

# Anatomy of Matriarchy



A Masculinist Manual

**Part I**

**Features of Female Power**

**Part II**

**Mother-power: In the Nest of His Father's Matriarch**

**Part III**

**Bride-power: In the Cockpit of Courtship**

**Part IV**

**Wife-power: In the Nest of His Own Matriarch**

**Part V**

**Matriarchy and its Discontents**

**Epilogue:**

**On Masculinism**

## Anatomy of Matriarchy

The term men's liberation was derived, from the term women's liberation and thus insinuates that women have power over men. Its very name infers liberation from female domination and is therefore an inversion of fact as well as women's liberation principles.

For instance, The Concise Oxford Dictionary (6th Edition, 1976) defines a matriarch as a "woman corresponding in status to a patriarch (usually jocular)". The venerable compilers of that dictionary add that the word is derived "from Latin mater mother on false analogy of patriarch". Treating the notion as a joke derived on a "false analogy" suggests that matriarchs are illusory, phantom figures. However, powerful matrons, often elderly, who dominate family groups and clans, who are patriarchs in all but their gender, are neither unknown nor rare.

Similarly, according to the Encyclopaedia Britannica, (15th Edition, 1986) matriarchy is a "social system in which familial and political authority is wielded by women".

[...]reject the conventional definitions of matriarch and matriarchy

Women do get, and always did get, what they want[...]

[...]other modes and centres of power which women monopolize. Such are the subjects of this inquiry.

As this inquiry shall show, matriarchs (who wield female power) and matriarchy (an organized structure or institution for the exercise of female power) do exist,

indeed have always existed. The power they wield is neither illusory nor a joke. Furthermore, in human society, it is not male power but female power which is supreme.

## **Part I**

### **Features of Female Power**

#### 1. The Five Pillars of Female Power

[...]women's control of the womb; women's control of the kitchen; women's control of the cradle; the psychological immaturity of man relative to woman; and man's tendency to be deranged by his own excited penis.

[...] "the hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world".

That is so because whoever trains a child in its first years shapes it for life. Woman, who rules the nursery, shapes boys and girls for life; and the ways in which she shapes boys make them what they become as men.

#### 2. Womb, Kitchen and Cradle: Control Centres of Female power

Woman's monopoly of the womb loads the mating encounter in her favour. It reduces the man to a supplicant. Since he is driven to survive through his progeny, he will pay any price to be allowed the use of a womb. He has little recourse.

In anticipation of the bride's demands, and of her monopolist's veto powers, a man is trained to seek adventure and win the world; by laying the booty at her feet, he can avoid her withering scorn and rejection.

Of course, man's situation is not as terrible as that of the male mantis which is obliged to surrender his life when he mates; but it is close enough: man is obliged to surrender his liberty and his earnings when he mates.

The power of the kitchen:

And the kitchen holds power over hunger. It holds the power to sate as well as the power to starve; and it wields that power every day.

The power of the cradle:

Mothers use their cradle power in the strategic interest of female power. In the nursery, they channel boys towards certain kinds of behavior, and guide them away from others.

If men are so powerful, how come they allow women to keep control of the kitchen and the cradle?

Woman's control of the womb is unassailable, and will remain so until such a time as cloning makes the womb unnecessary for procreation.

Why, despite all this, is there the illusion that a power as durable and ubiquitous as female power hardly exists?

Whereas male power is hard, aggressive and boastful female power is soft, passive and self-effacing. Whereas male power is like an irresistible force, female power is like an immovable object. Whereas male power acts like a storm, full of motion, sound and fury, female power is like the sun- steady, quiet and incontestable.

Generally, then, whereas male power tends to be crude, confrontational and direct, female power tends to be subtle, manipulative, and indirect. Whereas aggressiveness is the hallmark of male power, manoeuvre is the hallmark of

female power. And where man is the great physical aggressor, woman is the great psychological maneuverer.

From a male-centred view of what power is, it is easy to be misled into thinking that a female form of power does not exist at all; and even when female power is recognized, it is easy to dismiss it as power of an inferior type, just because it is not hard, aggressive or boastful like the highly visible male form.

female power

[...]vastly greater might is so well entrenched, in both biology and social arrangements, that it does not need to call attention to itself, and so goes largely unremarked.

[...]phases of female power (namely mother power, bride power and wife power)

## **Part II**

### **Mother-power: In the Nest of His Father's Matriarch**

#### 3. The Commandant of the Cradle

Many a son is only vaguely aware of being ruled, through such precise techniques, by his mummy dearest. A vague awareness makes it unlikely that he will ever stand up to his mother; and even if, by some miracle, he did, he is not likely to battle effectively against a power he hardly understands. With a daughter, matters are different. As her mother's apprentice, a daughter learns the game, is privy to its techniques, and could effectively counter her mother's moves if she got up the courage. The result of such knowledge is that the average daughter can, at some point, shake off her mother's authority, whereas

the 'ignorant son cannot. Her hold over him usually lasts till his death; even if she dies before him, her hold is maintained through his ingrained desire to please her memory.

But what is motherpower used for? The primary objectives of motherpower are to prepare boys so they can be ruled by their future wives, and to train girls to rule their future husbands. To this end, the main tasks of motherpower are these: 1) to lay the appropriate personality foundations in the children: narcissism in girls, and heroism in boys: 2) to secure kitchen power and cradle power for girls; and 3) to magnify wombpower by teaching sexual restraint to girls, through codes of modesty, while undermining sexual self-control in boys by addicting them to the female body.

Consider a beautiful girl and a strong boy. When they are successfully reared by motherpower, they mature into their respective gender ideals: the dolly bird and the macho. To bring this about, the girl is taught self-worship or narcissism; the boy heroism or self-sacrifice. Her narcissism induces an absolute self-centredness which smothers those self-sacrificing impulses which are fostered in the boy by male codes of honour, gallantry and heroism. When they grow up, the dolly bird will worship herself; but the macho will worship woman and serve her, even to the point of sacrificing his life to preserve hers.

The narcissist personality is what makes a woman take it as a matter of course that a man should offer goods and services to her for her contribution to their joint sexual pleasure.

Whereas the mother equips the future dolly bird with a narcissist personality, she equips the future macho with a heroic personality. The hero is a servant who performs extraordinary duties for family, community or humanity: as warrior or

protector, as organizer of wealth, or as bringer of vital knowledge. He is, at heart, a sentimental fool who takes great risks, carries out great labours, all in exchange for such vanities as medals, ribbons, statues, and being mentioned in talk and song.

In the course of his training, the future macho is taught to regard women as the weaker sex, to adore dolly birds, and to consider it heroic to provide for and protect his womenfolk. He is also taught that being given a beautiful woman to husband is the most precious reward for heroism.

This woman-fixated personality makes a macho consider it right and proper for him to give a woman sexual pleasure and pay her too. It prevents a love-smitten general or tycoon from entertaining the thought that the strumpet he is wooing might not be worth one millionth of what he is deliriously offering her for the right to help her put her womb to work.

These two types of personality (heroic macho and narcissist dolly bird) are complementary in serving female power. Narcissism imbues the dolly bird with a sense of her natural right to be worshipped and served by men; heroism imbues the macho with a sense of his natural duty to serve women.

Likewise, mothers secure cradle power for their daughters by channelling boys toward adventure and away from childcare duties.

For the magnification of wombpower, mothers primarily rely on female sexual restraint as taught through codes of modesty.



Mothers magnify the advantage of female restraint by not teaching boys to restrain their sexual appetites, and even by teaching them to become hopelessly addicted to the female body.

A child introduced to carnal pleasures by women's expert hands will be willing, even eager, in adult life, to do anything required of him in order to get what, for him, would have become the greatest reward on earth. The subconscious memory of that addictive pleasure will drive his behaviour long after he attains puberty.

Addiction to the female body weakens a man's powers of sexual abstinence; it puts him into the power of whoever can satisfy his cravings.

As any negotiator will tell you, the more desperate your opponent is for what you have, the more unfavourable the terms you could get him to accept. Or, as one woman friend told me: "When it comes to sex, the one who wants it less holds the power."

Thus, an addiction which makes a man more desperate for sex increases woman's power over him.

A mother who has raised a macho[...]a mother who has also raised a dolly bird - a narcissist beauty[...]who has contributed her expected quota to the continuation of female power.

### **Part III**

#### **Bride-power: In the Cockpit of Courtship**

##### 4. The Powers of Her Body beautiful

Male susceptibility to female beauty gives women a great leverage in their dealings with men; this leverage is further increased by women's artifice. Their determination to make the female body even more provocative has led to women's preoccupation with that delusive self-beautification which is commonly known as glamour.

Glamour bathes the body with an illusory beauty; its purpose is erotic provocativeness; its function, during courtship, is to arouse a man's aesthetic appetites, and thereby lure him into a trap a woman has set to catch a nest slave. The sexiness of her own body, as enhanced by glamour's tricks, is a woman's frontline weapon in the battle called courtship.

Glamour - the artificial beautification of the body for erotic provocativeness - is serious business.

[...]handbag[...] it is her magician's tool box.

In it are the essential implements of her economic activity- namely, self-beautification for the purpose of luring men to serve her.

Men, clearly, do need protection, both from their own stupidity and from their susceptibility to female beauty. Indeed, one of the best laws ever passed by men, one of the few which male legislators have passed in the male interest, was an Act of the British Parliament of 1770. It said:

All women, of whatever age, rank, profession or degree who shall after this Act, impose upon, seduce, and betray into marriage any of His Majesty's subjects by virtue of scents, paints, cosmetic washes, artificial teeth or false hair, iron stays, bolstered hips, or high-heeled shoes, shall

incur the penalty of the law now in force against witchcraft and like misdemeanours; and marriage under such circumstances, upon conviction of the offending parties, shall be null and void.

## 5. Love: Male and Female

A woman in love is far from insane; she is anything but unwise or blind to her interests. On the contrary, her first sigh of love is like a whiff of smelling salts which clears her head, leaving her with four eyes and night vision; it instigates her to a ruthless pursuit of what she wants.

"Woman in Love", she declared:

I am a woman in love And I'll do anything  
To get you into my world  
And hold you within.

To compare Willie Carter Spann with Barbra Streisand is to realize that love is a disease of the heart terrible for man's liberty, but an excellent pep pill for a woman hunting for a slave: when love smites a man, it turns him into a dazed prey; when it possesses a woman, she becomes a clear-eyed, calculating huntress coolly stalking her befuddled prey.

utilitarian view:

"Love makes men lame and tame".

When next we find a woman extracting love-struck nonsense from a man, we should not consider her absurd. No woman believes such nonsense literally. She knows perfectly well that they are lies, and exaggerations, but they give her

proof that he is sufficiently out of his mind to promise her anything, including what she really wants from him: life-long nest slavery.

Man, in his sentimentality, may refuse to acknowledge that the love felt for him by the woman who loves him is, at its core, a slaver's love for her slave.

Were men fully conscious of the predatory nature and exploitative purpose of a nesting woman's love for her man, they might be found each day praying: "God save man from the love of woman!" That men do not is a measure of how sentimentality thoroughly beclouds their eyes.

#### 6. Courtship: The Hunting of the Love-smitten Man

If he should pass her eligibility tests for economic ability, nest defence capability, emotional loyalty, sexual loyalty, etc.; and if she has no better candidate within reach, she accepts his application for the job of her nest-slave.

[...]the woman is like a judo artist who uses the aggressiveness of the man to bring him down.

If courtship were organized in the male interest, it would be a quick game of kidnap, rape and escape; but because it is organized in the female interest, it is an elaborate game of slave-breaking, with the woman as broncobuster.

To make the obstacle course seem worthwhile to the poor man, a rainbow of happiness-ever-after was painted at the end of it all. He would enter this paradise of eternal bliss at their honeymoon, from the moment he received the gift of her priceless virginity. He was made to believe that, as she wandered through a forest of marauding pricks, she valiantly preserved for him her

vaunted virginity: she would, on their wedding night, present it to him as a unique gift to his victorious manliness.

The cunning of it all is stunning! Imagine a hunt in which the huntress takes on the appearance of the prey; in which the true prey enjoys the illusion that he is the hunter; in which he is made to exert himself, alternately suffering pangs of disappointment and spells of exhilaration, while the huntress leads him, step by wily step, into her well-laid trap. And even after she has closed the trap over him, tied him up, and led him off to slave for her; she does not neglect to confirm him in his illusion that he has been the hunter. Still exploiting his hunter psychology, she lays herself out on his wedding bed, and acts the prey surrendering her irreplaceable hymen to his body spear. After plunging it into the prostrate "victim", he glories in his bloodied spear, like a hunter would after slaying a mighty beast. Well, has a more exquisite game of cunning ever been invented?

The length of a courtship depends on how long it takes the boss to make up her mind about the candidate's suitability, on how long it takes to tame and habituate him to her domination, and on how long it takes to conclude the bargain.

Let us first examine the job interview aspect of courtship. The principal job she needs done by her husband will be economic. He must supply the income to run her nest, especially if she herself is not wealthy; and even if she is wealthy, he will have to manage her wealth. Therefore, her first concern is to administer an economic eligibility test on the suitor.

If the man's social standing is obvious, the test is not difficult to conduct. Where his social standing is not obvious, and she has to find things out for herself, she

does so with professional thoroughness.

In urban, middle class America, the preliminary economic interview is the stuff of cocktail encounters. The man is asked: "What do you do?" If he gives an easily interpreted answer (for example, if he says he is a doctor, lawyer, banker, stockbroker, or high executive in a major corporation) then that part of the interview is quickly concluded. If he says he is a welder, bus driver, factory foreman or something like that, that also settles the matter. Either way, the woman has a fair estimate of what she is really after: How much does he earn, and what assurance is there that he will continue to earn at least that much?

Where a man passes the woman's economic eligibility test she might then test his abilities as a nest-protector.

[...]she may provoke a brawl and incite him to show whether, and how well, he would defend her nest (and her good self) from attack.

If the man's abilities as economic provider and nest-protector satisfy the woman, she may start to tame him by securing three essential commitments from him: sexual commitment, emotional commitment and economic commitment. Of these, economic commitment is central. The applicant must be taught to habitually devote his earnings to maintaining her nest and herself. All other feeders at his trough must be banished; those not banishable (like his parents, siblings, relative and close friends), will have their access to his income minimized. If he is the generous type, his impulse must be curbed, and he must be trained, if need be, to hand his pay packet directly to her each payday.

For securing a man's sexual loyalty, a woman's main ruse is to get him sexually addicted to herself, whether by heavy petting that doesn't go all the way, or by full and abundant sex. Once hooked, he is never let out of her sight, except when he goes off to work, lest some chance encounter with another woman should break her spell on him.

His jealousy and her cantankerousness are great instruments for this task. The more jealous she makes him, the more strongly the heat of his own jealousy bonds his heart to her. In inciting his jealousy to incandescence, a woman's ways can be quite bizarre. She might deliberately encourage the attentions of rival suitors.

[...]by her cantankerousness, she aims to test if he will stomach anything rather than leave her. She will play hard to get; she will insult and humiliate him; she will require him to flatter her to the point of irrationality.

Thus it is that, if a woman's behaviour during courtship seems mad, seems arbitrary to the point of tyranny, there is a simple purpose to it all: to establish and test her power over him. The suitor must be reduced to unquestioning obedience to her, otherwise her hold on him, on which the security of his nest services will depend, might prove tenuous.

[...]tactics of lust and motherly care.

To soften up a man to the point where he proposes, a woman can either withhold sex from him or lavish it on him. In the sex-lavishing tactic, the woman gives him sex, quite readily and freely, till he is addicted and can no longer do without his regular dose. Then, like an expert drug dealer, she can make him pay any price for what she supplies. And her asking price? A trip to the marriage altar.

## 7. Wedding: The Bride's Triumph Ceremony

Of course, the bride is happy because the wedding is her triumph ceremony marking the end of her man hunt, marking the beginning of her retirement on the earnings of her husband. She has spotted a suitable male, and disorganized him with the effects of her body-beautiful.

### **Part IV**

#### **Wife-power: In the Nest of His Own Matriarch**

## 8. The Husband Managers

To the management of her husband, a wife brings the highest possible professionalism. If the essence of professionalism (in contrast to amateurism) is in doing what one is doing for monetary or other economic reward and not for fun; at as high a level of skill as is possible; and with a singleness of purpose that is intolerant of distraction or frivolity - then it is in husband management that women show the highest professionalism.

The wives of elite men are, of course, the best husband managers.

She also has at her disposal the entire set of social arrangements, cultural values and psychological forces which, for millennia, have been organized for the exercise of wife power. These include the facade of patriarchy, the double standard, man's fear of woman, man's silly soul which is full of sentimental illusions, their almighty baby, and man's fear of divorce. In using these tools and resources of husband management, an elite wife is a pastmaster (pastmistress?) among women.



## 9. The Facade of Patriarchy

At society matrons, Western elite women control political parties from behind the scenes, from places where they are safe from political shrapnel.

If the wife became the overt head of her own nest, she would have to do all that for herself[...]

But why does the average woman prefer covert to overt matriarchy? Just consider the matter from her standpoint. Overt leadership would give a woman duties which expose her to too many pressures and risks.

Under this arrangement, a woman has everything to gain and nothing to lose, except little vanities. Being far more down to earth, she prefers the substance to the shadow, the power to the glory, the rewards to the exertion. Behold the matriarch, the great queen bee, in all her power. Hers is the power to manipulate from hidden and protected places.

But why do men settle for a patriarchy that is, alas, a mere façade? The answer is quite simple. A facade is the most that their rulers will allow them; and a facade is the least that will make the male ego feel good enough to endure the burdens of his allotted role. Furthermore, should men try to subvert matriarchy in order to substitute a genuine patriarchy, women will thwart them. Men, therefore, settle for a figurehead patriarchy simply because they must.

## 10. The Double Standard

1) In the Western World, the wife of a king is queen; but the husband of a queen is not necessarily king.

2) The rites of love require that if a man loves a woman, he show it by giving gifts to, and doing things for, her; however, if a woman loves a man, she is expected to show it by accepting gifts and services from him.

Thus, for him, it is better to give than to receive, while for her, it is better to receive than to give.

3) Men are expected to provide economic support for women, but women are not expected to support men.

4) A mother and a father are not equally responsible for the financial support of their children.

5) Beauty and virginity are valued in women; but physical strength and economic ability are valued in men. Moreover, if a man cons a girl out of her virginity, it is viewed with disapproval: in fact, where pre-marital loss of virginity is deemed to dishonour a girl's family, a man could be murdered by her vengeful relatives. But if a woman cons a man out of his wealth, neither a crime nor an act calling for vengeance is deemed to have been committed.

6) Everything possible is allowed (such as adverts with images of nude females in provocative poses, as well as live women in scanty dresses on the streets) which puts men in a state of sexual unrest

7) Men are trained to initiate sexual contact; women to be restrained, and even to offer coy resistance to sexual advances from men.

8) Whereas the world of high risk is reserved for men, the world of maximum safety is reserved for women.

9) In the division of labour, within each class, women get the lighter and less risky tasks, whether in the home or outside it.

10) It is also an example of the double standard that male chauvinism is declared sexist, but female chauvinism is not. In fact, female chauvinism goes largely unrecognized and uncriticised.

### 11. The Silly Souls of Men

The head of the average man is packed with silly beliefs about men and women. Like fumes of booze that boost the ego, these beliefs cloud up man's perception, and leave him swaggering and staggering through life like a hopeless drunk, to be taken advantage of by any woman who wants to.

A sober look at the actual world yields quite a different picture. It shows that women are far less fragile and weak than they pretend to be; that women are cleverer than men; that their fickleness, passivity, irrationality and helplessness are calculated instruments of power; that women are far less sentimental, but more down-to-earth, cynical and ruthless than men; that, in so far as a natural order exists, women are, within it, superior to men; and that women are not mysterious at all, but only appear so owing to male foolishness. Let us go through these popular male illusions and see how badly they accord with the realities, and how women use them to exploit and rule men.

Are women weak and fragile?

Because it helps them to exploit men, women have a vested interest in making themselves look more fragile than they really are.

Women may not be as weak or fragile as they look; but aren't men certainly cleverer? Now, now; men the cleverer sex? These creatures that women fool with a bit of face paint here, some finery there, and a smile under dimmed lights? These gulls who can be subdued with a trickle of actress' tears, or confused with a sliver of thigh showing through a split in the skirt? These fools who, down through history, have been stuck with clearing the marshes, digging the coal, and getting bloodied in battle? They the cleverer sex? Ridiculous, simply ridiculous!

The illusion of female helplessness is also a handy weapon against men. Because men's chief interest in women is sexual, men are prone to think that women's chief interest in men is also sexual. In so doing, they overlook the point that men and women are biologically complementary rather than identical; and that, therefore, their main interest in each other would be complementary rather than identical. This elementary error is the key to men's historic inability to understand women.

By focusing on women's key interest, women's behaviour becomes readily understandable and far from mysterious. In brief, woman's mysteriousness is projected unto her by the muddled male mind.

[...]man may be the brawnier and brainier sex; woman is not the weaker but the wilier sex.

## 12. Man's Fear of Woman

Nevertheless, if a man must choose between a Calypso and a Circe, which should he choose as his mate? Better a Calypso than a Circe, for Calypso's heart is not a block of flint. She knows what pity is; she has some sense of what is fair;

and one could negotiate a deal with her.

They are sometimes experienced as Ishtar, whose desire may neither be satisfied nor spurned without danger; or as Circe, the enslaving magician; or as the Sirens, the deadly enchantresses; or as Calypso, the gentle prisoner and weakener of resolve; or as Eve, the temptress who communes with snakes and reduced man to a life of hard labour. Their common lesson to men is: FEAR WOMEN!

[...]the cowed man, even if stronger than his woman, is inhibited from freeing himself from her rule. Man's fear of woman establishes a psychological climate in which female power can hold sway without brute force.

### 13. The Baby as Wife's Weapon

A baby is a breathing, bawling, flesh-and-bones club with which a woman can beat a man down to the ground, and compel him to toil for her. Even an embryonic baby, a mere speck of a foetus in her womb, will do just fine when a woman wants to bend a man to her will.

[...]she can count on the baby's arrival to weaken his resolve.

Secondly, his male peers will pressure him to do his duty by the child, regardless of whatever hostility he may feel towards its mother for tricking him. Though animosity may grow between him and her, he will be urged to stay with her for the baby's sake. Which is why a baby is a powerful man-trapping weapon in a woman's hands.

If he wanted it out of a desire for an heir, or a successor, or an immortalizer of his name, his ambition would be defeated should anything adverse happen to the child.

Because of his ambitions for the child, the baby becomes a powerful instrument of blackmail in his wife's hands.

She rejoices because of the power which her first-born gives her over her husband. That power, she knows, comes from the duties which a father expects his first-born to perform for him, including keeping alive his name and freshening his memory among humanity after his physical death.

Knowing that, she knows that their child is her certificate of entitlement to its father's support. She knows that she now holds him by something that is even stronger than law, custom and public opinion, namely his own ambitions. That is why she is now happy and content. Yes, indeed: a woman grabs a man by his balls, and then holds him securely by their baby.

Should the father of the child, for his part, attempt to leave its mother, she may threaten to deny him all future access to it.

#### 14. The Penalties of Divorce

In strict Mohammedan countries, like Saudi Arabia, where matriarch power is probably at its weakest in the world, divorce is not very difficult for a man to obtain.

Where there is an absolute legal or moral sanction against divorce, marriage becomes, for the husband, a form of life imprisonment, with the hard labour of carrying a talking and nagging millstone around his neck. Where divorce is

allowed, but is hedged with discriminatory penalties against the husband (e.g. alimony; child custody rules that are weighted in the mother's favour; the ouster of the husband from his family house; the loss of half his estate to his wife; social censure; etc.), such penalties can keep a husband trapped for life in his wife's nest.

Against remaining in nest-slavery, he will weigh the following: 1) the vexation of making alimony payments with which she will support herself and some new lover; 2) the humiliation of being ousted from the house he built or has bought, and seeing it turned over to the woman he no longer loves; 3) the penalty of losing half of his estate to her, an estate he either inherited or won with his sweat; 4) the fear of her getting custody of their child, with him having to endure a partial or total loss of access to it; 5) the fear of social censure, with loss of prestige, in a society that will view him as a weak man who could not keep his wife.

## **Part V**

### **Matriarchy and its Discontents**

#### 15. The Matriarch: Sovereign of Her Nest

[...]like any potentate, a matriarch wields over her court powerful weapons of persuasion and coercion. She can suggest or command or nag-nag-nag. She can quietly veto any of her husband's decisions which do not suit her. She can reduce the flow of her favours, or cut it off altogether.

A boychild may run away from home, but the matriarchist laws and customs of the larger society will seek to return him to his mother. If a husband absconds, the

matriarchist laws of the larger society will seek to return him to his nest duties, and to punish him for nest desertion; and should he decide to quit his nest duties permanently, he may find himself paying wife and child support dues in lieu of services he has chosen to default on.

If female power does not operate through large, formal organizations, it is because it doesn't need to.

Since the cardinal aim of female power is the procurement and management of a nest-slave by a nest-queen; and since, as we have seen, this one-on-one control operates mainly through intimate psychological manipulation; female power does not need those elaborate structures of formal authority which have evolved to control the large aggregates of persons required by the specialist activities of the male domain -namely, hunting and war and their modern extensions. In particular, grand councils of matriarchs are not necessary for the effective exercise of female power.

The nest or family home, where a woman is both mother and wife, is the seat of female power.

[...]female power also operates informal consultative bodies like sororities, kaffee klatches, gossip groups, and associations of the wives of generals, politicians, businessmen, etc. These suffice for exchanges of ideas on how to manage men, and for conspiracies against men which each wife then implements on her husband.

[...]matriarchy and patriarchy are, respectively, mother-rule and father-rule  
A nest (mother, father and children) has two heads: a female head and a male



head. A matriarch is the female head of a nest. A patriarch is the male head of a nest.

[...]the matriarch is the real head, with more of the actual power, the patriarch is the figurehead, with more of the aura of authority.

Matriarchy is a form of social organization in which the female head of a nest exercises dominant power in it, while the male head is her lieutenant who operates its formal machinery of authority.

Patriarchy is a form of social organization in which the male head of a nest operates its formal machinery of authority, while giving the impression of exercising dominant power in it.

So long as women exercise dominant power somewhere in the social system, that system is matriarchal, for it features mother-rule.

[...]the patriarchal subsystem specializes in the front structures of authority, the matriarchal subsystem specializes in back channel power.

The grand matriarchs[...]who rule the grand patriarchs who rule the world, are indeed the overall bosses of the world.

The relationship between grand patriarchs and grand matriarchs is this: the former, like a management team, run society in the interest of the latter who are, indeed, society's supreme stockholders.

Most women like being women, they are keen to get husbands to support them in the style they aspire to, and they wouldn't like to be men, or to live the way men do.

These privileges, which are available to all women, turn the lives of grand matriarchs (who enjoy them at the highest level) into the closest thing to paradise on earth. Unsurprisingly, the cardinal aim of elite matriarchs is to preserve the social arrangements which bestow these paradisiac privileges upon all women. And in furthering this aim, they can count on the support of the matriarchist majority of women.

## 16. Feminism: A Revolt in Paradise

Despite woman's paradise of privileges - privileges anchored on the womb, privileges of which most women are fully and happily aware - feminists claim that women are powerless, and are oppressed by men. They have therefore demanded a reorganization of society on the basis of equality between men and women. They say they want a world without roles assigned by gender: a world in which women share power and work and status equally with men - in the home and outside it, in the kitchen and in the office; in minding the mess and confusion of the children's play pen, and in managing the crises and disasters in the corridors of public power.

To help us assess feminism, we ought to note that, in their attitudes to men, there are three basic types of women: the matriarchists, the tomboys and the termagants. A matriarchist is a woman who believes that a man's natural or god ordained role in life is to serve some matriarch or married mother; and that the best way to get full service out of him is to make him think that he is his matriarch's boss.

A tomboy is a woman who would rather be a man. A termagant is a woman, whether tomboy or quasi-matriarchist, who insists on showing her man that she, not he, is boss; she therefore takes sadistic pleasure in harassing and bossing men.

Feminism is a movement of bored matriarchists, frustrated tomboys and natural termagants; each of these types has its reasons for being discontented in the matriarchist paradise that is woman's traditional world. Indeed, the career of post WWII feminism may be summarized as follows:

Bored matriarchists (like Betty Friedan) and frustrated tomboys (like Simone de Beauvoir) kicked it off; Termagants (like Andrea Dworkin) made a public nuisance of it;

Satisfied matriarchists (like Phyllis Schlafly) oppose it;

Non-militant tomboys (the female yuppies) have quietly profited from it.

Most men did not see feminist egalitarianism as the ruse that it was. Of the few who did, a mere handful glimpsed that feminism was not a revolt against oppression by men, but a clamour for additional privileges and opportunities for women.

Many non-feminist women understood the ruse in the egalitarian campaign of the feminists. While they were, understandably, less than eager to join a campaign which could endanger their paradise of traditional privileges, it was also not in their interest to expose it. In fact, for so long as feminism brought new opportunities to women, but without endangering traditional female privileges, many women were sympathetic to it. But when it became clear that gender equality might threaten their traditional privileges (by, for example,

requiring women to be drafted into infantry platoons), feminism lost many of its female sympathizers and fellow travelers.

In the USA, that threat emerged with the proposed Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) to the US Constitution.

What the anti-ERA women fought to protect was the traditional matriarchist arrangement where the husband takes responsibility for decision making, for earning the family income, and for the safety of his wife's nest. So many women wanted that arrangement preserved that they helped to stop the feminist tide at the gates of the ERA.

### **Epilogue: On Masculinism**

If the standard privileges of women make the world of elite matriarchs the closest thing on earth to paradise, then men, on whose risks and effort women's privileges rest, are the helots of woman's world. Even the grand patriarchs are but headmen among the helots; each is merely the chief public agent for the grand matriarch whose nest he serves.

To understand why men have not yet revolted in the wake of feminism, we ought to note that, in their attitudes to women, there are three basic types of men: the macho, the musho, and the masculinist. A macho is a brawny, and sometimes brainy, factotum who has been bred for nest slavery, and who is indoctrinated to believe that he is the lord and master of the woman who rules him. A musho is a henpecked version of the macho who hangs like a bleeding worm between the beaks of his nest queen. A masculinist is a man who is devoted to male liberty,

and who would avoid nest slavery.

The macho (or male chauvinist, or manly man) is a strutting factotum with bulging biceps, stone-dry eyes, brains that are ruled by his gonads, and an ego indoctrinated to believe that he is the lord and master of the woman who rules him. His psyche is primed to defend his woman's supposed honour from other men's advances. Thoroughly conditioned to serve women, his life satisfaction comes from loyally serving his nest queen. Naturally, he is the matriarchist's ideal man.

The modern musho (the new or feminal man) is one of that breed of diffident men who have been bullied, guilt-tripped, ego-bashed and penis-twisted into pram pushing, diaper changing and breast envy. He is the befuddled, henpecked male who lacks the wit to recognize his male interest.

The masculinist

In keeping with his commitment to the liberation of men from nest slavery, the masculinist would end the psychological, social and legal conditions for that slavery, and create instead conditions for equitable relations between the complementary sexes.

The masculinist is a libertarian. His commitment to men liberty, and his understanding of the conditions for male liberty, shape his beliefs.

The masculinist accepts that, contrary to what the macho believes and the feminist claims, it is a woman's world, and not a man's.

The masculinist accepts that, contrary to feminist propaganda and macho illusions, the arch enemies of feminism are not men, but that vast majority of matriarchists who do not wish to give up their traditional powers and privileges. Since patriarchy is but a facade for a basic matriarchy, the men whom feminists claim as their enemies are simply fall guys for the matriarchists. Masculinists, therefore, would redirect the feminist arrows to their proper destination, namely, matriarchy.

The masculinist accepts that, as the calypso songs say, "the woman is smarter" and "woman is boss". The masculinist accepts that men are the biologically more dispensable sex - which is why societies train men for high risk occupations like hunting and war, whereas wombs (and their carriers) are protected to maximize a society's reproductive capacity, hence its chances of survival.

The masculinist does not believe in being owned by any woman; nor does he believe in owning any woman. He recognizes that the owning of a human being by another was abolished long ago, and quite rightly too, and he has no interest in having the practice revived in any form.

The masculinist believes that every woman has every right to do whatever she wants with her body, except enslave a man with it.

The masculinist has no quarrel with love itself. He knows that a woman's love, when she is not nest-minded, when she is either pre-pubescent or postmenopausal, can be quite safe and pleasant for a man. But he also knows that it is rare, most rare, for a woman, between puberty and menopause, to indulge in non-nesting, non-predatory love.

To the masculinist, a wedding is a ceremony in which a woman is issued with a public licence to ride piggyback on a man and exploit him. He therefore does his best not to wed. He does not believe in marrying to obtain househelp. Unlike the macho; he finds it cheaper (financially, emotionally, mentally) to rent househelp than to marry it.

The masculinist does not subscribe to gallantry. He does not believe I that a man should open doors for, or give up his seat to, a woman.

He does not believe that it is for any man to defend any woman's honour. He believes that, if her honour matters to her, a woman is quite capable of defending it herself.

The masculinist believes that every woman should protect herself. She should learn karate and other martial arts so as not to depend on men for her physical defence. He believes that, since rape is better prevented than punished, martial arts, as well as anti-rape techniques should be standard items in every girl's education.

The masculinist believes that if it is all right for women to be feminists, it is all right for men to be masculinists. What is good for the goose is good for the gander: each should, therefore, define and protect its own interest.

But what is the male interest? Or rather, what are the sorts of things that are NOT in the male interest?

It is not in the male interest to be a nest-slave, or to be programmed for nest slavery.

It is not in the male interest to be society's specialists in violence, war and other

dangerous pursuits. So long as these pursuits are necessary, men and women should equally engage in them.

It is not in the male interest to maim or slaughter one another in their competition for wombs.

It is not in the male interest to live in an environment that is polluted with sexual stimulants which weaken men's bargaining position in transactions with women. It is not in the male interest to be exploited through alimony payments and other rackets of divorce.

[...]how do matriarchism, feminism and masculinism relate to one another?

Broadly speaking, feminism and masculinism are two different revolts against matriarchy. Feminism is a revolt by some women who are bored or frustrated within the matriarchist paradise; masculinism is a revolt by some of the helots on whose backs that paradise rests.

Matriarchists have been the expert exploiters of men since the beginning of human society. Their ideology, matriarchism, still demands the same thing from men: obedient and uncomplaining servitude. Since they are dedicated to nest slavery, matriarchism and matriarchists are most dangerous to masculine liberty; they are, therefore, the focus of the masculinist's freedom-loving scrutiny.

From the masculinist point of view, the demands of tomboy feminism are understandable, negotiable and mostly reasonable. Equal opportunities in the world of their brothers and fathers for those women who prefer careers in that arena? Yes. Equal pay for equal work? Yes, of course. But why, the masculinist wonders, do tomboy feminists limit their clamour for equality to the soft, white



collar jobs in the erstwhile male sphere? If, as they insist, equality should replace complementarity as the overriding principle in the gender division of labour, risk and status, then why do tomboys not demand that both genders be equally drafted into infantry platoons or coal pits? Should gender equality stop short at the edges of swamps, mine pits and battlefields? Until tomboys demand equal access to the nasty and strenuous jobs which men do, the masculinist can only be sceptical of tomboy feminism's good faith.

To the tomboy feminist who advocates gender equality, the masculinist would address this vital question: Is it fair to reorganize the centres of male power to accommodate women without also reorganizing the centres of female power to accommodate men? Upon the answer received would depend the masculinist's attitude to the tomboy feminist.

The demands of termagant feminism are another matter entirely. They are not demands with discernible remedies, but rather excuses for guilt-tripping, harassing and mauling men in the unhallowed tradition of harridans and shrews.

To termagant feminism belong those man haters who would legitimize man-killing for nest desertion (Jean Harris and her supporters), or even man-killing for spurned love (Ishtar style), on the implicit ground that a man has no right to choose whom to love, but must submit to any woman's offer of her embrace, like a slave to a tyrant's wishes.

To termagant feminism belong the palimony racketeers and the alimony extorters; and the man-humiliators who demand: "Love me, love my menstrual blood" (even in this age of aids?). Of termagant feminism, all sane males must beware.

Paradoxically, the tomboy is the masculinist's least uncongenial type of woman.

She is his partial ally in revolt against matriarchism; and, temperamentally, she is like a buddy with whom he could have sex and children.

He knows that probably nothing can be done about woman's relatively greater psychological maturity. But he also knows that much can be done, through cultural training, to whittle down woman's control of kitchen and cradle, and to reduce the deranging powers of the erect penis. He therefore welcomes feminist demands that men be obliged to work as baby-minders. When men get control of the cradle, they will be able to train children in the male interest, and so reduce the numbers of machos and mushos in the world. When men get control of the kitchen, female power over man's stomach will diminish. A man who cooks cannot be half-starved into submission, on any matter, by his wife. The masculinist believes in bringing about the revolt of the helots of matriarchy. Ah, what a different world it would be if only the macho ego would give up its ingrained stupidity and respond to the masculinist call: Men of the world unite; you have nothing to lose but your macho illusions and your nest-slave burdens!