

Who will provide happiness to the “sex outcasts”?

Women could be less attracted or not attracted at all by 80% of men. This horrific observation questions society as a whole, for the author of this chronic.

According to German biologist MS, 80% of women are sexually attracted by 20% of male. Were you having a nice Sunday afternoon, filled with joy and tranquility? Sorry for your loss. Because, since publishing her essay (references, stating in German only), the researcher is going at it: she’s promoting her thesis in the German press (Die Zeit, Der TGSpiegel, Der Standard, Dfunk Kultur), answer to her readers on her website, and begins to emerge in the English world (FBS).

80% of undesired men then. A number close to the one produced by prof. Mark Regnerus in 2017, in Cheap Sex: 20% of men aged 25-50 attract 70% of women. Want more? In 2009, OKCupid revealed that women judged 80% of men “unattractive” (that study was so controversial it got deleted from the web, but TechCrunch kept a copy). For those who may wonder based on the actual knowledge, you can’t do anything about it: men are less selective than women (but that’s not what we’ll be discussing here).

Have you just heard a loud noise? Those are the foundations of our love life mythology crushing down in front of you. Just like the usual saying, “everyone has a soul mate”, “Every pot has a lid”, etc.

Availability for men, selectivity for women.

Going back to M. Stoverock, because she’s the one making the News. According to her work, the standard for the human species (as for most animals’ ones), oppose availability of men to the selectivity of women (they offer (M), they pick (F)).

Partnerships are made for 3 to 4 years, time to secure the breeding and the first years of the newborn. This is something already notable nowadays, as it is the average extent of women’s desire for their male partner. After that, their needs are more oriented to someone else. If monogamy might prevent them to fulfill those needs, they will hibernate even if, of course, other reasons might reduce physical attraction (Doesn’t that sound a bit too familiar?)

When humanity settle down, over 10 000 years ago, if societies have been ruled by the law of women’s desire, life would have become impossible in communities: how to avoid violence when 3 out of every 4 men would be sexually frustrated? (To be precise, MS justifies her assumption from the drop of testosterone level in blood after sex – but that observation has been strongly contested by the scientific community. From her perspective, if you cut access to sex release, testosterone levels would rise, inducing violence. The author let the endocrinologists argue on that).

To avoid Chaos, most civilizations would had then invented the formalities of a “redistribution” of sex: One man shall have one woman, by right. Reproduction ceases then to be a giant lottery where the winner takes it all. Welcome to the world of monogamy, build on the taming of feminine desire: this desire shall only express itself at home.

This taming is not an option. There is a soft version, like romance: in fairy tales, women are urged to desire “one man, one only, and forever”, and their marriage will be the “happiest

day of their life". Then there is the hard way, like excision, marital duty (which is actually debated in France) or slut shaming for the ones who express desire outside of a monogamous relationship.

For MS, women's oppression is not a side effect of our civilization: it's its foundation. Thanks for women control, men got rid of sexual competition, got back some time and brain activity and used it to invent writing, technics and science.

This oppression is obviously not acceptable anymore – neither for the biologist nor the author of this chronic. Emancipated (work in progress), women are now reclaiming their right to choose. Not only on dating apps, but also through the increasing number of divorces filed (for which they are usually the instigators) or the reduction of marital sex (they are free to say no to their spouse, but not free enough to have affairs, so they put their needs on pause).

You can tame women's body, not their libido

This theory is not totally new. In 2014 already, the New York Magazine stated that women were not fit for monogamy (link to the article). We learned then that, based on the work of A. Carroll and R. Vreeman, the decline of marital sex wasn't due to a decrease in women's libido, but to the fact that it was not meant to express itself in a couple. Thus, a paradox: Men did invent a societal structure that guarantees "minimum sex for all", but that minimum doesn't guarantee women's desire. To be clear: you can tame women's body, but not their libido. They might force themselves, out of care or duty, to sleep with their husbands, but thinking about something else. And now what? If monogamy keeps falling apart, most men will remain in sexual tension. And nothing tells us that they'll follow Camus' advice, "A man is the one who prevents himself from doing".

The "incel" minority (which committed various terrorist attacks against women), the aggressivity of the "manosphere" (masculinists supremacists) and rape culture are threatening women with an immediate risk of violence. Each week, we learn that men can be willing to kill their wives instead of losing what they believe to be their property. On March 16th, in Atlanta, a young man opened fire in 3 massage parlors. 8 people died, including 6 Asian women. According to the presumed author, the killing spree was provoked by its "sexual addiction" (in the context of a rise of violence against Asian people in the US).

To avoid this proliferation of sexist's violence, MS presents 3 options, one more explosive than the other: increase the access to pornography (with a new production model), liberalize prostitution (Men shall give up on the idea that nonconsensual sex could be free), and change representations to allow those who'll be cut out from sex to live a respectable life. In an interview to Die Zeit, MS explained: "(undesired) men should not be considered as pathetic or losers. If we look at the animal world, not finding a breeding partner is the norm, and the alpha male is the exception".

Is dignity compatible with "sexual misery" (the author uses quotes, because masturbation would be a way to avoid any sexual misery)? We should change the equation: can success be decorrelated from accessing women's body? #Metoo proved, one scandal after the other, that some powerful men still use their position to comfort their sexual domination. As they remain in doing so, we shall fear the repercussions of sexual exclusion on Men well-being (solitude, depression) and on Women's safety (from street harassment to murder).

In 1994, Michel Houellebecq stated "the extension of the domain of struggle" in the access to sexuality. He described then the humiliation for men excluded by a cynical

love “market” which was getting more and more brutal. In 2006, Virginie Despentes dedicated her “King Kong Theory” to the “Outcasts of the market of the hot girls”. But the author was making of this exclusion a matter of power, free of masculine scrutiny, women were doing okay.

We’re in 2021, and still waiting for the logical next step: an essay that would offer a way to those “outcasts of the alpha male market” to get back their pride by reinventing the rules of love and sex.