

# A Genetic Hypothesis Of Feminism

Eugene Panferov

Revision 2, 2020-06-09

## Abstract

This article attempts to explain the “refugees welcome” phenomenon from the evolutionary biology perspective. If there exists a gene variant responsible for sexual violence (in males) then this same variant has to be responsible for feminism (in females), by encoding only one simple emotion (disgust for sexual intercourse) from which all social complications follow naturally (including the “refugees welcome” phenomenon). It is shown that the gene is not required to encode any complex behaviour.

## 1 Introduction

Here is a thought experiment. Suppose there are two competing variants of a gene in a peacock population: one encodes a blue tail and another encodes a red tail. The blue one also encodes adoration of the colour blue. However slight this adoration is, as long as it is greater than zero, the blue tail variant is bound to win the competition. If we have a gene (or more likely a polygenic complex) that encodes a sexually selectable feature in the selected sex, it is obligated to encode or cause in the selecting sex some degree of selective preference in favor of the encoded feature (otherwise it will be dominated by an alternative version that does the job).

The fisherian explanation of the runaway sexual selection is founded on the same observation, the selected trait and the preference for this trait reinforce each other: *If instead of regarding the existence of sexual preference as a basic fact to be established only by direct observation, we consider that the tastes of organisms ... be regarded as the products of evolutionary change, governed by the relative advantage which such tastes may confer. Whenever appreciable differences exist in a species ... there will be a tendency to select also those individuals of the opposite sex which most clearly discriminate the difference to be observed, and which most decidedly prefer the more advantageous type.* [1, p.159] We do not claim that the selection for rape is runaway in our case, we only highlight that the positive feedback discovered by Fisher (and causing in some cases the runaway effect) must exist as an unavoidable mathematical fact. *The two characteristics affected by such a process, namely ornamental development in the male, and sexual preference for such development in the female, must thus advance together* [1, p.160].

## 2 The Hypothesis

Given that females are the selecting sex in humans, what would constitute a strategy of sexual selection in favour of rape? The simplest genetically encodable strategy is: attract as much males' attention as you can, and **dismiss everybody**. Given the abundance of lust on the males' part, this strategy ensures copulation with violent males only. The proposed strategy, as being a single fixed behavioural pattern devoid of any decision making and discrimination, is even simpler than a preference for certain colours in bird species.

The “attention seeking” part of the proposed strategy is apparently supported by many genes (out of our scope) as the attention seeking behaviour is prominent in the entire sex. However, it seems overly emphasized among feminists specifically, and recently the attention seeking manifested unambiguously with unprecedented magnitude in the “refugees welcome” phenomenon (which obviously belongs to the sub-population that considers feminism mandatory for its members).

The "indiscriminately dismissive" part of the strategy may seem weak at first glance, but it is a strategy that excludes erroneous copulations. While the cost of erroneous copulation outweighs the cost of erroneous failure to copulate. The cost of erroneous failure to copulate is the cost of continuing the same strategy for some time determined by the abundance of males. The cost of erroneous copulation is pregnancy and raising a whole child that does not contain the desired allele, this cost could be as high as half of all female's reproductive resources in her lifetime, depending of how many children a female can potentially raise to adulthood. The disparity of the cost is so great that it is unlikely to make so many false negatives during a lifespan to outweigh a single false positive. Still this strategy may end in zero copulations, but in historical perspective this outcome appears extremely unlikely – how many virgins do you know?

Moreover, when a female bonds with a male, her exposure on the sexual market falls dramatically, therefore the "be dismissive" part alone **increases the exposure** of the female on the sexual market. So that the second part of the proposed strategy reinforces the first part, and even in the absence of independent "attention seeking" could have created it.

This is exactly what feminism does. Seek attention, dismiss everybody, deny bonding, repeat. In a society where humans evolved for thousands of generations this algorithm has to end with: until you are raped. Note that the genetic influence is only required to shape an emotion, this algorithm arises from this single emotion and the social movement follows as mere rationalization of this algorithm.

Furthermore, if this hypothetical "rape gene" causes disgust to sexual intercourse (of any degree) in males as well as in females, it still contributes to magnify violent behaviour. Disgust is easy to link with violence (which is supported by known rapists' confessions), males may act out their lust with violence, when negative emotions (linked to sexual intercourse) are present.

### 3 Conclusion

This hypothesis explains "refugees welcome" exhaustively. You can even notice that this call (or rather multiple various forms of this call omnipresent in mass media e.g. very popular "i only suck black" (more subtle expressions of this sentiment are more abundant)) is very often intended by the females as a formal insult to their males, being a declaration of universal refusal to copulate with the available suitors – thus, again, the both parts of the strategy (the call for attention, and the dismissal) manifest in a single act. Jordan B Peterson (in his speeches) has tried to explain the alliance between Muslims and feminists and half-succeeded from a psychological perspective, invoking "subconscious" (which should be read as a placeholder for an unknown underlying phenomenon) – the present hypothesis completes his explanation by offering a genetic mechanism responsible for said "subconscious".

This hypothesis explains why feminists insist that consensual sex is not possible [3] [5] [4]. These meager references are very indicative of the present apparent push for criminalization of all sexual behaviours in humans, although activism is even more important and more telling than "papers" and formal statements. No "references" required to point out the prominence of public calls to destroy the due process and the presumption of innocence (see: me too, Kavanaugh hearings, title IX, "believe weemen"). The presumption of innocence is not a manifestation of our humanism or liberalism, on the contrary, it is the bedrock of justice itself, without this presumption we are LOGICALLY UNABLE TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN CRIMINALS AND HONEST PEOPLE. The presumption of innocence is a mathematical requirement of a just trial. Thus every feminist "me too" initiative is in fact an initiative against our very idea of justice. And it is inevitably removing THE DISTINCTION between criminal and allowable behaviour, which in and of itself is a blanket punishment for non-criminals, and at the same time promotion of criminal behaviour (in our particular case, rape). If we assume that criminal laws have any positive degree of intended effect, then the evolution of the criminal law dictated by feminism is increasing reproductive advantage of rapists and decreasing reproductive opportunities of non-rapists.

Given this apparent push by feminism against justice in rape cases, **I assume only one thing: feminists believe what they preach** – they preach the impossibility of consent for sexual intercourse because they indeed feel it is impossible. With this single assumption we produce the simplest explanation possible: a social motion described above arises from personal views that in turn have arisen from emotions and attitudes. In other words, feminism is a rationalization of a particular emotionally driven behaviour that is originally intended to promote rape genes and has to be caused by these genes according to evolutionary logic.

## References

- [1] Ronald A. Fisher *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*, Clarendon Press, 1930, ISBN 978-0-19-850440-5
- [2] Richard Dawkins *The Selfish Gene*, Oxford University Press, 2006, ISBN-10: 0199291152
- [3] C.K. Egbert *Consent Is Not Enough*, 2019, <https://www.feministcurrent.com/2014/06/25/why-consent-is-not-enough/>
- [4] Dworkin, Andrea, *Intercourse*, New York, NY: Basic Books. ISBN 978-0465017522, 1987
- [5] ICD-11 <https://icd.who.int/browse11/l-m/en#/http://id.who.int/icd/entity/1630268048>