

Whigger *Sharia*

[Donald Thoresen](#)

1,635 words

One can quickly gauge the depth of infiltration of any given colonizing force by measuring the extent to which the subject peoples incorporate the ideological framework and symbology of their oppressors into their own thought processes. White Nationalists tend to be highly perceptive and thus particularly sensitive to the ubiquitous narratives of our displacement and marginalization. We are quick to spot examples of anti-whiteness wherever they are found, from pop culture to politics, and do a supremely admirable job of exposing such things so that others can judge our claims for themselves.

However, try as we might, we remain (for the time being) physically and mentally embedded in an anti-white system, and so cannot help but absorb some of its effects. This includes the notion that non-whites are somehow morally and racially healthier, abler to be themselves, and are justifiably liberated from the burden of self-effacement. Unable to be freely and unapologetically white in our very souls, unable to harness the cultural and demographic trajectory of our own countries, whites often turn submissively to other races for identity, for that glimmer of rootedness which we have been denied. We see this in others frequently and rightly call them out on it (e.g. “cucking” for Israel), yet White Nationalists – those who should be acutely aware of this type of thought process – sometimes fail to see how it infects their own behavior. This is the psychological underpinning of the “white *sharia*” meme.

As is the case of those who find personal meaning and community by subsuming themselves into the racial “other,” those who advocate “white *sharia*” are merely shining a light onto a tragically empty space in their souls. They have yet to mentally decolonize themselves. Rather than channel their anger towards the real enemy, and rather than reflecting on their own personal level of anti-white indoctrination, they lash out uncritically and valorize non-white culture for its perceived organic health and its “edginess.” It is yet another of the subtle effects of Jewish cultural control.

What is “white *sharia*”? It is a rejection of and a reaction to feminist excesses and the resultant diminishment of the male self which takes Islamic religious law as its model (whether used literally or not is irrelevant). Though there are other dimensions to the idea of “white *sharia*,” this, coupled with a general dislike and/or distrust of women, seems to be its primary manifestation. Looking critically at feminism is healthy. There are, however, so many resources to which one can turn to find the truth about the “wage gap,” “rape culture,” and other such absurdities that there is no need to rehash any of it here. It is sufficient to say that feminism as understood today is yet another aspect of the Jewish long con against white men and women. On this, most of us would certainly agree. What interests us here, however, is not that particular idea but rather the bizarre way in which some White Nationalists have

reacted to it, and what this reaction suggests about the level of pressure placed on us by our Jewish overlords. Advocating “white *sharia*” is, in most cases, probably just a childish troll but, given the gravity of our situation and the importance of getting the solutions right, *everything* needs to be critiqued and contextualized. Damaged thinking cannot go unremarked.

What is it that compels those who are otherwise pro-white to resort to fetishizing the culture of barbarous foreign peoples? The same thing that causes a “patriot” to simultaneously believe that one should not be a minority in the country his ancestors built while advocating death and destruction for any group which threatens the integrity of Israel: it is carefully inculcated self-hatred from above and the internalization of white subservience. “White *sharia*” is an implicit admission that what is authentically white has little value and is intrinsically incapable of dealing with contemporary historical contingencies.

White Nationalists have intellectually freed themselves from the toxic idea that whites do not have a right to exist on our own terms in our own countries, but the psychological effect of a lifetime of living in a system designed to prevent it will manifest itself in many areas of one’s life so that thought and action do not always converge. White Nationalists must struggle daily to create this convergence on an individual and collective level. One of the undertakings necessary for this to occur is the questioning of one’s personal, often subconscious, entrenchment in the system. In the case of “white *sharia*,” those arguing for it (again, whether in jest or not is irrelevant to this discussion) need to ask themselves why they are attracted to the brutality of the Islamic world. What is it that compels them to turn towards foreign religious law as a model for white advocacy?

Just as a white man might seek “traditional” Asian women, a white woman might seek “hyper-masculine” black men, or a white teenager might see black culture as more authentic and “cool” than his own, those who are attracted to “white *sharia*” are driven to it because they cannot find the corresponding values they seek in the white community. Why? Because whites have been taught that whiteness has no value, that that which is white is pedestrian and facile, that excitement and vitality are only to be found by embracing the cultures of non-whites. Our culture is being deliberately destroyed. We are everywhere confronted with messages claiming that we are unworthy of collective self-defense and that our traditions and values are pathological. White Nationalists are in a position to know this and remedy this problem, but some (a minority, fortunately) seem to have abandoned such things either for the sake of humor or because they *actually* believe that the primordial, mystical savagery of Semitic peoples can be transposed onto white societies and channeled into sound political action. Saving the white race is not a joke, and incorporating the social norms of desert-dwelling primitives into white societies is a colossal strategic mistake. It is neither sustainable nor desirable.

Any White Nationalist who engages in talk of “white *sharia*” needs to do some serious self-reflection. Is it necessary to ape non-whites in order to attack the imposed system of white destruction, that can be critiqued on entirely rational grounds using white, Western traditions and conducted within the bounds of white ethics? Absolutely not. We can and should attack the system *on our own terms*. Is the advocacy of a white version of a non-white idea based upon admiration or jealousy of that particular non-white culture? If the former, there will inevitably be a white intellectual tradition from which to

draw deeper and more nuanced inspiration; if the latter, then one should question the factors by which value is sought in non-white cultures rather than from within one's own racial tradition. And most importantly, of course, what precisely do advocates of "white *sharia*" want? A perusal of some of their texts would suggest that they want sheer brutality in place of order, blind rage in place of targeted anger, anarchic childishness in place of seriousness, and that policing white behavior is more important than defending white communities from invasion. None of these furthers our cause. Encoded in the word "*sharia*" are images of rape, stoning, torture, genital mutilation, acid attacks, honor killings, purdah, and a distinctly non-white incivility and mercilessness. Is this really a sound strategy for white advocacy? These are not things to which whites are naturally attracted. Indeed, we are repelled by them. We generally try to end such barbarity wherever we go – even when doing so does not directly benefit us. The "white man's burden" is an idea that is unlikely to be all that prevalent in our future global dealings, but it originates from our innate, biologically-based drive for justice and order. It is both a blessing and a curse, but *it is who we are*.

"White *sharia*" is nothing more than advocating for the subjugation of white women and others as punishment for their having been victims of Jewish lies and deceptions. It is yet another manifestation of the "white suicide meme" posing as a new paradigm for racial salvation. This kind of internal behavior will in no way convince anyone but sociopaths of the righteousness of this movement, let alone of the problems in feminism or any other "ism" being used as a tool for white displacement. Most White Nationalist women seem to readily accept that they have been victims of Jewish lies, and they are doing a noble job in advocating on behalf of white women. But we need more of them, and this will not happen if they are alienated by the unleashed anger of some loud, reactive young trolls who do not seem to understand the importance of growing this movement and who find something valuable in the superficial "edginess" to be found by incorporating the behaviors and symbols of our enemies into White Nationalist discourse.

If "white *sharia*" does not sound as ridiculous to you as "white Zionism," then it is time to take stock of who you are and for what, exactly, you are fighting. In doing so, not only will you naturally arrive at a more workable political strategy, but you will have eradicated one more remnant of anti-white indoctrination from your core being. There is no reason for whites to see themselves only through the ideological lens and cultural filters of the colonizers. Whites who push this meme are still stuck in the nauseating muck of anti-whiteness, subconsciously constrained by the forces they wish to resist, and will ultimately fail in their project because "white *sharia*" cannot be anything other than a joke and a distraction. It is an unfortunate but necessary reminder of how much we still have to do within our own movement to eradicate the residual poison of Jewish occupation.

Related

[Preguntas Planteadas](#) Published: June 7, 2017 | This entry was posted in [North American New Right](#) and [Frecuentemente, Parte 2](#) tagged [anti-feminism](#), [anti-white propaganda](#), [anti-white racism](#), [colonized mind](#), [Donald Thoresen](#), [Islamic colonization of Europe](#), [misogyny](#), [North American New Right](#), [originals](#), [white nationalism](#), [white sharia](#). Both comments and trackbacks are currently closed.

[« Two Orders, Same Man: Evola, Hesse, Part Two
We are All Miss Pross, We are All Millwall »](#)

47 Comments

1. Ike

Posted June 10, 2017 at 12:12 am | [Permalink](#)

Now lets see here, I'm married and have two beautiful blonde haired, blue eyed children and I'm willing to bet that the War Room has approximately ZERO children between all of them and I'd be considered a nancy boy cuck for disagreeing with their destructive misogyny. Yeaahh, this is really healthy. I'm so glad TRS seems to be wholeheartedly supporting this white sharia nonsense. Goodie Gumdrops! As if we don't have enough problems.

- Starfighter_Alpha_88

Posted June 17, 2017 at 9:49 am | [Permalink](#)

You are very lucky to have such a feminine wife more interested in bearing children than in "other pursuits."

I think everyone is missing the point of "White Sharia."

The esoteric principle underlying White Sharia is that VERY few women will return to a patriarchal lifestyle voluntarily.

Therefore, a large degree of force (such as locker stuffing, toilet swirlies, etc.) will be needed to re-establish male dominance over the average women.

After all, women control 50% of the vote in a democratic society, and therefore only 1% of the male vote is necessary to keep "The Matriarchy" in political power.

2. J.R. Phillips

Posted June 8, 2017 at 9:06 pm | [Permalink](#)

Thanks for saying what needed to be said. Advocating for "White Sharia" is like reading Jack Donovan and concluding that we need to form "White Crips" or "White Bloods" as a response to the war on masculinity. After all, the way of men is the way of the gang – and who has bigger gangs than inner city Blacks? They have some cultural influence and aren't tainted by feminism or liberalism. Why not follow the example they've set for us?

Because they're stupid, mindlessly violent thugs who do things like kill each other over a pair of sneakers, that's why. Whatever positive traits they have are swamped by the negative ones. Even if they do have some qualities we might think are worthy of respect, the image (and reality) of Black street gangs is overwhelmingly repellant to the sensibilities of healthy White people. The same is true of sharia, in any form. It bears as much resemblance to traditional Western gender roles as the Mannerbund does to the Compton Crips. Why adopt that as a positive meme?

I also find the images of a blue-eyed woman peering out from behind a full face veil that advocates of “White Sharia” use as repulsive as the Shepard Fairey “We The People” poster popular with “progressives” that features a woman in a hijab in the form of an American flag. In both cases, the intent is to promote the alien as an inherent part of our society. I don’t want hijabs, burkas, or veiled women on the streets as part of my society at all. Whether it is used to promote Muslims as an integral part of our society, or to promote Muslim attitudes towards women as something we should adopt, it’s something we don’t need.

If you want to troll leftists and promote an anti-feminist order, then this article from the NRx magazine Thermador is a better idea:

“Our Patriarchy Is Artisanal, Organic, and Locally Grown”

<http://thermidormag.com/our-patriarchy-is-artisanal-organic-and-locally-grown/>

Let’s use our own native ideas rather than reach for inferior ones from alien cultures.

- Michael Bell

Posted June 9, 2017 at 6:43 am | [Permalink](#)

This is another one of those “Because nonwhites do a thing, we should automatically not do a thing” arguments. So there has never been an Italian mob? Skinhead groups and soccer hooligans don’t exist either?

What’s next, should we NOT be sexually attracted to White women because Black men are?

If you are going to pick apart a meme, please deconstruct it with proper argumentation and not mere guilt by association. Our ancestors HAD forms of sharia, they just did not call it “sharia.”

- Starfighter_Alpha_88

Posted June 17, 2017 at 9:56 am | [Permalink](#)

The problem with the article you posted is that it is doesn’t really address

1)

2) “Don’t send me nudes; send me ‘Hijabi’ pics” – Caerulus Rex.

No one is actually, literally advocating for making white women wear burqas.

The joke is intended to highlight how modern sluts wear even sluttier clothing to the grocery store than a card-carrying streetwalker would have worn in centuries past.

- Starfighter_Alpha_88

Posted June 17, 2017 at 9:58 am | [Permalink](#)

My bad.

1) How exactly are we to get from our current state of affairs to a patriarchal social order?

White Sharia offers the means to that end.

3. Jaego

Posted June 8, 2017 at 6:32 pm | [Permalink](#)

A few women are allies. How do you know a female ally? They are against other women, like Queen Victoria:

” I am most anxious to enlist everyone who can speak or write to join in checking this mad, wicked folly of ‘Women’s Rights’, with all its attendant horrors, on which her poor feeble sex is bent, forgetting every sense of womanly feelings and propriety. Feminists ought to get a good whipping. Were woman to ‘unsex’ themselves by claiming equality with men, they would become the most hateful, heathen and disgusting of beings and would surely perish without male protection.”

As the Book of the Law says, “You are against the People, O My Chosen!”

4. Prester John

Posted June 8, 2017 at 6:25 am | [Permalink](#)

The oldest cultural infiltration into the white race is Christianity.

- Scuttle

Posted June 12, 2017 at 4:40 pm | [Permalink](#)

Yea, Christianity surely destroyed the glorious white culture that preceded it. Certainly didn’t educate and shape the Europe we all long for. Certainly didn’t make major contributions to art, literature, music or anything like that. What’s more, the destructive nature of Christianity is on full display these days — with Christian countries like Sweden, France and England welcoming their demise. Surely, we should reject this vile menace and return to worshipping trees.

5. Jaego

Posted June 7, 2017 at 8:26 pm | [Permalink](#)

We’re just using this meme to provoke controversy and therefore discussion. It’s obviously working. Obviously women shouldn’t be voting and we have to go back to a healthier time. There are plenty of models within our own culture to draw from – not just Christianity, but classical civilization. What? You thought the Greece and Rome let women do their own thing when they were healthy? In fact, feminine rights correspond with degeneration. Sir John Glubb found the same trajectory in Muslim Arab Civilization. The few women who are capable of high culture are welcome to it – but it should never be put forward as a popular model since they are so few. Most men won’t be voting either. The average woman can take satisfaction from that.

6. PWL1487

Posted June 7, 2017 at 7:57 pm | [Permalink](#)

Why are you punching right?

This is a joke, it's gallows humor and a way to trigger people, this reminds me of a leftist article on why some said topic that is unacceptable. You are attacking pro-white guys for the use of a meme that you don't seem to understand. It's not advocating for the subjugation of white men for falling for Jewish lies but rather a way of point out how castrated men of our race have become in terms of what they deem as acceptable behavior from our women. It's pointing out the desperate measures that white men would need to take to stem the behavior of white western women, while also pointing out the irony of these women willingly calling for that treatment from Muslims by advocating for refugees to be taken into their countries. Don't be the fun police that the left are, you don't see them doing this when Salon prints articles that normalize pedophilia or when they have college professors advocating for the genocide of white men. This does nothing but cause division, division now could lead to the slowing of a movement that is picking up more and more speed each day. You're making the wrong assumptions about this meme by letting real Sharia seep into what you consider White Sharia to actually be. You've taken shock humor and framed it into something far more than it really is and you let it trigger you. So now I ask who is yet to mentally decolonize themselves, the men who call for white sharia with their tongue in cheek using satire to show how far we've fallen as western men when our women crave to be dominated not by us but rather a invading brown horde or the author of this article who finds a subject to off limits to even joke about as it could make the holocaust... I mean message be taken less serious? This is dark humor that sheds light on things we seem to afraid to admit, things like how women (for the most part) are not natural nationalist and you will not make them into a nationalist with a good argument. You need strong white nationalist men to make nationalism something that is smarter, funnier sexier and DANGEROUS then the women will follow. They don't want the nice guy who waits hand and food on their women as the pop culture narrative would have modern men outside of our movement believe, otherwise they wouldn't be holding "Refugee's Welcome" signs in the streets, mixing with blacks or acting without thought of social consequences as they do now. We need the alpha male and when you make it so men can't show dominance or be dangerous even in there humor all you've done is castrate them and you know how much the western white woman yearns for the western white NuMale right? No? Come on we popularized the word! They cuck them

- Greg Johnson

Posted June 8, 2017 at 12:52 am | [Permalink](#)

There is no taboo against "punching right" at CC when the Right is wrong or stupid or immoral. <https://www.counter-currents.com/2016/12/punching-right/>

- Ironsides

Posted June 8, 2017 at 10:21 am | [Permalink](#)

"or immoral"

So nasty humor is now immoral? Sounds like you're saying — "It's okay to lose, as long as we do it according to Hoyle! Being a gentleman is all that matters, even if it means you're defeated!"

That's the attitude of the whole conservative movement in a nutshell, which is also why it failed totally and became the footstool and bootlicker of the Left. "We mustn't offend them — we need to rely on densely reasoned arguments presented in the most civilized manner possible!"

Shocked maiden aunts fluttering for their smelling salts don't win knock-down, drag-out street fights for survival. It's the groin-punching, eye-gouging, throat-elbowing, instep-stomping bastards who come out on top. Though this is a propaganda fight rather than a physical fight, the same applies.

You're wasting your time sniping at people on your own side. Use that writing time and Internet bandwidth to attack the Left. Slapping around the guy in the next foxhole over his haircut is pretty stupid when Charlie is making a concerted rush on your position.

- Richard Peters
Posted June 9, 2017 at 12:19 pm | [Permalink](#)

If 'punching right' means attacking confused white nationalists who think it's a good idea to turn whites into melanin-deprived sand people, then we need to keep punching until our fists turn into bloody stumps.

7. Michael Bell

Posted June 7, 2017 at 6:19 pm | [Permalink](#)

None of the White Nationalists who use the White Sharia meme actually want to see genital mutilation or any of the other barbaric aspects of bedouin culture. Also, I would say the majority are not fetishizing nonwhites. It is mostly about wanting our women to become traditional wives and mothers and dress modestly, and about keeping all women from voting because the VAST majority vote liberally as a result of feelz. Let's be honest, White women have been turned into a weapon against White civilization by the kikes, and the problem needs to be nipped in the bud. We need to change the culture so that White women have the same reverence for and obedience toward their fathers, brothers, and significant others.

The reason that Anglin uses the term White Sharia is because of the point made by Teutonick above, as well as the fact that the word "Sharia" actually originates from Persian, which at one time was a White Indo-European culture. It's also a catchy phrase. Anglin also does an excellent job of discussing the evolutionary causes behind WHY most women are not naturally loyal to their race or civilization, and that it needs to be put under control. It is not just "muh jewish brainwashing" by the way.

But as far as mimicking a few Islamic behaviors....Would it really be so terrible if the White thots who go clubbing and hook up with random guys get beaten up a little and shoved in the

kitchen? Would it really be so bad if the White girl who dolls herself up to look Puerto Rican so she can impress some monkey gets backhanded by her father or brother? Would it be such a threat to our race if women stopped letting their thongs show above their jeans for fear that they'd be disciplined by a male in their family? Would it really be "fetishizing nonwhites" if we put our women in a position where they literally feared for their safety if they decide to behave whorishly or fraternize with prognathic semi-humanoids? Does not Ariana Grande or Katy Perry deserve the kind of treatment that adulterous women got in ancient Germanic societies as explained to us by Tacitus?

- [Gunnar](#)

Posted June 8, 2017 at 8:45 am | [Permalink](#)

I am all for repealing the 19th, getting back to trad roles etc however hitting women is never acceptable I don't care who you are. If you can't get your point across without giving her a black eye you need to think about MGTOW.

- Matthias

Posted June 8, 2017 at 10:43 am | [Permalink](#)

"I am all for repealing the 19th, getting back to trad roles etc however hitting women is never acceptable I don't care who you are."

Completely unnatural and ahistoric, not to say ineffective view. If words fail and disrespect continues, OF COURSE a man has every right to chastise his wife, including physically.

- Michael Bell

Posted June 8, 2017 at 3:53 pm | [Permalink](#)

Well tell that to every one of our ancestors up until the boomer generation that hitting women is wrong.

So if you caught your wife blowing some other dude, would she just get a stern talking to? Or if she took the credit card and blew 20k on purses, she'd just get reprimanded?

- asterix

Posted June 16, 2017 at 12:49 am | [Permalink](#)

What if YOU cheated or wasted money, does she now have the right to kick your ass?

8. [Irmin](#)

Posted June 7, 2017 at 3:27 pm | [Permalink](#)

Any White Nationalist who engages in talk of "white sharia" needs to do some serious self-reflection.

Great essay on a crazy topic.

As a matter of fact, the high status of women is a persistent *trait* in Western societies. Jews didn't bring it about; we did, over many centuries. Unfortunately the proponents of "white sharia" are either unaware of our own cultural history or choose to ignore it.

I understand why WNs get angry at the deranged behavior of feminist women, but we have nothing to learn from Islam, which has proven to be a failure wherever it is practiced. Muslims want to live in the West because they have made their own countries unlivable, so any suggestion that we will profit by borrowing from their bag of cultural traits should be laughable.

Whether the high status of Western women *caused* the successes of our civilization is debatable, but that it *coincided* with them is a solid fact of history.

**

For anyone who hasn't been following this crazy topic, here is a white sharia advertisement:

What is White Sharia?

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5_0Z6-7mlH8

One of the best alt-right women has climbed on board as well, which is disappointing:

Emily Youcis about the White Sharia meme

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iBGH1ldybsQ>

- Michael Bell
Posted June 8, 2017 at 6:21 am | [Permalink](#)

It's only a trait when the Western nation or society in question is starting to decline, or is already in decline. Just because it is something that occurred in the West does not make it positive.

Ancient European peoples kept their women in check with different proscriptions that were similar to sharia. However, our "sharia" did not include genital mutilation, acid in the face, or sex with 9 year olds.

How can you even suggest that women's high status could potentially be the of cause success in our societies? Take a look at what they have voted into law over the last few decades in the Western world.

- [Irmin](#)
Posted June 9, 2017 at 10:56 am | [Permalink](#)

It's only a trait when the Western nation or society in question is starting to decline, or is already in decline.

That's incorrect. The status of women in the West was visibly high during the centuries of our greatest successes.

From the 1600s onward Muslim observers of Western societies regularly noted the high status and comparative liberty of European women, which they correctly

saw as marking an important distinction between their societies and the lands of the Christian infidels. In turn, Western observers of the Islamic world noted the servile status of Muslim women, which they often interpreted as evidence of Islam's backwardness.

No one can seriously argue that the high status of Western women invariably causes cultural decline, just as no one can seriously argue that the subjugation of women by Islam invariably causes cultural success.

Many WNs are angry at feminists, myself included, but that doesn't entitle us to ignore the clear evidence of history.

Take a look at what they have voted into law over the last few decades in the Western world.

Also take a look at what men have voted into law over the last few decades.

We are in decline, so our group behavior is often self-destructive. Women today are more self-destructive than men, but not by much.

If we take voting for Trump as a sign of cultural resurgence, as we should, then it is worth pointing out that most white women voted for him, forgoing the opportunity to vote for a feminist woman. About a third of white men voted for Hillary, a candidate who openly promised non-enforcement of immigration law, as well as more regime changes for the benefit of Israel.

As a general rule, white men are more likely to favor crazy Mideast wars than white women. On that subject, they are often a greater force for sanity.

— Irmin

- Michael Bell
Posted June 9, 2017 at 6:47 pm | [Permalink](#)

Women are against war only because it is "mean." They don't have any deep philosophical reasons for it.

"From the 1600s onward Muslim observers of Western societies regularly noted the high status and comparative liberty of European women, which they correctly saw as marking an important distinction between their societies and the lands of the Christian infidels. In turn, Western observers of the Islamic world noted the servile status of Muslim women, which they often interpreted as evidence of Islam's backwardness."

It does not really matter to me what so and so thought of so and so. What matters to me is objective truth, and objective truth says that female liberation is either a cause of or symptom of decline.

“No one can seriously argue that the high status of Western women invariably causes cultural decline, just as no one can seriously argue that the subjugation of women by Islam invariably causes cultural success.”

I would say that intact families are a sign of cultural success. Muslims generally have these, which is one of few things they do right. And if “high status of women” means that women get to vote, you will ultimately have cultural decline. Women vote in accordance with their feelings, not because of facts or deeply held political convictions (unless those convictions revolve around feelings and doing what is not “mean.”) I commend the women who voted for Trump, but I doubt they voted for him because they strongly believe in White preservation...or even something as normie-friendly as economic protectionism.

- [Irmin](#)

Posted June 10, 2017 at 12:02 pm | [Permalink](#)

Women are against war only because it is “mean.”

Perhaps.

But we could also say that many men are in favor of war only because wars seem tough and they enjoy seeing buildings exploding, just as they enjoy seeing death and destruction in the stupid video games they immerse themselves in. In our era, when most wars serve Israel’s interests rather than our own, typically female objections to war and violent regime change are objectively a force for sanity.

female liberation is either a cause of or symptom of decline.

If by “female liberation” you mean “feminism,” we’re in agreement. But it should be an uncontested fact that the status of Western women was high during the centuries of our greatest successes.

I would say that intact families are a sign of cultural success. Muslims generally have these, which is one of few things they do right.

That wasn’t the case throughout most of Muslim history. Ease of divorce, as promised by the Koran, meant that husbands could easily eject their wives and thereby impoverish their children. Western observers of Muslim societies were often struck by the sight of homeless women huddling on the streets with their kids.

That was not Mohammed's intention, but it was an effect of the rules he established.

Muslims today have intact families only insofar as they have quietly departed from the provisions of sharia that enable easy divorce and multiple wives for men, along with servile concubinage. In this they are emulating Western models, not the practices set down by Mohammed.

We had intact families before the 1970s. If racialists who support the white sharia meme are in favor of intact families, then they should pick some other vehicle, preferably from our own history, to express their support for intact families. They should not, as Donald Thoresen puts it, fetishize the barbarism of our enemies, especially since this particular barbarism (sharia) doesn't deliver what they think it promises.

... one of few things they do right.

Since, as we both agree, Muslims don't do much right, it is hard to see why you are supporting an idea ("white sharia") that strongly suggests the opposite.

9. Lemur

Posted June 7, 2017 at 2:46 pm | [Permalink](#)

Emily Youcis pushed this meme. When explaining it, she did actually link 'white sharia' to old Germanic traditions, but in the process sacrificed nuance on the alter of edginess.

10. Yeah Right

Posted June 7, 2017 at 2:33 pm | [Permalink](#)

Thank you for writing this. I've been irritated by the proliferation of this anti_WN meme for a while.

Really disappointed that the TRS guys have decided it is worth promoting. They're usually pretty good on most other subjects.

It's silly, cheap, bottom-of-the-barrel meme-making. Our content creators can do so much better.

11. Teutonick

Posted June 7, 2017 at 1:44 pm | [Permalink](#)

I think you're missing the point of the white Sharia meme.

By offering up White Shariah as an alternative to traditional Shariah, the left are forced to explain why traditional shariah is good, yet white shariah is bad. It forces them to expose their

true feelings. Those feelings being that Shariah law and the total subjugation of women is actually acceptable to them..... as long as it's not WHITE men doing it.

- Niko

Posted June 7, 2017 at 8:39 pm | [Permalink](#)

I've never seen it used that way and liberals would be quite unphased by it- as a meme it's too complicated to be effective. At least the way you've described it.

I've only ever seen the meme used as a way to promote patriarchy in white society. That's how Anglin promotes it on the Daily Stormer, and that's all I've ever seen it presented as. When used that way, it's pretty straight forward.

It's not used to expose the hypocrisy of liberals, it's used to counter signal "anti-sharia" conservatives who rail against "radical" Islam because it's sexist. For example, "We are against sharia because it calls for killing gays and cheating wives." Weev and Anglin and the guys at Iron March literally want that, however, so they counter signal the conservatives. That's the main motivation.

Maybe the meme started out differently, i don't know, but its meaning has since shifted.

- [Von Selten](#)

Posted June 8, 2017 at 7:08 am | [Permalink](#)

This is indeed the point of this meme, and it is a great point. Liberals, liberal women specifically, are not unphased by it, in fact, it triggers them into red hot rage. Mikey explained this several times on the show, including real world examples. It's worth a listen.

My main criticism of the meme isn't that liberals don't grasp it, but our own people don't grasp it. I don't say this to disparage WNs. If the meme divides our people, we need to reconsider the meme or the way it is presented, not our allegiances.

- CS

Posted June 8, 2017 at 10:25 am | [Permalink](#)

Triggering liberals does not, on its own, make a meme useful. Shouting 'nigger' at a black or calling feminists cunts would trigger them, but it wouldn't accomplish anything.

Memes are only useful (in relation to liberals) if they make liberals reconsider their worldview (either by pointing out the inconsistencies or just shaming them, like 'cuck'), which is improbable for most hard-core liberals, or point out why liberals are wrong to those on the fence (more likely).

I don't think the 'white shariah' meme accomplishes any of those goals. Almost no liberals actually support shariah law (as it actually is), they either have deluded themselves that most Muslims don't want shariah law, or that shariah law doesn't really involve stoning, keeping women in burqas etc.

So the 'white shariah' meme is not pointing to any inconsistencies. Nor does it have any sort of emotional attraction; any non-liberal normie, even if they're amenable to the underlying anti-feminist idea, will likely only have negative associations with Shariah (correctly) and so will be put off by a meme associating us with Muslims. It's also confusing since it seems pro-Muslim even though we're (obviously) opposed to Muslims.

So although it might be (possibly) funny in making liberals angry, it's a self-indulgent meme without any propagandistic purpose.

12. Aedon Cassiel

Posted June 7, 2017 at 1:13 pm | [Permalink](#)

You know, it occurs to me that we could probably benefit from a taxonomy that actually breaks down the specifics of *what* aspects of "white sharia" correlate in actual white traditions *where*.

For instance, some may not know that even veiling has a long tradition within white, Christian societies (and is explicitly discussed in 1 Corinthians 11).

Actually spelling out these details might, I imagine, be capable of satisfying everyone.

- the beer seats

Posted June 7, 2017 at 3:17 pm | [Permalink](#)

Corinthians.

She covers her hair when she talks to our Lord. He uncovers his head.

- Greg Johnson

Posted June 8, 2017 at 12:54 am | [Permalink](#)

It is not hard to find parallels between one branch of Semitic culture and another. Neither Christianity nor Islam is really European.

- Wser9

Posted June 8, 2017 at 12:00 pm | [Permalink](#)

Roman women were expected to wear veils as a symbol of the husband's authority over his wife; a married woman who omitted the veil was seen as withdrawing herself from marriage. In 166 BC, consul Sulpicius Gallus divorced his wife because she had left the house unveiled, thus allowing all to see, as he said, what only he should see

<https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Veil>

- Starfighter_Alpha_88

Posted June 17, 2017 at 10:16 am | [Permalink](#)

Amen.

Someone here understands what “traditional gender roles” actually means.

- Pareto

Posted June 9, 2017 at 9:47 am | [Permalink](#)

The author doesn't understand the meme and that's clear to anyone who does understand it. I'd also be willing to wager the author is over age 45. There is a generation gap in the Alt Right that will simply never be bridged. It has to do with how humor is expressed and interpreted. The older generation is saddled with a kind of autism in their interpretation of the younger generation's memes. We all just need to be patient with each other.

- Donald Thoresen

Posted June 11, 2017 at 7:30 am | [Permalink](#)

Pareto:

I have urged patience regarding generational differences before (in fact, in my last piece on CC). But silence in response to a grave error on the part of people who should know better is stupid and irresponsible.

I would also add that the “it's all a joke” theory is quite obviously a lie. Those few who might actually believe that this is the case have been suckered. But it would not make any difference if it were a joke. Every single word I wrote would stand, regardless of the intent of this deranged meme.

13.rhondda

Posted June 7, 2017 at 1:01 pm | [Permalink](#)

Thanks for this. I hesitate to say anything more, except only a man could say this to the boys.

14.Ironsidess

Posted June 7, 2017 at 12:01 pm | [Permalink](#)

While I agree that “white sharia” is pretty dumb, it's also futile to hope for “nationalist women.” Treating (most) women as funny-looking men is a critical, in fact deadly, error. While “white sharia” isn't what we need, men need to achieve a position of cultural and political dominance again. It's simply impossible to have endless millions of fanatically nationalistic women around

— it isn't in their nature. The best case scenario are women who stay out of politics and cultural debate, and leave these matters to men.

Hoping for women to turn nationalist en masse is hoping for equality to become real, instead of a pipe dream contradicted on every side by reality. Blacks really AREN'T natural conservatives just waiting for some Republican pol to grovel correctly to them in order to suddenly turn into Heroic White Men with Unusually Dark Skins. They're Africans, and they will remain Africans. The "nationalist woman" is a similar chimera. Women can't be men — and so, they should be firmly kept out of the cultural-political sphere.

- Le Happy Pepe

Posted June 7, 2017 at 3:03 pm | [Permalink](#)

I think it is more accurate to say that women tend to have a pro-establishment bias in their politics while men tend to have an anti-establishment bias. Women who live in nationalist societies, such as Japan, Hungary, or Israel tend to be just as nationalist as men, if not more so. However, women are much less likely to join political and social movements that are perceived as "radical," whether they are of the "far left" or "far right" variety. Therefore, as white nationalism becomes more mainstream and socially acceptable, we can indeed expect to see millions of nationalist women entering the movement.

Women aren't inherently less nationalistic than men, but they are inherently much more hesitant to take risks. And right now, being a nationalist is a major risk to one's social and economic standing.

- Rob Bottom

Posted June 7, 2017 at 7:17 pm | [Permalink](#)

Wrong. One need only look at the throngs of nationalist women in Germany's National Socialist era to see what is possible. The women of the Third Reich were perhaps less psychologically brainwashed than the women (and men) around us today, but what really transformed them was the zeitgeist.

We can and should expect to see millions of nationalist women, but only if and when we can convince men to take the lead and transform our societies. To do that, any help that women can provide should be celebrated, not criticized or minimalized. Look at the numbers of white women who voted for Trump; they are our allies. Telling them to "stay out of politics and cultural debate, and leave these matters to men" would have made Hillary Clinton POTUS 45. We need MORE women involved in the fight, not LESS. Particularly as it helps to attract more men to the cause.

In the same way that millions of women have fallen under the spell of feminism, the same could be achieved for nationalism if enough women lead the way. And we have the benefit of women who are not obese, ugly, man-hating Jewish lesbians on our side,

which makes them exponentially more attractive to uninitiated women. I suspect the effect of Youtube, and a single Lauren Southern, for example, will sway many more women than a Gender's Study course. But we won't get more Lauren Southern with your attitude, Ironsides.

- Ironsides

Posted June 8, 2017 at 7:57 am | [Permalink](#)

Well, go ahead. Try getting the Swedish Batikhaxor on your side, and go on believing that “women are our salvation.” Amazing that there are so many White Knights in the Alt-Right. Perhaps this is actually a civic nationalist site, not an Alt-Right site?

Do you also think that blacks are the real conservatives and that Jews are fellow white people? The Mexicans are a bunch of red-blooded Americans just waiting for a Republican to lure them away from the Dems, and that Somalians and Syrians make better British and Swedes than the British and Swedes?

Men are biologically designed to be defenders of the tribe and its territory. Women are designed to be peacemakers in the home. An “I love everybody” attitude is great for keeping the peace between the adult male members of an extended family — fathers, brothers, uncles, brothers-in-law. It is a disaster when applied to politics.

You can make women into Nationalists, but it's not the same way that's used for men. They'll be nationalists if their men are, and display strength, fierceness, and dominance. Those women of the Third Reich were nationalist because they were taking their cue from the aggressive men who were dominating and shaping the culture and politics of the era.

You can't forge a nationalist movement starting with women because you can't push on a string. Women follow authority and dominance; they aren't, and can't be, the source of that authority and dominance. You'll get your nationalist women at the point when they perceive nationalist men to be dominant over them, and therefore fit to defend their offspring. They are instinctively programmed to view equal or subordinate men as worthless, and will prefer foreign rapists to native cucks. Best of all are dominant native tribalists, of course, and they'll pick those first of all if they're available, but if you go to them hat in hand, they won't hesitate to replace you with foreigners who are willing to command them rather than implore them.

Study Europe at the moment. It's instructive.

- Niko

Posted June 8, 2017 at 11:22 am | [Permalink](#)

No one is saying we should “forge a nationalist movement starting with women ” or that women should be “the source of [...] authority and dominance”, in the WN movement.

You are being hysterical.

- Jaego

Posted June 8, 2017 at 12:41 pm | [Permalink](#)

No, he's being emphatic against stupidity. You just slandered him. Women aren't our equals. There is no equality in the manifest world. They are made to follow as he said.

15. Le Happy Pepe

Posted June 7, 2017 at 11:37 am | [Permalink](#)

I generally agree with this analysis. The original white sharia meme was created by two white nationalist combat veterans of the Iraq war. Whatever the merits of their military service, they spent the formative years of their lives living, working, and fighting within the context of a barbaric arab-muslim society. Some of it clearly rubbed off on them. They also learned a great deal of contempt for white women, since the wives and girlfriends of servicemen often don't act in the most honorable way (i.e. cheat on them while on deployment, exploit them for military benefits etc...)

Furthermore, they advocate that white men continue to accept being sent off to fight and die in ZOG wars, even knowing that they are ZOG wars, because it allows the white men in question to get drunk, get laid, and have a ritual passage into manhood—a viewpoint which is certainly in line with the pathological submission to nonwhites discussed in this article. As genuine combat veterans of our recent misadventures, they are very hardcore guys but very flawed as well.

- Mr. Frosty

Posted June 7, 2017 at 4:49 pm | [Permalink](#)

Excellent analysis. I think all the pieces just fell into place.

Beta manlets aren't good with women, so they join the military thinking they'll be "tough guys" and women will throw themselves at them. Other than a few skanky tag-chasers, this didn't happen. While serving ZOG overseas, they see a primitive culture where women are treated as slaves. They like this because an insecure, boring, dumb loser can force women to like them. They come back home and try to push the alt-right into supporting their only hope of getting a decent woman. They try to claim it's a rhetorical trick to expose liberal hypocrisy, but then they go and punch petite women in the face and celebrate it. The fact that they can't understand how deeply offensive "White Sharia" is to real White Christian men shows their level of Beta.

- Yeah Right

Posted June 7, 2017 at 7:09 pm | [Permalink](#)

Very, very well stated. My thoughts exactly.

What troubles me greatly however, is that these guys have no qualms attacking other WN if any criticism is laid towards them.

I'm starting to feel alienated from a group I've been glad to be a part of for nearly 3 years now.

They're so anti-intellectual that it's hard to believe they're really WN.