, or if you fail to pay lip service to them convincingly enough, you will be ostracized, persecuted, or killed.

- We in the religion are a minority of people who hold these beliefs. All those outside the religion who don't hold these beliefs, are evil. They are ‘nonbelievers’ (Christianity), or ‘infidels’ (Islam).

Where will you find the religious mindset?

Christians, Muslims, Communists, and Blank Slate Theory Egalitarians (Social Justice Warriors and Feminists).

18) Distrust Unjustified Certainty:

Be distrustful of those who claim to be certain, about matters that nobody could possibly be certain about.

In 2012 America, Leftwingers claimed to be certain that the killing of Trayvon Martin was unjustified, while Rightwingers claimed to be certain that it was a justified homicide; a killing carried out in self defense.

The truth is that it is impossible to know for sure what happened the day Martin died; the only people who can truly be certain of what events transpired are Martin and the man who killed him.

What is most disturbing is not the violence, but the phenomenon of both sides claiming absolute certainty regarding a matter where there is an immense amount of reasonable doubt.

19) Further Reflections:

“You must train yourself to see *circumstances* rather than ‘good’ or ‘evil’.” -48 Laws

Wise men think in terms of realistic options and practical consequences.

Fools think in terms of ideology, principles, and grand ideals. They do not live in reality.

Given the same set of facts, different people will formulate vastly different opinions. Given the same story, different people will all form the same opinion. As such, propagandists do not give facts; they give narratives.

Facts don't win elections. Narratives do.

Nobody in the history of the world has ever won an election by telling the truth.

Politics is nothing more than propaganda wars.

The mainstream media is a mass distribution system for propaganda. You can predict what public opinion will be 24 hours in the future, based on what the mainstream media is saying right now. As Orwell said, "The people will believe whatever the media tells them."

The internet is a democratized distribution system for propaganda.

Most people are terrified of thinking for themselves. They want someone else to tell them what is true. They want someone else to tell them what to think.

Truth is for the few. Delusion is for the many.

Real Critical Thinking requires 3 things:

- IQ of 130+

- High Realism. Being good at logic. Putting facts over feelings, and ugly truths over happy lies.

Having high testosterone levels helps with this.

- Time & Energy. A quiet space where critical thinking can be done.

Most people have none of these 3 things. If you have all 3, you are a truly exceptional individual.

A person can see the entire world and still never see what's right in front of them.

There are missionaries who visit 20 countries, but who haven't figured out Jesus is about as real as Santa.

There are men who visit 20 countries, and who are married for 50 years, who never figure out their wife is unfaithful to them and their children are not biologically theirs.

A conspiracy theory is the insane idea that powerful people would have conversations with each other about how to secure their mutual interests.

A minority of wisdom is telling you something you never knew. Most valuable wisdom is telling you something you always knew, but could never articulate.

20) Illimitable Man's Reflections:

"You can get society to accept the most fucked up things as normal and reject the most healthy things as abnormal, depending on how you frame it. The delivery and how you sell is always more important than what you're actually selling. The master manipulators know this."

"Doing the opposite of the masses is rarely a bad thing, in fact, I find it a useful heuristic in decision making. What do the masses want? What would they do? Deduce this, then do the contrary."

"Masses watch TV? Read books instead. Masses don't exercise? Do exercise. Masses think TRT is dangerous? Do TRT"

It's not an infallible heuristic, but if someone could never get advice ever again, & you were able to give them a single sentence of parting wisdom on how to best go about living, you wouldn't go far wrong with: 'Look at what everyone's doing, now do the opposite'"

"Much wisdom cannot be understood well enough to be appreciated unless it's been experienced. This means the inexperienced, by merit of their inexperience, will reject it."

“Don’t argue with fools. They’re more interested in preserving their sensibilities than knowing the truth.”

“Low IQs and emotional people tend to talk in the first person, think in binaries and personalise generalisations.

High IQs tend to talk in the third person with logic, think in probabilities and speak heuristically.

Inability to grasp nuance = low IQ/low logic tell.”

“When the burden of evidence applied is not equal, bias becomes abundantly apparent.

Because if you didn’t need evidence to hold a belief, but require evidence to alter it, then it is not you who holds your belief, but rather, it is your belief that holds you.”

“How to know if you’re high-minded rather than an ideologue:

-You assess each side’s reasoning.

-You apply the burden of evidence equally.

-You do not out of hand dismiss evidence as invalid.

-You subject all evidence to the same degree of scrutiny before taking a position.”

“If you integrate a belief into your identity, you no longer possess it, but it possesses you by becoming part of you. Now if anyone attacks your belief, you feel as if they’re attacking you rather than your thinking. This prevents you from giving up false beliefs.”

“Emotional people stop listening when you say ‘I think that’

Logical people stop listening when you say ‘I feel that’

Always say ‘I feel’ when dealing with an emotional person (99.9% of women, soy boys, and dumb men)

Always say ‘I think’ when dealing with smart men.”

“People rarely get upset because what you said is wrong, but are commonly upset because what you said is right.

If something is nonsense, people can laugh at it and not care.

But if something they don’t like rings true, they’ll feel the need to lash out & tell you you’re wrong.”

“Just because it makes you feel bad, doesn’t mean it’s untrue.

Just because it makes you feel good, doesn’t mean it’s true.”

“The masses are constantly manipulated through rhetoric, because they trust how words make them feel over actually examining the contents of said words.

It is the hallmark of an intelligent mind to look past aesthetics and consider a thing based on its plausibility and its merits rather than form a snap judgment based on how what you heard made you feel.”

“Tone policing is inherently feminine.

Censorship is inherently feminine.

Watching what you say and how you say it and being careful with your words as not to offend are things women do naturally. Men are direct, say what they mean, and laugh at you if you can’t handle it.”

“When you let women co-opt a movement or message, it invariably gets diluted down to fit the sensibilities of their collective groupthink. If you want to see an ideology or movement fall apart, just leave a woman in charge of it.”

“If you try to debate with someone whose mind prefers emotion to reason, you will engage in a grand exercise of futility that exhausts the patience. As such, do not argue with women. It is pointless. You cannot argue with feelings, you can only manipulate them.”

21) Additional Reflections:

21A) George Orwell:

“The further a society drifts from the truth, the more it will hate those that speak it.” – George Orwell

21B) Gustave Le Bon:

“The masses have never thirsted after truth. Whoever can supply them with illusions is easily their master; whoever attempts to destroy their illusions is always their victim.” -Gustave Le Bon

21C) Ed Latimore:

“The greater the gap between propaganda and reality, the more aggression is unleashed on those who point out the discrepancy.”

“The two biggest giveaways that you are being deceived:

-Information that should be there isn't.

-Information that isn't relevant is emphasized”

21D) WallStreetPlayboys:

“The most popular money making book is by definition the one that appeals the most to regular people.

Regular people aren't successful at all.

Odd are that most don't see the logical conclusion here.”