

On birth control

I was tempted to leave the previous [entry on women](#) as sticky for a while. But now [Jack Frost has responded](#) to the commenter I quoted there:

I agree there's a correlation [between feminism and the deranged altruism that invites millions of non-whites to invade our lands]. But it's only an interesting one because, unless I've misread you, you are also suggesting that there's a straightforward causal relationship between female "influence" and willingness to accept immigrants. But willingness to accept immigrants correlates with a lot of things: relative national wealth, underpopulation, whiteness, and Christianity all come to mind immediately. Conversely, an unwillingness to accept immigrants correlates positively with being already overpopulated, relative national poverty, non-whiteness, and non- (or anti-) Christianity. The causal relationships are debatable.

Also, from a racial point of view, there's no difference between immigrants who come voluntarily and people who are imported against their will. We should remember that even before feminism, the white men of the New World were importing negro slaves and breeding with them, along with the indigenous non-whites. So it's clear that a lack of feminism doesn't necessarily protect race.

One thing that seems unarguable to me is that the cause of female empowerment, and also a low fertility rate, is the availability and widespread use of scientific birth control, including abortion. If we imagine for a moment that these techniques had never been invented, the West would have a much larger white population than it currently has. Since women would always be getting pregnant, they'd have remained dependent upon men, and feminism as we know it today would never have come to pass. If you want to get rid of female "influence", the quickest way is to eliminate all forms of birth control.

On feminism

Some time ago John Thames wrote, and quoted, the texts below:

Woman, to a very real extent, is the "natural born Jew" of the universe. She thinks that man exists to serve her the same way the Jew thinks that the gentile exists to serve him.

To my enlightened female critics: Since you do not like my opinions, let me infuriate you with some more clear thinking. Let me describe to you American society as it existed before "sex discrimination" became a problem.

In 1950's America, women work to support men who stay home and raise the children. Women give men the house, the furniture, the car and all the money in divorce court. Women pay massive child support and alimony to automatic custody fathers. Women suffer 400,000 battlefield deaths in WW2 while Jimmie the Riveter works in the factories back home. Women go down with the Titanic so that men and children can climb on the life boats. Women work themselves into a seven year shorter life expectancy so that men can inherit 80 percent of all the personal wealth of the country, paid for by women's effort. Now tell me why men should have all the high paying jobs too?

As for Dear Old Mommie and her burdensome diaper changing duties, preach it to me as you throw unwanted babies into the garbage can down at the abortion clinic. Your concern for your own child (the ones you decided to keep) is truly touching.



Women are basically Jews. They think they can do no wrong. Far from being victims of sex discrimination, women are the most pampered, parasitical, good for nothing pieces of ass on planet earth. I enjoy *The Spearhead*, although it is completely gutless on the Jews. As to your idiotic female logic, it merely demonstrates a truth my mother once told me: "The worst mistake men ever made was giving women the vote. Women have no brains and by giving women the vote, men gave women the power to screw everything up."

No truer words were ever spoken.

Feminism in ancient Sparta

Feminism is not a modern invention, as many suppose. It existed in the ancient world—and its consequences were largely the same as now. A classic example is the Greek city-state of Sparta.

It would shock most people to know that the famous warrior state was a paradise for women, relatively speaking but it was. The Spartans granted educational and economic equality to women—and it contributed greatly to their eventual downfall. Spartan girls were given the same curricula as the boys and encouraged to engage in sports. They were also granted the right to hold property in their own name and inherit property on an equal basis. The Spartan economy was largely agricultural. While Spartan men were away on war Spartan women ran the household and controlled the finances. As much as 35-40 percent of Spartan land was owned by women some of whom became quite wealthy.

Sparta suffered quite a decline in its birth rate during its decline. Some of this was caused by economic factors, such as limiting reproduction to avoid splitting up estates and inheritances. But much more, it was caused by the independence of women. Women were too busy being "liberated" to bother with the necessities of reproduction. In several centuries time, the total number of Spartiae (Spartan citizens as opposed to the helots and half-citizens) had declined from 7000 down to 700 (a 90 percent drop). Spartan sterility was remarked upon by many observers, particularly the Romans. The Spartans eventually reached the stage where they could no longer replace their losses in war. They were conquered by the Romans and ceased to exist. Spartan women were noted for their adulteries,

particularly in their later stages of decline. There was no stigma attached to adultery and Spartan women could violate marital vows with relative impunity.

The similarity of all this to modern feminism is striking. The sterility, the free love, the equal educational and athletic opportunities, the female control of the economy are, in essence, the same trends observable today. And this brings up the key point: Totalitarian societies, past and present, do not enslave women, they liberate them. It was so in the ancient world; it was so in Jewish-Marxist Russia; it is true in the degenerating and decaying society of today.

Feminism and the fall of Rome

Feminism is not a new thing. Neither is it a sign of progress, as some imagine. It has flourished in the past with results as disastrous as presently. Many parallels exist between the feminist movement in the Roman Empire and the feminist movement of today. In the early days of the Republic, Rome was extremely patriarchal. The father, the *Pater familias*, held the power of life and death over his wife and children. This system lasted until roughly the end of the Second Punic war against Carthage. Then began a vast movement for the “liberation” of women. The war had, in a sense, been won by women. The Romans had lost the entirety of their manpower in three consecutive defeats at the hands of Hannibal Barcas. The final disaster came at Cannae where 60,000 Romans were surrounded and stabbed in the back.

When women had grown back the dead soldiers and the final defeat of Hannibal was achieved at Zama, Roman women demanded freedom. One of the first concessions granted to them was the repeal of the law against luxury. The repeal of this law allowed Roman women to flaunt their wealth in public. No longer did they have to practice frugality as matron of the household. Next they acquired the right to enter minor political office and the right to practice infanticide and abortion.

The Roman birth rate plummeted and vice and corruption spread among Roman men. A general strike against marriage ensued and the Emperor Augustus tried to revive reproduction with a bachelor tax. It was all to no avail. The situation became so outrageous that a famous Roman remarked that “We Romans, who rule the world, are ruled by our women.” The poet Juvenal remarked that the Roman aristocracy “divorced to marry and married to divorce”.

At the same time that this female liberation was taking place the Empire was overrun by swarms of slaves and racial aliens. Like many European cities today, it became difficult to find a genuinely Roman face in Rome. Diversity, like feminism, greatly contributed to the fall of the Empire. By the Empire’s end, the legions which had conquered the world were half Roman and half barbarian (rather like the American army today, where increasing numbers of Third Worlders proliferate). When Rome fell, the female irresponsibility which had so greatly contributed to the Empire’s downfall made a severe impression on the fathers of the Christian Church. They made a point to yoke females and to impose the virtue of chastity. Given what they had witnessed during the fall of Rome the misogynist viewpoint of the early Christian elders can hardly be criticized.

The parallels of all this to modern day America can hardly be disputed. Although America is not Rome the same trends, particularly that of the female unleashed, are evident. Women, throughout history, are either the bedrock of a social structure or the dissolvers of the social structure. In early America, as in early Rome, women were baby makers and home makers. In latter day America, as in latter day Rome, women are imitation men and unborn baby killers. The consequences are the same, then as now.

I could go on and on. It wouldn't take a race-realist reactionary person but a few weeks of reading the "manosphere" to understand why white women will not join us [white nationalism] in large numbers. White men need to become "sex realists" too and understand that white women will not change until things are in a bad way.

Traditional women

My paternal grandmother was born in the 19th century, specifically in 1888, and I lived alone with her in the late 1970s and early 80s, when she was in her nineties.

When I was a small child the institution of marriage was pretty solid. How well I remember in my sixth year that a boy of my age talked about a case of divorce: an unheard of phenomenon in my family! Nobody talked about homosexuality and no degenerate music was heard even in shopping stores (this was before the malls). No degeneracy was shown in those elegant, old-time theatres like opera halls where I used to watch films. As a boomer I am a witness that all of these catastrophic changes happened within my lifespan.

Below, my abridgement of "[Just what are traditional gender roles?,"](#) a piece published last month on The Daily Stormer:

"I'm in a traditional marriage"

"I'm all for traditional gender roles"

"I want gender norms to be like the old days"

These are refrains I've heard endlessly repeated as the discussion over *White sharia* has advanced. They are coming from women and a few weak men counter-signaling the *White sharia* meme.

Because of the critical importance of this discussion for the survival of the white race and its European civilizations, I wanted to take a minute to explain to all the men and women claiming to be so-called traditionalists all the concepts and social boundaries that defined traditional relationships. This is the most important education that I can possibly give the community at this moment, and I ask that you ask yourself if you are really embracing traditionalism like you claim to be.

Coverture

Coverture was the reality for all of European history up until the mid and late 19th century, when feminist agitators, the media, and academic establishment triumphed with their agitations through its abolition. The basic principle of coverture is that the rights of the woman are completely subsumed into that of her husband's. A married woman could not own property, sign legal documents or enter into a contract, obtain an education against her husband's wishes, or keep a salary for herself. William Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Volume I:

The very being or legal existence of the woman is suspended during the marriage, or at least is incorporated and consolidated into that of the husband: under whose wing, protection, and cover, she performs every thing; and is therefore called in our law-French a feme-covert; is said to be covert-baron, or under the protection and influence of her husband, her baron, or lord; and her condition during her marriage is called her coverture.

UCLA gender studies professor Ellen Carol DuBois (whose career is chronicled in the Jewish Women's Archive, of course) highlighted in her histories of women's rights "the initial target of women's rights protest was the legal doctrine of coverture," and that 19th century feminist icon Lucy Stone despised the common law of marriage "because it gives the custody of the wife's person to her husband, so that he has a right to her even against herself."

If a woman decided to leave her marriage she was a penniless non-entity no matter what her previous position was in life (truly, there is no better position for an errant whore to be rendered into). Any restoration of traditional gender roles starts by restoring coverture, thus removing financial incentives for worthless scheming whores to destroy the sanctity of marriage by abandoning it over whims and lusts. Marriage, up until the abolition of coverture, meant that the woman was permanent property of one man; it allowed continued existence and any degree of freedom only in accordance with his desires.

Bride price

The dower grew out of the Germanic practice of bride price (Old English weotuma), which was given over to a bride's family well in advance for arranging the marriage.

Before a woman was her husband's property, she was her father's. This is why the father gives away the bride at the marriage ceremony. Traditional marriage was a transfer of property, with the priest serving the role as the trusted third party to do the background research and make sure the transaction was honest. It was essentially like getting the sale of your apartment validated by a notary. The daughter was sold off by her father, and it was the father's sole judgment of who was eligible to lawfully purchase his property.

The status of women as property was nearly universal in European cultures, with the exception of Jewry and some groups of gypsies, where access to tithes and trust followed a matrilineal line. This was why the Jews were so keen to attack these ideas, because the patrilineal passing of property was innately offensive to their culture. Europe only has this absurd notion of women as independent entities because of organized subversion by agents of Judaism.

Domestic discipline and “marital rape”

Coverture and bride price were abolished to ridiculously assert women were independent entities with “rights” so that they could lobby for suffrage. The implementation of suffrage culminated in legal penalties for domestic discipline and the concept of marital rape so that women could abandon their most basic household duties, thus destroying their homes and their husbands’ lives.

The thing about these changes is that they are really fresh and new. While the 19th century might seem like a long time ago for many of our young readers (it isn’t, on the civilizational timescale it is just last month and on the evolutionary timescale it is mere seconds) these new changes began in the lifetimes of our parents and finished in many of ours, and civilization was immediately and measurably the worse for wear. According to Wikipedia:

The reluctance to criminalize and prosecute marital rape has been attributed to traditional views of marriage, interpretations of religious doctrines, ideas about male and female sexuality, and to cultural expectations of subordination of a wife to her husband—views which continue to be common in many parts of the world.

These views of marriage and sexuality started to be challenged in most Western countries from the 1960s and 70s especially by second-wave feminism, leading to an acknowledgment of the woman’s right to self-determination (i.e., control) of all matters relating to her body, and the withdrawal of the exemption or defense of marital rape... The criminalization of marital rape in the United States started in the mid-1970s and by 1993 marital rape was a crime in all 50 states, under at least one section of the sexual offense codes.

Rape is a property crime and nothing more. First a crime against the property of the father, and then a crime against the property of the husband. This change only finished in the US and UK in the nineties, when I was eight years old. Women existing in a state of slavery to the sexual whims of their husbands is not some barbarism of prehistory. This was universal common sense for whites up until a couple decades ago.

Likewise, hitting a woman out of her head was seen as benevolent and a universal necessity in every marriage until the sixties, and even portrayed positively in movies and film. Regular slapping and the occasional vicious beating of a woman was a necessity in every household. Women need to be regularly disciplined to keep their heads about them. They can be intellectually mature and clever to the point of deviousness, but they will always have the emotional state of a very young child and we all know what happens when you spare those the rod.

On this subject I hear two narratives from low-T men in the alt-right. The first is that all these transformations in the rights and status of women happened in reaction to family abandonment and general hardships upon women. Even those I respect fall for this sniveling lie from the mouths of manipulative whores. To these I have said: let us examine the data. *[Editor’s note: the graph is not included in this abridged post.]*

Broken families happened as a result of these changes in the status of women, not as the cause of them. The reality is that extramarital sex and birth was at an all time historical low because of Victorian standards of morality. The only spikes on that chart before 1950 were a result of world wars, because a man that died in some kike's war could not marry his whore. Men held up their end of everything. They married women, they provided for them, they gave them newfound comforts and innovations like laundry machines that reduced their domestic workload to nil. They gave them full legal independence, and then they even stopped giving them the basic boundaries of discipline.

What did women do with all these new rights and comforts? Well, you see how that graph goes. *They whored like never before through the sixties and seventies, and Western civilization has been rotting ever since.*

They did this because white men had a fool's compassion in their hearts and lost the good sense to shove their faces into a countertop and give them a swift kick to the gut as hard as they can when these skanks had it coming to them.

Men counter-signaling White sharia

So most of this "I'm totally traditionalist but *White sharia* is terrible" nonsense is coming from women, but sometimes it is coming from small-souled bugmen as well. Some of these men are being bullied by their wives. Some of them just have no will to power. Beardson just used this line, and as far as I'm concerned he's not only no longer the leader of the thot patrol, but no longer eligible to even be on it. We'll be bullying whores without him from now on.

Here's the reality of European tradition: *women were a category of property* that had a single instance of sale. They were *complete slaves to the will of fathers then husbands*, both having free reign to beat them and the latter having *the lawful right to fuck them, where and when they pleased.*

This was the reality for thousands of years of European history and the change in this status only finished in our and our parents' lifetimes. There's nothing Islamic about this. It is just the default position of any civilization that is not being destroyed by decadence.

Man up, put women under your heel, throw away their birth control and make them bear you children and take care of your house. If they resist, discipline them.

If you are uncomfortable with the *White sharia* meme because it contains the word sharia, I can understand that, but "muh feels" is not an argument against the efficacy of the meme. This meme is effective because it has an immediate effect of being shocking and lurid to the senses of women and weak men and forces people to talk about the status of women in our civilization.

All we are pushing for is a return to the status of women we had in the early 19th century before Jews and their feminism ruined our civilization. This should not be controversial. If you are opposing *White sharia* because you disagree with women being reduced to the status of property to be beaten and fucked at the whims of her husband, you are a faggot and a cuckold and have no place in any right-wing site, and instead belong at the bottom of festering bogs like Reddit and Voat.

The scourge of male feminism

in the WN movement

by Andrew Anglin

Male feminists refuse to explain why a book—written by a woman for women about BDSM is now the best-selling book of all time. I get a lot of hate from white knights (who should really be called “male feminists”) for my straightforward commentary on the collective behavior of women.

The fact that women are sexually aroused by the idea of rape and abuse is extremely difficult for a lot of men to process. In particular, men have a hard time processing this in relationship to the female obsession with flooding the West with men who are shockingly prone to rape and abuse of women.

However, although I have laid out my arguments for this phenomenon in great detail, as of yet, no male feminist has bothered to give a counter-argument. Instead, they attack me personally, claim I must have some personal problem, or else I wouldn’t even care about the data which supports my claims.

It doesn’t matter what people think of me. If I was concerned about the opinions that random anonymous people on the internet have of me, I would have chosen a different profession. My concern is with the concept itself, that of shaming men who dare question the behavior of women.

By attacking me, these male feminists are sending a message to all men: if you question women, we will turn against you, we will insult and attack your masculinity. This is called “Man-Shaming.” It is the same exact system that the Jews used to silence men opposed to homosexuality: “If you’re against the gays, you must secretly be one yourself.”

The reason that white men will shame other white men with feminist garbage is that they themselves are emotionally incapable of dealing with the fact that their girlfriends and wives (or their objects of romantic interest) are not the princesses they imagine them to be.

This is objectively true. If they simply disagreed based on data, they would present counter-arguments and relevant data. Instead, they personally attack the man making the argument that causes them to feel the uncomfortable emotions.

I am absolutely disgusted by the idea that white men are willing to shame other white men, to question their virility and masculinity, in order to protect their own fragile emotions. This needs to stop. Man-shamers within the white nationalist movement are inhibiting free and open discussion of ideas, which can only be good for our enemies.

Beyond this, they are also creating a narrative that will harm men who are trying to have successful relationships with women. In order to have a successful relationship with a woman, a man must understand that they are fundamentally non-loyal (as opposed to disloyal), amoral (as opposed to immoral) and have a strong need to be dominated and controlled (in the modern system, where this

need is not being fulfilled because men have been taught to treat women as “equals” with “valuable input,” their desire to be dominated and controlled expresses itself through pathological sexual desire).

I take criticism well

I am very good with criticism, and am fine with the idea that I might be wrong about certain things. I don't consider myself infallible, and am always open to discussion and debate. However, because the feminist arguments are emotional and not based on data or logic, they do not engage in constructive criticism or debate, instead resorting to name-calling: woman-hater, MGTOW, etc.

All insults, no data or logic. My point, continually, has been that these concepts have nothing to do with me, and attacking me for presenting the concepts shows that the attacker lacks a rational, data-based defense.

I understand that this is a sensitive issue for many men, and I do my best to understand men where they are. I believe that the bonds between men are what make up the foundation of any society, and so I do my best to remain as sympathetic to the men who are taken in by feminism as the men who are able to acknowledge that they are victims of the Jewish-feminist agenda.

Nevertheless, it is the male feminists who are in the wrong, and who are harming others with their man-shaming agenda. Attack me all you want. It doesn't matter. I care about my brothers, and sticking up for my brothers. We are all victims of feminism, whether we acknowledge it or not. All you have to do is look around you. In all likelihood, your own mother destroyed your life and the life of your father, for no explainable reason. Your friends have family members [who] have had their lives destroyed by women.

You are told that “somewhere out there” there are women who are different. But you keep looking, and you do not find them.

For the sake of the movement

It is very important to our personal lives that we understand women and their behavior. But our personal lives, individually, are irrelevant in the face of our agenda. And our agenda suffers very greatly if we do not take a realistic approach to the female issue. For one, if we allow women to assert influence on the movement, it will never go anywhere.

Perhaps even more importantly, we want this movement to expand, and we are not going to do that by being a movement of a bunch of losers who can't get women. As such, it is important to me to teach men to be the kind of men who are successful with women, and the kind of man who fantasizes about women as princesses is not the kind of man who is successful with women.

The ironic thing about all of this is that while I am accused by the male feminists of “alienating women” and “limiting our movement to men only,” I am in fact doing the opposite of this. The only

women who are ever going to truly feel adamantly about right-wing politics are women who do so because they have a boyfriend or a husband who is involved in the movement.

Women do not have moral convictions and do not have ideologies. These are masculine concepts. All philosophers understood this fact (literally, all of them, so there is no need to cite an individual philosopher here).

Given that women do not naturally possess their own beliefs, they adopt the beliefs of who they view as their natural physical protector. So in our modern situation, women adopt the beliefs of the state. The way we will get women “into the movement” is by getting girlfriends for the men already in the movement. Not by trying to cater an ideological message to women.

Single women who get involved in the movement do it either to find a man, or for attention whoring/funding purposes (in certain cases, they may also find it fashionable). Not because they were moved by a logical or ideological argument. As the woman exists for the sole purpose of producing children, her entire orientation is geared towards gathering resources and/or acquiring a man/men who will gather resources for her.

As such, the way to get women involved in the movement is very simple: *Create a movement of men who are desirable to women.* The female partners of those men will then, by default, be involved in the movement.

Male feminists are inhibiting our ability to do this, by attempting to shame men who take on a character that is attractive to women. Men who “respect women” are not attractive to women. They are viewed as weak and pathetic. That is not the kind of movement we want.

You cannot compare this to leftism

One cannot say “we have to follow the pattern of the leftists and recruit single women into our movement ” because the concepts are totally different. Women are naturally drawn to leftism, for innumerable reasons. In part, it is because they are natural communists.

One should read the ancient Greek play *Assemblywomen* by Aristophanes, about women taking over the government (or at least [the Wikipedia synopsis of it](#)). In 391 BC, this man was able to predict that women, if given the chance create a government, would institute communism. This is because women do not have the ability to gather their own resources, so they prefer that they are distributed based on “equality” rather than merit.

In the play, the women also dissolve the family, and require that the most attractive men be forced to have sex with all of the women in the city, so that unattractive women are also able to have a chance to mate with attractive men. It has always been understood that the sexuality of women is deranged by any male, moral standard.

Modern leftism is also satisfying the sexual desires of women by importing men whom they find sexually desirable. They manipulate weak, beta males (the type of males who are drawn to leftism to begin with) into helping them import brown people who they view as sexually dominant.

Blaming Jews for the behavior of women isn't helping anything

There is a saying: “the only thing worse than a white knight is a white knight who blames Jews for the behavior of women.”

This is accurate. Of course, Jews should be blamed for the liberation of women. It was, on the whole, their idea. However, the behavior of women is the behavior of women. As I mentioned above, men in the 4th century BC understood that women, if given the chance, would do exactly what they are doing now.

If Jews released thousands of tigers out onto the streets of New York City, and they started mauling people, you would say “Jews are responsible for the fact that these tigers are mauling people on the street,” but you would not say “Jews are responsible for the fact that tigers are natural predators.” Claiming that Jews are responsible for the behavior of modern women simply confuses the issue.

Jews are responsible for creating a culture in which the worst, primitive instincts of women are celebrated as virtue, and the natural male desire to protect women is redirected into protecting her ability to indulge in these destructive, primitive behavior patterns.

Man-Up

It is time to act like men, and to take responsibility for the situation we are in, which includes taking responsibility for our women. Claiming that women are not a problem is simply a way of passing off male responsibility.

Our movement needs to be sexy. We want men to look at us, and say “that’s something I want to be a part of.” A huge part of that is being something that is attractive to women. And women are not attracted to men who “respect women.”

Call out the man-shamers for what they are: subversives who are harming this movement in order to fulfill a sad emotional need to believe in the virtue of women.

Patriarchy vs. feminism

I have just deleted the PDF “War of the sexes.” The section where I quoted the blogger Turd Flinging Monkey was long-winded. I have extensively reviewed it for inclusion in the 2017 edition of *The Fair*

Race's Darkest Hour. This abridged and reviewed version is now available in another PDF for a more comfortable reading (if the visitor wants to print it):

<https://chechar.files.wordpress.com/2016/12/turd-flinging-monkey.pdf>

The article shows that feminism will die and patriarchy will be restored in Europe, either by regenerated Whites or by Muslims. Pay special attention to what we say in the last three pages.

Thursday update

An “angel of the library” visited me. Lately I have been reading Tacitus’ *Germania* very slowly, opening his book written in 98 AD once in a while. Today, in the edition of Ostara Publications, the bookmark I had left on page 8 opened the book here:

Very rare for so numerous a population is adultery, the punishment for which is prompt, and in the husband's power. Having cut off the hair of the adulteress and stripped her naked, he expels her from the house in the presence of her kinsfolk, and then flogs her through the whole village.

Although [it is feminist rubbish](#), we saw something like this in the chapter “Mother’s Mercy” of *Game of Thrones*: the punishment of adulterous Queen Cersei.

The loss of chastity meets with no indulgence; neither beauty, youth, nor wealth will procure the culprit another husband. No one in Germany turns vices into mirth, nor is the practice of corrupting and of yielding to corruption, called the custom of the Age...

They receive one husband, as having one body and one life, that they may have no thoughts beyond, no further-reaching desires, that they may love not so much the husband as the married state.

Here I lean toward Roger Devlin more than Turd Flinging Monkey: marriage was instituted to control hypergamous women, not brutish alpha males. It seems to me that, since we men are morally superior to women, our male ancestors had no choice but invent marriage as a rock-solid institution. It is the only way to avoid that female hypergamy, a residual instinct so natural in prehistoric times, destroys an incipient culture or civilization.

The wisdom of the ancient Germanics in Tacitus’ passage (thanks angel!) can be fully understood if we take a look not only to the PDF linked above but also to [Devlin’s seminal paper](#).

*A passage from This Time the World
by George Lincoln Rockwell*

Without anybody coming out and saying it, the mad scramble for ‘democracy’ has been extended to the sexes and the natural dominance of the male, and the passive submission of the female, which are basic to both natures and absolutely necessary to their happiness, have been scorned as evil carry-overs from our animal natures. A ‘modern’ girl cannot avoid the impression that it is somehow ‘inferior’ to be ‘just

a woman' or 'just a housewife and mother', and the corresponding idea, therefore, that she must try to 'be somebody' or 'do something worthwhile' by having a 'career'. She receives all sorts of 'education', particularly in college, which is not only useless if she becomes a wife and mother, but which irritate and frustrate her natural capacities.

It is not a question of 'superior' or 'inferior', but a question of possibilities. A girl will grow up to be a woman, a female, no matter what education, ideals, ideas and training she may get. Perhaps it is 'unfair' that she was born a woman, physically weak, less able to reason, coldly burdened with the inexorable cyclic functioning of her reproductive system and blessed with the soft, warm, emotional, understanding and patient nature of the machinery designed by Nature for motherhood, above all things.

The effort of feminists and liberals to 'correct' what Nature has decreed, whether the effort is 'good' or 'bad', can lead only to misery for those who attempt to fly in the face of a cold and merciless Nature, and a social agony for a world which is deprived of warm and submissive females and mothers.

It is a mark of insanity for an individual to ignore reality and act as if he were something which he is not. It is no less insane when women pretend that their female natures do not exist, that they are not only the 'equals' of men, but the same as men, except for a slight physiological difference. No matter how a few of them manage to succeed in the poses of engineers and steel-workers and fighter pilots and business executives; women today, as a group, are fundamentally acting in the manner of the insane: defying and ignoring reality.

The results are frightfully visible in our whole civilization. The women are becoming masculinized, while the men are getting feminized. One has only to look at a crowd of our teenagers to see how things are going. They wear the same tight pants, the same jackets and the same hats—even the same duck-tailed hairdos. We are breeding and training up a generation of jazzed-up, negroidal, neutered queers.

Our whole approach to women today, as with most of our social attitudes, is that of the Soviets who have women in the army, working in the streets and even in firing-squads, just like men. God save us from such women!

Women are indeed the equal of men, as a group, only when they fulfill the task for which Nature equipped and made them—motherhood. Man was designed, even in the creative process itself, to supply the spark, the drive and the aggressive push of life, while woman is designed to supply the basic building material of new life; nourish, treasure, warm and guide it, until it can sustain its own life. There is no escape from this fate, even if it were bad, which it is not.

If a man is to be honored for making cigars or building bridges or making beer, as our great businessmen are, then surely we ought to honor those who make our people! But the trouble is that our insane 'liberal' attitude toward motherhood and homemaking has given women an impossible inferiority complex and frustration about their possible and real achievements in life. We train our girls by the millions to be anything but successful wives and mothers, lead them to believe they are to be an 'equal' part of a 'man's world', when the truth is that it is only Nature's world, and man's share in it is

no greater or more glorious than that of a female-oriented woman who produces, brings up and gives to society a family of happy people.

If our girls were brought up from first consciousness to realize the absolute and total inevitability of their mission in life, but above all to be proud of that mission; train for and then fulfill it joyously, there would be no more talk of ‘achieving’ equality. They would find that Nature has already given them equality in generous measure, if only they will accept it. There can be no sense in discussing the superiority of negative or positive electricity in a battery; they are merely different forms of the same thing, but the difference is vital if there is to be any current. When the male and female potential or voltages are permitted to become ‘equal’, they must be strongly opposite or the current will stop...

It is not women who are at fault in the growing madness of our family and our sexual frustration, it is the men who have permitted it. The women are still born passive and submissive and if our fathers and grandfathers had not failed them as a group, as I failed my first wife as an individual, they would still, as a group, be enjoying their birthright and the honor owed them by society for being the most exalted manufacturers and executives in the world, the manufacturers of Our People!

Upon achieving power, one of our first tasks will be an all-out public relations drive to help our entire population—men and women—to see that ‘motherhood’ is not the silly, sloppy thing which is made of it today.

Unlike most white nationalists, Andrew Anglin has been telling the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth about women. He’s even better than the MGTOW complainers because MGTOWers are not racists. Below, a few excerpts from [Anglin’s article today](#) on the Stormer:

What I am “claiming”—which is in fact simply explaining an objective reality, based on accepted science—is that women have no concept of “race,” as it is too abstract for their simple brains. What they have a concept of is getting impregnated by the dominant male.

Believing in “racially aware women” is a furry-tier sexual perversion. A woman is hardwired to breed with whoever she perceives as dominant in the society, as she wishes to give birth to dominant children. That is simple, mainstream, accepted evolutionary biology—not to mention painfully fucking obvious.

In a natural society, all women wanted to fuck the dominant warlord tribal chief. Because that would produce for them dominant, warlord children, who would protect them, feed them, house them and clothe them when they were too old and unattractive to have a male protect them for sexual reasons. This is the biological instinct of women to produce the most dominant male offspring—that instinct does not recognize race.

And we now have a society that has elevated the brown man to the status of dominant male. *So the increasing female desire is to fuck the brown man.* This is not complicated and it is not controversial.

The female sex drive is primitive and obsolete. Having been sexually liberated, they are leading our race to oblivion...

Primitive, obsolete female sex drive needs to be controlled with brutality.

I wish there was another way.

But there isn't.

War of the sexes, 23

Update: The following text is rough draft. The series has been substantially revised and abridged, and the section by the YouTube blogger *Turd Flinging Monkey* is available in a single PDF: [here](#).

—————卐—————

“What feminism calls patriarchy is simply civilization, an abstract system designed by men but augmented and now co-owned by women.”

—Camille Paglia

Treating men and women as equals, the blogger says, can only hurt men. “This retardation of equality needs to stop.” As he has said in previous entries, gender equality is absolutely impossible due to sexual dimorphism in human beings favoring men. Exactly the same should be said about race: but the folks at the manosphere are only halfway regarding egalitarianism.

Alas, the blogger’s worldview is not only partially cooked. Not being a follower of the 14 words, he is a degenerate. He has many videos that I won’t watch about porn, sexual robots and sexual toys. This is one of the problems with the manosphere in general. Without the moral compass of the 14 words, partially awakened whites kill their time in self-debasing ways.

But the blogger’s observations about the whys of the Empire of the *yin* that we are suffering still merit citation. In his video “social intelligence is bullshit” he responds to some critics of his video “Men are smarter than women”: guys who advance the argument that women have “emotional intelligence,” presumably to manipulate us. The blogger counters with a thought experiment: If a woman waked up with the body of a guy she would loss all of her power over us! It is not emotional intelligence what they have to manipulate, but merely their fuckable little bodies.

Old and young women

The blogger adds that when women reach the age of 50 they become invisible. They usually cannot manipulate us as they used to do. The reason is obvious: their bodies are now unfuckable. Even before their forties they are no longer little reds riding hoods. Lycanthropes no longer drool while seeing them.

Older gals are not even fertile anymore. In the words of the blogger, “Social intelligence is not intelligence at all. It’s merely female difference, specifically, young attractive female difference.”

All of this bullshit of social intelligence and emotional intelligence are pure gadgets to assist the self-esteem of inferior humans: women. The blogger’s exact words once more: “Women are basically retarded children. They have to be shielded from reality, the reality of sexual dimorphism.”

Remember de Tocqueville: equality is a slogan based on envy. Ultimately all of these pious self-delusions do not help women. They are the same kind of delusions that career women suffer: those who, in their forties, start looking for a husband clueless that we wolves don’t find them palatable anymore. This is what Nietzsche wrote in “Old and Young Women”:

Why do you steal along so furtively in the twilight, Zarathustra? And what do you hide so carefully under your cloak?

Is it a treasure that has been given to you? Or a child that has been born to you? Or do you go on a thief’s errand, you friend of evil?

My brother, said Zarathustra, it is a treasure that has been given me: I carry a little truth.

But it is naughty, like a young child; and if I do not hold its mouth, it screams too loudly.

As I went on my way alone today, at sunset I met an old woman, and she spoke thus to my soul:

“Much has Zarathustra spoken also to us women, but never spoke he to us concerning woman.”

And I answered her: “About woman, one should speak only to men.”

“Talk also to me of woman,” said she; “I am old enough to forget it presently.”

And I obliged the old woman and spoke thus to her:

Everything in woman is a riddle, and everything in woman has one answer—it is called pregnancy. Man is for woman a means: the purpose is always the child. But what is woman for man?

The real man wants two different things: danger and play. Therefore he wants woman, as the most dangerous plaything.

Man shall be trained for war, and woman for the recreation of the warrior: all else is folly.

The warrior does not like fruits which are too sweet. Therefore he likes woman—bitter is even the sweetest woman.

Woman understands children better than man does, but humanity is more childish than woman.

In a real man there is a child hidden: it wants to play. Up then, you women, and discover the child in man!

Let woman be a plaything, pure and fine like the precious stone, illumined with the virtues of a world not yet come.

Let the beam of a star shine in your love! Let your hope say: “May I give birth to the overman!”

In your love let there be courage! With your love you shall attack him who causes you fear!

In your love let there be honour! Little does woman understand about honour otherwise. But let this be your honour: always to love more than you are loved, and never to be second.

Let man fear woman when she loves: then she makes every sacrifice, and everything else she regards as worthless.

Let man fear woman when she hates: for man in his innermost soul is merely bad; woman, however, is evil.

Whom does woman hate most? – Thus spoke the iron to the magnet: “I hate you most, because you attract me, but are too weak to draw me to you.”

The happiness of man is, “I will.” The happiness of woman is, “He wills.” “Lo! Lo! Now has the world become perfect!” Thus thinks every woman when she obeys with all her love.

The woman must obey, and find a depth for her surface. Woman’s soul is all surface, a mobile, stormy film on shallow water.

Man’s soul, however, is deep, its torrent thunders in subterranean caverns: woman feels his strength, but does not understand it.

Then the old woman answered me: “Many fine things have Zarathustra said, especially for those who are young enough for them. Strange! Zarathustra knows little about woman, and yet he is right about her! Is this because with woman nothing is impossible? And now accept a little truth by way of thanks! I am old enough for it! Swaddle it up and hold its mouth: otherwise it will scream too loudly, the little truth.”

“Woman, give me your little truth!” I said. And thus spoke the old woman:


“You go to women? Do not forget the whip!”

Thus spoke Zarathustra.

P

War of the sexes, 20

Update: The following text is rough draft. The series has been substantially revised and abridged, and the section by the YouTube blogger *Turd Flinging Monkey* is available in a single PDF: [here](#).



The case for patriarchy

We have seen that the patriarchal society is the only kind of society that, in the long run, can be

functional. Society degenerates in proportion of abandoning the patriarchal model. To no avail, I have told white nationalists many times that they must widen their optics from a perspective to a meta-perspective of white decline. For example, the fact that the Iberians polluted their blood in the peninsula and in the Americas when their Inquisition targeted crypto-Jews proves that there is an Aryan problem in addition to the Jewish problem. No monocausal nationalist has answered this challenge honestly.

We could say something analogous disregarding the old story Spain and Portugal: present-day Japan. With no Jewish press they are committing demographic suicide. While they are not importing masses of coloreds into their island, the blogger says that Japan will also face collapse. Like the deranged West, the Japanese government is pandering the women through welfare programs. In his video “Women will not save Japan” the blogger says that the Japanese women won’t ever consent any reform, even facing a demographic winter.

The West is in far worse shape. Ant-racism, anti-whitism and feminism have reached maddening proportions. Women have become so toxic that white men are pretending to be eunuchs. In “She will never love you too” the blogger responds to a common objection: “Men are just as bad as women. They just want a woman for her body, which means they don’t love women either.” He responds: “No: *You* are your body” in the sense that we love women directly, not indirectly (economic resources and protection). I have observed how in the lives of cousins of my age the wives are the ones who have applied for divorces taking away their houses and children, while my cousins continue to love them.

In another video, “The case for patriarchy,” the blogger addresses two common objections:

Objection 1. The moral or fairness argument: Patriarchy oppresses women; it is unfair.

Before answering this argument we have to ask a question: Are the sexes equal? The blogger recapitulates what we have seen before. In his video he inserts diagrams of human skulls showing the dimorphism between men and women. The male skull is taller and stronger and its brain larger and denser. This is reflected in his higher IQ.

This is so because in barbarous times the alpha male had his harem. Civilization tamed him through the institution of marriage. In tournament species the strong has the power on reproduction and controls the society of that species. If the dimorphic species is controlled by the female, and here the blogger reproduces a photo of a queen bee, we have a matriarchal society: the queen controls reproduction. If the dimorphic species is controlled by the male, the king of the tribe controls it. In our species sexual dimorphism shows that Aryans were biologically predestined to form a patriarchal society (see also William Pierce’s *Who We Are*).

Brainwashed normies usually reply to our rhetorical question *Are the sexes equal?* with platitudes like “Everyone should be treated equally” or “Everyone should have equal rights.” The blogger replies that treating people equally doesn’t mean that they are equal and that “rights” is a legal concept, not one observed in Nature. If men are wired biologically to be the protectors and the providers of the family that means that we do the primordial thing. The blogger comments that the sexes are drastically

unequal in their contributions to society. Giving birth? He mentions the extreme example that a woman in a comma state gave birth to a baby. Like the Spartans, we do the really hard work.

Since the 1970s the patriarchal authority of the man has been destroyed and handed over women, even the custody of children. The result is the collapse of fertility of the white peoples (and the Japanese). “Whichever sex controls reproduction controls the family and thus controls society.” In sharp contrast to thousands of years of history and prehistory, presently a matriarchy is imposed throughout the West.

Objection 2. The economic or practical argument.

France was the cradle of modern egalitarianism. But the spear-head of feminist movements initiated in the 19th century in the United States, according to the blogger. Then the US 1963 “Equal pay” Act was copied by the English in 1970. But women will never be equal to males. Sexual dimorphism favors the male in humans. This is why, when men are allowed to compete physically or intellectually with women, like in sports or chess, they usually win. “Since equal opportunity favors men, the only way to achieve gender equality is to tear them down.” Eventually men are going to be tired of this perverse game. “This is the inevitable result of the feminist matriarchy. By attacking men and tear them down to the level of women, the society is attacking its own foundation.”

Like me, the blogger hopes that a new society will be born after the ashes of the present one.

War of the sexes, 19

Update: The following text is rough draft. The series has been substantially revised and abridged, and the section by the YouTube blogger *Turd Flinging Monkey* is available in a single PDF: [here](#).

_____卐_____

Phony anti-feminists

In his video “League of the shadows” the blogger says that traditional conservatives are like Batman: they want to save a corrupted Gotham City and its people. They believe that the government can be reformed, or that it is possible to reason with women. I would say that even the priests of the 14 words who want to save Aryan female beauty only receive hatred from these very women whose physique they want to save. It is impossible to reason with them. And in the same way that I scold white nationalists for not wanting to study the work of those economists who say that the dollar will crash and civilization crumble, the blogger quotes Batman’s enemy while he scolds the non-radicals of his Men’s Rights movement: “When a forest grows too wild, a purging fire is inevitable and natural.”

So-called families without the male figure are a liberal aberration. In his video “The government can’t replace fathers” the blogger says that it is not the nuclear family what provides the structure and authority for children, especially the boys. *It is the man itself*. I love that video because the blogger

confesses he was raised by a single mother. He adds that 95 percent of single mothers are on welfare. You can imagine what will happen with single mother “families” after the dollar collapses (poetic justice...).

The blogger also cites tax statistics showing that the government is sucking men’s salaries to deliver them to women (even nigger women I would add), and that the women’s role is to rear the child until his fifth birthday (seventh birthday for the Spartans I would add). Once they reach the seventh year all pedagogues must be males. “Mothers can raise babies into children, but only fathers can raise children into adults.” This is something that feminists won’t ever understand, not even the feminized males of the white nationalist community.

In the video “Where have all women against feminism been?” the blogger explains that MGTOW has been around since 2004. That’s barely more than a decade. It explains my initiative of placing this series “War of the sexes” in this site. Unlike the racial literature that started with Gobineau’s seminal book in the nineteenth century, with the exception of that chapter of Schopenhauer on women the comprehension of human sexuality is fairly recent. There is no book that I know that maps MGTOW under a single cover, so I felt obliged to pass the microphone to one of its most radical voices. This for example is MGTOW manifesto. The ultimate goal is to instill:

- Masculinity in men
- Femininity in women and
- Promote traditional gender roles.

The blogger explains that MGTOW shifted between 2009 and 2012 and it expanded its focus from merely an anti-feminist conservative movement into one that examines female nature as the underlying basis of feminism. The result was a change from a movement that sought to reform society by fighting feminism to one that rejected today’s spoiled women as a whole and walked away from relationships and marriage. The blogger then claims that MGTOW has grown in popularity and relevance since the shift. (Incidentally, my opinion of what men should do today with our sexual urges appears in [Jake’s interview to me](#)).

The blogger then talks about phony anti-feminist movements. I would say again that, with the exception of Andrew Anglin, white nationalists are in his group. The blogger notes that the “anti-feminists” don’t complain about the original feminism. Remember: in the modern era feminism has already 168 years. It started in the 19th century, specifically in 1848 in the United States. “Anti-feminists” never complain of the laws from the first and the second feminist waves. A true anti-feminist, the blogger says, would repel feminism *in toto* from its very origins:

- Women’s suffrage
- Affirmative action
- Abortion on demand
- No-fault divorce and
- Men arrested for domestic violence (including marital rape).

So according to the blogger the chronology of anti-feminist “conservatives” is extremely myopic and ultimately traitorous for men. They believe that the mess started in 1973 with Roe v. Wade. “The Men’s Rights Movement wants to return to the 1950s,” says the blogger. But the so-called anti-feminist women are even worse. They “want a return to the 1980s” that is, they merely reject the third feminist wave.

Personally, in addition to the bulleted points above, I would go as far as Cato the Elder. Let us reevaluate the values back to the Spartan/Roman mores! *Lex Oppia* must be restored—and implemented in the ethnostate(s). This was—and will be again—a law that forbids any woman to possess more than half an ounce of gold and also her display of wealth. I must quote a passage from [the chapter on women](#) of the mini-book that I translated:

Spartan women did not even know the extravagant hairstyles from the East and they wore, as a sign of their discipline, their hair up with simplicity: probably the most practical for a life of intense sports and activity. Also, all kinds of makeup, decorations, jewelry and perfumes were unknown and unnecessary for Spartan women, which proudly banished all that southern paraphernalia.

And let’s remember what Seneca said: “Virtue does not need ornaments; it has in itself its highest ornaments.”

War of the sexes, 17

Update: The following text is rough draft. The series has been substantially revised and abridged, and the section by the YouTube blogger *Turd Flinging Monkey* is available in a single PDF: [here](#).

_____ 卐 _____

Solutions

Apropos the traditionalism cycle, in his fourth video about “solutions” the blogger says that the current feminist stage simply cannot get back to the stage of humane patriarchy, that he calls *soft patriarchy*. The pendulum has swung so far to the left that it will come swinging violently to the far right, towards brutal patriarchy. This is exactly what we have said in one of the most popular posts of this blog, [“Lycanthropy,”](#) and you can see it visually if you pay attention [to the arrow at the bottom of the blogger’s triangle](#). He also predicts what I’ve been saying in my books [about the rape of the Sabine women](#).

But brutal patriarchy is not the solution. It is a harsh stage not only for women but for most men. In polygamous societies women are monopolized by a few alpha males (matriarchy is bad for every single male). It is the Aristotelian golden mean what whites must strive for, the humane patriarchy of the Jane Austen world. It may still be a gynocentric society but males are in charge. It is the world that I knew as a small child: and is the same world that my parents, grandparents and great-grandfathers lived in.

In his video the blogger says that in this society there must be marriage because this institution avoids tournament mating by the alphas. The Austen world is a pair-bonding society. Soft patriarchy is the lesser of the three evils of the cycle as illustrated in the triangle. Women obey. The blogger disagrees with those vindictive fantasies in the manosphere to remain in the brutal stage so that women may be “sold like cattle.” This is a passage from the poem *Goetterdaemmerung*:

For England or Iceland,
Byzantium, Vinland,
Far land or ancient
And ripe for the plunder,
The burning of roof-trees,
The seizing of women,
The tooting of treasure,
The flowing of red blood,
And wine for the victors.

Presently, in our Empire of the *yin*, the mores are exactly the polar opposite from those times when white women were sold like cattle. In our times, the blogger says, the problem is not the unchanging female nature but the government, the laws and the liberal zeitgeist. I would add the influence of the Jews in the media, Hollywood and the universities.

In the Aryan ethnostate women won't be treated as slaves but like a father treats his child. Never empower children to the point of enacting laws against toothbrushes or having free candy! “Feminism at its very core” says the blogger “is exactly the same as having a spoiled child.” Every time the child makes a tantrum we buy him or her a toy. “And the kid turns into a spoiled brat. That is what feminism is. Society has given women everything they wanted, and now they're spoiled old brats.”

The blogger comments that he has seen videos in the manosphere claiming that women are evil. He counters that that is only true if we consider that spoiled children are evil. When women are under our control they behave reasonably well. By empowering them they become bad but neither they nor the children are intrinsically evil: they should simply be controlled. It's only when women are left to their own devices that they do become bad. Our goal should be to treat our spouses as we treat children. However, it must be pointed out that even these patriarchal societies are gynocentric—even the [super-Yang Sparta was gynocentric!](#)

Gynocentrism has reigned but presently women are not only out of control. Many are indeed evil. Just see those pictures of spoiled European women with pickets welcoming migrants with skin of the color of shit saying, “Better rapists than racists!”

The blogger is concerned that a soft form of patriarchy could last only a hundred years. He fears that even with protections and education feminism will come back (again, see the arrows of the triangle). The new generations can fall again to the original sin, *superbia*. They will think they know better and will throw all accumulated wisdom out of the window, as it has happened before. (Remember the imposition of Christianity on all white peoples that destroyed the pagan temples, the statues of Aryan beauty and burnt the Greco-Roman libraries.) The blogger says that when this is about to happen again—when our wives start whining and complaining (e.g., in the ethnostate) that the storm is over and they want the right to vote, we must tell them angrily: “Fuck you! Go on your knees and suck my dick!”

We must convey a most emphatic “No!” as if they were brats making a tantrum. “Children and women are just incapable to understand these abstract concepts”. They don’t know what is good for them in the long run. The key for a functional ethnostate is to keep authority outside the reach not only of Jews, but of women alike.

War of the sexes, 16

Update: The following text is rough draft. The series has been substantially revised and abridged, and the section by the YouTube blogger *Turd Flinging Monkey* is available in a single PDF: [here](#).

_____卐_____

“The desire for equality becomes more and more insatiable as equality increases.”

—Alexis de Tocqueville

In his “Guide to feminism” the blogger explains that the first wave of feminism was women’s suffrage; the second wave equal pay, and the third wave hatred of patriarchy. He reminds us that, once women were “liberated” in those three waves, they never accepted responsibilities like going to war to risk their skin: they merely demanded “rights” —a Newspeak term that in Oldspeak means exactly the opposite: privileges. The blogger defines feminism as “a hypocritical ideology for mentally-retarded children with penis envy that resent their biological inferiority and would never be satisfied no matter how much legal, political, social and economic superiority is granted to them over men.”

The feminist epitomes the Orwellian sentence that everyone is equal but some are more equal than others. Affirmative action was not enough for her: like the coloreds she now wants equality of income and equality of opportunities. To boot, through the divorce courts the feminist is oppressing men, in

addition to pushing for an exception of the law regarding her claims of rape: men must be presumed guilty until proven innocent.

Presently, as we are continuing to pander or going along with her desires, the West is heading toward the cliff. Imagine for a minute forcing gender quotas on a basketball team or in one of those international chess tournaments formed by four boards each nation. These hypothetical teams of males with females, whether they compete for physical or intellectual ability, would lose big time in the real world.

Let's think about de Tocqueville's epigraph above. My working hypothesis is that Christian ethics is the devil of the white race. Given the Christian insistence of regarding all souls as "equal in the eyes of God," [cognitive dissonance](#) has been the axis of the escalation of both anti-racism and Western feminism. Races and genders are unequal. But because of the laws of cognitive dissonance, the liberal mindset is condemned to escalate egalitarianism as reality never stops fact-checking the liberal.

The blogger says: "Women are biologically inferior to men and they know it even when they deny it." I would add that only by falling into an ever-amplifying downward spiral of male bashing the feminist is able, through the mental gymnastics of cognitive dissonance, to self-bamboozle herself into believing that they are just equal to us.

War of the sexes, 12

Update: The following text is rough draft. The series has been substantially revised and abridged, and the section by the YouTube blogger *Turd Flinging Monkey* is available in a single PDF: [here](#).

_____卐_____

Are men superior to women?

Those who design computer games depict warrior women as faster than robust men. The same with Hollywood. Remember one of the films of the *Matrix* trilogy? The black actress who plays Niobe is the best pilot of a Zion hovercraft. In reality women are slower. Men are not only stronger but faster, including reflexes.

The same with intelligence. I used to be a chess player. Generally, the sexes are separated in chess tournaments. Even those female child prodigies in China trained to become chess masters are no match for male grandmasters. (By the way, the 2016 world chess championship is scheduled to start this November 11 in New York City between Magnus Carlsen and challenger Sergey Karjakin: two male whites.)

The same can be said about the careers of physics, mathematics and computing. Men perform far better. The System's solution? The blogger does not mention race but what is being done with the fair sex is exactly what is done with the niggers: "lower the math standard for women." That is the official policy in the universities. Once again, Hollywood brainwashes us with poisonous films like *Starship Troopers* where the main characters, Johnny Rico and his girlfriend Carmen Ibañez, travel in a spaceship to conquer a bug planet. Johnny had obtained low math grades and has to work as a mere infantryman while the smarter Carmen got high math grades, obtaining a job to pilot a starship.

Independently of this shameful inversion of reality in Hollywood and computer games, the blogger says that emotional intelligence is bullshit, that it does not exist. But I agree with Schopenhauer on this point, that "women never see anything but what is closest to them. To consult women when you are in difficulties, as the ancient Teutons did, is by no means a bad idea: for their way of looking at things is quite different from ours, especially in their propensity for keeping in view the shortest road to a desired goal and in general what lies closest to hand, which we usually overlook precisely because it is right in front of our noses".

The blogger continues to say that the only way that women can win against men is if the system is rigged, exactly what is happening now with the 2016 US election. Sean Hannity is virtually alone in the entire media to openly support Donald Trump!

In his video the blogger has concluded that men are superior to women not only physically but mentally. In a follow-up video, "Men are smarter than women," he adds that he received critics for his prior video even from the manosphere. He refutes the argument of deceiving IQ studies conducted by dishonest egalitarians showing that pubescent girls score better than boys of the same age. The dirty trick consists that girls reach physical maturity before boys, something that is reflected in IQ studies of the span of puberty where girls score better. But they reach their maximum brain volume at 10.5 years, and boys at 14. ("The nobler and more perfect a thing is, the later and more slowly does it mature. The man attains the maturity of his reasoning powers and spiritual faculties hardly before his twenty-eight year; the woman with her eighteenth" —Schopenhauer.) Adult men have a brain ten percent larger than women, and five more points of IQ (again, the antiracist blogger simply ignores IQ studies among the races). In the case of those humans who reach the Himalayas of IQ, say from 140 to 160, they are all males. "In conclusion, men are smarter than women, period."

I would add that we men are not only physically and intellectually superior, but morally (honor, nobility) as well—and thus objectively superior.

But like white nationalists MGTOWers are still plugged in the Matrix of political correctness. Remember the hysterical fuss at *The Daily Stormer* that Andrew Anglin suffered for stating the obvious about women? Exactly the same happened to this blogger in the manosphere community. In a follow-up video, "False stereotypes," the blogger says that in the comments sections of his YouTube channel he was accused of incredible claims: that he was probably gay; an ugly fellow incapable of getting laid; an unredeemable misogynist who lived in his mom's basement, etcetera. All false, *ad hoc* stereotypes coming from those who cannot stand hard facts.

Still in another follow-up, “Men are smarter than women 2,” the blogger responds to another tactic from utterly dismayed viewers: the denial of the validity of the science of sexual dimorphism.

*Natural science impossible to refute:
male and female mallards. The male mallard
has an unmistakable green head.*

In this follow-up video the blogger responds to a feminist that made a career in so-called gender studies. The woman claimed that men have larger brains because the brains are proportionate to their larger bodies in general. The blogger counters with the fact that even children have more cranial capacity than girls, and the same can be said about adults: the difference between the male and the female brains is of the size of a soup bar. Liberals want us to believe that this has zero relevance for their egalitarian dogma.

The blogger then mentions a crude test for cranial size that we could use at home: measuring tape around the heads of family males and females. But as the staunch antiracist he is, the blogger fails to present the perfect argument. Even tall and robust, muscular niggers have a smaller brain size than skinny Caucasians!

So far for the proportional argument that the feminist used. Finally, remember once more Schopenhauer’s wise words about the fair sex:

Women are suited to being the nurses and teachers of our earliest childhood precisely because they themselves are childish, silly and short-sighted, in a word big children, their whole lives long: a kind of intermediate stage between the child and the man, who is the actual human being, “Man”.

In the girl nature has had in view what could in theatrical terms be called a stage-effect: it has provided her with superabundant beauty and charm for a few years at the expense of the whole remainder of her life, so that during these years she may so capture the imagination of a man that he is carried away into undertaking to support her honorably in some form or another for the rest of his life, a step he would seem hardly likely to take for purely rational considerations. Thus nature has equipped women, as it has all its creatures, with the tools and weapons she needs for securing her existence, and at just the time she needs them; in doing which nature has acted with its usual economy.

In another video, “Women are children,” the blogger implies that today’s westerners are slaves of the egalitarian dogma: a dogma they pursue independently of the data we can gather from nature. Gender equality simply cannot be enforced in the real world, and he concludes his video with the words “Women will always be children.”