

Paraphrased discussion with “Critical Rationalist” (chat log). From memory, stylized, trying to make some points, some stuff way out of order or skipped, not attempting anything resembling literal accuracy.

by Elliot Temple, Jan 2020

Critical Rationalist: I see that you agree with All Women Are Like That (AWALT). I’m doubtful.

curi: It’s an internal PUA/redpill debate about whether ~98% or ~100% of women are like that. You aren’t familiar with the debate. Want to learn about the PUA/redpill intellectual framework?

No, I just want you to tell me an empirical test to distinguish AWALT and NAWALT.

I don’t have a good decisive test experiment to settle this, but this isn’t armchair philosophy. People test the PUA/redpill framework IRL a lot. AWALT views are related to extensive experience with what women are like. They aren’t derived from some a priori principle.

Further, I don’t know of a single documented NAWALT example despite many, many attempts (which are consistently wrong – the person claiming NAWALT just didn’t know how to notice and analyze the visible AWALT traits in the data).

Other fields like evolutionary psychology can test everything, no problem, so your stuff is low quality.

No way, bro.

Testing is easy. You want to test if X causes Y. You come up with a proxy to measure X, a proxy to measure Y, and you see if they’re correlated. Done! Works on anything from *static meme corruption that hinders learning to attraction to men*.

That’s the thing refuted in *The Beginning of Infinity*, ch. 12, using happiness as an example. Effective empirical science requires *good* proxies, not any old crap. Those are broadly hard to come by for issues like psychology.

Comments: Critical Rationalist hasn’t responded to this yet. The actual discussion was long and got sidetracked by e.g. his false claim that Xq28 is a gene, which was in service of his false claim that he was speaking in an exact, strict way when talking about a singular gene in some evolutionary psychology research which doesn’t say that. That led to his biased rationalization that different people define “gene” in different ways (but no definitions were provided on request). The conversation was further derailed by his claim that he didn’t make any errors which he defended with the claim that he had *forgotten* about the Xq28 being a gene issue ~immediately after it happened. It wasn’t the first time he’d conveniently forgotten something from a few minutes earlier. His errors of memory, fact and logic ~all go the same way (favoring his side) rather than being random, which indicates systematic bias.