# Forum:Pheromone Reviews - Real People - Real Reviews - Real Pheromones

## Thread: My comment on the article (URL below)

*jvkohl - December 15, 2009, 2:37 am*

http://www.redding.com/news/2009/dec/13/to-curb-abortion-teach-girls-the-facts/ One obstacle to education about ovulatory (i.e., hormonal and also thereby pheromonal) influences on both male and female behavior is that the truth makes us seem very animalistic. Most people would rather not equate their sexuality with the properly timed reproductive sexual behavior of other mammals, let alone "lesser" species. So, even after I extensively detailed the animalistic facts in an award-winning published review, I continue to hear that, unlike other animals, humans are primarily visual creatures. Note, I'm not saying that visual input isn't part of it, but the chemistry of food and of potential sex partners is conveyed via olfactory/pheromonal signals, and only these signals can directly effect hormones and affect behavior. Other sensory input may make us think that we're responding to cues that are not so closely linked to the animal kingdom, but if we haven't developed a different sensory system for food choice, how might we have developed a different sensory system for mate choice? Olfactory/pheromonal input conditions what we think is our response to other sensory cues. That, simply put, is the only way to explain human sexual behavior from a biological perspective. My thanks to the author for attempting to clarify the problem of educating people about the biology. James Kohl
http://www.pheromones.com
Kohl, J. V. (2007). The Mind's Eyes: Human pheromones, neuroscience, and male sexual preferences. In M. R. Kauth (Ed.), Handbook of the Evolution of Human Sexuality (pp. 313-369). Binghamton: Haworth Press.

*Gone with the Wind - December 15, 2009, 5:00 am*

We seem to be much more consciously aware of visual stimulus and its effects on our behavior. Perhaps the visual stimulus is more directly linked to the cortex.

I have often noted how people mistakenly attribute their behavior to visual stimulus. This is particularly obvious when wearing pheromones. For instance going into a nice restraunt in scruffy clothes, wearing pheromones, and getting sincere compliments on my attire.

I explored this a bit in this thread at AD.
http://www.pheromonetalk.com/pheromone-theory/mistaken-attribution-attraction-visual-stimulus-4948.html

This collective "blind spot" we humans share concerning the effect of olfactory stimulus on our behavior is going to continue to make it difficult to get widespread acceptance of pheromone research. That can be both a good thing and a bad thing.

*jvkohl - December 15, 2009, 7:02 pm*

Your example interests me because it tracks back to food choice. The nice restaurant probably "dresses up" the food served (with garnish, or added food-coloring). This makes it look better on presentation, but it does not change the underlying chemical appeal of the food. Spices may enhance the chemical appeal of the food without altering its visual appeal. But whether the food is "dressed up" or spiced up we are likely to say that it looks good because of its chemical appeal. We might even be conditonedto look forward to eating it again by the chemical effects of the food. Thus, a picture on a menu or other advertisement might have the associated appeal of the food, just as a

picture of a person might have its appeal because of the odor association. Yet neither the picture of the food nor the picture of the person will be universally appealing because our preferences for the associated chemicals develops across a lifetime of experience. Enhancing a male scent signature can't be expected to affect a lesbian female's sexual response, any more than spicing up roast beef would be expected to affect a vegetarian's appetite for meat.  James V. Kohl http://www.pheromones.com Ã‚Â

*Niatalya - December 17, 2009, 12:45 am*

(12-15-2009 2:02 PM)jvkohl Wrote:   Your example interests me because it tracks back to food choice. The nice restaurant probably "dresses up" the food served (with garnish, or added food-coloring). This makes it look better on presentation, but it does not change the underlying chemical appeal of the food. Spices may enhance the chemical appeal of the food without altering its visual appeal. But whether the food is "dressed up" or spiced up we are likely to say that it looks good because of its chemical appeal. We might even be conditonedto look forward to eating it again by the chemical effects of the food. Thus, a picture on a menu or other advertisement might have the associated appeal of the food, just as a picture of a person might have its appeal because of the odor association. Yet neither the picture of the food nor the picture of the person will be universally appealing because our preferences for the associated chemicals develops across a lifetime of experience. Enhancing a male scent signature can't be expected to affect a lesbian female's sexual response, any more than spicing up roast beef would be expected to affect a vegetarian's appetite for meat.  James V. Kohl  http://www.pheromones.com Ã‚Â  This puts a whole new spin on monosodium glutamate. A lot of researchers believe msg is an excitotoxin, and basically what it does it makes almost any food, even the cheapest lowest quality food, taste amazing, makes you crave it, and makes you hungrier. Hmmm a pheromone equivalent of that would be quite lethal.

*jvkohl - December 17, 2009, 1:14 am*

MSG may not be lethal, but for some people it results in severe illness. One bad experience is all that's required for those affected to know and avoid any additional exposure. Olfactory/pheromonal associations with positive or negative experiences can be equally powerfull. Thankfully, most of us are not unduly traumatized during day to day chemical exposure. But each of our experiences across a lifetime of development can ultimately influence adult choices--even when the choices are not consciously made. James V. Kohl http://www.pheromones.com  (12-15-2009 12:00 AM)Gone with the Wind Wrote:  This puts a whole new spin on monosodium glutamate. A lot of researchers believe msg is an excitotoxin, and basically what it does it makes almost any food, even the cheapest lowest quality food, taste amazing, makes you crave it, and makes you hungrier. Hmmm a pheromone equivalent of that would be quite lethal.

*Niatalya - December 17, 2009, 1:30 am*

(12-16-2009 8:14 PM)jvkohl Wrote:   MSG may not be lethal, but for some people it results in severe illness. One bad experience is all that's required for those affected to know and avoid any additional exposure. Olfactory/pheromonal associations with positive or negative experiences can be equally powerfull. Thankfully, most of us are not unduly traumatized during day to day chemical exposure. But each of our experiences across a lifetime of development can ultimately influence adult choices--even when the choices are not consciously made. James V. Kohl http://www.pheromones.com Ã‚Â  Sorry I should clarify, I was joking and meant lethal as in a pheromone version of MSG would leave the target helpless in the presense of the wearer, impossible but fun to think about.

*jvkohl - December 17, 2009, 2:09 am*

Joking? With a neuroscientist? In a Research Forum? Wait a minute; I'll try to find my sense of humor.... "Helpless" is a great name for a pheromone-enhanced product, seriously. James (12-16-2009 8:30 PM)Niatalya Wrote:  Sorry I should clarify, I was joking and meant lethal as in a pheromone version of MSG would leave the target helpless in the presense of the wearer,

impossible but fun to think about.

*Niatalya - December 17, 2009, 4:06 am*

Just for you James (I have more if you like lol)
Which brain cells attend ballet and opera? Cultured neurons.....
What is the best toothpaste for the brain? Neural Crest.....
How are young neurons served their dinner? On neural plates.....
What kind of fish performs brain operations? A neurosturgeon.....
Why was the neuron sent to the headmaster's office? It was having trouble controlling its impulses...
What happens when a neurotransmitter falls in love with a receptor? You get a binding relationship.....
If some of Fred Flintstone's synapses could talk, what would they say? GABA-daba-doo-time.....
Why is the left cerebral cortex always wrong?Because it is never in the right hemisphere.....Ã‚Â What works even after it is fired? A neuron.....
Why did the action potential cross the optic chiasm? To get to the other side.....
Oh did you get my pm from earlier?
And on a related note: http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/12/071220195636.htm

He's not dead.
He's electroencephalographically challenged! Ã‚Â Ã‚Â Ã‚Â Ã‚Â Ã‚Â

*mark-in-dallas - December 17, 2009, 4:28 am*

(12-16-2009 11:06 PM)Niatalya Wrote:  He's not dead.
He's electroencephalographically challenged!

And probably Electrocardiography challanged too!

Then again, I think I just might know one or two prople that are brain dead, but still have a heartbeat.Ã‚Â

*Mtnjim - January 7, 2010, 6:03 pm*

(12-16-2009 11:28 PM)mark-in-dallas Wrote:  ...Then again, I think I just might know one or two prople that are brain dead, but still have a heartbeat.Ã‚Â Ã‚Â Only one or two???