



A MEN'S LIBERATION GUIDE TO WOMEN

**sam fryman**

# A Men's Liberation Guide to Women

*Revised and enlarged 4th edition*

*by Sam Fryman*

*The cover painting is "La Belle Dame sans Merci"  
(the beautiful merciless lady) by Henry Maynell Rheam*

*Copyright Sam Fryman © 2005*

# Contents

Introduction	4
Chapter 1 – What is this “liberation from women” nonsense all about?	6
Chapter 2 – What do Women Want?	21
Chapter 3 – Identity Theft – the Stealing of the Male Identity	29
Chapter 4 – The Sexual Enslavement of Men Masquerading as Freedom	35
Chapter 5 – The Shame of the Feminist Agenda	47
Chapter 6 – The Demonization of Men – Let’s Blame Them For Everything	52
Chapter 7 – Being a Mother – the Greatest Job Any Human Being Can Have	63
Chapter 8 – The Tragedy of Modern Woman – Betrayed By Her Own Kind	79
Chapter 9 – Women on Top – Rule by Paranoia	85
Chapter 10 – Hypnosis and Irrationality – the Secret of Female Power	106
Chapter 11 – The Fall and Rise of the Sexually Empowered Woman	122
Chapter 12 – How The Feminist Woman Damages Her Male Children	139
Chapter 13 – Sex in the City – Making Boys and Men into Pavlov’s Dogs	144
Chapter 14 – Women, Women, Everywhere, and Not a Man Does Blink	153
Chapter 15 – Givus a job - Men’s Battle for dignity of labour in the feminist society	166
Chapter 16 – The Princess Diana syndrome – the rejection of true love	179
Chapter 17 – I don’t love you any more – the horrors of divorce	190
Chapter 18 – Molestation, indoctrination, humiliation? – not the proper way to educate a child	201
Chapter 19 – How to Handle a Woman – Courting Our Woman	209
Chapter 20 – Commercial Sperm Donation and Other Crimes Against Men	220
Chapter 21 – Luck be a lady tonight - saving the male gambling addict	243
Chapter 22 – Drug abuse – a road not to heaven, but to hell	221
Chapter 23 – Bullying – a game without frontiers, a war with real tears	262
Chapter 24 – New Age Spirituality – Buddha turns in his grave	277
Chapter 25 – My Unfair Lady – Makeovers, Cosmetic Surgery and other tricks	285
Chapter 26 – Conclusion – What We Can Do To Bring Paradise About	295
Appendix I – A Meditation Technique to Help Us Control Our Mind	299

## Introduction

It may surprise male readers of this work, or female ones who in their curiosity or anxiety have chosen to take a peek, that this book owes its initial inspiration to a woman.

An attractive and very intelligent woman, called *Esther Vilar*, whose classic and remarkably courageous work, *The Manipulated Man*, the author first read around the time of its publication over thirty years ago.

The word “courageous” has been used deliberately, as this remarkable woman, seeing the cruelty and dehumanisation that was being inflicted on men by the feminist society, has in fact had her career as authoress seriously damaged, and been barraged with actual death threats from women ever since, for revealing *the truth* of the shameful feminist agenda, the domination of society by women in general, and standing up for *the rights of men*.

We put it to you that this lady is little less than a modern day saint, and for those who would wish to support her, following her decades of being sidelined and persecuted due to speaking up for men, her book is now republished and currently available.

The present book however seeks to go a step beyond even that lady's fine work, which if you doubt the veracity of a man's view alone on women's psychology, you should first check out for yourself.

For here is set before you, the truth about women, your mother never told you, your father didn't know, and your girlfriend or wife doesn't want you to know – but *should*.

For the heterosexual men on the planet who comprise between forty-five and fifty percent of the total global population, surely it is the most important information which as soon as they hit adolescence they ought to be told or taught as routine.

But instead, boys and men are left to helplessly and recklessly blunder their way through the minefield of relationships with the opposite sex, frequently making complete fools of themselves, typically becoming either homicidally angry or suicidally depressed victims of women's rejection and cruelty, or on the other hand, flip into the equally sad and meaningless role of macho monsters, using women as playthings and fathering unwanted and unloved children, who then go on to contribute heavily to the vandalism, drug abuse and crime statistics with which we are all familiar.

If you feel neither of these descriptions applies to you and your “beautiful relationship” with your girlfriend or wife, it is suggested that you are living in a fool's paradise from which you will sooner or later be rudely awakened – for example by your lady's infidelity or divorce of you.

Or else the only other likely possibility is that you are one of the sad countless millions of Western men who have been brainwashed into a state of downtrodden subservience and slavery, which in your ignorance of the true freedom and self-respect possessed by your more courageous and stoic forefathers, you imagine to be *love*.

If that is your condition, alas, from the viewpoint of manly freedom as portrayed in these pages, there is no hope for you, and this book is clearly not for you.

The question we would however have a doubting man ask himself who is unsure of what he makes of the subject matter before him is - in your heart of hearts, are you a *Spartacus* – a freedom fighter who is dedicated to justice and the truth within his soul – or are you happy in your role as *slave* in the barbaric, sexually perverse and female dominated modern *Babylon* that is being created all around you by the day?

It is hoped that those who like the author, are *not*, will read on, as this book seeks to provide an education in the details of this quest for the re-establishment of respect for the male identity, which it is suggested is not easily to be found elsewhere.

## **Chapter One – *I'm free and I love my woman, you say – what is this liberation from women nonsense all about?***

As rock group *Pink Floyd* asked on their album title track *Wish You Were Here?*

*did you exchange. . . a walk on part in the war. . . for a lead role in a cage?*

It would seem to those men who grew up in a former era, believing that they were entitled to a life of dignity, freedom and self-respect – brought up on images of heroes like *Douglas Bader*, who after being shot down in World War II carried on flying a *Spitfire* with two tin legs; or *Scott of the Antarctic*, who braved death to explore the polar wastes – that such voluntary self-incarceration is exactly what so many modern men have done, and are enthusiastically fitting more bars upon their cages under the orders of their female owners by the day.

The tragedy of modern man's life is that he has grown up dominated by female influence, and he no longer knows what it is to be a man, except in the movie fantasies of superheroes like *Spiderman* and macho men like *Rambo*, *the Terminator*, and the like, which beings he cannot in real life even remotely emulate.

He lives in fear of his woman rejecting or deserting him, he lives in fear of losing his job, he lives in fear that the man in the next urinal will see his less than average sized sex organ. Lost without a religious faith, he lives in fear of his own inevitable decline and death, and above all, deep in his heart, perhaps even without ever being fully aware of it, he lives in fear of the fact that he will likely never be truly a man.

In this deep void in his soul, which no religious belief can any longer fill - as dismissed as nonsense by the "high priests" of modern science such as *Darwin* - his only solace is to bury himself yet deeper in his woman, and his other destructive escapes of excessive drinking, drug abuse and gambling, or carry out some bullying or violent and hooliganistic acts to reassure himself that he is still a man.

But there is an alternative to this state of vacuous angst inside him – well depicted by the character played by *Jim Carrey* in the movie, the *Truman Show*. He can break out of this prison of disempowerment and slavery to woman – he can again, like *Truman*, fight for his true identity, and thereby become brave and noble and free.

Because however, this feminist controlled society is currently set dead against the development of a man who is true to himself, and therefore strives to become a real hero – a self-possessed and emotionally mature human being, like for example the fictional character of *Caine* in *Kung Fu* – the information revealed in this book is not widely known.

To study this work in earnest – which is the distilled collective understanding of the thought and lives of many, gained by the author by tortuous personal experience, experimentation and research conducted during a period of over a quarter of a century - is, we put to you, virtually a holy quest, like the search for the *Holy Grail* conducted by the brave knights of old.

For this book cannot be understood in its entirety, merely just by one or even several readings, because it has to some degree *be lived*, it is the initiation to a lifelong endeavour.

Its theme is that for a man to be worthy of the name, he must not be merely someone with large muscles who can bully others into submission, which makes him little more than a prize animal, but a human being of great understanding and emotional maturity, who like the boy *Caine* in *Kung Fu*, bereft of his natural parents who are both dead, is willing to wait alone in the cold and rain outside the temple for as long as it takes, until the wise masters will consider him worthy to teach and let in.

We may hold jobs, drive cars, we may have girlfriends and wives, and be proud of our sexual freedom and the pleasure it brings, but if we are not in control of our desires, if we are not masters in our own homes, if we are not respected in our work place and by our own children, how is it that we can call ourselves men?

And sadly, that is the lot of most modern men, and if they cannot see it, they have been persuaded by a great lie, which is that being a slave and virtual lifelong child to women was how things were meant to be.

And we put it further to you that the answer to the problems of our world are not to be found by worrying unduly about whether UFOs or ghosts really exist, who really killed *JFK* or *Marilyn Monroe*, or even whether there are some secret group of “illuminati” as *David Icke* proposes, who are pulling the strings behind the scenes – not that such brave, investigative explorers like Mr Icke have nothing to teach us.

But the trouble is that all this speculative “mystery hunting”, which ends up almost always as inconclusive, makes *not one iota of difference to our real daily lives*, as little does most of the so called *New Age religion* and “*spirituality*”, and thus is effectively just a hypnotic distraction from *the real issue* in our lives, which is *our lack of mastery over ourselves and our concurrent unresolved conflict with women*.

That is, we are emotionally, sexually and psychologically dependent creations of a female goddess whom we daily worship, and this weakness and immaturity, we never confront and become masters of, as therefore neither do we become masters of our women. And then in our flight from the reality of that failure to grow, we imagine that by chasing moonbeams and spectres, or chanting some mantra in a Buddhist temple we can become “free” and “enlightened.”

Though this book is not aimed only or even especially at those of a religious or “spiritual” persuasion, to the religious or spiritually minded, a question is posed

*who is your real allegiance to – is it to your woman or your God?*

Because, really, the current attack on the male of the species and the Muslim culture in particular, which is perhaps the last stronghold of traditional *male* oriented religion, is effectively an attack on the idea and ideal of such a God.

For example, in the Hollywood version of *El Cid*, the Spanish Eleventh Century hero, with *Charlton Heston* playing the role, we see that to protect *the honour* of his family, he has to demand an apology from the father of the lady he loves, who refusing that to him, he is then forced to kill in combat, knowing that his intended bride may be lost to him forever in that process.

That is, to please his woman, El Cid would have had to betray his honour, and as he was a deeply religious man, at least in the Hollywood version of his life, therefore, betray *his God*.

We see more generally that a man is often forced to choose against the wishes of his woman, *to be true to himself*, and so it often comes to such a clear choice – his woman or his principles, his woman or his God.

Or even taking the Taoist-Buddhist perspective of *Kwai Chang Caine* from *Kung Fu*

*what is a man without honour?*

The truth is that many women are irreligious now, not particularly because they have any strong feelings about the existence of God one way or the other, but because when men do not believe in any “cosmic father figure”, they then believe only in *women*, and she becomes man’s reason for living, and therefore effectively, *his god*.

And this is, according to the thesis of this book what the *corrupted* women, who control so much of society, government and the media now want.

They want to be a man’s *god*, and like all “gods” they are jealous of any rivals, and thus say any such “cosmic father figure” is nonsense, despite the fact they don’t have one iota of explanation for their own existence, or the existence and functioning of the universe as a whole.

We see the dramatisation of this *fact* of women’s *self-deification* very clearly in the sadomasochistic practices, where a woman is bowed down in front of and knelt before, referred to as a “goddess”, and literally *worshipped* as such.

And because as we know, power corrupts, and *absolute power corrupts absolutely*, she is a corrupt goddess, high on her power, who dominates, beats and accuses her whimpering, humiliated and slavish “subjects” – that is *we men*.



We put it to you that this widespread practice of the female domination of men, is not merely some harmless piece of sexual foreplay and theatrical fun – some men and even women are *willingly* beaten and tortured very severely in these encounters for which they typically pay substantial fees; but rather what we are looking at is the fantasy dramatisation of what is going on psychologically and socially between men and women *in their real everyday lives*.

We shall repeat the *Pink Floyd* quote once again for emphasis:

*did you exchange...a walk on part in the war...for a lead role in a cage?*

So is it not now clearer that we have thrown our male heroism and *Spartacus* spirit away, to be a feeble “new man”, who is his wife or girlfriend’s slave and puppet, and really that she is his “goddess”, who like *Jim Carrey’s* imprisoned and manipulated *Truman*, she is keeping in her cage, just as the sadomasochistic “goddesses” do?

And then we must ask ourselves *honestly* - do we really care, do we really care that we will never if things carry on this way be proud, dignified, *masterful* men, but only live on fantasy dreams, like those provided by comic book superheroes and screen “macho men” such as Bruce Willis, Arnold Schwarzenegger, Sylvester Stallone and all the rest?

None of those mostly likeable gentlemen could in real life do the things we see them act out onscreen. Just like the rest of us, in real life, they would be dead within the first or second reel. They merely have got rich by feeding us a pure fantasy of the heroes that neither we nor even they will ever truly be.

Or we can equally get lost in “male empowerment” fantasies of being great knights and warriors inside a computer video game.

We play at being only *fantasy heroes* whilst women are getting more and more empowered, and taking more and more jobs and positions of high office and business success *in the real world*.

So really, could we see beyond our comic book heroes and video screens, we would have to face up to that fact that *in the real world* we are no heroes, and women are just laughing at us, we little boys and our little toys.

Is that what we want life to be like – pretending to be a man, while women mock and scorn us? Or would we be so bold to consider attempting *the real thing*, which is uncertain in outcome and scary indeed?

As the rather more sophisticated than appeared at first sight 1970s “punk rock” band *The Stranglers* said, there are *No More Heroes Any More*.

And no apology is made for making throughout this work continuous quotes from popular culture rather than so called “mainstream psychology” or “academic research.”

For though the society is currently being ruled by *the academic and scientist*, either of the physical or “social” kind – since he or she is the adviser to government right now – it is put to you that *the truth* of society is being commented more significantly, as ever, by *the philosopher, the artist, the writer*.

Science has its place, much of the technology it has created is at least for the moment essential to our lives, but it is not answering our fundamental questions, it is not solving our political and social problems, it is not satisfying the gnawing emptiness in our hearts and minds.

So for a different solution let us turn to *John Lennon* for example, in his hit song *Mind Games*:

*Love is the answer*, he says, or in his earlier *Beatles* days - *All You Need Is Love*.

But then we have him saying in the heart rending *Mother*, reflecting on his own *real* childhood:

*Mother, you had me - but I never had you,  
I wanted you - but you didn't want me,  
So I got to tell you,  
Goodbye, goodbye.*

*Father, you left me - but I never left you,  
I needed you - but you didn't need me,  
So I got to tell you,  
Goodbye, goodbye.*

*Children, don't do - what I have done,  
I couldn't walk - and I tried to run,  
So I got to tell you,  
Goodbye, goodbye.*

*Mama don't go,  
Daddy come home  
Mama don't go,  
Daddy come home...*

In the final verse or arguably chorus, which is repeated over and over, begging for his mother not to go and his father to come home, Lennon literally screams and wails the words like a child.

We know he was experimenting with all kinds of ideas such as “rebirthing” or “primal scream therapy” during his post *Beatles* period, but this most powerful of emotional confessions which he made in this song, seems very far from the “all you need is love” panacea he advocated in his earlier days.

Really, like all men with such a broken family background – deserted by his own mother and father, and raised by an aunt - Lennon was hunting for love all his life, for a short period for example as an ardent devotee at the feet of *the Maharishi*.

And one suggests that he never really found it, except in the form of the motherly and non-judgmental *Yoko Ono*, which clearly did not satisfy him as a man, as he subsequently went into a spell of drug and alcohol abuse, and had affairs with at least one other woman after his relationship with her had long been.

By the time of his tragic murder in 1980 however, he seemed to have settled into an image of himself as romantic father figure, devoted to his wife and son.

His songs *Starting Over* and *Woman* expressed that he no longer had a “spiritual quest” as in his *Maharishi* phase, but had as explained earlier descended into “woman worship” as demonstrate below, quoting from *Woman*:

*Woman - I can hardly express  
My mixed emotion at my thoughtlessness  
After all I'm forever in your debt*

*And woman I will try to express  
My inner feelings and thankfulness  
For showing me the meaning of success*

Compare this kind of sentiment, to the cocky, witty, self-possessed, rebel who appeared on stage in front of the Queen in the mid 1960s and said “you peasants in the stalls can clap yer hands, and the rest of you up there in the royal box can just rattle yer jewellery.”

Or he would call the then British prime minister, *Harold Wilson*, to his face by his first name, “ ’Arold”, even dropping the “h” without seeming to care, all this in a time still of comparative deference, corporal punishment of children in the home and school, and British gents with brollies in bowler hats, like *the Avengers Mr Steed*, you will appreciate.

But then suddenly, a mere decade and a half later, instead of progressing to some kind of mature enlightenment, he had it seemed become largely the sentimental, woman worshipper of the above verses, and apparently obsessing somewhat on his son, to a degree that seemed perhaps a little unhealthy in the song *Beautiful Boy*.

Another song on the same album, whose cover is a rather exhibitionistic and arguably embarrassing kiss on the lips between himself and *Yoko Ono*, is called *Watching the Wheels*, perhaps the most creative song of the set, but again suggests Lennon has surrendered his quest for meaning in life and was trying to fob us all off with “pseudo truths” such as:

*People asking questions  
Lost in confusion  
Well I tell them there's no problem  
Only solutions*

*Well they shake their heads  
And they look at me  
As if I've lost my mind  
etc.*

In the sense of the quest for the truth of life - the male hero's search for *the holy grail* - in that sense, it would appear that Lennon *had* lost his mind, as most men do, in the sense that - *unable to find answers to life's fundamental problems, we give up and descend into a diet of sex, sentimentality, materiality and woman worship.*

The whole song and album released in 1980 at the time of his death has this sense of resignation about it, and descent into romantic fantasy and sentimentality, and the inclusion of Yoko Ono's typically bizarre and inferior songs every second track, which from the public's point of view just ruined the album, are another sign that Lennon was perhaps losing his grip on reality.

Though we have no desire to assassinate the character of a man who was himself assassinated in the physical sense, we feel obliged to point out that this "working class hero", though obviously very artistically talented and poetic, was also a very psychologically damaged man, as an example of the generality of what happens to men when they do not have a stable upbringing.

That is - he failed to *fully* develop his masculine identity as an autonomous self-directed being apart from female influence, just as at least perhaps ninety-five percent of men currently do.

And after failing in this spiritual quest - *that is, his search to be whole and self-sufficient as man, independent of woman* - due to lack of proper guidance, he apparently regressed *psychologically* back into the state of a lovesick teenager as indicated in his over-sentimental final songs.

It is somewhat ironic to observe that Lennon himself in some of these last few songs, became somewhat sweet and sugary, which he had in fact himself criticised Paul McCartney's post Beatles efforts for often being not many years earlier.

Hardened John Lennon worshippers will of course find this analysis offensive, but we would like to point out to them, that we are exercising that same right to free speech that all true artists such as Lennon have always fought for, and we would also wish them to ask themselves whether Lennon himself would have acted in the same angry way to such opinions about him - he who for example upset so many by claiming, perhaps even with justification, that the Beatles were more popular than Jesus Christ.

It is never a pleasant task to demolish icons of history, but if we want to be “enlightened” and truly “grown up” we have to stop buying into the rose-tinted illusions and emotional fantasies about celebrities which stop us seeing what is really going on in the world and in our own lives.

John Lennon was a fine and innovative songwriter, and a philosophical, creative, thinker, but psychologically he was just a man like you and I, who had problems with sex, alcohol, drugs and his various women, the first of whom he divorced, leaving his son Julian almost entirely to her care, and therefore *from the point of view of this thesis*, neglecting him, just as he himself was deserted and neglected by his own genetic father.

We will see later in this work, for example, in the case of *Princess Diana*, that this “history repeating itself” is the typical behaviour of the damaged and abused person towards their own children, rather than the exceptional.

As to the relationships in the Beatles in general, perhaps drummer *Ringo Starr* made one of the most telling comments in the *Beatles Anthology* TV series, when he said (approximately):

*“the Beatles were just four talented guys who loved each other very much.”*

And we put it to you, that their period of greatest creativity came from this love for one another, in the non-sexual sense, *before the women in their lives became dominant* – i.e. Yoko Ono in John Lennon’s life, and Linda in Paul McCartney’s.

They were during that phase the “brothers-in-arms” whom all men should be, helping one another to explore and understand life.

But what did we then see?

After Lennon failed to find a father figure to respect in transcendental meditation guru, *the Maharishi*, suddenly Yoko Ono started to become the central figure in his life, to the irritation of the rest of the band, because they kept their girlfriends out of the creative process, whereas Lennon insisted on having her “here, there and everywhere”, including in the studio beside him during recording sessions, as well as alongside him in the famous “rooftop concert.”

Again, this kind of behaviour suggested the unhealthy claustrophobic attachment of an emotionally needy and damaged person, who certainly ignored *Khalil Giban’s* now well known dictum - *let there be space in your togetherness*.

So we can say that John Lennon was a great artist and poet, but due to the aforementioned information and explanation, at least half of which is undeniably factual, can we really say he was a great man?

The bitter truth we suggest is that, though he wrote some remarkable songs, and as one of the principle Beatles, made history, John Lennon *with others* led a generation of youth to what *seemed* like freedom and enlightenment, but ended in the dropping out of society and destruction by drug taking of millions, who lacking his fame and money, did not in many cases ever recover from that lifestyle.

A rich rebel, which Lennon eventually was, can go on wild drink, drug and sex orgies - as *Ian Dury* sang, *sex and drugs and rock n roll is all my body needs* - and protest at what's wrong with society to his heart's content, but can also carry on more or less as normal with the rest of his life.

He can sleep off all those binges, and his world doesn't turn to dust.

But if those who have no name or fame - which was the status of most of his many millions of followers - do the same, they fail to apply all the energy of youth that is required to carve out for themselves a place in the world, and never live a proper life.

Vast legions of the so called "hippy generation" came to such a fate, descending into an undisciplined, drug based and sexually restless lifestyle, having bought into the philosophies and lifestyles of Lennon, Timothy Leary and all the rest.

Thus Lennon led his followers not to the liberation with his - *peace and love is the answer* idealism - which his words seemed to have promised, but into irresponsible, stunted, self-neglecting lifestyles, which pushed many millions of the above averagely intelligent people who comprised his followers out to the fringes of society, and therefore having no significant role in family life or influence in the world in general.

In this vacuum left by men who should have been taking over the reins of leadership in family and society in the next generation, but instead were sitting round smoking marijuana and staring at their big toes, *women stepped in and took over*.

So do we now see our hero John Lennon in a rather different light?

That is, as a talented artist, who appeared at just the right moment in tandem with his Beatle buddies to become the first global media pop megastars, but as a man, really much like the rest of us, in that he didn't really understand his own mind, his women, or his own mixed up childhood, and though he was for most of his life seeking answers, he never really found them, and even at the time of his death, he hadn't really grown up to become a mature and self-sufficient man.

The *make love, not war* hippy culture that surrounded his era also encouraged millions of men to father children in an irresponsible manner, without first establishing stable relationships with their women, who then later became the millions of one parent families with which our society is now swamped, whose children never had a father in their lives, whilst the men who had fathered these children were pushed out of the family in humiliation, and in despair became alcoholic, drug addicted and demonized.

So without realising was he was doing, John Lennon together with others of his generation, supported the feminist agenda of empowering women and disempowering men, by filling men's minds with ideas of easy enlightenment via drugs that didn't happen, and misleading romantic love songs – e.g. the casual sex encounter of *Norwegian Wood* – which made them rush ever faster into bed with women, who then later ejected them from being masters and moral authorities in the home, as demanded by the feminist propaganda machine.

As previously stated, there is no desire here to assassinate the memory of John Lennon, a tragic figure, and ultimately a decent man, who did much good also, but if we want to be real men, whose goal is always *freedom and the quest for true understanding*, we have to be able to look at every illusion which is cast before us and see *the reality* behind the concocted world view we are being given.

The above interpretation of Lennon's life is a fairly simple analysis, and we suggest that if you have never heard of or considered it before, as is likely, this is because we are all being fed a dumbed-down version of the life stories of those before our eyes, whose twin goals are commercial and to preserve the status quo of *woman worship*.

We in fact, see that the whole sixties phenomenon, while appearing to be a time of liberation, and was so *in the artistic sense*, was also actually the most destructive period to the mass of men in society there has ever been, not only in England, but throughout Western "civilisation" as a whole.

For at that tragic point in history, we men lost our role as head of family and master in the home, seemingly forever, judging by current trends around forty years later.

We lost our *right* to expect sex or fidelity from our wives or girlfriends, because the contraceptive pill had now liberated our women to sleep around with as many partners as they liked without fear of pregnancy.

And then Mrs Thatcher finished off England in the 1980s for men, by taking most of our jobs away in the mining, engineering, shipbuilding and manufacturing industries.

So it seemed that the feminist agenda was almost complete.

That is – give woman the power to betray and torment men, take men's economic and social power away – the only thing left to be done then was to take men's role as father away, which by addicting them to drugs or tempting them to have affairs with loose women, and changing a few laws in women's favour, was soon achieved.

The many professional men who might one day read this work, may very well not be aware of this scheme that appears to have been going on behind the scenes, because jobs for the professional classes of men have largely been retained, albeit in a dumbed-down, compromised and disempowered form.

For example, many male doctors and teachers suffer under the cosh of all sorts of government rules, regulations, and fears – such as accusation of molesting their patients or pupils - and demands for targets, which they did not previously have to put up with before the feminist era began in earnest in the nineteen-sixties.

Equally men are also now having to routinely compete with women for an ever diminishing number but ever widening spectrum of jobs demanded under the “equal opportunities laws” (equal for *women*, that is) so that there are no longer plenty to go round as there were in England from the start of the sixties right up to the commencement of the Thatcher era in the UK.

So let us leave John Lennon aside now, just noting that the feminist controlled media is telling us he is a great hero – when it now on reflection appears that he is *truly* heroic only to feminists, who have taken control of society while men sat around listening to *Sergeant Pepper* and *The White Album* smoking dope.

We find it no coincidence that feministic UK prime minister's wife *Cherie Blair* is caught singing Beatles tunes at public events, such as her famous rendition of *When I'm 64*.

*Mahatma Gandhi* on the other hand, is as far as is known, not a significant artist at all in the accepted sense, nor glamorous and entertaining like Lennon, but was *a great man*, who focussed all his mental powers upon setting his entire nation free, and *mastering himself* in that process.

For example, Gandhi put himself on a hunger strike for many days, until his own people stopped rioting, which nearly resulted in his own death.

That is *real heroism*, played for the ultimate stakes, and because it was done for the sake of his people even at the likely expense of his own life, we surely have to say that makes him a far greater *man* than someone who merely plays a musical instrument and sings well, no matter how poetic, entertaining or influential he may be.

But we see that *modern* society is telling us that John Lennon is the one to worship, and not Mahatma Gandhi – and those under the age of twenty or thirty may well be asking – *who is he anyway?*

The suggestion here is to please check out an encyclopaedia or preferably *Richard Attenborough's* wonderful movie *Gandhi* to find out.

In one sentence, he was a puny little Indian man who in only a few years defeated the entire might of the *British Empire*, the greatest empire the world has ever seen, which at its height, the sun never set upon, so pervasive was it across the globe.



So you will see, that our true male heroes like Gandhi are being effectively written out of history, while we are obliged to worship the “feminist friendly” Lennon and the current mostly egocentric pop and movie stars, who are really no ideal to follow if we wish to have a *civilised and secure society*, in which you and I count just as much as any other human being, rather than these rich and famous celebrities who it is made to seem have a life far more important and significant than we.

Yet surprisingly, few modern males dwell on this disempowerment of us as men, because as will be explained in a later chapter, we are hypnotised into not doing – mainly by the non-stop enticing images of women we are surrounded by twenty-four hours a day – in particular, in the media and on TV.

Even if a man desired never to see a naked woman, now it would be nearly impossible to achieve, because the hypnotic form of the female body is being used to sell everything.

As *Joni Mitchell* sang on her 2002 *Travelogue* album

*Doctors' pills give you brand new ills  
And the bills bury you like an avalanche  
And lawyers haven't been this popular  
Since Robespierre slaughtered half of France!*

*And Indian chiefs with their old beliefs know  
The balance is undone-crazy ions-  
You can feel it out in traffic;  
Everyone hates everyone!*

*And the gas leaks  
And the oil spills  
And sex sells everything*

Typically a TV drama or movie, will have a nude, near nude or sex scene quite early on, to keep us watching through the often boring or mediocre rest of it, in the hope of getting some more of the sexually stimulating images we have already seen.

But by the time we are then hooked on the movie, and it is over, we likely didn't get any more of those juicy scenes, and then they hook us again, just the same way in the next show that appears.

Note, that if we watch carefully, we will be surprised how many of these programs and movies have some sort of feminist or “woman empowering” message in them, such as the well known multi-award winning British TV series of dramas, *Prime Suspect*, showing *Helen Mirren* portraying a woman police chief, long after the path had been blazed by US police series such as *Cagney and Lacey*, which replaced you see, the “male buddy series” *Starsky and Hutch*, and also of course the 1974 *Policewoman* starring *Angie Dickinson*.

Note again, as will be explored later, the hypnotic mechanism here is we as men are given a sexy woman to look at, to keep us interested while we are made to accept the role of women in positions of power or authority which were formerly held *only by men*.

Rest assured, that *in real life*, any woman who gets to the top of these power structures is likely to be a lot less attractive and *feminine* than *Helen Mirren*, but rather a more likely plain *feminist* type, who is busy compensating for her lack of femininity and acceptance by men, by *ambitiously seeking power*.

Note also that we see grants, publishing contracts, and awards going ever more to any dramas, movies, literature or even scientific research that promote *women's empowerment* in one form or another, such as the awful bad taste of the "in your face" *Vagina Monologues*.

And as to this continuing use of sex in the UK, as elsewhere, to hypnotise men whilst *women's empowerment* issues are put forward, because the war for ratings now dominates TV, in which even the theoretically non-commercial BBC are joining in, all the channels are drawn into a battle to see who can get people's attention most by tempting them with the promise or actuality of some naughty, formerly forbidden scenes.

Or alternatively we are hypnotised by images of violence and revenge, which appeal to the macho side of men, and create the *excitement* to keep us hooked.

But let us ask ourselves – why do we get bored? Why do we seek out excitement all the time?

In the many decades and centuries before TV, radio, and computers, a man or woman and child could just sit around contentedly staring into the flames of a fire, and talking quietly or playing simple games.

But we find now that we are *addicted* not only to images of women, but to excitement *per se*.

Watching some movie hero like "environmentally friendly" martial arts expert *Steven Seagal*, knocking seven bells out of the bad guy give us an incredible feeling of *relief*.

But relief from what?

Relief from *feeling like nothing inside, or just a deep anxiety and restlessness from which we need to escape*.

This is not natural.

We should not live our lives based on exciting pastimes, which like say - scuba diving in shark infested waters, driving a car or motorcycle at high speed, bungee jumping, parachuting or flying a *Microlight* plane - are frequently very dangerous pursuits indeed, and are therefore against our clearly dimmed survival instincts.

As this book will explain, we only feel such lack of peace, because most of us have been damaged to a greater or lesser extent – like in John Lennon's aforementioned song – by having an insecure childhood with either a negligent, abusive or too clingy mother, and likely an absent or distant father, and in that psychological malaise we are then taught exciting pastimes – above all of course *sex* – not to cure, but rather to blot out our anxiety and lack of inner peace.

This is happening everyday to countless more male children, and women do not seem to be aware of this or care, and due to our unnatural emotional and sexual dependence upon them, we are not organising and objecting to this as we should.

For example, women will freely buy video games for their male children, in which some children can spend almost all their free time, and then become overweight, rather than playing sports or other traditionally healthier male activities such as the kind of adventurous and life-skill learning pursuits once enjoyed by boy scouts.

Again, the scout movement, which we see promoted confidence, cooperation and camaraderie amongst boys and men, has been decimated by allegations of child abuse, which may be true to some extent one sees, due to perversion developing in abused and disempowered men denied wives – see a later chapter on this.

So it is hoped that this chapter has portrayed sufficiently, the humiliating and degrading imprisoned status of modern man, such that the sane male reader, now realising better the theft of his *natural* status as a searching soul, brave explorer and male hero, will desire to recapture that former glory, and read on.

## Chapter Two – What do women want?

As our goal in self-mastery is above all to make right our relationship with women, we must learn to understand the female gender as best we can.

But this subject is not taught to us at school like reading, writing and arithmetic, but rather with a deafening silence we are left completely untutored, and only with hypnotic little images like in the nursery rhyme:

*What are little girls made of?  
Sugar and spice and all things nice*

And why are we not taught as men the nature of women, as traditional religion – for example, *Proverbs* in the Jewish Old Testament or various sayings in the Muslim *Koran* – once did?

The reason is that this is really a female dominated and controlled society and *they do not want us to know what their real agenda is.*

As the saying and movie title goes:

*the hand that rocks the cradle, rules the world*

and the truth of that is what we see before our eyes.

By the time a girl is in her teens, when a boy is obsessing about sport, video games, acne and the newly developed functioning of his sexual organ, she is reading her teen magazine problem page, and studying hard with her fellow little professor girlfriends about *how to handle him.*

If we men as boys were taught women's true nature, that would put *us* in charge, and *not them.*

But this does not happen, and thus we progress pretty much uneducated and unchanged from the stage of being a girl-obsessed teenager, to a woman-obsessed adult male.

So however old we may be, and however negligent it may have been on the part of society not to educate us, the time to start understanding women *truly* is *now.*

The allegedly great founding fathers of modern psychology, Freud and Jung, did not supply this information to us, and in fact, Freud himself freely confessed his impotence before perhaps the most important question in any man's life:

*What do women want?*

There are really three different answers to that question, which are to a lesser or greater extent in their own way all true.

They are –

- what women *think* they want
- what women *say* they want
- what women *really* want

But it is suggested that the real answer is that *the question* is the wrong one, which is why Freud and Jung could never solve it, as neither has any other widely published psychologist to date.

Because they asked the question - what do women *want*? When the question they really should have been asking is - what do women *need*, and *how should women and men behave jointly in order to provide it for them*?

But right now the first question is the one that is being answered by all the media and so called “experts.” And to put it politely, the answer is - they want *everything*.

The list grows daily, but we can safely assume in alphabetical order it includes –

- *academic* prowess
- outstanding *beauty*
- glittering *career*
- *celebrity* and fame
- talented and gorgeous *children*
- wardrobes full of fashion *clothes*
- physical *fitness* and self-defence skills to “kick male butt” with
- a bevy of *Sex in the City* style *girlfriends*
- all available *health* services including breast enhancement and plastic surgery
- extravagant *holidays* abroad
- a beautiful *home*
- financial and psychological *independence* from men
- a glorious *love* or sequence of exciting marriages or love affairs
- wild *nights out* on the town with guilt free drinking, flirting and maybe drugs
- *riches* and all the status and accessories that can bring
- a never ending adventure of *romance*
- wild passionate and fulfilling *sex* with one or several well trained men *or* women
- at minimum several dozen pairs of fashion *shoes*
- in a surprising number of cases even *spiritual fulfilment*
- and in the absence of that unlikely occurrence, she will settle for just eternal *youth*

So then let's put the next question. What does our hypothetical modern average woman want in a man?

Very simple – obviously, someone who can provide all those things for her, or be as perfect as possible an accessory to a life that includes all those things.

Which in theory makes the ideal man for this hypothetical modern woman a rich and handsome plastic surgeon who lives in Hollywood and turns a blind eye to her many affairs.

And it is no surprise that many dramas and romantic fiction novels have such “heroes” in them, whom all women are supposed to seek and find satisfaction in if they can only capture such a specimen of man.

But taking a reality check, how many male rich and handsome plastic surgeons are there in the entire world?

Not more than a few thousand surely, though if we expand the list of that type of “trophy man”, it goes up to a few million when we throw in all the business tycoons, film stars and directors, pop and sports stars, best selling authors, minor celebrities and very wealthy professionals.

And then there are the rest of us – the nearly three billion men who are not represented by the less than one percent of world population that makes up those elite and privileged classes.

So really we have a situation in which ninety-nine percent of the female population are in theory chasing far less than one percent of all men.

Is it any wonder that the rest of us are upset?

But leaving aside men's more or less legitimate gripes on this matter - what of the fate of the woman herself desiring of such a virtually unattainable man and lifestyle?

As previously stated, we make no apology for quoting liberally from popular culture in this work, because it illustrates the current societal thinking, and is part-and-parcel of the process of mass hypnosis which is going on in our Western culture, and as time goes by, is becoming part of the entire global culture also.

Here we shall quote from the well known *Abba* song, *Money, Money, Money*.

The lyrics are not complete, but it is suggested that one reads this as a woman's “personal statement”, rather than as a song, and take in the literal meaning of the words:

*I work all night, I work all day,  
To pill the bills I have to pay,  
Ain't it sad?*

*I have a dream, I have a plan  
If I can find me a wealthy man,  
I wouldn't have to work at all  
I'd fool around and have a ball*

*Money, money, money,  
(it) Must be funny  
Living in a rich man's world*

*Money, money, money  
Always sunny  
Living in a rich man's world  
Aaaaaaaaah – all the things I could do  
If I had a little money  
It's a rich man's world*

*A man like that is hard to find,  
But I can't get him off my mind.  
Ain't it sad?*

*Even if he happened to be free,  
He probably wouldn't fancy me...  
That's too bad.*

*So I must leave, and I must go,  
To Las Vegas or Monaco,  
And win a fortune in a game,  
My life will never be the same...*

So this song is portraying the *Barbara Cartland* or *Danielle Steele* type fantasy with which we are all familiar, of the glamorous rich and powerful man who is supposedly sought out by the vast majority of the female of the species.

Of course, statistically speaking, ninety-nine percent of women can never get such a man, but that doesn't stop them dreaming, and therefore, being dissatisfied with the man they actually get – *us*.

So the next time we stop to admire the pretty singing duo on an Abba video and hum the catchy tune, please let us consider that this undeniable talented pop group has become rich, fulfilling for *them* the fantasy of the song which is utterly unattainable for the rest of us, on the back of at least one hit which has helped hypnotise girls and women into seeking an unattainable ideal of men, and therefore being dissatisfied with what they eventually are obliged to accept – i.e. *us - the average man*.

Of course Abba are only a small part of the whole culture, and should not be singled out as deserving any special criticism, and their subsequent somewhat disappointing personal private lives – if the news reports are to be believed – are a measure of the truth that the dream their song portrays, which *they* have actually lived out in reality, is in most cases a hollow one.

That is – the personal lives of the rich are no more happy or secure than those of the poor – *they just have better props*.

But the paradigm in general which is being encouraged, is that of the worship of rich, celebrity men, at the social and psychological expense of the rest, which is of course the vast majority of men.

That is – we Indians down here – who do all the dirty work and go through all the agony, while the big chiefs of politics, business and media sit on their thrones, womanising with their secretaries, junior employees, employees' wives and daughters and prostitutes, and bossing the rest of us around and feeling important.

So what's wrong with all that? It's "survival of the fittest" isn't it? "Nice guys finish last", don't they? That's just "the way of the world and things will never change." Surely we should just stop moaning about the status quo and "get a life" and "learn to deal with it"? Or even some may ask "are you some kind of a Commie sympathiser?"

All the above phrases are in fact hypnotic suggestions, each if we examine them one by one based on some particular ideology or world view which we are bullied into accepting, but which in itself doesn't necessarily have any conclusive evidence or reality behind it.

The main thesis of this book, is that women should turn away from the ideological prison of the Barbara Cartland or Danielle Steele novel, which tells them that happiness is only available with a tall, dark, handsome, rich and powerful celebrity, or on the other hand, the mindset of the *Cosmopolitan* reader and *Sex in the City* fan, which tells them that life is a series of sexual adventures amidst an effort to find a likely hopeless and unattainable "true love", and have gloriously beautiful and talented children while holding down a super-powered, internationally visible career.

The principal fictional "heroine" of that TV series, *Carrie Bradshaw*, we are told "knows good sex", but she never really gets the suave, sophisticated and rich romantic hero, *Mr Big*, who goes off and marries some submissive young dolly bird, leaving her permanently in an emotional and philosophical conflict.

Her conclusion really, is that intelligent women with minds of their own aren't happy, because *they aren't meant to be*. That's what her experience tells her, and that solution is the best she can do. But *this* book has quite another solution, both for such a woman and the man who would be her king, which seems far brighter.

The suggestion for women's own ultimate happiness, is that they should turn to the things they *need*, rather than what they have now been miseducated and hypnotised into egotistically *wanting*, and that such an honest view of reality, themselves and society, is the only possible route to a happiness with themselves and the men in their life, which is based on peace, respect for all and security, instead of the destructively competitive pursuit of glamour, gratuitous wealth and sex, which is in fact causing personal and collective global chaos.

But this book does not stop there. It goes further in expressing that most women are not going to take this path of their free choice.



Because of the mass hypnosis which has been conducted in society, especially during the era of “feminism” and so called “women’s liberation” during the last forty or fifty years, they are going to fight tooth and claw against anyone who tries to stop them enjoying their vain and egotistical pursuits, which as this work will explain, can ultimately only lead to misery and disaster for themselves, their children, and the end of the world as we know it in any valuable and worthwhile form.

So though not forbidden to women, this is a book mainly for men, because as women are lost, they are generally not going to rescue themselves.

We men are going to have to rescue them without their permission – we are going to have to so to speak “save them from themselves.”

Whereas right now, they are engaged almost in the full time occupation of destruction of what is left of value in the male sex, as well as what is best in their own.

To put it simply, and no doubt in objectionable terms for those of a feminist persuasion and their male puppets, if *Robin Hood* is risking his life to save *Maid Marion* whom he loves, she should not turn round and tip off *the Sheriff of Nottingham* and see that brave Robin goes to the gallows, which is effectively what modern women are doing to the few men remaining who would try to rescue them.

But alas, the problem can no longer be solved on the level of bows and arrows, and other deeds of “derring do” (not to rule such acts out entirely however) but has mainly if not completely to be solved on *the psychological level*, or even arguably on the “spiritual level”, depending how we define and regard that term.

This book is really the first and hopefully only required volume to initiate a training program for men across the world to understand and learn to master women – it is one might say, a training course to become *a warrior or Bruce Lee of the soul*.

The problem in this endeavour is that most men start out as innocent, simple, trusting souls, whereas by comparison, even by her teenage years, the average woman is a complicated, largely unpredictable mass of emotions, deceptions, fantasies, tease and stealth, which at least partly accounts for the fear that men have of women in general, and more or less wholly for their consequent defeat and subjugation in the vast majority of close relationships with members of the opposite sex.

So men have to become not merely “street-wise”, but “woman-wise”, and each man must study like a professor the complex gender he is dealing with, and know all its tactics and moves, just as we see the young girl with her teen magazines has already been studying the moves of the boy.

To those male or unwitting female readers who howl – “hang on, this is the modern era – the battle of the sexes is no more, where is the equality?”

The answer to them is that equality between men and women has never existed, is not possible, and in fact, women themselves have proven that, because now they are winning the “battle of the sexes” conclusively – progressively taking all the jobs, power and respect from men, and according it to themselves, as subsequent chapters of this book will clearly demonstrate.

The average modern woman's idea of “equality” is – having all the advantages of being a man, *whilst retaining all the privileges of being a woman.*

As one rare honest women remarked to another “I have my *double standards* to keep up, you know, my dear.”

Of course, there are countless of *Esther Vilar's* manipulated men in society now, who are so brainwashed by the feminist culture, that they have completely surrendered their male identity and power, and in fact take their feeling of pride and security from being the faithful and dominated slave of one or more women, both in their personal and working lives.

For them, no doubt this work will seem some kind of iconoclastic heresy, knocking down the images of the revered goddesses whose boots they enthusiastically lick, as they waste their pathetic and tragic lives in the service of egocentric and beastly women, who derive their happiness from sucking the life out of the souls of men.

A man who is content to live like a soulless dog, burying bones and fetching sticks for his mistress owner, and is happy to salivate in her presence and satisfy himself on her body as all dogs do, will not of course see there is anything wrong with his life, or how his woman treats him.

This book is therefore intended only for “real men”, and a real man is not according to the thesis of this book merely someone who works out down the gym, is good at punching other guys, and imagines himself a dab hand at DIY and fixing cars – but a man with a mind of his own, who *thinks for himself, makes decisions for himself, and is master of his own life and in his own home.*

Examples throughout history of real men – *Christ, Buddha, Mahatma Gandhi, Mohammed, Moses, Lao Tzu, Beethoven, Leonardo Da Vinci*, the fictional character of *Kwai Chang Caine* in the seventies TV series *Kung Fu*, and the like.

*Real men* according to this definition do not “follow the party line”, do not mindlessly conform, do not even avoid pain and suffering if it's necessary to endure to be true to themselves and their principles and ideals.

Above all they think and act for themselves, without having a woman controlling all their actions like a puppet on a string, and whose bosom they cry upon like a baby in their hour of need.

So as *Clint Eastwood* might say in asking the question – “do you think for yourself?”....

“Well . . .do you . . . *punk?*”

Real men will take that last statement as the joke it was intended to be and laugh or smile, whilst their emasculated feminist-brainwashed counterparts will take the typically feminine strategy of placing petty labels and accusations on the author.

It is usually a very clear indicator of the feministic influenced man or woman that they lack any kind of genuine sense of humour, and have a sick, judgemental and cynical mentality which functions on intolerance, and lacks any real sense of perspective and proportion.

So by now you will know which kind of man you are, or *wish to be*, and whether it is worth your while reading on.

### **Chapter Three – Identity Theft – the stealing of the male identity**

It has never been easy to be a man, but we don't hear much about this issue, amongst the never ending clamour for more jobs and opportunities and healthcare for women, and nursery places and "childcare" for them to neglect their children in while they hold down meaningless and trouble causing careers.

But let's be fair. Many women are forced to work by having chosen useless, unreliable men to have children with, and many women are also doing valuable jobs in society as teachers, doctors, nurses and the like.

This book is not an attack on women *per se* – but on the feministic based social structure that has brainwashed them into desires, and empowered them with rights and wants they don't actually *need*, and all this at the expense of their own sanity, and the lives of their children and men.

For example, a woman may think it is great when she beats a man at her workplace in the promotion race.

But will she think it is so great when her son grows up to be beaten by somebody else's wife or daughter and maybe even commits suicide because he cannot cope with the loss of identity and role in society thereby caused?

Let us be realistic and honest.

Most of us would like a glittering career – to be a musical, acting or sports star or have a well paid and respected professional job, but for at least seventy-five to ninety percent of the population, those are not the jobs on offer.

We see this "go getting" agenda particularly with immigrant cultures all over the world.

Lacking the natural acceptance and respect that members of an indigenous population receive, just for being born as the majority race or culture in that country, they are driven to seek a status which by nature they frequently are not suited for.

That is, an immigrant who in his native country would have been accepted and content to be a farmer or a shoemaker, comes to a major Western country and is immensely pressurized by his family to become a professional person – such as a doctor, lawyer, etc. - so that his family can glow with pride.

Let us be clear – we are not questioning the right of talented immigrants to do jobs they are capable of and suited to do, but if the pressure to be accepted in a non-native country makes people enter occupations they later prove to be incapable of due to lacking the necessary talent and personal qualities required, they will inevitable be to a greater or lesser degree incompetent in those occupations, and therefore a danger both to the integrity of their profession, and to the population in general.

Of course this logic applies many times to female immigrants also, but we shall not surrender to the ridiculous nonsense of saying “he or she” throughout this work, in order to satisfy some feminist paranoia or brainwashing program, or worse, even adopt the “she” of the “female supremacists” in preference to “he” in the text.

If women don't like men and consider them an inferior species (i.e. gender), that's their right and choice as theoretically freethinking human beings. But in that case, it is also men's right to view women in the same way if they please!

Anything else is obviously *dictatorship* and *tyranny*.

But it will be argued elsewhere in this book that there are sound biological and social reasons why, *generally speaking*, men should take a leading role in external society more so than women, which again, will no doubt have the feminist influenced women and their male slaves howling like those aliens in the movie, *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*, when they spot a human that hasn't yet been subsumed and had their body and mind made totally subservient to the alien race.

Because that is what is happening in truth.

*David Icke* suggests it is some kind of a lizard consciousness from another dimension which has invaded the human race, but what is certain is that there is an unholy spirit of contempt, disobedience and disrespect spread throughout society which is causing havoc on the whole planet, wherever it is coming from.

The point is – we do not necessarily need to know where it originated from, because like any other infectious disease, once out of the bag it's too late for that, and the issues are - can we stop it, can we immunize against it, or cure those who are already sick and in its grasp?

But the main “snatching” we have to be concerned with right now, is not of physical bodies, but of “spiritual” or “psychic” identities. In particular, the loss of male identity and the consequent confusion between the concepts of male and female.

Many modern women think that to get their children in touch with “their feminine side” is a very desirable thing – *the Billy Elliot syndrome* - and that boys and men should possess sensitivity, thoughtfulness and artistic capacity is of course part of what the current thesis's concept of a real man should be.

But surely that is only acceptable when not at the expense of the traditionally masculine traits which are required to get him through life in general in one piece.

That is – a boy who is *incapable* of athletic and sporting pursuits is really only half a male, not that girls or women should be incapable in that respect either. But in men it is especially important, because despite this so called “civilised society”, for the foreseeable future, men may always be called upon to physically defend their female partners and children in times of crisis, or threat from the aggressive and low minded.

It is not necessary to list in detail the many incidents of men having to carry out such acts of physical courage, sometimes even at the expense of their lives, but again, we see that this is a topic which is ignored by those who would seek to feminize men, and divest them of their inherent masculine attributes.

Simultaneous to this denuding of a man's masculinity, we see the rising of an aggressive type of female – the “girl power” phenomenon – who sees the threat or actual use of violence as a legitimate tool in her social functioning.

Girls are now operating in packs, as only boys used to do, to bully other girls, and this kind of behaviour is encouraged – amongst other things – by the immensely popular TV series about women prisoners, perhaps the first major offender of which was the Australian TV drama series *Prisoner Cell Block H*.

At this stage in the argument, it is only necessary to point out that such series depict behaviour that is not only unladylike – a concept which obviously washes little with the hardened feminists – but is simply *not civilised*.

Such TV shows are virtually educational training videos for apprentice female bullies, and until the media chiefs are honest enough to recognise this, no doubt they will continue to show such shockingly bad examples of female behaviour, in their never ending search for ratings.

In their currently unlikely search for honesty, they should therefore acknowledge that they are directly responsible for packs of girls going out on Friday or Saturday night binge drinking sessions and getting in fights, and gangs of girls in school acting out the same prison bullying scenarios on sensitive young girls who may end up committing suicide, unable to cope with the savage and unchecked cruelty towards them.

So clearly, there are strong reasons for protecting the traditional female role – i.e. *kind, caring, protective, non-aggressive* – that have apparently not crossed the minds of the media chiefs and moguls who assault our senses and sensibilities with this rating chasing violent and malevolent trash.

It's a very simple concept after all – how do we get a big crowd to gather in the playground? Easy – stage a fight, and they all crowd round in a big circle to urge on the strong and violent one to punch and kick the living daylights out of the weaker one.

It sells tickets, puts “bottoms on seats” as they like to say – but surely we can't call it civilisation, any more than we could call the Roman society that put on slave gladiatorial fights to the death for public titillation, the same?

So dear TV chiefs and movie makers – if you want to use people's savage emotions to profit from, fine, go right ahead, but do not think of yourself as a civilised human being in that process of exploitation for financial gain and status of the lowest, most animalistic qualities in man *and woman*.

And further, we say to you, as this violent culture spreads further and further *no one is safe*. One day it will be you, or your son or daughter who meets some malevolent maniac out there, who has been created and hypnotically programmed by the media culture into deriving their sense of identity only from dominating, torturing and beating others to a pulp.

We see this same aggressive female behaviour portrayed in all kinds of scenarios such as a well known TV car advert, in which a man is thrown by a woman through an upper floor window into a swimming pool (no doubt the *real* feminists would have preferred an empty one) for borrowing his woman's car without permission.

In yet another car advert, is depicted a window cleaner who loses his grip on a ladder, and the fashionable lady in the window cries "hang on" – as if to run to his rescue. But to his horror he soon discovers that she is only concerned that he might fall on her lovely, shiny new car, and simply moves it out of the way and leaves him dangling.

Is this supposed to be funny?

Clearly only to a sick mind.

Would it be funny if it was reversed, and it was the woman who was thrown out the window or left dangling awaiting a fall to her death?

Clearly, only to an equally sick mind.

And this is the whole point. This feminist man-humiliating concept is coming from a sick mind – a mind which is jealous and vengeful. A mind that doesn't know about love - i.e. the good Samaritan type feeling for one's fellow human being, regardless of gender, race or any other factor.

Another example was an incident reported by British TV presenter Richard Madeley (of *Richard and Judy* fame), who for no reason he could understand, was when off camera, accosted by the most foul-mouthed abuse from a well known and apparently otherwise articulate and well-educated leading feminist authoress and icon.

Why? Simply *because he was a man*, who dared to speak his mind, and have an opinion of his own.

That he, a mere man, dared to criticise and question this icon of feminism, just as he would do any other interview guest, challenged her clearly fragile sense of self and triggered off her obviously extremely deeply rooted hatred of the male gender to the degree that he had abuse lashed upon him, justifiable to an average woman only in the case of some extreme act such as rape or molestation of her children.

So it is clear that in the case of these extreme feminists – who though only a small minority of women, are leading the rest of potentially decent women into a destructive rebellion against all that is good – we are dealing with people who are really very mentally damaged, and unbalanced.

They wish to not only deny the male the right to be male, but his right even to speak and think his own thoughts.

This is tyranny of the most extreme kind, equivalent to or even worse than anything that happened in the Nazi death camps – that is, the Jews and others deemed “undesirable” may have been tortured and murdered, but there was no attempt to steal their *minds* and *souls*.

We are witnessing a very real, comprehensive and aggressive war on the male of the species, led by a few man-hating feminist maniacs, who by taking undue precedence in the modern global media, have encouraged most of the entire female population to follow them in this war and rebellion to a greater or lesser extent.

And where is this war fought?

It is fought in every home, in every living room, in every office and workplace, in every bar, in every newsroom, in every college or university, and every other human institution and social gathering place.

Consider the lyric from the cleverly penned *Democracy* by renowned singer-songwriter and poet *Leonard Cohen*:

*the homicidal bitchin',  
that goes down in every kitchen,  
to determine who will serve,  
and who will eat.*

Equality is obviously an illusion, because if men and women could agree to be equal, surely there could be no “battle of the sexes”, no war?

So let no man imagine he is free from this war. And let him rest assured also, there will be no peace, until each man takes up this battle willingly, and the war is decisively won.

But be clear, this war is not against women in general, it is not to be fought against individual women in an angry and hostile way.

It is against those in authority and influence who would seek to destroy and pervert the natural love between woman and man, and between man, woman and child, which is at the heart of a proper family, and ultimately, must be at the heart of any orderly and civilised world.



## **Chapter Four – The Sexual Enslavement of Men Masquerading as Freedom**

We are all men here, aren't we? So let's have a "man to man" talk about sex. But not of the kind you have ever had before, we would suggest.

Just the mere mention of the word sends a hypnotic shock through us, and hopefully still causes uncertain youths to blush with embarrassment.

But seeing our embarrassment then they laugh at us, don't they?

They don't want us to be irresponsible - so they *say* - and "sow wild oats", but when as young or even not so young males, we express or in some way show our insecurity, inexperience or confusion about sex, we are mocked, made to be objects of fun by them.

And who are *they*? Other men perhaps, or the boys at school?

But that other men mock us is not so bad, we can live with that, we know most of them are lying about their own sexual successes and failures and hang-ups anyway.

But surely one hundred times worse, is when we are mocked for our lack of experience or prowess, or embarrassment or confusion by our mothers, sisters, girlfriends, wives, female colleagues, or other women or girls, who really ought to know better not to do that, but far too often do not.

For thereby we are driven out of ego-defence to become sexually experienced and proud of our sexual nature, or at the very least, pretend that we are.

Traditionally – that is before the 1960s – women or girls who had sex outside of marriage were seen as deserving of shame, whereas males who managed that same feat were regarded by their fellows as "lucky guys" and worthy of esteem.

Well that obviously was not good for the prospects of a civilised society either, because it sooner or later left the girl or woman with the sorry choice of having an illegal or covert and dangerous abortion, or perhaps otherwise be forced to live shamefully and on charity with an "illegitimate" son or daughter.

So really, if the man refused to "do the right thing" and marry her, or could even be forced in to it - *a la so called "shotgun wedding"* - it was a very cruel price to inflict upon a woman or girl to give him his feeling of ego-confidence and full membership of male society.

So can women check their "double standards" on this issue please?

That is - if you humiliate men in general for their lack of sexual experience, or even performance, they are going to be driven to use and abuse other women in their quest for self-respect.

In fact, because obtaining sex from women has become a measure of a man's esteem in general - "go on, he's a lad!" - this general value judgement placed on sex experience is driving men to seek sex prematurely, with multiple partners, and in other ways which have destructive consequences for themselves and the society in general.

But as this is in theory a message to men, let us address men's perspective on this hottest of topics.

Almost certainly by the age of eleven or twelve, or at the latest thirteen, a boy will have had his first erection. It comes to him as a total shock. He suddenly has an ability he didn't have before - to have sexual pleasure, and, in cooperation with a female partner, to cause babies to be born.

Women should not underestimate the fact that this first experience of sexual stirring and later of orgasm is probably the most unexpected and shocking development in a man's entire life.

He certainly didn't ask for it.

Like a young woman's monthly cycle, the ability to have erection is simply there one day, whether he likes it or not, with all the consequences that such an attribute entails.

And in that process, simultaneously, the irritating and silly girl across the road or in the playground suddenly becomes an object of utter fascination and to be approached with trepidation.

If there is no social framework or regulation to stop him, he will go on experimenting with this facility and interest until he manages orgasm, or even sex with a woman or girl. And if that happens too soon, he is likely to experience various consequences, most of them negative.

Since at least ninety-five percent of men will not see anything negative about having sexual experience at an early age, here it is necessary to introduce an age old theory of yoga, which if true, changes the whole picture on that issue.

Since ancient times, it has been believed that celibacy or at least, sexual restraint, can lead to higher powers of the mind, and has been considered important, if not essential for spiritual development.

Millions of yoga practitioners in India for example have practiced sexual restraint or celibacy for thousands of years for this reason.

With our modern scientific minds we might write this theory off as some myth of antiquity, but we also have modern scientific explorers such as *William Reich* postulating an energy in the body which is essentially of a sexual nature, and many modern psychologists have believed that suppression of sexual energy could lead to enhanced creativity - the so called "sublimation effect."

Since the 1970s in particular we have yoga and kundalini author Gopi Krishna saying exactly this based on his own experience in modern times.

He goes a step further however, and alleges that the sexual energy when transmuted can actually evolve the finer structures of the brain leading to increased creativity and higher states of consciousness.

Further, he alleges that the same sex energy when not overused for sexual pleasure or reproduction, is absorbed back into the bloodstream and helps to regenerate and rejuvenate the body and brain generally speaking.

Supposing this theory is correct, that would suggest that by overusing the sex energy, or by as children, having onset of sexual activity too early, we could produce various catastrophic effects on our mind and body.

Firstly, we could hinder the development of our brain and nervous system, and thereby stunt our intellectual and creative growth.

Or secondly, even if we make it through adolescence more or less intact, we could flatten our intellectual, creative and physical batteries by having too much sex over a period of time.

Could this be the reason that great artists, writers and musicians so often seem to have such a short period of outstanding creativity?

A brief golden spell, lasting maybe a few years, or even only a "one hit wonder", and then their success brings so much sexual opportunity which they take, that their brain deteriorates ever so slightly, and they lose the fine edge of brilliance which formerly set them apart from the rest, and they descend into relative mediocrity in their later works.

A study of the lives of many great scientists and artists of all types will show that a larger than seems commensurate proportion do their finest work in their youth, and then deteriorate into mediocrity and make no major breakthroughs or works of genius thereafter.

For example, has *Paul McCartney* really created anything as great since his Beatles days, to name but one of many?

Some fine work yes, but has he really done another *Yesterday*, or an *Eleanor Rigby* or a *Hello Goodbye* or *Penny Lane*? The list of those early works of *genius*, goes on and on and space does not permit mentioning more.

Has *Stephen Hawking* done anything earth shattering since his halcyon days of challenging and embarrassing his professors? Not really – now *he* himself is the scientific establishment, waiting to be challenged by the brilliance of some other upcoming youth.

And then lastly, we have to look at the ageing process and disease.

Why do some people so young catch cancer yet others apparently experiencing the same lifestyle do not?

Or why do the relatively young now get multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's or other degenerative diseases, heart problems, or just prematurely succumb to becoming mentally and physically feeble, old looking and worn out?

Is it because due to overuse of our sex organs, the sublimated sexual energy formerly available by sexual moderation is not there to repair and rejuvenate us in our time of need, as the yoga theory according to Gopi Krishna, for one, suggests?

Let's not draw any hard conclusions here, but let's be aware of the general theory.

The link between sexual excess and mental illness is already well documented. That implies having a lot of sex is definitely doing something serious to the brain, or else there is some deterioration of the brain that is causing people to be very overactive in sex.

It is somewhat a chicken and egg problem – but let's put it differently – suppose we had a car with a medium sized engine and we insisted on throttling it flat out day after day.

How long would it be before something burned out?

There is virtually no known publicised research on how the varieties and degrees of sex activity and behaviour affect the brain, but we know for sure that at the very least it tires us out.

Many men routinely go unconscious after a powerful orgasm, and we can assume the same depletion of energy applies also to a large extent to women who indulge in frantic sex activity. So at the least, to put it politely, we are "worn out."

The same is true of drugs.

One day we have some drug like alcohol, or some other currently illegal stimulant, and we find that the next day, we have to have more to get the same effect. The day after that we need even more and get still less effect.

Whilst this is not always so noticeable in early youth, it becomes more and more so with advancing years.

Our general mood and efficiency goes down until we stay clear of the drug in question for a few days. The same is true of sex. We may well feel good afterwards, relaxed and satisfied, but what has it done to our abilities in general?

Perhaps we were working on a great piece of scientific research or music composition, artwork or novel, but whatever subtle acrobatics we had to do in the dark caverns of our mind to make it a work of genius, we just can't quite perform any more – the burning, laser-like energy that melts hard problems to dust is just not there any more, because we burnt our supersensitive circuitry and batteries out without noticing, in a heavy bout of sex.

Or perhaps we are a sports person, in the *Wimbledon* or *US Open* final, and at that critical moment, we miscalculate the winning shot and are defeated, also due to lack of mental energy which we have used up in the sex act.

And there is a clear fact – we simply don't enjoy anything, including sex, if we do it too many times repeatedly. That tells us there is definitely some circuitry or energy in our brains which gets depleted, such that the nerves stop registering sensation to the same degree, which is then reported to us as diminishing pleasure, that in time can turn even to pain.

So this preamble is not to give any definite proof other than to put a very serious question.

Just what does a powerful orgasm do to our body and brain?

And given that sex is for most of the population unavoidable at least now and then, what are the consequences of having the kind of gratuitous obsessive sex life that the media are currently urging us to perform, and the women in our lives are encouraging us to believe is a good thing?

But let us get to the motion of this chapter's debate – we are being told – *you've never had it so good*. Sex is *good*, sex is *available*, and the more sex we have *the better*.

Whilst if Gopi Krishna is right, in excess it might just be leading to the destruction of the finer faculties of our mind, and therefore prospects in life, or even worse, to mental illness, to premature ageing, degenerative diseases, and death.

This chapter is not meant to be alarmist, but for someone who has well overslept, alarm bells are unfortunately necessary.

It is just suggesting – Mister Smith goes to a bar two or three times a week and has an enjoyable drink. It doesn't damage his health much, since he doesn't drink to great excess and leaves several alcohol free days for his body to recover.

On the other hand, Mister Jones goes to the bar every night and gets so drunk he can hardly walk home. A few years or decades of that, and he is going to be fat, prematurely aged, have a bad liver and kidneys, forgetful, mentally stunted, and maybe even dead.

The point is that we are in our sex activity being encouraged to be like Mister Jones - and nobody, no doctor or psychologist or hardly even a religious figure any more, is telling us to do a single thing to stop it, and take a sensible moderation in this activity, like Mister Smith's moderate and sensible drinking.

But part of the reason no one tells us, is that even if they did, we wouldn't likely stop, because sex is being used by us not just to satisfy our genuine instinctual and natural urges, but to satisfy an ego need, to blot out mental anxiety and pain.

If we consider ourselves as evolutionary creatures, we have obviously got this far due to a biologically superior mode of behaviour. For example, the animals in general only mate in season, but we mate all year round.

However, we are having our sexual nature artificially stimulated by the media, by images and ideas of sex in advertising, TV and film drama, literature, by the progressively more enticing and revealing dress and behaviour of women in public places, and finally by pornography.

On a recent TV chat show, witty *Maureen Lipman* remarked following the new trend of women exposing their bottoms in public by wearing low slung jeans and thongs – “if you think about it there's only one part left to show - and *it won't be long now.*”

In a sense, surprisingly the more subversive forms of stimulation of men's sexual nature are not by overt pornography, which is not freely available, and has to be sought out by men by a deliberate act and often precarious route.

Some might say pornography *is* now freely available on the Internet, but for all one knows one may be monitored in that process, both by the authorities, and even possibly by one's family and wife, making it still a dubious route for a “respectable man” to sexual relief.

But regardless of the risks for the male user of Internet pornography, the more dangerous stimulation of this sexual nature is the *real life* twenty-four hour process of enticement that goes on to hypnotise him into sexual thoughts.

The girl on the bus, who crosses her legs and exposes her stocking tops, or the shop windows which display models in skimpy teasing underwear, the lady in the office who dresses sexily to control men and further her career, and the TV adverts which constantly use enticing images of women, are really hypnotic subliminal messages to keep men forever thinking about women and sex.

One tires of feminist influenced psychologists forever remarking – *the average man thinks about sex every fifteen seconds* - or whatever it is currently supposed to be.

What sheer nonsense!

The average man can go for hours and sometimes days or weeks without giving it a thought, lost in his work or hobbies of sport, science, fixing cars, art, music, martial arts, or whatever else takes his fancy, without one single sexual thought crossing his mind *until he sees a woman or image of a woman*.

This is the kind of diabolical misinformation that is put around about man to dehumanise him, as if he were some animal or dog with his "tail" permanently up.

The thinking you see, is that if women can make out a convincing image of *man as animal*, that entitles them to treat him like one, and there are some very serious attempts to do this going on, under the mask of "science."

This statement of the typical university trained female psychologist, and even many male ones, is only true to the extent that men are being *deliberately* targeted with sexual images all the time, unless they stay locked in their rooms with the blinds drawn and their computer and television screen permanently switched off.

And why is this happening? Answer – for commercial reasons obviously, but also *because women want it to*.

Many women are against pornography, so they say, but why are they not against this subversive use of sexual tease, which all day long is inflicted on men?

If we trail a big juicy piece of meat behind us on a string as we walk down a street, is it any surprise if when we turn round there is a big pack of dogs behind us, salivating at the mouth and ready to dig in?

There are many women's action groups who are campaigning against rape, but have they not considered that *the best and most successful* route to that goal, would be to stop supercharging the sex desire of boys and men all day long with sexual images and fantasies in the media, and the public teasing that goes on in every city street, shop and workplace by women's needlessly provocative behaviour and dress?

Likewise, the "wisdom" *in the current society* of mixed-sex *secondary* schools needs to be questioned, as not only is this probably detrimental to academic studies during adolescence – *particularly of boys* – but that in the UK we have had several women teachers raped by school aged boys, which could never have happened if there were all male schools taught *only* by men, and all female schools taught *only* by women teachers.

And it seems worth pointing out that in any single sex schools still existing any place in the world, surely any woman who chooses to work in an all male school, knows that she will become an objective of sexual fantasy by almost all her male pupils, and then perhaps a victim of molestation or attack by the small number unable to control themselves, which obviously is therefore not a good idea.

Equally, the male teacher entering a teenage mixed or girls only school, is similarly asking for trouble, as immortalized in real life ex-school teacher *Sting's* first hand interpretation of this phenomenon - *Don't Stand So Close To Me*.

Men are born with a biological nature which at adolescence sprouts into desires that they did not ask for and cannot fully control. This fact must be acknowledged, and men and boys must be protected from undue stimulation of this aspect of their being.

Why?

Firstly, quite simply, because men *do not want* to be stimulated sexually all day long.

Sometimes, they just want to have peace - they want to play golf, or have a beer with their friends, or look through their telescope at the starry sky, or play on their guitar, or a thousand other things which bring them a joy, apart from that which a woman and sexual activity can bring.

If a man doesn't do those other things, he becomes a dull uninteresting, underdeveloped, lazy, sex-crazed creature. Not anyone who is really of great value to himself or his woman or children, or the world in general.

And secondly, because by filling the atmosphere with sexual signals, bombarding men with teases, his sexual nature is being stimulated to a point where he is going to do something destructive with it, which he would probably rather not, and his woman and women in general will probably regret.

He may use prostitutes, or seduce his secretary, he may in a reckless off-guard moment molest or have unprotected sex with some willing, malevolent, or merely lonely women with a deadly disease such as AIDS, and then his whole life as he knew it will be over. *That* is how dangerous sex in the modern world can be.

He might not even know he has such a disease, and he might then give it to his girlfriend or wife who might then even pass it onto her unborn children unawares.

For the ladies who have been brave enough to read thus far – think please, think, what you are causing men to do! The danger you are putting them and yourself in!

At the rate medicine appears to be moving it may take decades to cure AIDS if such a cure is even possible, which nobody really knows. And even if they do, who is to say something else will not appear even worse?

Why do these sexually transmitted diseases exist? Does it not seem perhaps even that Nature for some reason wants things this way, with AIDS and all the other horrific kaleidoscope of sexually transmitted diseases?



We can only offer a theory, though it is again supported by ages of yoga and other spiritual scriptures – Gopi Krishna's work in particular – and imagined by even atheistic science fiction writers and philosophers.

Nature is trying with man and woman – the human species – to produce a fantastic being, a super being, who will one day perhaps have the powers of *Steven Spielberg's ET*, but hopefully will be a lot more aesthetically pleasing to the eye.

Of course, Darwinists and suchlike will say, Nature has no plan, all is random and purposeless. But the *fact* is we are the most evolved species on the planet, the one that creates fabulous works of art and science, and successfully fires a rocket ship to the moon.

And then scientists also say millions of years ago there were first only plants, and then mere one celled animals, like amoeba, but only millions of years later did Nature produce the higher animals and man.

So there appears to any fool, to be an obvious movement of life to increasing complexity and power of brain and creativity. So then the question surely is: *are we the end of evolution or is there something further?*

And the appearance of geniuses and prophets, seems to suggest that there is something further, except to those who in their egotism imagine their could never be anything anywhere in the universe greater than us, as the vast mass of us currently are – often little above any other member of the animal kingdom in our behaviour and appetites.

It was however a recurring theme in episodes of *Star Trek* for example, to suppose that the most evolved life forms had become as pure energy and able to transform themselves and matter into any shape at will, which incidentally is what is claimed as the achievement of some advanced and saintly yogis, in certain religious or spiritual traditions.

But where the sexual disease may fit into this *plan of Nature*, which the feminists don't understand, is that when a being becomes more evolved, it needs a much longer nurturing period, as pointed out by *J Bronowski* in his famous book and TV series, *The Ascent of Man*, in a chapter entitled *The Long Childhood*.

Man takes far longer to grow to independence and maturity than any other living creature of which we know.

What is the reason for this? It is *the extraordinary development of his brain*. This fabulous organ, which has made man superior to all the other animals, and so dominant on the planet, he could even destroy its surface almost completely if he willed, is the jewel in the crown of the human animal.

We only grow to sexual maturity at around ten to fourteen years old, and only become fully finished adults at around sixteen to twenty one, a time when most other animals such as dogs or horses would be considered in their old age.

And as any doctor knows, the growing or developing stage of any bodily organ, limb or other formation is the crucial state when the growth will proceed rightly or wrongly, just as with the child in the womb.

So this suggests to common sense that beings whose bodies are still in a state of such rapid growth and development – including their brain – need to be handled with a lot of caution and care.

This would suggest that to be protected and nurtured as much as humanly possible during this delicate growth period, at least until adolescence when real independence is gained, is a definite evolutionary asset, that is, in simple terms is required for the physical and mental development of a healthy adult.

So the sexually transmitted diseases may actually be a device from nature, which kills off or makes “pariahs” out of those members of the species who attempt by infidelity to destroy the protective family unit – which as throughout the aeons always needed a man to physically protect it, and in many cases *still does* – to ensure that this evolving new life form grows to its best potential.

The woman who runs off to the office, leaving her child to some childminder, or gives it a door key to take care of itself at an early age while she is off elsewhere, is obviously not fulfilling this kind of protective nurturing role to the required degree.

So on the one hand, in man we have this trapped, relatively powerless, doomed animalistic creature, addicted to sex, dominated by women, with only disease, old age and death to look forward to.

Or on the other hand, we have an evolving purposeful being whose destiny is an expanded consciousness, maybe psychic powers and some sort of extra-terrestrial or spiritual life.

But the dominant and leading women on this planet, whose main concern appears to be the acquisition of worthless sparkly baubles, the social standing of celebrity, vanity of beauty or of intellect, wish us men to be only emotionally and sexually enslaved to them, such that we are obedient little servants who go out and work themselves to death, frequently doing jobs which humiliate us and we hate, in order to help them buy their wardrobes full of clothes and shoes and finance extravagant holidays abroad, in return for them waiting teasingly in our beds to give us our sexual rewards when we arrive home - *should we still have the energy* – just like a trained animal, one of *Pavlov's* most docile and obedient dogs.

And do we men call that freedom?

Surely, if we have any fragment of sanity and self-respect left, we certainly do not.

For such a perspective on the life of men which so many of the female population now seem to hold as justifiable and “appropriate” is utterly dehumanising, it is making a pet animal out of a searching, sensitive being, who if not *abused*, one day might become a god.

But then you see, we would not be mere slaves any more, who worshipped at the feet of the "goddess."

So please now, do we see what the sexual enticement and hypnotism of men is all about?

The short answer is that the jealous goddess, just wants to enslave us, and wishes us never to be her superior, or even equal, taking our rightful place on our throne, not *beneath* her, but *beside* her, as king to her queen, and to her goddess, a god.

But what is alleged here in this thesis, is that this is only the behaviour of women when acting under the misinformation and negative hypnotic influence of the feminist extremist movement.

Left to herself, she would be not only happy, but joyous and delighted to share her throne.

As *Jimi Hendrix* sang in *The Wind Cries Mary*:

*Somewhere a queen is weeping  
Somewhere a king has no wife*

## Chapter Five – The Shame of the Feminist Agenda

The first and most fundamental error of the feminist agenda, is that the typically university educated and intellectually awake feminists, believe they represent and know what is best for the mass of women, who are neither fundamentally intellectual, nor essentially feminist.

Whereas the reality is that the vast majority of women are only interested in what women have always been interested in since human society began – having and raising children, being loved by a man, and feeling emotionally and physically secure.

The *average* woman who can find a kind man who is capable of earning a modest living and taking care of her in a financial, physical and emotional sense is not going to have the slightest interest in the feminist agenda of career seeking, and political, intellectual and sexual empowerment.

Let us take those issues one by one.

Do women want careers?

Before marriage or having children, in theory fine, why not?

If a girl has a burning desire to be a doctor, or teacher, or any other occupation which develops herself and benefits the community at large, what could be wrong with that?

And women should surely never be banned from doing such useful and fulfilling roles in the community.

But what is the reality of work for *most* women? It is more often than not, at best drudgery, and at worst, mischief making - for example in the sex and gambling industries.

Women have a great problem in the workplace which men do not.

Men go to work to have a role in society, to feel clear in their conscience about supporting themselves, and hopefully doing something that means something to them, though again, unfortunately often it does not.

But women have a very different motive beyond money and social acceptability – *they are hungry for recognition, for love.*

As in all other fields of life, women emotionalise everything they touch.

Men are on the whole, rational, relatively unemotive creatures, as observation of any sports team or group of soldiers will show. They work for money and status and the feeling of achievement – not to get a pat on the head and “feel loved.”

The consequence of this, is that millions of women will quite happily and faithfully perform meaningless and mindless tasks of drudgery even for low pay, such as punching numbers into an enormous batch of computer forms all day long, just to get their little pay packet, and more importantly “a pat on the head” from their supervisor or boss.

That is why they fit so well into the corporate globalization culture – unlike *real* men, they are quite happy to be insignificant cogs in a huge impersonal machine, as long as someone somewhere gives them a pat on the head, and they can proudly proclaim “I am good at my job!”, no matter how mindless, uncreative and soul destroying it may be, when viewed from any objective point of view.

Because most such jobs are low paid – *whether done by men or women* – this amounts to slavery really, doesn't it?

The woman who butters bread all day in a café for next to no pay, has been conned by the feminist ideal into doing exactly the same work as she would have done “chained to the kitchen sink”, but even worse. Because unlike in the case of a woman preparing food and doing chores for a man and brood of children she loves - *she is not doing this work for anyone she really cares about.*

The first drudgery mentioned above, done for the employer, has no *love* in it. It's done only for money. Whereas the second “drudgery”, is carried out by a sane caring women in joy, as it is given meaning by it being an act of love for husband or male partner, and her children.

So by heartless and pernicious social engineering, on the excuse of or caused by feminist propaganda, countless millions of women have been made slaves to the capitalist system, as if this was superior to their alleged role as slaves of husband and children.

Again, this is a clear indication that the intellectually awake feminists, are dead in the emotional sense to love.

The simple and powerful love the average woman naturally has for a male partner and her children makes the theoretically dull tasks of cooking, washing, cleaning etc. into a joy, because we all love to please those whom we love, and who love us.

Please, Ms Feminist, ask that lady if she is more content washing shirts and dishes for her family, or rather banished for most of her day from those she loves, taking annoying phone calls all day long from rude and irate customers in a corporate service centre.

The truth is that the intellectually proud feminist woman despises the average woman with her simple mentality, and simple love of home, children and family.

She wants to make this average woman into a carbon copy of herself – an intellectual, free thinker who needs no man to be whole.

If she is a physically beautiful feminist, as some arguably are, she can live in her own narcissistic world of beauty and intellectual superiority, and imagine she is a goddess, heroically leading the average uneducated and unintellectual woman out of the bondage of domestic life, as *Moses* led the slave Israelites out of Egypt.

But the truth is, Ms Feminist, that the average woman does not care for your high flying and grand goals, just as the average man has no desire to be an Einstein or a Beethoven.

Thus instead of leading the mass of women to freedom, the feminist has led the mass of women to economic slavery, and the frustration of being exiled from her male partner, and more importantly, *her children*, for the greater part of her waking hours.

She then becomes the tired, ratty woman, who is too shot-out from work to want sex with her husband, or to take proper interest in her children. And though she likes to imagine that she can spend "quality time" with them, which makes everything all right, and that she is a great example of *a working woman* to the girls in her brood, the truth is that she is neglecting them, and *they* (both male and female children) *know it*.

Adults can be fooled on these issues, but children see the truth of a distant mother, who is too tired and busy to really care for and give attention to them.

Could Ms Feminist please stop and ask herself why apparently, according to a recent statistic, at least *one in ten* girls or women is self-harming (e.g. cutting herself with a knife) either occasionally or regularly? To say nothing of all the anorexics, bulimics and attempted suicides amongst young women and girls.

But for the sake of argument let us suppose that a girl or woman has intellectual capacity which she wishes to develop. Suppose she wishes to be a musician, a linguist, or an artist or writer.

What better opportunity to do that than by having the free time on her hands, which due to modern technology such as washing machines, microwave ovens and vacuum cleaners, she has in abundance as a "housewife" or "homemaker"? Especially when her children become of school age.

In the *Suzuki* method of music teaching, for example, the mother and child both learn the violin or piano or whatever *together*. Now how is a mother going to have the time and energy to do that with her daughter or son, and hold down a stressful, demanding busy career as a lawyer, accountant or even as a nurse?

Answer – *she obviously cannot*.

There are unlimited opportunities for women to educate themselves, without the need to attend formal full-time courses, there are great libraries in every town in the Western world, and there are all kinds of private tutors and college courses which can be taken part-time or even via television or the Internet, and fitted in comfortably amidst her family duties.

A working woman on the other hand will cut herself in ribbons trying to study while trying to cope with children and holding down a stressful full-time job.

For example, do we know any adults who learned to play a musical instrument after the age of twenty-one? Very few. Why? Because they don't have time, they don't have the energy. Their *job* takes it all, and they have little or none left for what they *really* would like to do.

Hence we all buy tickets for the national lottery, hoping to escape formalised full-time work forever, futile hope as that is for all but the lucky and insignificantly small few.

Equally, if a woman wants to be a novelist, like ex-one parent family, *J K Rowling*, of *Harry Potter* fame, what better way than for her to have the freedom from conventional work?

J K Rowling had the free time and energy to write her initial books thanks to the UK benefit system, but now the British government is trying to encourage *all* single mothers into work! So if they get their way there will be no more J K Rowlings, whether or not we think that is a good thing.

If women really want to be liberated to be their own person via *creative* pursuits, rather than brainwashed into entering some too stressful and typically strait-jacketed and uncreative (in the true sense) job or career path, to be free of formal work is obviously the best way. We can look back to the *Bronte* sisters for example, to confirm the truth of that principle throughout all history.

In this mad rush to make women into self-supporting economically productive units, she may forget, that though likely she will be a comparatively poorly paid slave in the workplace, as a "homemaker" she can be *her own boss*, and within the parameters of her child care duties, she can really do whatever she pleases.

So again, forcing unwilling women into conventional work and careers may more often than not rob them of their opportunities for self-development, for freedom, rather than the opposite, as the feminists suggest.

The truth is that the average woman, who survey after survey now confirms does not want to work while she is raising a family, except where economic necessity compels her to do so, is being imprisoned, made so unhappy she takes sedatives, drugs or resorts to self-harming for relief – she is being enslaved by the feminist philosophy, rather than liberated as the feminists supposedly intended.

The feminist agenda has hurt her deeply, it has hurt men, it has hurt children, and continues to do all three.

Shame on you Ms Intellectual and Narcissist feminist activist! Shame on *you* for the state of society and not on men!

## **Chapter Six - The Demonization of Men – let's blame them for everything**

The problem with the average woman who just wants husband and family, as previously throughout recorded history, is that there is a high probability that the man she in theory wanted as a life long partner and friend, has been demonized and destroyed by the feminist agenda, and likely she has been persuaded by the prevailing man-disrespecting and masculinity-denying culture into living in the vulnerable, unfulfilled and problem-laden condition of a one-parent family.

Literally countless millions of modern women have been placed in this situation which the vast majority of their mothers never had to endure.

Without the need to rely on official or government statistics, a glance at the staggering number of marriage and dating sites on the Internet will confirm that there are millions of women in this unfortunate *lone parent* situation throughout the Western world, which though attempted to be deified by the feminist brigade, is obviously not satisfactory to the women concerned *or else they would not be advertising for men.*

In Eastern Europe and the former soviet states, this is also a particular concern, as it appears millions of these Eastern European women wish to desert their countries of origin, and the men who fathered their children, for Western Europe or America.

Whilst it is understandable that women in general should wish to leave Eastern Europe, simply for the revolution-free security that most of the well established Western capitalist so called "democracies" currently enjoy, why did so many of these women first have children to Eastern European men, who if these ladies' plans succeed, will be more or less permanently removed from the family situation, and presumably from ever having any real contact with their children?

That is, just how is *Boris* in Siberia ever going to get access to his children, who now have a Hollywood plastic surgeon as a step-father in L.A.?

So regardless of the merits or demerits of Eastern European men, clearly *childrens' rights* are being totally overlooked in this attempted exodus of women from the former communist Eastern bloc.

The excuses apparently given by the Eastern European women for deserting their country of origin, parental families and native men, are that Eastern European men are heavy drinkers, lazy unambitious workers, and above all *disrespectful to women.*

It appears that these men were not however too repulsive to go out on dates with and have sex with, because many of these women have had children not only once with such men, but several times.



So they are good enough to date and mate with, but apparently not to live with, and be allowed access to their own children.

If we look at these Eastern European women objectively, we see that many of them are beautiful and intelligent. So there is obviously a genetic pool in those countries which must be producing equally attractive and intelligent men, presumably the ones who are fathering children to these women, who then later for reasons best known to themselves, wish to *en masse* “defect to the West.”

So what of the fate of this lost army of men, deserted by their women, and any children they may have fathered to them?

Obviously, these women seeking to exit Russia and Eastern Europe generally do not care. And what is the real reason they want to come to the developed West?

It is clearly twofold – *economic and feministic*.

That is, apart from the obvious better wages and more freely available consumer products in the developed West, Eastern Europe still retains strong vestiges of male authority, and demands that women support men in the traditional way, and do not trample all over their rights – for example, rights of access to their children – as is being done generally speaking in the Western world.

These ladies are buying into the dream of a glamorous and “empowered” lifestyle as portrayed in the Hollywood movies, TV shows and magazines, which have been allowed to saturate Eastern Europe since the collapse of the communist bloc.

That is – the average Eastern European woman has if she is lucky maybe five or ten pairs of shoes, compared with the twenty, thirty, fifty or a hundred pairs which most Western women now own, to say nothing of ex-Philippines dictator’s wife, *Mrs Marcos*, and her alleged three thousand pairs.

The average member of the Eastern European exodus wants masses of sexy Western made shoes, clothes, a lovely Western made *Mercedes, Jaguar or Rolls Royce*, first class international travel, a high profile job, and *a man who will let her be and do all those things she wants to do and be*.

So on the one hand, she is seduced by the extravagant, glamorous and comfortable Western lifestyle, but on the other hand, she has to be absolved of the guilt of deserting her country, its men, her parental family, and quite probably the father to her one or more children.

So how is this miracle accomplished? Easily – *by the demonization of men and the concurrent desecration of the traditional female role as wife and mother*.

*Miss Russia or Bulgaria 1999* has to be persuaded that the natural feelings she has, which make her want to devote herself to her children and husband are unworthy, and that they are interfering with her freedom to be a modern woman, and this pernicious piece of mental manipulation of millions of formerly man-loving women, is very hard to achieve without demonizing men.

It is worth pointing out in passing that many of these attractive Eastern European ladies are deceived and “trafficked” to be prostitutes in other countries, allegedly including Western Europe, America and even Israel, sometimes under the cover of these “mail order bride” companies or via tempting but fraudulent offers of work abroad.

However, there appears to be such widespread prostitution in modern Russian and Eastern Europe itself – that is *in these ladies' own native countries* - this perhaps is not quite the clear-cut issue it all seems.

The feminist intellectual of course looks upon the mass of men as savage uneducated brutes, who are all potential or actual abusers of women and children. In their paranoid mindset a child molester hides under every rock and manhole cover.

Of course there have been in recent history a substantial number of men who abused women, by physically beating them, humiliating them or forcing an unwelcome amount of sexual activity on them.

But the answer to this situation is not to howl like a banshee with cries of “man alert”, every time an unchecked-out male appears near a woman or child. But rather whilst restraining and protecting society from men who are proven *without doubt* to be a serious danger to woman or child, to find out what is causing this unhealthy desire to abuse.

And the statistics indicate that most if not all serious abusers are themselves former victims of abuse.

But this group of genuinely criminal child molesters or rapists is not the group with which women are generally speaking concerned.

The general problem is what we might call “the emotionally stunted man” – the emotionally immature man who cries like a baby if a girl or woman rejects him, or throws childish tantrums, which may include violent behaviour, especially when drinking is also involved.

So no doubt, this is the catalyst that has spurred the average Eastern European female émigrée to uproot her whole racial identity, and try to implant herself and her future onto what she believes is more civilised Western soil.

But we have established conclusively that the Eastern European man is not genetically inferior to the Western man – generations of top athletes like hundred metres champion *Valery Borzov* or tennis champion *Goran Ivanisovitch*, dancers *Nureyev* and *Baryshnikov* and chess champions like *Boris Spassky* and *Gary Kasparov* have proved that conclusively.

So just what is going wrong, why are Eastern European women rejecting men who come from this kind of obviously talented genetic stock?

The real problem as in the West is that males are not developing to emotional maturity due to the *absence of strong male role models* and the simultaneous spoiling of male children by women incapable of imposing correct discipline.

This problem is of course also currently prevalent in the more economically developed West, as the current generation is growing up without these kind of strong masculine role models at the head of families, which lack is now gradually showing the disastrous consequences of, as indiscipline, drug addiction, criminal and abusive behaviour of Western and no doubt Eastern European youth.

Feminist-influenced women cannot however understand the concept of maleness, of correct discipline of children, particularly male ones, and as a consequence typically fail to exert any significant discipline at all.

*We can't let these men – these violent monsters and child abusers – near our precious little children,* they cry, and so they are lost, as are their children.

The major part of this demonization of men is directed against their tendency to use force, or the threat of force, as a principal disciplinary tool.

The feminist cannot see the difference between a timely and non-injurious slap, occasionally necessary to keep order, and the serious beatings which leave bruises and broken bones, which would obviously constitute child abuse.

This does not of course prevent legions of women from hitting quite gratuitously their own male children in particular, often in a random, inconsistent way, when she herself merely cracks from time to time under the inevitable excessive strain of being a lone parent.

But the consequence of that is clearly that such disciplinary action, laden with trauma and injustice, is *real child abuse*, but unlike the male variety, is seldom picked up by the police or social worker.

Why is it for example, that we now have apparently droves of adult men addicted to paying considerable sums of money to a female authority figure, who humiliates, beats and abuses them?

This desire cannot come from a vacuum. It surely must come from abusive episodes in such a man's childhood, at the hands of his mother, or perhaps some abusive relative or babysitter who once had total power over him.

Is this issue ever questioned in the public media – why men are driven to take up these bizarre and humiliating activities, as if their life depended upon it?

Never! It is just looked upon as a kind of running joke, to be smirked and sniggered about, and the men who do these activities labelled as perverts, when what we are really dealing with, is a clear case of the neglect and abuse of male children by millions of *women*.

We are dealing with men who as children were so emotionally traumatised and damaged, that such abuse and humiliation of their whimpering male spirit in its adult form, is the only thing that they can recognise as love – that is, the clearly perverted and abusive love which their own mothers inflicted upon them.

Have we not heard the kind of women who *even in a public place* will very aggressively boss about and bark orders at their disobedient little male children, as if they were dogs, with threats of “*wait till I get you home!*”?

This is the sort of thing we are talking about, which makes us guess and fear what happens in private away from the security cameras and concerned eyes.

So apart from the compulsive visits to the bossy abusive “lady” who performs humiliating and abusive acts upon him *for money* – and how sick is that for a way to earn your living? – what are the other consequences of this traumatising and humiliation of the young male?

The main and most serious consequence is that he never grows to emotional maturity.

He is emotionally attached to his abusive mother's apron strings, and he then hypnotically seeks out as an adult – without being ever consciously aware of it – this same abusive relationship with another female, who becomes his girlfriend or wife.

Such a girl has over a long period of time observed her mother humiliate and traumatise her younger or even older brothers in this way, or alternatively, witnessed from year one this same abusive and disrespectful attitude from her mother to her father, and so she can spot the tortured traumatized male who is already a victim of this culture from afar, and waits patiently for him to surrender to her cruel and vindictive rule.

He believes at first he is in love, and she is an angel with whom he has entered heaven. But all the time, whilst she is seducing him and wrapping him around her little finger, she is secretly despising him, and waiting for the day when she can put him in his place – i.e. grovelling like a little child at her abusive feet.

When she has with no great difficulty persuaded him to give her the child she wants, as soon as he makes his attempt to impose authority in accordance with his natural feelings about his masculine role, he is at first told to stop by the real boss – *her* – and if he persists, he is labelled child abuser, and then if necessary, has legal and *physical force* used against him to throw him out of the “family home.”

One reported case for example was of a mid-twenties male with a drink problem, who would try to see his young daughter, having been led to believe by the ex-wife that he could park his car and stay overnight in a spare room to sleep it off.

But the mother deliberately picked a quarrel with him, knowing he would in anger jump into his car to drive home, still half-drunk. Then, as soon as he left, she would call the police, knowing he would be arrested and imprisoned.

At minimum we could safely call that uncaring, and at maximum a thoroughly abusive, wicked and despicable act.

But such acts, though relatively common, are receiving little publicity, and little boys are still growing up believing in the concept of little girls and their adult counterparts as made of *sugar, spice and all things nice*.

And please just look at that little rhyme with which whole generations of Western children have been brainwashed - what a shameless and pernicious little piece of genocidal (i.e. against the "male race") propaganda it is:

*What are little girls made of ?  
Sugar and spice and all things nice...*

*What are little boys made of?  
Frogs and snails, and puppy dogs tails...*

Shall we try turning that around somewhat?

*What are little girls made of?  
Jealousy, envy, tantrums and male hate...*

*What are little boys made of?  
Sensitivity, innocence, friendliness and courage...*

Well – what do you feminists and male high-heeled shoe worshippers think of that?

No doubt you will go howling to some law court demanding that this expression of "negative images of women" must be censored and erased from the history books.

Of course, little girls are not made of just negative emotions, and neither are little boys all angels, but by refusing to recognise and accept the equally malevolent possibilities in both genders, we fail to have a healthy realism in society which is necessary to create order, justice, and leave open the door to healthy adult relationships and the possibility of families existing which are based on justice, truth and true love - that is, pure, non-exploitative love, which cares for others as a good gardener cares for his or her plants.

In short, we see to it by this denial of reality about women's and men's true nature, that peace and happiness in society at large can never be.

But the demonization of men, as in this prickly little nursery rhyme, from even the stage of little boys, is apparently endorsed by the whole society from day one, and is destroying the whole culture of civilisation by undermining a civilised and caring family life.

In response to realising that men have been displaced from their proper role in family life, many women have responded by suggesting a new role for men, as some kind of feminized childcare assistant, who is supposed to love feeding and dressing up little boys and girls, changing nappies, carries babies around in a child sling, and to believe that being present at the birth of his child is the most fulfilling experience a man can ever have.

The truth about the latter, is that men in general feel distinctly uncomfortable about the whole mechanics of the female reproductive system, just as most women would not want to witness surgical operations in general, and sometimes faint or vomit when obliged to do so, as indeed do some men.

If there is a justification for a man being present at childbirth, it is surely to support his wife in her time of need, and keep a watchful eye on the medical staff to see they don't negligently murder her or her unborn child on the delivery room table.

But this fantasy of men being enamoured with new babies is a piece of mass hypnosis which has no par.

Whilst men should not evade the duty to help their wives with young children where she really cannot cope alone, they do not generally speaking wish to deal with little babies, they are not equipped to do so emotionally or biologically, that is not their role in life.

Their role is to keep order, protect and educate the family, particular any male children, which cannot really take place until the child is at least on the threshold of a major speaking stage.

If you reject that out of hand, could we just ask a question – could we please look at this from *the baby's point of view*?

Has the baby no rights in this situation? Do we think this utterly helpless and dependent infant wants to be placed into the hand of a typical hairy, rough, clumsy and angular, breastless adult male with his gruff and aggressive adult male voice, or do we think rather that he or she would prefer the warm, rounded form of a female to cuddle up to, with her gentle and sensitive movements, her bright loving eyes, her soothing melodic voice, her lovely soft nourishing breasts, and her gentle and dexterous hands?

It's hardly a competition, is it?

But such obvious and unalterable *realities*, the feminist and male feminizers overlook as if they didn't exist, in their efforts to run off to their high or not so high-powered job, and leave their most precious project and possession in the hands of an incompetent, bumbling, milkless, breastless, and frankly often from the baby's point of view, callous and life-threatening male.

The clumsy physical strength of many men can easily smother, break the bones of or even kill a delicate baby just by total accident, leaving the man with a life long guilt he may never recover from, and the woman with a seriously injured, brain damaged or dead baby or young child.

Let's be clear about the traditional image of the husband pacing up and down outside the delivery room while he waits for his wife to give birth.

The anxiety is *not* that the child will have three arms or legs or its head will be on the wrong way round, though of course he does not wish for anything but a healthy child.

It is simply, that *he does not want his wife to suffer or even die*, as historically many women did under childbirth, though modern medicine has made that event comparatively unlikely and rare.

But as usual, this kind of image has been used as some kind of spurious evidence that men have "maternal feelings" for their children, which the generality of feminist thinking now denies that even *women* possess!

What incredible "double-think", as *George Orwell* in his classic novel *1984* put it!

Much of the feminist thinking that is leading women and society around by the nose, is deeply damaging, and must be stopped, because it denies biological realities and natural gender roles.

This is not about stopping a woman becoming a musician, artist, writer, scientist, teacher, doctor, accountant, or even a soldier or astronaut if she is crazy and anti-survivalist enough to want to carry out the latter dangerous and life-threatening roles.

But it *is* about protecting *young children* from neglect by quite likely the only person in the world who is fit and able to do the job of caring for them – *i.e. their natural mother*.

It is about creating a family environment that is secure and orderly, and based on healthy and familial, rather than only sexual and egotistical love.

To have order in the family, as in any successful enterprise there must be a boss. And *generally speaking* the boss must be the most rational and logical and self-controlled person, and *generally speaking* that should be a man.

Why a man? If a woman has those qualities of rationality and deeply rooted commonsense, yes, why not – she can be the boss.

But typically, women are ruled more by emotion than reason, and then if she rules, the male children grow up as emotionally stunted, female-addicted beings, and the girls grow up as manipulating, teasing, emotionally-hungry, self-centred and egotistical little madams.

Logic dictates that we cannot have a world full of such female vain self-seeking princesses, and emotionally stunted and out-of-control princes, and have anything but chaos and misery. Which is pretty much what we have got, and *why* we have got it.

The natural biological, mental and emotional differences between *most* men and *most* women, must be accepted, and society must be built on that basis.

Exceptional men and women may always follow different rules, but they must not attempt to impose their untypical attributes upon the population in general – as is being done by the intellectually able feminists who wrongly seek to make the masses of women unwillingly into clones of themselves – or they cause the breakdown of mainstream family and society, and the consequent social, national and global disaster which we are now witnessing before our eyes.

Finally, another kind of “gender bending” exercise is often suggested by the feminist led psychology schools.

That is, that the general silent stoic nature of most men, in not desiring or being able to talk openly about their thoughts and particularly *feelings*, is the reason for their inadequacy as human beings, and that they should therefore be more like women and encouraged to air their feelings, either to a counsellor or in some other kind of group context.

This idea that making public exhibitions of peoples’ private lives and inner feelings then solves their problems, is very misleading, and generally does more harm than good, as do the ridiculous and theatrical TV confessionals such as those orchestrated by *Jerry Springer*, which we must remember are all about getting the ratings, by titillating peoples’ voyeuristic desires and judgmental tendencies on others, to make themselves feel better by comparison.

We observe also in many of these shows, they are exercises in *trial by TV*, usually of men in front of audiences of snarling, mocking and condemning women, again, to advance the feminist agenda.

More generally, suppose in a group therapy session or meeting of some other “support group” like *Alcoholics Anonymous* or whatever, we discuss our private lives and feelings openly, typically to a bunch of adult strangers, with some kind of a mentor or psychologist as supervisor.

Firstly, we do not know the motives of such people, who for example in some cases may be using such groups as means to pick up women or even men, in the case of homosexual men.

Equally, we do not know if the very private and personal information we freely put on display under the social peer pressure of the group, may at some time be used against us by them, for example to blackmail us, if we accidentally or even willingly let something of a sensitive nature in one way or another slip.



It is simply not sensible or logical to reveal our private selves and thoughts to a group of near total strangers in the modern society, which is riddled with crime, envy, manipulation and blackmail of various sorts, either sexual, emotional or financial.

For if we attend such a meeting of Alcoholics Anonymous, it may for example be not quite as *anonymous* as we think, as some person from our large office building is also there, and then reports our attendance back to our colleagues or bosses who knew nothing of our private addiction.

Once the gossip spreads far enough, we might even lose our job, and we will almost certainly suffer serious damage to our reputations.

So these modern therapies are yet more hypnotic attempts to get us to submit to what looks like caring help, but in actuality is intrusive and potentially traumatic and dangerous to our whole lives.

As we become wiser, as older people, we realise ever more that many things are better left unsaid, and thus we see that men's stoicism and reticence in speech is in many cases a logical and wise behaviour.

Men do not need to learn to express their feelings to groups of strangers or even individual therapists, who they will find generally are ultimately incapable of helping them.

But rather they need to *understand* by private reflection for themselves, their own thoughts and feelings, which they can only do in collaboration or discussion with the truly understanding and wise, who at this point in time, are as rare in society as rocking horse teeth, and generally speaking are only available through their books.

One method of dealing with our thoughts and feelings is explored in the *appendix* at the end of this book, after the model set by *J Krishnamurti*.

Therefore, is this work put before such men, so they may begin to understand their own lives and feelings better, without requiring to resort to the exhibitionistic and generally unwise female methods, which seem to be based mostly on the concept that talking *per se* is enough to solve a problem, which in reality, is most times very far from being the case.

## **Chapter Seven – Being a Mother – the Greatest Job any Human Being Can Ever Have**

Everybody in human society wants to be cared about and treated with respect. But whom should we respect?

Right now the greatest respect is given to the rich, powerful and celebrity classes.

But do they deserve it?

An *Itzhak Perlman* or *Nigel Kennedy* can rattle off millions of notes on a piece of wood with strings attached, that thrills millions of people and even persuades them to part with substantial amounts of their hard-earned cash to witness or hear, either in person or as a recording on a shiny plastic disk.

The same is true of feted actors, artists and sporting stars.

Why is it we are devoted to and respecting of them, and not to our local heroes whom we know in real life, to our local artist or actor or musician, or our local sports team?

The answer is that we seek *greatness, magnificence*. We all feel pathetically small, so we want to be part of something great, something unassailable, which we can be part of by proxy, as if we had the same mark of greatness on ourselves.

We may not be handsome or beautiful, but we can wear beautiful clothes, with the most expensive and famed designer labels on them, we can drive the finest of cars, and live in the most sumptuous and extravagant of homes, and we can even have the art of an expert tattooist stamped upon our carcass somewhere, if we are so stupid to want to deface our body permanently with what was throughout history regarded only as *the mark of a slave*.

Is that the *real* reason millions are doing it – while they believe it is merely a fashion statement or accessory – because subconsciously it is an admission and voluntary acceptance of their status as disempowered slaves?

For even as a fashion statement, it shows lack of foresight, as a few years down the line, the fashion may have completely changed, and then they will be *out*, and it will be just a shameful embarrassment to be covered up.

Equally the obsession with piercings seems to be another *self-destructive* tendency which suggests that those who seek out this voluntary branding and mutilation do so out of either a self-destructive low self-esteem, or at the very least, a desperate search for identity which they obviously cannot get through satisfying interpersonal relationships or intellectual or creative pursuits.

It is also worth pointing out that to acquire either of these desecrations of the natural human form, we are obliged to undergo a substantial amount of pain, which a more sensitive, undamaged and rational man or woman – or even *animal* you see - would *instinctively* avoid.

We have to look at the deeper psychology behind these mass behaviours, and we find in the case of female piercing and tattooing, this is very much a *rebellious* act – that is - *her mother or father wouldn't approve or like it*.

Girls and women are rebelling against the traditional *feminine* role, whereas the worryingly diminishing percentage of sane, feminine women, would not and do not permit any *permanent* branding or mutilation of their beautiful bodies.

The rebellious, out of control, really *damaged* girl celebrated by *David Bowie* in this otherwise fine artist's *Rebel, Rebel*, is recruited by the feminist culture, which she believes is her only friend, but really, by encouraging and supporting her rebellion is putting the final touches to her destruction, and chances of ever finding happiness as the natural feminine woman millions of years of evolution intended her to be.

If we look at the private lives of many of these girls and women who are carrying out ambitious roles in society such as UK prime minister's wife *Cherie Blair*, we will find that they came from broken home scenarios – in her case, an absent, mostly alcoholic father who deserted her as a very young child.

We will also find such women generally in politics now, and other arenas of power, who have this similar background, because they seek out these positions of power to compensate for being not properly loved, or indeed were actually abused, and therefore want to “set the world to rights” due to the wrong that they often quite legitimately feel has been done to them.

Unfortunately, this would seem to indicate that they are unsuitable for the positions of power and influence they hold, because it surely implies they have a private agenda, rather than acting *dispassionately* and impartially for the good of all as a right minded leader should.

And it is no surprise to discover that most of these relatively young ladies in politics are following the feminist agenda of more power and jobs for women, and more nursery places to neglect their children in while they hold these jobs, because as will be explained at other points in this book, they are *hypnotically driven* to impose the same kind of loveless agenda on their own children – *or even other people's you see via government* - which was once imposed upon them.

The hypnotic force is that of *trauma*, which “makes the criminal return to the scene of the crime” or put differently, the traumatised person returns to or somehow re-enacts the original trauma.

Thus, though one would rationally expect the opposite, the aristocrat who had to suffer the horrors of boarding school puts his or her own children through the same, as we shall see later in for example, *Princess Diana's* case.

But more generally, why is it that we need celebrities, fashion designers and tattooists to feel good about ourselves, and the expensive products they create and we have to labour hard to afford?

The answer is because we are living in a state of spiritual and emotional desolation.

We don't feel good about ourselves, we don't believe in anything which gives us a feeling of belonging, not only to human society, but of existing as a significant being in the universe, a child even of a god perhaps, hidden someplace in the sky.

Leaving the spiritual or cosmic questions aside, we don't even feel good about our role in our parental or adopted families, we don't feel happy in ourselves, above all we don't feel really cared for or loved.

So life becomes a denial of this unacceptable *reality*, an escape, a constant seeking in the external world for the comfort and fulfilment and feeling of greatness we lack, *which should have been supplied by proper parental love*.

A lonely young boy is nothing, but *John Lennon* is a genius, a household name, and so he buys a guitar and tries to write songs, hoping one day he will be a "somebody" too. One boy in a million makes it, the other million - *minus one* - fail.

A young girl feels lonely, worthless, and she looks at the glamorous and beautiful celebrities in her teen or fashion magazine.

The answer to her sadness and misery is surely to be like one of them she feels.

So she learns makeup, she runs to auditions for young soap opera hopefuls, but likely she is not pretty or talented enough, so if she is more intellectual she maybe tries to write a novel, or studies hard at some difficult subject to become a professional person and have a little halo over her head.

But chasing celebrity is a stacked game against "the house." Celebrities are only so because they are so few. In *Andy Warhol's* future world of "everyone being famous for fifteen minutes" such celebrity is worthless as it is so quickly forgotten.

Many men and women will do virtually *anything* for the chance to appear on television – even strip naked and perform sexual acts on camera – as is now happening in some of the less salubrious TV "reality" shows.

But then they find that their fame is short lived and hollow, and the novelty wears off.

They may even become targets of hostility, abuse, stalking or whatever, and whilst under the hypnotic spell of being in front of the camera, reveal all kinds of private information that once out of the bag they can never again conceal, and may well end up wishing their so called "fame" had never happened.

They failed to realise that fame is only safe and desirable – if ever - when you have millions of dollars, pounds or roubles to protect you behind security doors and body guards from the jealous and obsessed masses.

They realise too late they are only being used as fodder to tease and please the viewing public, in order to get ratings to sell whatever it is that business currently wants to sell us during the commercial breaks.

But the burning desire for fame continues, because, until one appears on TV or in the news media headlines, the hypnotic media influence has assured us that except as an innumerable and insignificant statistic on the census register, *we don't really exist.*

They are talking about *Tom Cruise*, and *Tom Hanks*, and *Jennifer Lopez* and *Nicole Kidman* – not about *you and me* – we don't matter, *they do.* We don't exist – *they do.*

So we then accept we can't be "famous" as such, but surely we can be a doctor or a lawyer or a business manager, if we have the talent, the support and the luck?

Yes, we can, but we have to live a life of utter devotion to our work, really enslavement, and watch our wives and families bleed us dry as we approach old age and death after a few nice luxury holidays, a few nice houses and cars and parties with friends, and a few thousand bouts of often unfulfilling sex.

Or if we are female, we can get to feel good about ourselves by holding down such a professional career, and "making a difference", even if we can never find that peace of mind that used to come from religion, and a real life relationship with that fabled "knight in shining armour" who will make us glow with happiness, and love us truly for forever and a day.

The truth of life is that the exotic is not commonly available to us. Strings of pearls, Faberge eggs, diamonds and gold, are not part of the common life. Their ownership requires either skilful theft, or a price that is typically too high for the average man or woman to pay.

The beauty, glory and meaning of life has to be found in what is commonly available to all, or else it can only ever be a possession of a fortunate and insecure few – insecure, because if we alone possess riches, whilst the rest do not, we will forever live in fear of them being taken away from us by the envious majority

Rich women have been attacked and killed just for their jewellery, because, due to a society whose values are distorted, these fundamentally worthless baubles – from the survival and evolutionary point of view - can at a stroke give a man freedom, pleasure and independence for the rest of his life.

As he robs you he is thinking – “It is either you or me. It is either you, rich lady, who will have a life of pleasure and freedom, or me. So what makes you think that you deserve such pleasure and freedom and I do not? And if in your self-righteous pride and avarice you deny it to me, you resist my theft, in my anger, I may kill you, so deep is my envy and hate.”

So maybe a woman throws her life away to protect what are really just worthless stones, from the survival point of view, which typically she has got well insured in any case.

Note, she is not really protecting the jewels, whose price she knows she can recover, she is protecting *her right to own what others cannot*, and *her identity as one of the elite*. But she forgets that for real security, such people must live behind protected walls, as do the rich everywhere.

It is said that billionaire *Howard Hughes* took to being a tramp to avoid his fame, and descended into various obsessive states – such is the consequence on a sensitive mind of the burden of being famous and rich.

We see the same bizarre behaviour in the lives of millionaire artist *Salvador Dali* and multi-millionaire pop star *Michael Jackson*. The experience of grandeur inevitably creates delusions of grandeur, and the mind of such a superprivileged being finds it hard to live in any kind of normal reality any more.

The home is a palace and full of any luxuries a man or woman could ever desire. But the heart is empty, the human soul wanders amongst its worldly riches, desolate and alone.

Some of the richest and most famous people in society are the loneliest in the world. They live in paranoia of their family, friends and employees, as well as the countless total strangers who know and envy them, imprisoned outside their security walls.

Every rich man lives like *Czar Nicholas* – in fear of the day the masses will rebel and overrun his palace and try to murder him, just as happened with *George Harrison* in his last years, who was attacked and almost murdered by some obsessed person due to his fame.

So Abba were wrong – it really is *not* a rich man's world, but just appears to be so.

Therefore, the answer to the riddle of happiness for man and woman is not in riches, but in learning to have joy in the commonplace, in what is freely available to all.

It is in finding a role in life which by nature we are fitted to, rather than what the envious and ambitious eye, and the bullying of the macho culture on men, or the feminist culture on women would have us believe we must be.

So please tell us, especially as a woman, in what job you believe you could find utter fulfilment, feel that you have done something of great importance to yourself, your family and the world?

Put differently, that is to say – what is it that to you is the most important thing in your life?

The generality of women and men have answered that question already conclusively, even the famous and celebrity ones – the answer is always the same – *my children*.

So now having established the premise that a woman's children – we are of course talking of the vast majority of women now, not of *Marie Curie*, *Joan of Arc*, or even *Kate Bush*, who may due to their extraordinary talents gain fulfilment on other levels – are the most important thing in her life, even likely beyond her interest in any man, how should she see to it that they have the optimum chance to grow healthy, happy and fulfilled?

Suppose we bought a houseplant from a garden centre. What care and attention we would give it, carefully watering it and checking the temperature of the room is not too hot or cold. We'd look for signs of disease upon its foliage, and make sure it is always in the place where it can receive the right amount of sunlight.

So to such a relatively unimportant life form, would we devote such great painstaking care and attention, but to the raising of a child, the most complex and sensitive life form we are aware of in the whole universe, we believe we can cut corners with and neglect, and still get the right result.

Does this child we are growing need a father? Maybe not - *let's get rid of him*.

Does it need us to be constantly with it until a certain age, and the security that comes from that?

Apparently not - *let's get a maybe child-abusing and mercenary baby sitter to come and give the child that for us, while we go gallivanting around with our friends, or make sure we keep on top of that high powered and glamorous career*.

This is not fiction, for using a hidden camera device, several middle class American ladies were horrified to discover that this hidden camera showed serious neglect and abuse of their children, whilst they left them with childminders to attend some party, theatre performance or restaurant. In one case a young child was shaken nearly to death like a rag doll, by an irate and brutal child minder whom the mother had unwittingly hired and trusted.

But who is the real abuser here?

Is it the impoverished childminder driven to a desperate act by a screaming baby for whom she has no love, or the mother who should be loving her child *properly*, who has left it without adequate protection and care?

But this is taking a negative judgmental point of view. Why not consider the other angle?

Have we never experienced pleasure from serving someone we love?

To carefully carry out some task to the best of our ability, no matter how intrinsically insignificant, such as making a simple meal, or ironing someone's shirt, and seeing the satisfaction and gratitude for the service we performed for them, that perhaps they weren't even capable of doing themselves with such care and finesse.

Even making and serving a cup of tea can be a great skill and art, as the traditional Japanese tea ceremony shows.

Again, such unglamorous and commonplace tasks become things of great satisfaction and beauty – in the hands of *someone empowered with love, someone who cares*.

You may as a woman argue that you carry out all these tasks for men and children with your “loving care” and they are typically ungrateful little brats, of either small, medium or large size.

So why should you bother, why should you care?

Let the ungracious so and sos do it for themselves, while you do something “creative and fulfilling”, while you write your novel, or attend your drama class, or study hard to get another notch up your difficult professional career ladder.

You don't get a pat on the head from your family for your never ending service, but at least you get a “gold star” from your boss at work, or a badge of progress from society in general, when you pass yet more of those tough professional exams.

So where is the answer to this dilemma facing women?

Firstly, as to the man in your life, who “takes you for granted” – don't you take him for granted too?

Though it may never happen, if disaster comes, he is maybe ready to die for you. If the ship goes down, he may well bundle you and your children into the crowded lifeboat, while he willingly surrenders *his life* into a watery grave at the bottom of the sea.

He may well if called upon, go out to fight a neighbour who threatens you or your children, maybe ending up in hospital, paralyzed or dead as a consequence. Such a case appeared in the UK recently, when a man was killed by a gang of youths while he tried to stop them vandalising his sister's car.



He may well love you more than anything in the whole world, but be too embarrassed or feel it's too unmanly to express it, or even lack the words to do so, not able to equal the naturally superior language skills possessed by the average woman in comparison to the average man.

Do you really need such words of worship, are you really so insecure that you need to hear those words of love or adoration, or do actions speak louder for you than words?

Men have since time began gone out to get the bread, and maybe had to wrestle with wild animals, fight other men, or perform other heroic and dangerous acts just to bring the dinner home.

And now – there is perhaps less glory in it for them than ever. Typically a working man is now an abused slave in the workplace, creatively frustrated and unfulfilled and very, very far from having the security and independence of feeling he is his own man, his own boss, and master in his own world.

But he hides these feelings of humiliation and inadequacy to please you, not to worry you, to hand his money to you, to make you feel safe and secure.

As the multi-million selling song by Canadian *Bryan Adams* said - *Everything I do, I do it for you.*

That song stayed at the top of the UK pop charts for around twelve weeks.

Were men buying it?

Of course not. Women were buying into the fantasy of a man whom they loved, who was utterly devoted to them, and yes, fully prepared to even lay down his life for her.

And that is not fiction, but a reality that has been repeated countless times through human history, most recently by millions in the two major twentieth century wars, and is unfortunately continuing to a lesser extent now in the twenty-first.

So now can you show me please the women who would be so equally willing to lay down their lives for their men?

History does not seem to abound with such stories of women laying their lives down for men, and personally the author does not know of a single one – apart from the *fictional* heroism of *Marlene Dietrich's* saloon girl, *Frenchy*, taking a bullet to save *James Stewart* in *Destry Rides Again* – not to deny that such real life cases have existed sometime somewhere.

But this is not a condemnation of women – because biology alone dictates that women's principle role is to protect their children, not their man.

So the average man is prepared to do all these *actions* for his woman, but this she is not satisfied with, she demands hearts and flowers, and words of adoration and love?

The great irony of this situation, is that the kind of men who are the most forthcoming with words of adoration and other signs and symbols of so called "love", are often the very ones who are the least faithful, and when the going gets tough, will be the quickest to move on to another more comforting and less troublesome woman.

Women have found over long and bitter experience that the words which mean so much to them mean relatively little to most men, and they are right.

Women should learn to respect what really matters in a man – a man who is forthcoming and faithful in his actions, rather than merely his words.

But there is a problem for the woman who desires such a man to find one. Such men are becoming gradually extinct due to the feminist propaganda which has eroded the concept of the mature, self-confident man.

Oh yes – there are millions of dominant men, who win the battles in the boardroom, or on the sports field, and *appear* to be the man whom they need.

But does he also win the battle in the bedroom?

Or does he just end up as a tongue lashed slave, sexually and emotionally dependent on his woman, and therefore not capable of taking a leading role in family life, in particular, in being a strong role model for his male children, and a loving, security giving presence for his female ones?

Because if he loses this battle *in the home*, he is really impotent in terms of his contribution to the psychological development of the children, particularly his male ones, who will just grow up being addicted to the confusing, teasing and whimsical messages coming from the *average* woman.

Why is it that women in general cannot impose proper discipline on boys?

It is because they want their male children's approval, they are seeking emotional comfort from their children, they want to be seen as *the comforter and giver of love*, whereas a *real* father is quite happy to be unpopular and disliked in his irrevocable duty to create order, and put limits on the tendency to excessive frivolity and fun.

The incredibly successful and familiar 1960s musical *The Sound of Music* summed things up quite well.

The "captain with seven children" had them all performing to attention with a whistle, until failing nun *Maria* arrived. So if we are to follow the superficial view of the story, *Maria* in the form of *Julie Andrews*, brought a happiness and love that had been lacking under the Captain's supposed stern rule.

Again we make no apologies for using popular culture, rather than quoting from Freud or Jung to make the case, because the mass of people are being influenced and programmed by popular culture, and not by Jung and Freud who are influencing a minority of intellectuals alone.

But the point here is, the indulgent, entertaining and nurturing behaviour of fantasy step-mother Maria, is only one form of love, which is how the mass of women in general tend to behave with their children.

The more formally educated categories of women of course tend to try to impose value systems on their children, which steer them to more intellectual pursuits, and in some cases, thereby have a stultifying effect on their developing minds and hearts, far worse than anything *Captain Von Trapp* and his whistle blowing could ever do.

There is a different kind of love, rather than the physically comforting, emotionally supportive and touchy feely – “come and have a hug” – love that women typically offer.

We might call it “character” or “spiritual” love, and that is what men should be there to provide. Feminist influenced women just imagine man is there to bully with his threats and violence and big stick, but that view is wrong beyond belief.

A man is there to impose order and rationality on the sensual and self-indulgent tendencies which are developed in children by women.

Why is this necessary? What is wrong with a life dominated by sensual values? What is wrong, is that when people become addicted to feelings and sensations, this displaces the real sane, sensitive and balanced human being inside them who was once there.

Thus a drug addict or alcoholic becomes more loyal to his drink or drug than to his wife or family, and a sex addict becomes more loyal to the next easy woman than any girlfriend or female partner who might seek a long term relationship with him.

Likewise some women become addicted to the feelings of the first flushes of “love” in a new relationship, and become hooked on this process and never find a stable relationship with a man, as inevitably all relationships diminish in sensual intensity from the early stages when their partner was so strange and different and new.

The male Romeo is following a similar agenda, and obviously if people in general are allowed to carry on like this, we have an unstable society, where no man and woman can possibly trust one another, and of which the real victims are ultimately the children, who see no stable role models in their life, and thus have disbelief in the concept that a man and woman could ever live happily together, and care for them and each another for any significant length of time.

We see countless movie and TV dramas have been made on the theme of warring parents, whom the unhappy children of are conspiring to get back together. So not only are the feminists who deny the man-woman relationship hurting men and women, they obviously do not care a cent or penny about *what children want*.

More generally, if people are allowed to freely indulge their sensual desires, they gradually lose control, and slip into some kind of addiction, which probably the majority of the Western population is now in, in one form or another.

Everybody has their little addictive passion, which gets them through the day or night, and some people have several. This is not natural, it's not healthy, and it's certainly not freedom.

But how to stop this addiction, this out of control behaviour?

We see in cases, such as British soccer legend *George Best*, that once the pattern is set, it is virtually unstoppable. Apart from genius as a soccer player, Best is famous for his womanising and prematurely destroying his career with drink. After nearly dying, he was a few years back given a new liver, and though he vowed never to drink again, as he had done so many times before, he was soon back to his old ways, and his life continues to unfold as a never ending series of tragedies.

It is of course part of the vain delusion that millions of women live under that they can change such a man – they believe their “love” will reform him. But it is too late – the lesson women have not learned, is that their job is to be mother to little children, *not to adult men*.

If an adult man – i.e. of sixteen years old and after – is not already relatively in control of himself, and relatively grown up, no woman is going to make a mature and controlled being out of him. It's far too late!

The Jesuits used to have a saying

*give me the boy until he is seven years old, and I give you the man*

and it is surely not far from the truth.

This *want* in children of both sexes has got to be stamped out from an early age.

Both by the whistle blowing discipline, and by a feeling of self-worth that comes from being self-possessed and having a free heart and mind and spirit, which does not therefore feel the need to escape through addictive and sensual pastimes.

In this process of education, the most important thing is for the child's mind to be free and creative – whether it's being good at art, music, engineering, DIY, or whatever.

Then in adult life, the restless creative energy has the ability to do something constructive for a man, instead of being like a whirlwind inside him, and driving him to destructive acts.

The problem with George Best, apart from the fact his mother was also an alcoholic, has been that he had no great talent in life apart from his soccer skills, and originally, his movie star-like good looks.

As he grew older, the physical ability to perform his great talent – like *Maradona*, who also of course became a drug addict – virtually disappeared, and his life became comparatively meaningless to him.

On one infamous TV interview, Best turned up drunk, and when asked what he did to pass his time, he pathetically but likely sincerely replied that apart from drinking he just liked having sex with women, and that was all.

There are those who attempt to put such addictions like alcohol down as genetically caused. This is a serious cop out and misses the point. The point is, that of course talent is genetically inherited, and so the same creative power will cause the similar problems in one generation as the next if it is not constructively harnessed.

So children must be disciplined – in the correct way – and before effective verbal reasoning is possible with them, and sometimes later in stubborn egotistical moments, if a non-physically injurious slap has to be given occasionally, the disciplined adult will thank his parents for their *timely* correction of him in his formative stage.

But this is not to underestimate the legitimate and positive effect of a woman as a playmate to a child and teacher in helping him or her develop in a thousands ways.

Above all, she needs to show her child *patience* and *calmness*. Like a horse or other animal, the animal being trained, will tend to take on the characteristics of its owner or trainer.

Showing children “love” is not possible except by action.

Endless hugs and the words “I love you” are utterly meaningless and even demeaning, if they are not backed up by *the reality of love*, which is demonstrated by the *action* of care, patience, calmness, consideration, gentleness, kindness, and above all *the continuous physical presence and availability* that *proves* to them she cares.

For example, suppose a young child asks its mother some question as children *naturally* endlessly do.

She must *never* say – “be quiet and stop asking me silly questions” or “listen honey, I am busy, go play with your toys,” as this would be to frustrate and destroy the confidence of the child’s mind, its natural quest for understanding everything in life.

She can say "I am too busy right now, we will discuss it later", as long as *she means it, and she keeps her promise.*

And quite often, childrens' questions will stump *any* adult, as most of us really do not know as much as we think we do.

In such a case she must (as must a man also) confess her ignorance, and say something like "I am not sure about that – let's go to the library tomorrow and check it out" (or look on the Internet).

Again, it is put to you, that the busy "superwoman" who is trying to do all this whilst attempting to hold down a full time job or career, or even a *demanding* part-time one, will not have the time and energy to be this proper carer and educator.

But in this education and caring must also be an understanding of how to stop a child becoming the blueprint for an addict in adult life.

For example, if at four years old a child demands some insignificant toy or sweet, which the mother feels is not at that moment good for it, and demands and demands on and on merely to get its own way, to give in to it would not be love, but a sign that persistent complaining and harassment is a legitimate means to get your own way, and the setting of a pattern that culminates in addiction in one or several forms in adult life.

Such out of control people are a menace to society, and women have to realise, that they are usually the ones who have unwittingly created them, by failing to understand the right way to discipline children.

Every human being, *as a child*, must learn that sometimes we can have what we egotistically want, and other times, we cannot, and if there is to be order, a screaming match each time children don't get their own way, cannot be tolerated, or regarded as acceptable behaviour as they grow to adolescence and adult status.

The question women have to answer for themselves is – if a timely slap has to be *occasionally* given, to short circuit what later will become drug addiction or women abuse, should that be given or not?

And the point is, that once children are used to rules of order, and are self-controlled by the age of five, six or seven, they are that way *all their life.*

Such balanced, self-possessed children can then go on, using that essential tool of self-discipline, to learn and achieve a thousand things that the uncontrolled child and adult cannot and never will do.

Women should not worry too much about a child's reading or arithmetic, though those things may have their importance too.

For a child could grow up completely illiterate, but if it has self-discipline and the confidence that comes from the security of knowing - *due to its mother's devoted behaviour, not mere empty words* - that it is valued and loved in the true sense, it can overcome all obstacles in time.

From the child's point of view, the love of another person is a very simple matter to ascertain. The person who loves you *wants to be with you*, if possible, twenty-four hours a day. They don't want to miss a single smile, or a single beat of your heart.

As the *Beatles* said in their early hit *Here, There and Everywhere*:

*To lead a better life, I need my love to be here  
Here, making each day of the year  
Changing my life with a wave of her hand  
Nobody can deny that there's something there.*

*There, running my hands through her hair  
Both of us thinking how good it can be  
Someone is speaking but she doesn't know he's there.*

*I want her everywhere  
And if she's beside me I know I need never care.  
Each one believing that love never dies  
Watching her eyes  
And hoping I'm always there.*

Again this fascinating piece of pop culture is used to illustrate *how men really feel*, which obviously translates from the childhood experience of love with their mothers, or female guardians in the case of Lennon, who was raised by an aunt.

This *model of love and togetherness* cannot be created by a woman who goes off to work leaving her screaming child (it only screams for a while, before it becomes permanently scarred and insensitive by her neglect, you see) to the unpredictable mercies of a hired nanny, or hurls it into a group nursery, where it experiences the trauma of trying to fight for the attention and love of a "group mother" and is forced to endure the hostility, abuse and bad habits of other children all desperately battling for the same attention.

And this abuse, traumatising and consequent destruction of toddler age children, is being encouraged and facilitated by feminist controlled governments worldwide, who wish to destroy this vital and beautiful relationship between mother and child, which when rightly done, becomes the role model for all good and loving relationships in the entire world.

Such an example of devotion and kindness shown by any human woman to her child, creates greatness of spirit, and possibly of talent too, in the recipient.

And this is the task and reward of the woman who is willing to devote herself to her child. She can be *the greatest of artists*, slowly enabling her creation to become a great human being, who can one day soar off into the stratosphere, and be his or her own, uniquely individual, creative and loving human being.

She may never appear on TV or on a platform, get no medals, though her son or daughter might.

All she gets is the experience of the deepest love and fulfilment she could ever know, to know deep in her heart that she has loved someone truly, and that inevitably in time, that love and respect is returned, and even if she is somewhat motivated by pride, she can still say – *just look at my beautiful and wonderful child.*

Please tell us, what other job on earth can compare with that?



## **Chapter Eight - The Tragedy of Modern Woman – betrayed by her own kind.**

Let us indulge some more into contemporary popular culture with a quote from David Bowie's *Life on Mars*.

*It's a god-awful small affair  
To the girl with the mousy hair  
But her mummy is yelling "no"  
And her daddy has told her to go*

*But her friend is nowhere to be seen  
As she walks through her sunken dream  
To the seat with the clearest view  
And she's hooked to the silver screen*

*But the film is a saddening bore  
For she's lived it ten times or more  
She could spit in the eyes of fools*

*As they ask her to focus on  
Sailors fighting in the dance hall  
Oh man! look at those cavemen go*

Whilst it is most definitely often a lonely scary life to be a little boy, it can be just as scary and lonely to be a little girl. In fact, it is almost certain that feminism is really the cumulative product of the neglected, unloved female child.

In theory, we would wish flawless kind, loving, patient parents for all children – but in practise of course that rarely happens.

The actuality is that we all tend to implant our own psychological complexes and weaknesses into our children. Our anxieties, our intolerances, our anger and rages, they witness before their eyes, and subsume into their own makeup like a sponge.

And then the lost lonely girl gets to be a teenager, and lives in desperate fear that she will not be considered attractive and desirable by boys. And then she puts *David Bowie* or some more current star like *Justin Timberlake* upon her hi-fi and dreams.

What is the Bowie song about?

We can't say exactly without talking to Bowie himself, and maybe he won't even be quite sure of the answer either. It certainly is about some action the daughter has either carried out or intended to. Maybe she gave herself to a disapproved of boyfriend, and now she is not her parent's "little darling" any more.

Maybe now she is *Bryan Ferry's Virginia Plain* figure – *you're so smart, you're so chic, teenage rebel of the week* – or on the other hand, Bowie's *Rebel, Rebel*.

Whilst our society obsesses on the male child molester, the topic of mother-daughter relationships receives very little public attention, but speaking man-to-man once more, it appears that there is most definitely something very strange going on there.

The mysterious world of inter-female relationships is a closed book to most men, but judging from the cover, it appears to be every bit as savage, or more so, than anything that ever happens in the all male world.

Yet we are told by the feminists that women are different – they are cooperative and civilised creatures – as opposed to the ever warring, competitively aggressive, and perennially immature men and boys.

But now gangs of female bullies are common in schools and society at large, and no doubt in some tamer form than the present have always existed. Until recently, women's weapon has been principally their tongue, so spiteful backbiting seems to have been the pattern for ordering the female society.

Certainly, we have witnessed women getting very competitive indeed over possession of men and jobs, and they can suddenly become aggressive tigresses like any animal, in the defence of their children.

Women often say in public that they “would kill for their children”, and having the evidence of violent and savage behaviour from some women, for instance in the *Bobbitt* case, no doubt in states of emotional rage and vengeance, it is clear that the *sugar and spice and all things nice* description does not entirely describe the behaviour and mentality of the female gender as a whole.

So it appears also that this myth of “sisterhood” is only a reality, when faced with a common enemy - i.e. *men* - just as a group of nations who don't particularly like each other as a rule, may temporarily come together in praise and support of one another, when faced with a mighty common enemy in times of war.

It appears that a mother is mostly interested in creating a carbon copy of herself in a daughter, and this often succeeds. However, for a large proportion of the time, it also fails, and then we have a rebel daughter, of whom, quite likely, since the husband married and approved the mother, is loved and accepted by neither parent.

Then as soon as she is able, she is off seeking the love from somewhere out there in the world, which she never got at home, and typically getting herself into all kinds of trouble in that process.

So what is happening in this family situation that explains these two beings – *the conformist* and *the rebel*?

We could write a thousand complex books on this situation, such as for example, that by one of the gentler, more rational, yet still largely destructive and confused feminist authors, *Nancy Friday*, in her 1996 effort, *The Power of Beauty*.

In this very long book she puts forward all sort of fascinating theories about “the power of the female breast”, etc. but the most interesting aspect of the book from a man's point of view is how she reveals her own mixed-up psychology through it.

The book is almost a cry for help, from a feminist who has lost confidence in the basic concept of mainstream feminism, which is *that a woman's mind is more important than her sexual attributes*, particularly as assessed by men.

The problem with her book, is that even though it is obviously an honest attempt to understand female psychology, in its complexity it misses the simple truth.

Women's fundamental concern is just the same as it has always been – *the desire for love and acceptance and security*.

And it is a sad fact to report to the lady authoress, but the probability is that like hopeless alcoholic, George Best, she will likely never find what she seeks, because it was robbed from her at an early age.

Nancy Friday is temporarily socially important, as she is being read by millions of women, but is not so far gone unlike some of the more hardened feminist authors, that she is impervious to reason or a shift of view.

The telling point she makes is lack of acceptance by her mother, and how that hatred of her mother has soured her whole life.

So here, we have a suggestion for women everywhere – why not stop worrying too much about acceptance by your mother, and instead seek acceptance from your father, or else an understanding and nurturing adult male, hard as that may be to find?

Because if you do the first of these options, and continue to hate your mother for failing to empower you as a feminine rather than feminist woman, you will become locked lifelong in this obsession, and miss the boat of focussing on attaining a proper relationship with an understanding man.

The odds are that a mother who shows little affection and care for her daughter is herself damaged, and is just unwittingly passing on her “baggage” to you, or else she is very concerned that your youthful charm is going to put her firmly in the shade, with both her husband and everyone else in her fragile social sphere, as she is clearly not very happy with herself to neglect and abuse her daughters so.

We have to be aware that we are not living in a world of free thinking and emotionally mature and rational people. We are living in a society composed of hypnotically programmed, unaware of that fact, mixed-up, misinformed, neglected and abused people, who are therefore compelled to take out their frustrations on anyone else who is handy.

Each human is like an iceberg. We see only their public face, the little bit that floats above the water, whereas most of the human male and particularly female personality – as they are typically more complex – is hidden totally below the surface, and only visible to those who are brave enough to dive down into the icy waters and take a peek.

So when we men get into a relationship with a pretty or not so pretty girl, we find out as things progress, that she is complicated beyond belief – a mass of conflicting desires and prickly defences, kindness, meanness and crazy ideas all rolled into one.

She loves us, she hates us, she wants us, she sends us away, she pretends she doesn't care, she accosts us with anger or tears when we leave her alone as she asked, and then finally after exhibiting the behaviour of someone who could not be viewed as reasonable and rational by any stretch of imagination, she finally condemns us for neglecting and not understanding her.

We feel that whatever we do we cannot win. And the sad fact is that we quite possibly cannot. All we can try to do is give her the understanding she seeks, but for that to happen, *we have to have it to begin with*, which currently most men do not.

This book is to try to put as many men as possible on that road to understanding in a wise and judicious masculine sense, instead of just being the emasculated feminist-programmed “new man” who is totally useless to his woman in understanding her *true nature*.

Such a damaged woman or girl may in order to feel security, try to lure us via sex, into an intimate relationship we don't actually want. Then if we reject her, in fury, she may turn against us for not “loving her.”

And all this, whilst the feminists cry “rape”, and it is nearly we, the men, who are being forced into the sex act by women, by emotional blackmail.

The well known song *Private Life* written by *The Pretenders' Chrissie Hynde*, and sung memorably and hilariously by *Grace Jones*, who appears in the video like one of the bossy ladies in leather whom men visit to be abused, is relevant here.

*Your acting's a drag  
It's ok on tv 'cause you can turn it off  
But don't try me*

*Yes your marriage is a tragedy  
But it's not my concern  
I'm very superficial I hate anything official*

*Your private life drama baby - leave me out*

*Your sentimental gestures only bore me to death  
You've made a desperate appeal now save your breath  
Attachment to obligation through guilt and regret s\*\*\* that's so wet  
And your sex life complications are not my fascinations*

*Your private life drama baby - leave me out*

*You asked me for advice - I said use the door  
But you're still clinging to somebody you deplore  
And now you wanna use me for emotional blackmail  
I just feel pity when you lie, contempt when you cry*

This song lyric appears to be worth quoting, as it shows the kind of tortured “psychodrama” that is going on in the real world out there – the world of emotional and sexual blackmail, and addictions that can never be satisfied, which we get caught up in when healthy relationships have been abandoned or failed to live up to our expectations, leaving us on a fruitless never-ending search for emotional and sexual satisfaction which is doomed to failure.

If women impose neglect and cruelty on their daughters which results in them rebelling into an emotional damaged and out-of-control state, fathers have to be there to act as anchor and refuge to their daughter, and stop the “wicked witch” in her tracks to whatever degree is possible.

We have the *Snow White* fairytale involving the wicked witch who poisons Snow White with an apple to stop her having the love of *Prince Charming* which the queen can never have, because she is not *the fairest of them all*, whereas Snow White is.

So aside from the fact this story was written by a man as far as we know, it is confirming the image of the jealous mother trying to sour her precocious and beautiful daughter's life.

And in real life, little does the better kind of woman – the Snow White type innocent girl – often realise, but this “wicked witch” may appear in her life in all kinds of disguises, even in the friends she surrounds herself with and implicitly trusts.

Many women, complex creatures that they are in comparison to most men, can deceive even their best friends of decades completely, and history and press reports and perhaps our own real life experiences show this is often true.

Again, this sisterly loyalty counts for nothing, when there is something large enough at stake, which creates a disagreement between the sisters – usually *a man*.

Let us recall that *Queen Elizabeth I* chopped off her cousin's head in order to secure the throne for herself. The true cause of the death of the modern female “young pretender to the throne”, *Princess Diana*, may possibly never be known.

So let us be clear that throughout history, and especially today, behind the smokescreen of cries of “abusive men” is a web of female deception and dictatorship, not only against men, but when considered appropriate, against their own girlfriends and daughters – *women become traitors against their own kind*.

## Chapter Nine – Women on Top – Rule by Paranoia

It is apparently an interesting and somewhat amusing fact that generally speaking, when a woman is asked by her man where she bought a loaf of bread, she replies “why, what’s wrong with it?” Whereas a man when asked the same question by a woman, or indeed another man, simply tells us where he bought it.

One might say a typical man *answers questions*, whereas a typical woman *questions answers*.

This points to something deeply different in the mentalities of men and women which it seems the mainstream psychology literature in its current efforts to debunk commonsense, never points out or touches, or more typically makes every effort to deny.

No doubt even at this very moment, there is some demented feminist Ph D, writing a paper on “the illusion of gender difference” to further hypnotise those foolish enough to listen into this state of unnatural and frankly mentally unsound denial.

After all, if society were to accept the *reality* that *most* men and women are apart from the obvious physical differences, very significantly different in many ways - really, a different *polarity* like the positive and negative terminals on a battery - we would have to face up to the consequences of that, and assign to them *suitable and differing roles*.

The electrical analogy is worth exploring further.

That is, if we look at a battery, we have a positive and negative terminal on it, but aside from the markings, we cannot tell which is which without testing it with a meter.

Electrically positive and negative currents are *both* electricity, so apparently the same thing, but if we put the battery into a device the wrong way round, not realising that there is a *direction* to the electrical flow, the electrically powered device will not work, and may even be damaged in that process.

This electrical analogy is significant as electricity, and positive and negative forces are absolutely fundamental to the human body, and in fact, the whole universe, any scientist will agree.

Our thoughts are either – depending on your interpretation of consciousness – caused by or accompanied by electrical nerve currents in the brain, as are all our physical sensations and perceptions.

In Nature we constantly see this interplay of what we call the negative and positive forces, right down to the positive proton and negative electron in the atom, and likely even beyond the atomic level.

The one and the zero are the fundamental components of both mathematics and the binary arithmetic and logic circuits which are the concepts and elements underpinning the whole of digital electronics and computers.

We see this *duality* in Nature everywhere – light and dark, night and day, noise and silence, the sun and moon (in the sense that the sun is *giving* of light, and the moon merely *reflects* light and produces none of its own), in the two hemispheres of the brain - one of which is primarily concerned with rationality, and the other with creativity or intuition - and finally in the duality of male and female in every sexual species, which in its human form is man and woman.

So when everything in Nature is a contrast of opposing elements or forces, why would we expect men and women to be the same, which unnatural concept the feminists are attempting to force upon us?

According to an ancient Chinese scripture, the well known *I Ching*, this dualistic pattern of nature is brought out, as also in the *Tao Te Ching* attributed to *Lao Tzu*.

Stated there is a clear and detailed analysis of the differing natures of men and women, and their consequent *naturally* differing roles in life.

In particular, is stated – *the role of the man is in the outer world, dominant (in the marriage) and that of the women (again, in marriage) is submissive, inside the home.*

Whilst feministic types will howl at the mere mention of the term *submissive* as describing women, since it conjures up images for them of enslavement to household chores, forced sex and wife beating, this is not at all what was meant by the unknown author of the *I ching*.

He or perhaps for all we know, even *she*, was trying to convey an orderly model of family, and as a consequence society, which is after all merely a collection of families.

A woman is apparently happy to be bossed about in some silly and pointless job or career she is pursuing to intensify her ego-pride, but in the most difficult and most potentially rewarding job of caring for home and children, the feminists are saying she should not take any such fundamental satisfaction, nor orders, particularly from a man.

The truth is none of us, man nor woman, likes taking orders, except from someone we respect. But without occasional orders imposed by the intervention of someone wiser or more experienced than we, there can be no *order*.

So the solution for women is not to throw dominant men out of the family, as is being done now, but to *find one you respect*.

The awesome task before men, is to become somebody whom a woman respects – a very difficult task for most men currently, due to having been raised principally under female influence – i.e. spoiled, self-indulgent, undisciplined, sexually obsessed and attached to women, which despite what many men currently think and feel, is not at all a natural state for a *civilised man*, but only for an *animal* which is never able to rise above its instinctive urges, as it has no mind and will of its own to do so with.

The *I ching* – which incidentally, the only reliable edition of known to the author is the *Richard Wilhelm* translation – is really a book describing the transformation of society from a state of chaos to one of order, these states again being examples of two opposite polarities.

Do the feminists, who would have their sisters kill themselves diving in front of horses to win the right to elect two nearly identical political puppets as leader, and incidentally, often neutralize and render impotent the vote of their male partner or husband in that process, understand the cosmically deep philosophy in this book?

Of course not.

To the above summarized quote on the “traditional” roles of men and women described, they would say two things no doubt.

Firstly, that the book was no doubt written by a *man*, which incidentally is not a definitely established fact. Even the authorship of the famous *Tao Te Ching* is unclear, partly because it appears that true prophets and sages were so humble and reverent before the unfathomable power of Nature or “God”, they did not necessarily even wish the work to be personally attributed to them, unlike the modern egotistical authors with whom we are familiar.

Secondly, they will call such concepts “outdated”, just as many modern teenagers will call classical music, jazz or sixties and seventies pop and rock music outdated, though the songs and instrumental works in these earlier eras of music were vastly more creative than virtually anything produced in the last decade or two which has appeared in the popular music charts.

Like the mainly trashy and ephemeral pop music of the present, so called feminism, may be as forgotten in twenty, fifty or one hundred years time, as will be the empty-headed, shameless commercially manufactured non-entities comprising *most* of the current pop music output here at the dawn of the twenty-first century.

Suffice it to say, that many of the lyrics of the 1960s and 70s pop and rock era were deeply poetic, philosophically and psychologically astute, whereas most of the current output is totally obsessed with an immature view of man-woman relationships, feminist anthems (such as *You Gotta be* by feisty black female artist “Des’ree”) or on the other hand, the depressive and nihilistic perspective of groups such as *Nirvana*, whose lead singer unsurprisingly ended up killing himself with a drug overdose.



Songs such as the aforementioned *Des'ree* effort with its hypnotic chorus of affirmations:

*You gotta be bad  
You gotta be bold  
You gotta be wiser  
You gotta be hard  
You gotta be tough  
You gotta be stronger  
You gotta be cool  
You gotta be calm  
You gotta stick together*

have been taken up by women as anthems, and in fact almost *prayers to the feminist Mother Goddess*, in the scary psychological security vacuum caused by the absence of “old fashioned” religions – i.e. those which encouraged belief in a “God” perceived as a male force - or alternatively, guidance from some mere mortal man, be he husband or father.

The average modern woman is trying to face the world all alone, with her equally scared and confused sisters, who are all frantically trying to assure one another – like the *Sex in the City* characters - that everything is OK in the absence of reliable male love.

She is, like Nancy Friday, quite likely not only in the feminist manufactured and deeply unnatural and sad war with men, but also with her own mother, and cannot rely on her equally self-obsessed and screwed-up sisters.

So it is little surprise that we find as many as ten percent of women *admitting* to “self-harming”, which leaves one wondering how many more women are hiding some addiction that “gets them through the night” - whether it's overeating, Princess Diana's famous anorexia/bulimia, or compulsive smoking, which though now proven as very dangerous, is common even amongst the most educated and talented of women.

Very intelligent British female comedian *Jo Brand's* – check out her book on men, *A Load of Old Balls*, if you disbelieve her brains - culture of “a shag and a fag” is the sad reality of modern single women's existence in the absence of leading truly meaningful lives and having truly meaningful relationships with men.

Incidentally, it is comforting and enlightening – as proof of the power of Nature beyond our petty little personal ideas – that such theoretically feminist icons as *Jo Brand* and talented Canadian singer songwriter *Tori Amos* - who was very upset about having had a strict minister for a father, apparently - have in the last decade or so settled down to a situation and mentality of traditional *feminine* married-with-children, as has incidentally in its male aspect, former 70s gay icon rock singer *Tom Robinson* ( *Glad to be Gay*, *2-4-6-8 Motorway*, etc.)

The factor distinguishing these two ladies from most of the ardent feminists is that *they both have a strong sense of humour, a good heart, they care, they are fundamentally “earth mothers”- concerned about all in Nature.*

They are *not* in the swelling ranks of the Westernised, capitalistic and narcissistic, man-hating clones, whose hearts are twisted by childhood obsessions and traumas they are unable to release, and who get their satisfaction from trying to intellectually outsmart men, or become the “managing directrix” of a multinational company that manufactures toothpicks or whatever.

Jo Brand, who listed her male heroes in the aforementioned book as including *Buddha* and *Jesus Christ*, herself was recently interviewed on an all woman chat show, and registering the surprise of the other female panel members at her status as married caring mother of young children, remarked ironically in her sad clown's, apologetic and sensitive voice “Why? Did you think I was just a big fat scary lesbian?”

We have all got to learn – as they say in religious terms *Man (or woman) proposes, God disposes*. Or in scientific impersonal terms – *Man proposes, Nature disposes*.

For example, we think “hey, this booze is great, let's drink till we drop”, but then Nature says, “sure thing, buddy – do what you like, *but I will take your liver.*”

Or we say “I'm tense, where are my cigarettes?” and Nature likewise answers “yes, enjoy your smoke while you may - *for in a premature tomorrow, is death.*”

We think we are free to with our intellect – and this applies to the feminists in particular – interpret reality to our own design, but then Nature punishes us for our denial of its immutable laws.

Unfortunately in this case, by the feminist denial of men's role as leaders in society and family, and women's principle role as carers and social diplomats, we are descending further and further into familial, social, national and global chaos.

The feminists will no doubt immediately cry out into response to this view – *hang on, most of the top jobs in the world are currently filled by men!*

Well, are they really, or is this only superficial and illusory?

For example, let's go right to the very top of our Western systems, with for example former President *Bill Clinton* in America and current prime minister *Tony Blair* in England.

Each of these men was a lawyer, as were their wives. Clinton was a self-confessed womaniser, forced into having to make public apologies to his wife, and at least one biography of him suggests that he was not even manly enough - in the sense used in this book of the *traditionally dominant male* - to make the first move in courtship on her.

*She approached him*, again, contrary to what Nature as expressed by the *I ching* would have, i.e. *that the woman modestly waits for the man to show her respect and approach her*.

All this would suggest she was the real boss in the relationship, and it is no coincidence that she was described by some as “the arch feminist” and has like Mrs Blair, shown a strong desire to put herself and her political viewpoints forward on the speaking platform, unlike the traditionally modest and supportive roles of leaders’ wives, such as *Raisa Gorbachev* or the recently defeated British Conservative party leader’s wife, *Sandra Howard*.

This is not to suggest such “modest” women are weak or inferior. They may well be just as or more intelligent and capable than the women who choose to thrust themselves into the limelight, but they may simply have a more mature perspective on female power.

When a woman chooses a man whom she really loves, and is in philosophical and spiritual harmony with, it does not matter to her who gets the headlines, and most truly intelligent women would prefer to avoid the glare of direct publicity, knowing the dangers and unpleasantness that can bring.

But by deliberately thrusting themselves and their own agenda into the limelight as both Mrs Blair and Mrs Clinton have now done, not only are they showing that they are almost certainly the dominant partner in the relationship, but that by feeling the need to claim the public ground, they feel their husbands are in fact incapable of fully representing their views.

Tony Blair has freely admitted for example, that his wife, reportedly an equivalent millions dollars a year barrister and judge, is a better lawyer – and therefore presumably intellectually brighter person than he – so how can he possibly be the boss in the relationship, when as a lawyer, she can outtalk, out-argue and outsmart him?

So it appears that perhaps the two major players on the world political stage for the last decade or longer have effectively been ruled by two argumentative, legally expert and financially successful women, who have been putting into practice as much as possible of the feminist agenda.

Girls in their clamour to become “successful career women” like their role models such as Mrs Clinton and Mrs Blair, as well as all the numerous and typically “eye-candy” based, and relatively talentless female actresses and pop stars, are outdoing the boys at school in nearly every subject – except hard sciences and sports – in virtually every Western country, and no doubt this trend will set in soon in the Asian counties too, especially India, China and Japan where the pace of change is so quick and the downfall of men – by disempowering and over-sexualising them – is well in hand.

Why, puzzled men readers might ask, is being very sexually hungry a path to downfall?

The reason is, because sex is the carrot that women use to control men. If we can't say “no” to the seductive offers of women, we lose our freedom – it ultimately makes us the slave of the bossy women with the leather boots and the whip.

But unfortunately, most men cannot see what an immense and degrading degree of slavery they are in. They think having loads of sex with lots of willing women who will satisfy all their wildest desires is great. In theory, of course it does sound like paradise. Every emperor has his harem, doesn't he?

Yes, but the Emperor is the master of the harem – *not its slave and victim*.

Even if he allowed himself to be tied up and teased by one of his harem girls, for the perverse pleasure of it, if in that situation she acted against his wishes, it would be her who would be taken out by his guards and whipped, not the other way round, as is happening now.

Can we silly and immature men wake up please?

For example, let us take the *Bobbitt* case. Mrs Bobbitt committed the most horrific act on a man that is perhaps humanly possible. By a miracle, a now more or less canonized (by men, that is) doctor managed to sew her husband's severed appendage back on, and create a near normal state of sexual functioning.

But for most men, to lose their sexual organ, is possibly worse than losing their life.

Imagine, what would happen to a woman in an Eastern, Islamic country who did that to her man. She would likely be flogged, stoned to death or hanged.

But in the West what happens? Women snigger and laugh, and she is let off with a telling off and a plea of *temporary insanity!*

“Cutting off a man's sex organ is a very naughty thing to do, young lady...” – and with a wag of the finger from the likely female judge “don't be such a naughty girl, and don't do it again . . .” (giggle)

Likewise many women have managed to escape conviction for murder on various similarly flimsy grounds of “abuse” which could in reality mean absolutely anything from a few petty insults to systematic beating and humiliation. Once the man in question is *dead*, he can hardly tell his side of the story, can he???

So this appears to mean that women will if this trend continues – especially when backed up by the rapidly growing army of female legal officials and judges – be virtually immune from prosecution, and many feminist influenced types are arguing that women should never be imprisoned for any crime whatsoever, on absolutely astonishing grounds such as “it might emotionally damage them.”

This is happening of course, completely parallel to men becoming more criminalised than ever before, in fear of accusation of paedophilia if they accidentally or deliberately even touch a child – even their *own* child – or accused of wife-beating if after a woman goes berserk in a rage and hurls plates or knives at him, or indeed attacks him, he gives her a non-injurious slap to calm her down.

Again, the extremely emotionally volatile and violent capacity of many women is not widely discussed or acknowledged in society at large – back to the *sugar and spice and all things nice* idealisation, which any man over three years old knows is not wholly true, and is backed up by the *fact* that a substantial amount of violence in relationships consists of *battered men*, who no doubt again, are a far larger percentage that will admit it, due to the shame and mockery which will be placed upon them.

Another apparently trivial example of the “sexploitation” of men, in tandem with disempowering them, is the evolution of the famous *Star Trek* series, which is now such an ingrained part of (note) *male culture* that it needs no further introduction.

But let us briefly consider the evolution of the series, bearing this seeping feminist fuelled female “empowerment” – in reality, enslavement of women to mutually destructive values – in mind.

At first we had the traditional masculine hero figure of *Captain Kirk* – a “man’s man” so to speak, though his *implied* sexual behaviour over the whole series could have been viewed as a role model even for the antics of Bill Clinton.

So that was the mid 1960s, when the idea of men as leaders and heroes was still alive.

Feminism was however also alive, but only in the limited form of communications officer *Lieutenant Uhura*, a bossy black lady, who would from time to time have to sternly tell off the lecherous *Mr Sulu* – and if necessary, in traditional bossy leather clad lady style, give him a slap.

But she was still a servant, and her short skirt, black stockings and boots presented her as a sex object for the entertainment of men, of which the feminists could surely not approve.

Though sexually irresponsible however, Captain Kirk was under no woman’s thumb. His close advisers were only the wise, deeply rational and emotionally aloof *Mr Spock*, and the over sentimental, but morally ardent and loyal *Doctor McCoy*.

Captain Kirk was a man in a man’s world, for whom women were just considered objects of pleasure and a passing fancy. His real “love” was not a woman, but *his ship, The Enterprise*, and no woman could rival *her*.

But by the 1980s, that had all changed, and we had – whether we liked it or not – a new more “politically correct” *Captain Picard*, who though still appearing masculine, was surrounded by “wise women” to advise him, and unlike the self-contained Kirk, seemed to live in permanent regret of never having a child, which theme was explored in one of the subsequent *Star Trek* movies.

Pathetically, under the howling feminist paranoia canonised into the tenets of “political correctness” – which is really the most tyrannical attack on free speech in history, far worse than anything the Inquisition ever thought up - he was compelled to say *where no ONE had gone before*, rather than *where no MAN had gone before*, as Captain Kirk had said in the original opening credits.

This is mentioned for the benefit of the younger male Star Trek fans, who likely don't know how long this systematic stealing of their masculine identity and heroism has been going on, in even the most trivial aspect of life.

In particular this new “politically corrected” captain, was advised by *Counsellor Troi*, who was an “empath” – that is, she possessed an insight and sensitivity he clearly lacked. Though Picard was theoretically strong and decisive when required, this did not really ring true and consistent with all the insecurities he seemed to expose.

In short, we had started to dip into the unreality of the feminist imaginary world.

Picard would constantly have to be saved in one way or another by a succession of these wise women authority figures, such as female *Doctor Crusher* (bye bye *Bones* and the lovely *Nurse Chappel*, you will also note), and a supposedly mystical and enlightened black alien played by *Whoopi Goldberg*.

The male heartthrob vacancy left by Captain Kirk was filled by an ambiguous figure – *Riker* - who was no longer in command, and under the spell of female *Counsellor Troi* (note the *promotion* to being in the “command team” from being a mere “lieutenant” like *Uhura*).

So really, was setup the modern feministically oriented family, with a troubled, confused, insensitive man – *Picard* – guided/ruled/comforted by wise women – *Troi*, *Crusher*, *etc.* – with a spoiled and sexually hungry child in tow – “*Commander*” - as if he was, but really wasn't – *Riker* – who had somewhat Freudian feelings for his (allegorically and psychologically speaking) mother *Troi*.

The progressive destruction of the male role and its replacement by the female, was completed in the subsequent Star Trek series, *Voyager*, with its first woman in charge, *Captain Janeway*, whose performance was described by one critic at its initial screening as “wooden.”

The chosen name itself for the new female captain was almost childishly ridiculous – as if to say – we've tried “*joe's way*”, now let's try “*jane's way*.”

But there was a problem with the acceptance of this sci-fi series, as sci-fi is principally a male obsession – how could we get male superhero fans to stomach this idea of a female captain?

How as a middle aged, somewhat voluptuous though hardly beautiful woman, could she possibly compete with a male macho hero like Captain Kirk, or even the stoic charm of the Shakespearian expert actor who played Picard?

Especially after the actress herself in question had failed miserably to compete with *Peter Falk's* brilliant and quirky detective, *Columbo*, in a soundly flopped series as his wife and female counterpart, *Mrs Columbo*.

The solution was easy. They wrote in a virtually naked (in some kind of lycra bodystocking) beautiful female alien to keep men and boys watching, whilst the captain's throne was handed to a woman.

So most men believe they cannot be or have never been hypnotised, yet men in their droves meekly and silently watched the star ship captain's role – *Kirk* and *Picard's* chair of command - taken over by a woman, while they hypnotically ogled the near naked, beauty and bossy female alien.

More importantly, it was just one more example of the insidious invasion of every traditional male role, however ridiculous that might be in reality.

This is not to deny that there are some few exceptional women who are able to fulfil a major leadership role, even perhaps a military one, such as *Joan of Arc*.

But such rare beings like say *Moses* or *Joan of Arc* are so far above the strata of those currently available in general to fulfil high office of either sex, as to be outside of the general debate.

So the short answer to how women are taking power away from men and according it to themselves is – *they are stealing it from men under our noses whilst they keep our minds on sex.*

It really *is* that simple.

But let us look at the end of their endeavour, rather than the means.

What are women in power like, what is life like when we do things “jane's way”?

Here we need to raise the issue of *objective* and *subjective* judgements.

Modern society is awash with statistics, which seek to present a view of reality that those desirous of influencing us wish us to have. *You've never had it so good*, they say, but somehow we don't *feel* the way they say we should.

The trouble with statistics, is that those who wish to make a case will take all the statistics that support their case, and ignore or discredit all those that don't.

So though they can be useful, when they indicate decisively on a crucial issue, they can also be used falsely to convince us of illusory world and reality views, and some of the basic techniques for using statistics in such a way were outlined in a classic book called *How to Lie With Statistics*, by *Darrell Huff*, first published as long ago as 1954, in the days when a good number of men still had minds of their own to think with, before feminism and sex addiction set in.

The message and lesson for us here is – don't let so called "statistical facts" fool you – the reality is *how you feel*.

So subjective information, though tried to be rejected by so called "empirical science", is extremely important, because the only fundamental reality for each of us that really matters is *how we feel*, which the average drug addict conclusively proves, as once addicted, *nothing else in his or her life matters but the acquisition and use of the drug*.

The reason this point needs to be emphasized, is because this selective use and abuse of statistics is one of the major ways that the feminist leaders and their cloned legions of followers in every sphere of activity justify their perverse ideas, which generally result in destroying the traditional family, disempowering men and creating confusion and chaos in what is left of *civilised society* – that rapidly disappearing phenomenon.

So the following is derived from many subjective reports and experiences of women in power.

This unavoidably *subjective* piecemeal survey – which you now understand, we should adamantly refuse to have dismissed under the grounds of being "unscientific" or "not statistically proven or significant" – says women in power are frequently far more dominating, unreasonable and controlling than any man.

Not only men report this, but women also, many of whom say they would rather have a male boss any day, than another woman, presumably in many cases, because they can't use their womanly wiles on another woman to wrap her round their little finger, as they typically can with a man.

Women in general, especially when given power *over men* seem to lose all sense of proportion. It excites them egotistically, and sometimes even in a sexual way.

Their appears to be a dark devilish side to women, which appears when they get into power, just as much or more so, as with any man in the same situation.

The *fact* that so many women can apparently without feeling any guilt whatsoever, take jobs in which they actually physically and mentally beat, torture and humiliate men – *and even at times other women* – for money in the "sex industry", seems to prove something about them, for which there is no male counterpart or equivalent.

Are women lining up, purses and credit cards in hand ready to get men to beat and humiliate and torture them? We don't see that happening – *some women might even desire such a service* – but men would either feel too wrong about doing such a thing, or society at large – feminist controlled, you appreciate - would not let them.

But neither women nor *Western* society at large seems to care about this humiliation and degradation of men, and we have just seen that further confirmed in the behaviour of some of the soldiers, *including female ones*, in the current Iraq war.



Is this one wonders the real reason for the war on the Arab world – because it's the only place left where men have got any real authority and self-respect?

After all, if it's only the oil the West wants, surely we could negotiate for that? Why the need to murder and kill, and invade, and degrade and humiliate?

It is clear again, that sex plays some part in all this conflict between man and woman.

We have the Hollywood drama of *Disclosure* in 1994, which shows how a woman uses her position to force a married man into sex, and threatens to ruin his career when he rejects her.

This kind of sexual intrigue, no doubt still more commonly found in the woman trying to sleep her way to the top, is no fiction, and again, many eye-witness and first hand accounts confirm it, as does a study of legal cases.

Sexual harassment works both ways, but can be a lot more subtle when used by women than men. For example, many man-hating women – and virtually every but the most mature and saintly of women must have at least a little of that resentment – gain great satisfaction from feeling in charge and abusing men beneath them, just like the “madam” with the leather boots and whip.

They revel in turning “Nature” upside down, not seeing that the consequent destruction of male authority leads to disorder, violent crime, vandalism, drug addiction and most of the other social woes, including *crimes against women*.

They do not have the breadth of view, or foresight to see the long term effects of their actions.

For example, millions of mothers with absent fathers become completely unable to control their sons as soon as their male children become physically strong enough to challenge them, which in some cases, could be as young as even ten or eleven, and most definitely once the boy enters his teens.

The reality is, that when no man is present to stop him, such a boy, if not already well civilised, becomes the boss in his house, and it should be noted that there are also many violent girls who are able to intimidate and dominate their mothers at an early age, also due to the absence of a man to stop the mischief and maintain order.

No doubt millions of women are too ashamed to reveal this situation publicly, and are on sedatives or undergoing counselling because they don't know how to deal with their out-of-control male or female child.

So again, in their denial of reality, the feminists turn to a thousand “experts” to try and find some kind of sophisticated alternative to this problem, when the obvious solution is clearly *the presence of a man*.

That is – in their usual “double-think” the feminist have “zero tolerance” (i.e. complete and tyrannical intolerance) of a man disciplining a child, or even sometimes his wife (in a *verbal* way), but apparently aren't concerned about children intimidating and beating their mothers.

How long will it be, one wonders, before one hears of mothers being raped by their own children? Surely it has happened many times already.

In the UK, we have recently had one teacher being raped by her twelve year old pupil, so it is only a step away from the mother-son scenario, especially if the mother is still young and attractive as so many of them are, having had children so young instead of waiting until they were more sensible and grown up.

But as usual, in what anything but the most blinded of men will now see is really almost totally a woman-dominated world, society is not governed by sense anymore, but by hypnotic images of women like those in *Dallas* or *Dynasty* or the *Danielle Steele* novel – these “women of substance” who wear *Versace* suits, *Givenchy* perfumes and hold high-powered jobs, and take young lovers as playthings, while their divorced husband pleads for child access and pays maintenance, and their children are abused unbeknownst to them by some cruel or perverted nanny, step-father or babysitter – especially their *male children*.

Because this technique of hypnosis is now so prevalent in society, it needs a whole chapter to discuss, because it is really the main tool in the wrongly motivated woman's armoury, and if man, woman and child are ever to be liberated, all men must understand it thoroughly, and learn to rise above its evil and destructive influence.

Women should not generally be in positions of great power – such as presidents or prime ministers – because they are ruled too much by emotion and too little by reason. They say “don't smack that (naughty and disobedient and wilful) child”, but when he or she grows up to be a hooligan or a drug addict, it's too late.

We had generations of *well behaved adults* who grew up with a certain amount of physical discipline, and the vast majority say *it did them no harm*; whereas the neglect of discipline of children is obviously now doing everybody a lot of harm, including the poor defenceless teachers who now regularly get sworn at, abused and beaten by their pupils.

It this to suggest the “hang ‘em, flog ‘em” style of discipline and criminal justice?

Not at all – but the point is, when there is no *option* to control children physically, as at present, how can a teacher control a class of unruly children at all?

There is no reliable way known at present, so if you would decry the *possibility* of using or preferably merely *threatening* physical punishment on unruly children, whether in the home or school, where is your alternative please?

You have none!

Both male and female teachers are desperately searching for answers to this problem, and are merely being conned into accepting sophisticated but unworkable solutions which temporarily persuade them all is OK, such as *Getting the Buggers to Behave*, a best selling pile of nonsense, written of course inevitably by a woman.

The point is, we do not need to read this book from cover to cover to know it is a spurious waste of time. Why? Firstly, because it has hilariously actually gone into a sequel! - *Getting the Buggers to Behave II* – which in itself is an admission that volume one was inadequate, or why bother with a follow up?

Note the use of the – dare we say – thoroughly *politically incorrect* term “buggers” to describe *children*, which shows the utter depth of despair and *outrage* being felt by so many teachers, such that they should find such a vulgar term acceptable.

Moreover, the simple truth is – we must simply *demand* behaviour, and *enforce* it with something that scares them – i.e. the threat of pain.

Then, and *only then*, when we have established *order*, should we *dare* to show the kind and gentle side of *love*, which otherwise will be just rejected and spat upon as weakness, by these apprentice little bullies, as will *we*.

It is high time that teachers went on strike *en masse* in every country in the Western world, to demand they have the right to either discipline children themselves, or have some central figure who is able to do that on their behalf.

My god – would we then see silence in class, and children diligently and obediently getting on with their work!

After all, how is public order kept? If we riot – even when protesting for a just cause – a policeman will come along with a big stick and beat us with it, hand cuff or tear gas spray us and lock us in the back of a van.

So Western society retains the right to *beat senseless* misbehaving adults – mainly *men* note, as usual - but not even *touch* children or give a relatively gentle slap!

Has this incredible inconsistency not been noticed by anyone!!!

The point that the feminists and “human rights campaigners” miss, is that if *the threat* of discipline on children is available to parents and teachers, *likely actual punishment seldom needs to be used*.

In fact, in time, when society really does become truly civilised, such physical discipline of anyone above the age of five or seven should gradually wither away to non-existence through lack of use.

But in the present, we have chaos and disrespect, and both of these things must be decisively addressed – but in a spirit of justice, not of the random injustice and sadistic savagery of many of the old fashioned teachers who abused such disciplinary powers.

So such a re-introduction of discipline would need to be carefully monitored, but there appears to be no alternative for teachers to maintain control of large and unruly classes in schools.

For example, if we accept it would currently be very difficult for teachers – especially women – to try to impose physical discipline on children after the tradition has been dormant for a few decades, by closer liaison between parents and teachers, the parents could discipline children who misbehave at school when they get home in some fashion which would take the pressure of the teachers for that job, and simultaneously relieve them of the fear of intimidation from parents as is currently a real concern.

Yet principally female paranoia prevents such sensible policies being put in place – there are only howls of “child abuser”, “paedophile”, “monster”, so that those who would seek to put children in their proper places – i.e. as obedient followers of parents and teachers rather than as despotic rulers over them as is happening now – are hunted out of society as viciously and inconsistently as *Matthew Hopkins* once hunted witches.

Society – and its men in particular – are swamped further every day by an endless number of new rules and regulations which the governing female mentality keeps thinking up trying to plug every little leak in the dyke.

But what does the wise author of the *Tao Te Ching* say:

*When governments govern much, the people are miserable.  
When governments govern little, the people are happy.*

*The more (ridiculous) laws are made, the greater the number of lawbreakers.*

And in the twentieth century widely respected philosopher Krishnamurti said:

*The wise do not seek power, and those who (currently) seek power are not wise.*

This interfering, busy body style of government by the ambitious men and women who are now ruling us, demonstrates the truth of these age old writings.

These is an absence of trust. It is *rule by paranoia*.

We *think* maybe the Iraqis have weapons of mass destruction. Anyway – just look at the way they abuse women – stoning adulterers and things – *they can't be trusted!* - a paranoid feminist voice cries. *Let's bomb and murder the hell out of them just in case, and ask questions later.*

This is not sane rule. It is rule by paranoia.

Do men routinely go through their wife's handbag and pockets?

Unlikely – it's a sacred area to women, off limits even to their husbands without express permission. But it is common knowledge that women (under the excuse of cleaning) go through men's pockets and most private personal assets looking for clues to infidelity or some other thing that could threaten the security of her private little world.

Many men are hounded on their mobile phones. To feel secure, she has to know where he is and what he is doing all the time.

Doesn't this sound a bit like the so called "war on terrorism"?

And how as time goes by we are all being monitored as to who we are, where we are, and what we are doing, whether on the countless security cameras in almost all Western major cities, or by other even more surreptitious means, like storing out private emails on Internet Service Provider computers for many years, as is now law in the UK.

Incidentally, as men, we should all become aware of computer security issues, for example, that it is relatively easy for a woman or even male boss – remembering that many men now have "defected" over to the feminist agenda also – to spy on the internal email in a company, and if we are careless, possibly any of our private emails we may send or receive using our workplace Internet facility.

To be masters in our environment as men, as the PC and Internet is now so pervasive in our whole lives, we must either avoid computers completely, or master them to at least a basic degree, or typically we will find our girlfriends or wives who work in an office, or even our children, will know far more than we.

No man should be discouraged from imagining that this is a subject he cannot master.

All that is required is the patient assimilation of many small pieces of information, like the pieces of a large jigsaw puzzle, which at first seems daunting only because of their anonymity at first sight.

Just like the jigsaw puzzle however, it takes no great intellectual prowess to become an expert computer *user*. It is certainly no more difficult to achieve than learning to drive a car.

As the world is now so controlled in almost every way by computers or computer based technologies, we cannot at this point in time remain ignorant as men of these technologies, leaving women to steal this arena of power from us also.

As to women in positions of authority generally, we need to become aware that many women placed in such situations that their gender has not been for long accustomed to coping with, may use overkill and heavy-handed solutions, to deal with situations, imagining *wrongly* that is how men would do things, so as not to be seen to be as a "weak woman" in a man's world.

For example, the *Waco* siege was apparently administrated by then female US Attorney General, *Janet Reno*, and we all know how that ended – in a lot of innocent people *including children* dead, who it seems really need not have been killed if more patience and tact had been applied, for example by the authorities *backing off* to let things cool down.

It seems there is an increasing tendency more generally, under these kind of draconian “zero tolerance” policies introduced during the era of this effectively feminist rule, to push people into these kind of siege situations, celebrated for example, in the *Samuel L Jackson* movie, *The Negotiator*, in which they are then *forced* to take regrettable actions they would rather have not, due to this heavy handed, unsympathetic and intolerant approach.

For example, recently in the UK, a proud man in his fifties, who was being threatened with having his welfare benefits stopped – and thereby pushed into a siege situation – shot a policeman non-fatally, when “the flying squad” were called in to deal with him, and ended up shooting first his dog, and then himself to avoid being taken, on what seems to have been only a relatively trivial legal matter.

Such originally averagely decent men, have clearly become so sidelined and abused by society at large, they descend into an armed war with society like the famous *Unabomber* in America.

None of this need be, if we see to it that *all men – especially those of mature years – are treated with respect*.

In both America and the UK we have seen women attorney generals, in control of the entire legal system of these major world powers.

Which means, these no doubt feminist women have been the ultimate authorities over the justice and legal systems, which ultimately control the injustices and justices and freedoms and imprisonments perpetrated upon men everywhere in these countries, that is, upon *you* and *me*.

So though in theory, we might like to imagine that if we get into legal trouble, we will be in front of an impartial, deeply civilised and utterly just judge, like for example, that depicted in the wonderful recent BBC TV drama series, *Judge John Deed*, with *Martin Shaw* in the title role, we should be warned, that as more and more feministically inclined women and men infiltrate the legal system, the reality may be very different.

It is worth mentioning that the above series depicts a noble, though perhaps a little too sexually adventurous, British high court judge, who battles heroically against the feminist-capitalist alliance political authorities, who seek to prevent him from carrying out *true justice*, as did a marvellous character in an earlier legal drama series involving an eccentric, no doubt now thoroughly “politically incorrect” barrister, *Rumpole of the Bailey*, play by well known stage and screen actor, now sadly deceased, *Leo McKern*.

In his role as *Rumpole*, Leo McKern frequently played out dramatic scenes cross-examining parties to the case in a sometimes near brutal manner, which was a real life simulation of how tough at times questioning must be to get the truth out of an accuser.

For example, in a case where a man is wrongly accused of rape, and will have his whole life destroyed if found guilty, such unremitting cross-examination is clearly essential, which if we are not careful, the right to carry out, we will lose under this feminist regime, and many innocent men will then be sent more or less to societal oblivion and likely brutal assault in prison, for crimes *they did not commit*.

Note that a further wide injustice perpetrated on men in the West is the naming of mere *suspects* accused of such life-destroying crimes as rape, who clearly should in any true justice system have their anonymity protected *unless they are proven guilty*.

That this right to anonymity is not given to male rape suspects, is again *a clear piece of evidence* that feminist activists who do not care for the fate and suffering of *innocent men* are exerting undue influence on our Western governments.

On this issue of the right to cross-examination of women who have alleged rape, let us not also forget that the legendary *King Solomon*, in his wisdom, had to resort to threatening to have his soldiers cut a baby in half to get the truth out of two bickering women, who both laid claim to the child, if we imagine that we can easily determine the truth in these “matter of life and death” cases.

Any jury members who may find themselves in this situation of having to decide the fate of any man who has these allegations placed against him, are urged where possible to use the full extent of the term *beyond reasonable doubt*.

For as with child abuse, as usual, the blame is always assigned to *men*, and never on the woman's carelessness in protecting herself, or perhaps some unnecessarily teasing or provocative behaviour that has caused some man to attack or molest her, in the *genuine cases of rape*.

We also need to note that the advertising and propaganda campaigns used by women's pressure groups, tend to portray unreal depictions of these scenarios – including violence against women in general – in which some completely innocent and irreproachable woman is savagely attacked by some malevolent beast of man, which is not statistically speaking the actuality of the vast majority of genuine rapes nor violent assaults on women.

Equally, as to *selection of juries*, it seems unfair to have juries of principally *women* in such cases, as for example the recent Michael Jackson trial in which the jury was composed of *eight women and only four men*, and seems to be an issue to be campaigned upon in the legal sphere.

That is – it is suggested a man should have *the right* to have an at least 50/50 if not *all male* jury passing judgement on him, and perhaps a woman should have the right to the same.

Again, men in the current situation, who may be able to stop a man getting falsely imprisoned, are urged to use their legal right to overturn such unsafe convictions to whatever degree they possible can.

It seems however, under the current prevailing conditions, a 50/50 split of the sexes would be best for both male and female trials, as we may well find that women would be a lot more forgiving of their own sex than men are.

It even seems likely that many men might do better on *some issues* with a wholly female jury, but logic would suggest that *child molestation* is not one of them, and thus Michael Jackson can despite the likely unfair trauma placed upon him, consider himself a comparatively lucky man.

As to women in powerful positions of military authority, who can say that a real life *Captain Janeway* might not in some emotional, possibly hormonally induced crisis, or other spell of “temporary insanity”, use the power of a Starship to destroy a whole planet, killing billions in the process, followed by an “oops – I was on an off day – it was all down to *women's problems*”?

The tragic irony, is that it is likely only a matter of time before in the real world of the twenty-first century a female finger of a president or prime minister of a Western or even Asian country is upon the nuclear button, and then we will surely all tremble, whether we be man, woman or child.

Society and international politics must be based on trust, not suspicion and petty considerations, and emotional slights. Surely, in the absence of a remarkable woman, who has risen far above the pettiness and emotional instability of the average female of the species, it is safer that for the present at least, the world is still best governed by men.



## **Chapter Ten - Hypnosis and Irrationality – the Secret of Female Power**

We have already touched on women's "need to know." They are natural spies, and it is therefore no surprise that we have already had at least one female boss of the UK secret services, so that for once at least, the depiction of the female spy chief in the more recent *James Bond* movies, is not a piece of pure female-empowering propaganda.

As Krishnamurti explains, that word *propaganda* is a most important and actually simple one, as *propagate* means "to sow a seed" - so that *propaganda* is to put a "seed idea" before us time and time again, so it takes root and becomes an ingrained part of our minds, which we are thereby programmed to accept and parrot without question.

The advertising experts know this, and thus they hit us over and over with the same TV messages and billboard signs.

In this way, our mind becomes full of ideas planted there by *someone else*.

It is incidentally, as pointed out by mathematical educationalist, *W W Sawyer*, very unlikely that any of us have ever had an original idea of our own, that no one else has thought of throughout history, except perhaps regarding technical subjects which did not exist in the past.

Even then, by the time we personally get to the issue, a hundred experts have already looked at all the angles to the point of exhaustion, and we find our minds going, unlike the *Starship Enterprise*, only where almost definitely another mind has gone some time before.

This initially depressing revelation can in fact be used as a positive – because it means, *somewhere out there* is the answer – if solvable – to virtually any question or problem we will ever have, or at least, the best thoughts so far available on it.

Where do all our existing thoughts and beliefs come from?

From day one we are educated with dos and don'ts and explanations, and facts and figures, until by the time we are in our teens, though we all imagine we are different, we are in fact all pretty much the same.

Right now, someone, somewhere in the Western world is likely thinking pretty much the same thoughts as ourselves, doing pretty much the same thing, and part of the reason for that process of brainwashing and indoctrination is that the consumer society wants us that way, so it can predict what we are going to do, and what it can sell us next.

So let's put aside the vain idea that any of our ideas, as indeed anything written in this book, is revolutionary or new. All it means, is *the truth (or lie) was out there*, but that *no one told us about it before*.

So we are without question *all* victims of a massive amount of propaganda, really the products of a lifelong and detailed process of mentally programmed material and beliefs, and it is hard to see how we are actually individual in anyway, unless we do something remarkable like some great creative artist, scientist or musician.

So many things *seem* new, but we don't necessarily see what went before.

The aforementioned Star Trek series seemed to be utterly revolutionary TV at the time, but it was preceded many years before for example by the movie *Forbidden Planet*, which was every bit as creative as any Star Trek episode, and was virtually the blueprint for the whole series.

And then we ask what came before *Forbidden Planet*, which was apparently a sci-fi variation on Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and so on. Where did Shakespeare get *his* ideas? Who knows? Or even *who cares?*

The point here is just to establish that there are virtually *no* original ideas in society, just variations on old themes.

Similarly with our thoughts. When watching children interviewed on TV, it is so obvious that most if not all of what they are saying in terms of their opinions has been planted there by "mum" or "dad" or by some other authority figure in their life, such as *the TV*.

In the viewing of their performance we also distinguish the "well trained" children who successfully manage to parrot their parents words and ideas, from the poorly trained, who just produce "don't knows" or some bizarre jumbled up ideas they haven't properly digested.

So as we grow up, we imagine we are becoming more intelligent and aware, but the reality is, we are only becoming much slicker at parroting someone else's ideas, taught to us over twenty thousand nights and days - we no longer remember who or where they came from as a general rule.

But we do all have the ability to create, originate, though some more than others, and all of us on some subjects more than other subjects.

For example, were we marooned on a desert island, some of us might create fire and other familiar technology unaided, whereas almost certainly many of us could not.

The *Tom Hanks* movie *Castaway* is a good example of how somebody placed in such a situation, stranded on a desert island, when forced to fend for himself, used faculties of mind that hardly anyone living amidst the freely available facilities in a Western country ever will.

Of course, although that is fiction, there are real life counterparts of such experiences, and the movie is chosen as an example, because it is common knowledge, and a detailed study of the theoretical evolution of an intelligent man's behaviour in such a scenario.

Is it interesting to note therefore, that the occasions we are called upon to use our own minds are relatively few, and in time, most of us therefore lose the urge and ability to think for ourselves at all, and place our minds and the direction of our life into the hands of someone else, typically *a politician or a woman*.

The advertisers are of course very happy about this situation, because it means they can make us believe whatever they want, sell us anything they like. It is also equally pleasing to politicians and dictatorships, because we will absorb whatever they tell us at face value, so they can carry out whatever plans they please without our resistance.

For example, the current Western leaders told us that there were weapons of mass destruction aimed at us, and enough people believed it to support the Iraq war.

Again, here we must look at the differences between men and women.

Few women, apart from the few very practical and intellectual ones, choose science courses. If we go to a university science class in physics, computer science or engineering, we will be wondering where are the girls. There are no female *Steven Hawkings* and almost no prominent female scientists in the "hard sciences" (i.e. those based strictly on logic, and a high standard of scientific proof).

Of course in the so called *social sciences*, which are in reality, mainly voluminous masses of opinions, theories and ideas, and not really genuine *sciences* at all, we find women in their millions studying hard at parroting someone else's half-formed and often misinformatory and destructive ideas, to gain their degrees, and feel the imaginary presence of that little halo on their heads which proudly says "I am a graduate, I have a degree."

Incidentally, these efforts they make are not futile in terms of *power*, as they thereby go on to attain jobs and positions of power, for example in law, business or the civil service, which they could not otherwise have obtained by becoming such *bacheloresses and mistresses of nonsense*, instead of their male or even in some cases female counterparts, who become a *Bachelor* or *Master* of some *genuine* art or science.

The feminist authorities and leaders know all this, and have created all these pseudo-educational courses quite deliberately, so that girls and women who are really not very logical or intellectually bright, can get a degree, and go on to cause the confusion and chaos that the unintelligent logically *must*, in the various professions, business enterprises and departments of government which they thereby invade.

Feministic UK prime minister's wife, *Mrs Cherie Blair*, for example, is a chancellor of a major UK university, and therefore in a position to see that such things happen.

A careful study of many of these “non-rational” kinds of modern university courses, will find that they have buried in them somewhere these feminist agendas, empowering women all the time, at the expense of sanity, and of men.

Thus, as to *real knowledge and understanding* – like that which built our car, or put a rocket on the moon, those holding these mostly spurious degrees know nothing.

Virtually all the inventions making up the world around us were created by men. In the past, the feminists say women never had the opportunity to take these scientific and engineering degrees, but now they do, and they still don't appear in anything but a definite minority.

What women *are* good at in droves however, is arguing, and that is why we see so many women lawyers and writers, expressing in voluminous speech and prose their ideas.

Unfortunately, many of these verbally capable women mistake *ideas* for *truths*. There is in fact a phenomenon recognised in philosophy and mathematical logic, known as a *sophism*, which is an argument which can be extremely plausible and persuasive but have some hard-to-spot logical flaw in it.

So what we are saying here, is that these *sophisticated* women are extremely good at producing arguments which are not necessarily rational.

Here we have to understand two concepts: what is known in Indian philosophy as *Tarka* - which is *reasoned argument meant to discover the truth* - and *Jalpa* - which means *argument meant to defeat the other side*, i.e. the points scoring exercises we are so familiar with from modern political *and* legal debate.

As Krishnamurti points out – we *should* be concentrating on the first kind of argumentative process - *that motivated to discover the truth*. But in reality, much of the talk and writing that goes on, is not to discover a truth, or apply reason, but “*to get one over*” *on the other side, and to get our own way*, and that is often how women use words, and also at least partly the explanation of why they use so many.

We might say – *they are always trying to justify their case* – however unreasonable it may be.

For example, suppose we want to do something forbidden in Western countries such as bigamy - that is, marriage to multiple wives.

We start thinking up ideas and gathering data *to support that desire*.

That is, as Krishnamurti explains, we have *started with a conclusion*, instead of trying to impartially ascertain the truth – in this instance – *having multiple wives is OK*.

Thus we point out in certain countries there are no limits on the number of wives available to us, or that even in our own country religious groups such as the *Mormons* are allowed to do it, so why are not we?

Or that because many women are too plain to be desired by us as marriage partners, if would benefit them to be allowed to marry us, as an act of charity. Or we find any other kind of argument no matter how ridiculous which seems to satisfy our desire.

Then we argue it till we are blue in the face against all opposition. When logic fails, we start to attack and discredit the person opposing us, so that they lose credibility and will not be listened to, even if we are wrong and they are right.

Unfortunately, this is the mode of operation of the deceptive female mind, and the male mind, which also that has become dishonest and adopted these techniques.

Society is currently governed by *Machiavelli's The Prince*, whose goal is to maintain power at all costs, regardless of social justice and betrayal, thus resulting in the current state of continual war and social chaos, rather than by *Plato's Republic*, which would result in us arriving at a state of harmony and world peace.

This “scheming” philosophy is of an underlying female character, but how can it be justified as described as the product of a female mind?

Firstly, we are not talking about *Saint Teresa* or *Joan of Arc's* female mind, or that of the good modern woman who possesses purity and noble mental attributes. We are talking about the average lesser developed woman, and the corrupted and ambitious state of female mentality which is currently dominating society – and has unleashed *Pandora's Box of woes*.

In the last chapter, we discussed women's “rule by paranoia.” By fear of “what if” rather than of any known existing threat.

It was not wholly fair to leave the discussion there, because it seemed to indicate that this was a flaw in the female personality. Well, it is a flaw, but *only from the point of view of leadership*.

The paranoia which starts to overtake women put in positions of authority comes because by nature, biologically speaking, they are primarily interested in security, just as we are well aware, men are primarily interested in finding and impregnating suitable mates.

We are all, with only the rarest exceptions, still at least fifty-percent animal, and to deny this is irrational. As of animal origin, women are still principally interested in rearing and protecting children.

It is logical to imagine that many women who *out of choice* do not have children are from the evolutionary point of view *women gone wrong*.

That is not to deny any woman the right not to have children – it is just to say that if that is how she feels, as many feminists do, she does not and cannot possibly represent and speak for the mass of women, whose biological motives are unchanged from what they have been for thousands if not millions of years.

So because women need to protect themselves both during pregnancy and once their children are born with much greater care than does a man, it is logical to assume they have evolved protective instincts to a degree not found in men.

After all, from the animalistic evolutionary point of view, once man has fulfilled his function of passing on his seed, in a sense it matters little if he lives or dies – it is only his children who matter, and that survival is largely in the hands of his woman or wife.

But because his primary *animal* goal is to spread his seed as widely as he can, he may be compelled to embark on adventures that could easily cause his death at the hands of a rival male, as we have seen in real life.

So these differing characteristics in men and women are still there as the remnants of our long evolutionary past, or we simply would not have survived.

Where is the proof, we hear the feminists cry?

Firstly, it seems obvious to anyone who has even a vague grasp of the evolutionary theory. But let us suppose it is wrong for a moment.

This security seeking behaviour of women is found in a thousand and one things, and particularly obvious in their different, often ultra-cautious style of driving a car, whereas we see the average male *instinctively* tries to drive his car as if he were in Formula One upon a Grand Prix racing circuit. We have “boy racers”, but virtually no “girl racers” it seems.

This is not merely *cultural* or an ingrained process of enforcing of gender roles. The girls have got just as much free choice. It is just they are clearly more concerned about their personal survival than boys! Now isn't that interesting?

But of course the other aspect is, in general, women and girls are more physically sensitive and delicate than boys, and thus have more reason to take care, and also to find alternative means to seek satisfaction of their desires than by the use of physical force.

So that powerful and fluent tongue in the heads of most females is also there for an evolutionary reason. Women control their world mainly by *use of words*.

Men use words also sometimes to threaten, but in the case of the more civilised men, the main function of words is a tool with which to reason. Resolving conflict by reason appeals to most men, because they don't have to resolve their quarrel by fighting, whose outcome is often uncertain, and if defeated can lead to a major loss of status and self-esteem, quite apart from the risk of serious injury or death.

But when in a dispute, women tend to use words like weapons rather than logical tools. They accuse and spin words in a rapid flow, like throwing ten daggers at someone who has to weave and duck like a spinning top to avoid being impaled by one.

And frequently, the victim of such an attack is a defenceless man. That is – he is defenceless, because comparatively speaking, the average man is in a state of shock at such behaviour, and stands mute like a dumb beast before this woman, who talks with such power it is as if she is a hydra with seven heads.

Every man who has been a victim of such a verbal assault from women even once, will understand all that has been said.

What men do not understand is that this verbal assault is both a form of defence and attack. On the one hand it is to defend herself from the man's objections, as he hardly gets a chance to speak, and on the other hand, it is actually a form of hypnosis, which silences him and if successful, allows her to get her own way.

Here, we must explain hypnosis, one of the least understood concepts, yet so freely tossed around in modern society and mediaspeak.

The populist concept of hypnosis is that of either the person on the couch who has been talked into a "trance" and perhaps recalls some "past lives", or else the stage hypnotist who has his audience members doing silly things such as barking like dogs or talking like babies at his command.

Not incoincidentally, the humiliating antics performed by the stage hypnotist's subjects are often just like those performed at the feet of the madam with the whip and leather boots.

Many do not believe in hypnosis as if it were on the same level as belief in flying saucers or ghosts. But they should not be fooled – hypnosis is a real power, which is used by clinical psychologists, it is an accepted part of medical practice, though arguably should not be, due to the inherent dangers in it.

The power the stage hypnotist has over his victims is *real*. One previously young, healthy lady, later died of a heart attack after a stage hypnotist made her believe she was having a five thousand volt shock.

We see that animals can be trained to attack and possibly therefore kill on command, and in the hands of an able hypnotist, it is plausible that many humans could also be made to, which the fabled *MK Ultra* program would seem to indicate that the authorities believed as long ago as the 1960s.

The only cure for this situation is that *no one should ever allow themselves to be hypnotised* and its use in any form should be either banned or discouraged. The stage hypnotists themselves can become high on the power they get, and who knows what antics they have got up to with their powers which may never come to light.

For example, suppose that a woman goes to a hypnotherapist for a smoking cure.

How does she know he will not take control of her mind, and perhaps commit acts upon her when she is dazed that she may never even be aware he has done?

We are having many cases of “drug rape” reported in recent times, so it is clear that many men will go to virtually any lengths to get sex with a woman they could not otherwise gain the consent of.

So what exactly is hypnotism? Basically, it is just putting someone's mind in a passive state, in which they become “suggestible”, that is - non-resistant to the will of the hypnotist.

But people are protected from this normally, because it takes a relatively long time to put most subjects into a deep trance, and most people will fortunately not allow even the time in the hands of another person to allow that to take place.

But women have other ways of hypnotising men, and there are two main ones.

They either use seductive means, involving obvious use of their sexual attributes to make him passive, and then they give their orders in that pillow talk state.

Or they have another equally common technique – *hypnosis by force* – that is, instilling her commands into the man by barking them out as if she were addressing and trying to command a dog, or as a sergeant major does to his men on the parade ground.

The solution to the first situation is that as a man we should not make any promises during sex or in order to get it, unless we are fully rational when we make them and it has been a reasoned decision.

And also to be aware that at such times of vulnerability a woman may try to compromise us in such a fashion.

If she wants anything from us, let her talk to our reason at another time, not when we are at the height of sexual passion and just trying to enjoy the moment, and express our feelings for her.

But many men will not succumb to pillow talk, partly as the sex act is often over so quickly, women don't even get the chance.

So then a woman has other ways, and that is by nagging, and bullying.

This too is hypnosis, but instead of putting us into a relaxed state in which we are willing to accept suggestions, she is faced with our resistant and lazy normal consciousness, which makes her words fall on “deaf ears.”

So she resorts to drilling her thoughts and desires into our mind by tiresome repetition, wearing us down gradually, until in torment we finally give in.



Or alternatively she may in an otherwise quiet situation bark her demands at us, causing shock, particularly when she wants some information from us, which we do not wish her to have.

Again, rather like the madam with leather boots and whip, if one thinks about it. i.e. she torments or bullies us until we *submit*.

Is this behaviour fiction?

Not at all. Surely we have heard women say to one another, even in soap operas, when faced with some uncooperative man – “don't worry, I will get to work on him, and he will soon change his tune!”

So just what exactly does this *getting to work on him* entail? Obviously it involves this deliberately wheedling away at and bullying of a man until he submits.

One might say in this respect, that *the tongue is mightier than the sword*.

Another extremely commonly used tactic is that she will try to speak in an ultra-confident authoritative manner to persuade us that she knows better than we do, that *her world view* is right, and *ours is wrong*. She may claim to know and understand many things which she really does not, especially if she senses we are unsure in a certain area, as she will use such moments *to try to get the upper hand*.

Many women will not stop short of the most outrageous lies to justify such points of view in their pursuit of control over us.

That is, we see, that if she can deceive us on *anything* at all, persuade us that our judgment and perception is lacking, that is a victory for her, a point to chalk up in her battle against our authority.

Whilst we should not attempt to fight her on every small issue, we should learn to be aware of these efforts at deception, often saying nothing, and save our strength only for the things that actually matter, as otherwise we can waste great energy in conversations and arguments that are ultimately destructive and futile, when we could use that valuable time and energy for far better things.

To be clear on this, we have to understand, that she is *trying to make us doubt our own powers of observation and perception of reality*, in order that our confidence in *our ability to think and reason with our own minds*, and therefore have understanding of and control over her is diminished, while her power to deceive us and justify the unreasonable things she wants to do and us to cooperate with then grows.

This again is clearly another form of hypnosis, it is an effort by her to make us believe in *her* version of reality, rather than our own – that is, she is trying her “make-believe” out on us, to see if she can get away with it.

This is generally what goes on in court trials, and again, why we see women are so numerous and successful in the legal field.

In the average trial only the parties involved in the crime or dispute know the *real* truth, and the defending and prosecuting lawyers only know what they have been told, which frequently is inevitably going to be at least partly lies, and sometimes even wholly so, where one or other party is fabricating their story completely, as in the King Solomon case with the baby.

The court trial is therefore largely just a contest between two lawyers about who is the best at persuading the jury that *their view of what happened* – which of course, they cannot possibly know, as they weren't at the scene of the crime – is *the true one*.

So quite often therefore, whichever side has the cleverest, most persuasive lawyer wins, regardless of the truth, and many times that person is *a woman*, as men are usually not as persuasive as women, *unless they are armed with the real evidence and facts*.

Speaking more generally, when they haven't had sufficient first hand experience of women, decent men are shocked and astounded by women's ability to lie so frequently and casually about even little things that don't seem worth the trouble, because the truth is often very important and even "sacred" to such "honourable men", and they can't understand why women don't see things the same way.

But now we see it is not from a woman's point of view an issue of truth, it is rather *a power game* in which the goal is to get the upper hand over us, and therefore *get her own way*, we can understand just what it is that enables her to manufacture lies so alarmingly easily.

To put it differently – lying is the survival strategy of an egotistical person, to stop him or her ever having to behave themselves and admit to the truth.

It seems that when a man who proposes to a woman remarks he is *trying to make an honest woman out of her*, there is more truth in that saying, than at first sight appears.

If a man cannot get during courtship to the point where *he is certain* the woman has opened up to him, and is revealing her true self, he had best never marry her, or else he will be sentencing himself to a whole life of such "courtroom dramas" and deceptions.

So remember my friends, from her point of view, just as we find with disobedient and misbehaving young children, the game is about *power*, and thus using lies to cover up or justify actions, which though *wrong*, she and they want *the right* to carry out.

But though many women feel that telling lies on a regular basis is their legitimate right, no man is allowed to do so, or he is branded *a liar* and therefore, *since he is a man and not a woman*, he is regarded as the scum of the earth.

That is because, in her lack of trust and insecurity, she must know *everything* about him – another clear case of double standards once more.

In this relentless pursuit of power over us, as already mentioned, she even will sometimes make a sudden violent and bullying demand to gain cooperation, just like if we think about it, an animal trainer might do with a stubborn dog or other animal he has partly trained.

So if we look at this objectively – yes, again, we are back to the “lady” with boots and whip – this is a dehumanising way to treat a man, which the woman obviously thinks is just fine – it gets her *what she wants* after all, which is apparently all that matters *regardless of right or wrong*.

The remedy to this tactic is that we have to be aware of the possibility of such a sudden violent assault on our mind *at any time*. At such moments, we must pause briefly if necessary, while we recover our composure, stare her firmly in the eye, and refuse her demands stoically and maintain our male authority and freedom.

So again, we cannot have the kind of women who use these tactics holding positions of high power and influence in society, as society must be ruled by justice, fairness and respect for all.

Of course we do not wish to create a view that *all* women behave like this.

There are some good and even saintly women out there, most of whom are not noisy and attention seeking, making them hard to find - but unfortunately it is necessary to focus on the behaviour of the generality of women, as they are the only ones *whom we are ever likely to meet*.

If the *Virgin Mary* is out there some where, rest assured we will not find her in the local bar or sandwich shop. She will usually be well-hidden like the most precious of gems or flowers.

So what to do about these forms of bullying generally?

Just *being aware* is the key.

*Be aware* that the pretty, smiling girl across the way, when provoked may be more trouble than a barrel full of monkeys, possess a tongue that can lash us like a cat of nine tails, and have in her armoury a vitriolic stare of rage, that like Medusa, could nearly turn a man to stone.

If we are *aware*, we'll be ready for the storm when it comes.

And when the storm comes, remember that whatever we do, we must be like *James Bond*, *we must always keep our cool*, because staying calm and collected is ultimately *the only certain victory we can ever have*.

Even if it seems to “the crowd” that she has “won” in a particular verbal encounter, such victories quickly turn to dust when there is nothing real underlying them, but only *as long as we don't lose our cool* when she “storms us.” Because if we get angry – which you see, is often her plan – we *will look wrong, even when we are right.*

And when will the storm come?

Any time now.

Shakespeare wrote his famous *The Taming of the Shrew* not about an extraordinary woman, but a very ordinary one, surely based on someone he knew, maybe even his wife.

The problem is that pretty little girls (and don't forget, they are *all* pretty to a soft-hearted, doting father) learn to get exactly what they want from a very early age, and so their wilful and selfish behaviours don't ever get stamped out.

So we are dealing with a horse that has never been broken, an untamed mustang, who will quite likely try to kick us like a mule, if we try.

Each man has to decide for himself what he thinks he can handle, but if we don't start with the clear concept that this “delightful girl” before us is likely a wild mare, ready to huff and puff and toss any would-be rider off, we are doomed from the outset.

Which brings us to the concept of freedom. Freedom is now taken by people as the ability to do *whatever we like.*

So should people be given the freedom to lie, cheat, bully, molest, rape, and murder, if that is *what they like?* Of course they cannot be given such rights in a *civilised society*, or there can be no order or security or peace.

But then those people must be imprisoned to protect the rest, if those are their desires, though of course to imprison anyone at all is where avoidable, not desirable.

Thus freedom can only be had in the relative and not absolute sense. The real freedom can come surely – *logically* – only when a person is not a slave to his or her desires.

If we give in to the demands of a man, woman or child continually, we make a monster out of them – an *Emperor* or *Empress Nero* who eventually, once loosed from the boundaries of social responsibility and accountability, perpetrates cruel and barbaric acts.

Really, everybody apart from a true saint needs someone to slap them in one way or another now and then (preferably *verbally*, not *physically*) to keep them in touch with the reality that we have to live in a cooperative society and make sacrifices (i.e. deny *some* of our own desires) at times for the sake of our fellow woman and man.

So the person who is not able to deny *any* of their desires, as the spoilt boy or girl is not, becomes a social menace or criminal. And this applies just as much to women and girls as to men and boys.

For example, every gangster has his moll. She may not do the beating and killing herself, but she watches without objection and lives off the income of such acts.

In the writings of Mohammed is said *the best of women are content with little* and in the Old Testament *do not be too soft with your daughters*.

No wonder most modern women don't like traditional religion. It's full of rules telling them not to do most of the things they want to do.

So if all else fails – the hypnotic techniques and bullying – a typical woman will just confuse the issue, producing all kinds of irrational responses and excuses for what she does or doesn't want to do.

The effort here on the part of the man must be to not seek to find sense where there isn't any.

For example, suppose a man decides he doesn't want to go on holiday someplace she wants to go for reasons he feels are justified, but she does not.

This could be an excuse to bully and threaten him in all sorts of ways, including irrational and manufactured accusations of affairs that don't exist (that's why he won't go, you see, because he is too busy with his (imaginary) lover), or completely irrational and irritating behaviours.

The point is, that because she was never stopped getting her own way at an early age as should have happened, she will throw all kinds of childish tantrums and find ways to "punish him" for denying her, and some women will even resort to physical violence on their husbands if they think they can get away with it, and some actually do, because their husbands are either so shocked, naturally timid, or afraid to fight back for fear of what they may do to her if enraged with their (usually) superior physical strength.

All this is laid out to illustrate to the inexperienced – which amounts to any man who has never lived with or been in close contact with a spirited woman for any length of time – that to have a relationship with a girl or woman, is not like we see in the movies, and especially not like we were encouraged from childhood to believe in from day one in the fairy tales.

It is like going into a war zone.

It may not be so before we marry, or have children supposing we do not marry. It may all be love and kisses, but once we are living or sleeping together with her, or there are children, the war begins.

The solution is that we have to reject this culture entirely which is coming from the media of – day one *boy-meets-girl*, day two *holding hands and kisses*, day three *sex*, day two hundred and seventy-four *baby arrives*, day two hundred and seventy-five *serious row*, and day two-hundred and seventy-six *fight and split up*, followed some time later by *divorce* and lawsuit against boyfriend or husband for maintenance (or *alimony* as the Yankees say) and possession of the family home.

The only safe way to relate to a potential partner, is that we have to choose a girl or woman very carefully and get to know her as a friend *inside out* before ever making any serious commitment to her, or having sex with her.

This is of course the exact opposite of what society and the media is urging us to do right now.

But if we do things as they suggest we will end up in a scenario like that two paragraphs up, which has endless variations and tortures in it, which may leave us for example dressed as *Batman* protesting on a high building, because she won't let us see our daughter or son, and the law and social workers will have backed her up, because she made some false accusation about us beating one of the children or something.

The reason we don't think this will happen, is because there are so many couples together, and *from the outside*, their relationship looks OK.

But what we don't realise is that more often than not, the man is the woman's puppet and she only allows him to be there because she is getting what she wants out of him.

What we don't see, is that generally he has surrendered his true masculine self to get her approval and permission to stay, and maybe even she will let him have sex now and then, though how many women deny their husbands sex, we don't know, because it doesn't show up in any census statistics, and the vast majority of such emasculated males would no doubt be too ashamed to tell.

So do we see now, my man-to-man friends, what a dangerous game we are playing, and how it is so very hard to win (i.e. have a woman *and* our self-respect) and how very easy it is to lose in a thousand ways?

While our girl or lady is hypnotising us, she is simultaneously ruling us and stealing our masculine authority and manhood away.

Thus if we want to maintain our masculine freedom and dignity, in the face of what we now appreciate is a very different creature than we once imagined, we will have to relate to women in an entirely new way, as set out in this book as a starting point, and on that basis to engage our own minds in a fresh way with the encounters we will in future have with women in the world around us.

We should be aware, none of us is alone in this endeavour, we are *a brotherhood of men*, and rest assured, when our desire is sincere, we will always get help from somewhere.

## **Chapter Eleven – The Fall and Rise of the Sexually Empowered Woman**

Somewhere amongst the sayings of the Prophet Mohammed, the founder of Islam, which to an impartial eye the modern Western armed affiliation of nations seems intent on eradicating, is said about women:

*the world and all things in it are valuable, but the most valuable thing in the world is a virtuous woman*

And as already mentioned:

*verily, the best of women are those who are content with little*

The latter saying goes some way to explaining why the typically materialistic and egotistical feminists are against organised religion in general, and the Muslim religion in particular.

The image conjured up is of a virtuous (i.e. modest and sexually reserved women) who takes a quiet dignified role in society, and supports her husband and man.

The bra burning, intellectually proud, bold and argumentative, fashion and sex obsessed, sometimes drunk, rebellious and frequently unfaithful modern feminist influenced Western woman, obviously does not fit this description.

But the former saying also deserves attention. The good woman – i.e. the *Snow White* or *Virgin Mary* type woman, full of radiant beauty and selfless love – is perhaps the most wonderful creature on the planet.

She is genuinely the *sugar and spice, and all things nice* that the verse spoke of, and such woman really *do* exist, or at least appear to, particularly in their relationship to children, and as nurses or doctors who care for the sick.

The patience and selflessness of the *Florence Nightingale* type woman is extraordinary – women in general exhibit a capacity for *devotion* that few men can equal, which was often expressed in religious feelings in the days when there was thought to be a God. That is, before the Darwinists sacked God as creator, and the feminists stirred up rebellion and hatred in women's then anchorless minds.

The so called *women's liberation* brigade, who would generally regard such devotional behaviour as yet another form of female enslavement – especially where the devotion is accorded to men – do not possess this ability to unselfishly love another person, which the “virtuous woman” does.

Part of the feminist “bible” is that women should be sexually liberated, and that includes kicking men out of the bedroom altogether when desired, and even replacing them with another woman.

Lesbianism and extreme feminism go hand-in-hand because both are based on the rejection of men, both as equally valid human beings and as intimate and trusted friends.

Because of men's inherent tendency to be dominant and authoritative, and also because of the awful immaturity of many modern men in comparison to their more reserved and well-disciplined forefathers, and in particular after one or more episodes of personal experience of serious rejection or betrayal by a man, it is easy for women to label men *en masse* as uncaring beasts, which sets up the stage for the kind of identity blurring and mutually narcissistic relationships to develop between women which may eventually become sexual.

To put it simply, a woman can play the role of a man for her partner, to give her all the love and sex that a real man she desires or once desired may not, but without the unwanted judgmental and authoritarian side she would get with a real man.

Obviously, women know the female sexual apparatus and emotional inner world first hand, and therefore, it theoretically gives them a great advantage in stimulating other women sexually in the mechanical and emotional sense.

Just as with male gay culture, we see this lesbianism being encouraged in all sorts of ways, not only in pornography, but in soap operas, and even "respectable TV dramas" such as a historically based one called *Tipping the Velvet*, first shown on the BBC in 2002.

Again, it is interesting to note that these dramas sometimes use the most beautiful women to make it acceptable to men and even *women* who don't necessarily approve of lesbianism.

For example in the above case, using the very classiest of top draw British actresses, *Anna Chancellor* and *Keeley Hawes*, who are equally likely to be seen in such *heterosexual* romantic comedies as *Four Weddings and a Funeral*, as the former actress was.

So the mechanism we see is again just as in advertising – we are hypnotised by images of beautiful women, even naked or performing sex acts, *whilst we are sold an idea*, i.e. in this case *lesbianism is good, lesbianism is normal*.

No attempt is made here to cast judgement on men and women who are, as it were, seemingly *naturally* drawn to same sex relationships, though activities which if everybody did them, would inevitably result in the extinction of the entire human race within a generation can surely not be regarded as *totally* normal, can they?

The issue here is, how much is lesbianism or homosexuality *Nature*, and how much *nurture*?



Because if we cannot answer that question definitely, which to the best of our knowledge the homosexual and lesbian communities cannot, then how can they feel it is right and justifiable to actively *promote* these lifestyles to the majority who do not share their inclinations?

That is – young males and female pass through very difficult phases in adolescence when they are uncertain of their sexual feelings and ideas generally.

If in such a phase, they are in their pre-existing state of fear persuaded that to do something they would never have otherwise done, except for the current propaganda on the subject, is OK and normal, is that a right thing or is it rather *abusive*?

That is, if we say gay sex is normal, and we reduce the age of gay consent to sixteen, as has been done in Britain since December 2000, and was described by one leading judge as “the bugger’s charter” even when reduced from twenty-one to eighteen, do we not thereby legalise mature homosexuals to prey on young boys, by using their superior experience and bribes of money and gifts to persuade them into what may even cause their death sooner or later by contracting AIDS?

That is, if two *mature* adult males or females, let us say at minimum aged eighteen or preferably twenty-one, wish to do sexual things with one another in private, then that is their own business.

But we are surely talking here, about the *luring* and *pressurizing* of children who are not yet formed in their sexuality and ideas.

This age was lowered in 2000 in the UK by Tony’s Blair’s government, by using something called “The Parliament Act” to circumvent the continuous defeat over years of this measure by *The House of Lords* and was viewed by many as undemocratic, as normally *all* other bills have to be passed by “the upper house” – that is, *The Lords*.

So it appears we saw a burning desire on the part of those in government, to get this law put into place *at all costs*.

And it also appears that by allowing this law to go through, the government have more or less set the stage for the rape of sixteen and seventeen year old boys and girls by older males and females who desire them.

All this at a time, when such enormous governmental paranoia and attention is directed at paedophiles!

On the one hand, they are seemingly vehemently opposing paedophiles, but on the other hand encouraging them with this law. Just what kind of “double-think” is this? Just what the hell is going on?

But by a closer study of these issues, we see that *both measure* satisfy *the feminist agenda*.

Because in fact, the obsession about paedophiles is not about protecting children at all, it is about *demonising men*, and making them so afraid they don't hardly touch their own children, or dare to work with them as teachers.

If it were *really* about protecting children, the government would have ensured that women were encouraged to be always with them, keeping an eye on them until they are old enough to start taking care of themselves properly, rather than encouraging single parents and even married mothers into jobs and careers as is constantly being done.

For this issue of just *how* does a molester *ever* get *access* to children, if they are not his or her own?

Always the super-emphasis is on the molester, and *never* on the negligent mothers who have allowed their children to be exposed to attack by leaving them unsupervised. So the truth is only really to be found by ignoring official statistics and keeping our eyes and ears alert to what is going on around us *in the real world*.

Thus, their laws and behaviours are perfectly consistent on this issue, because neither are they protecting children, by reducing the age of consent, because if they had kept it at age eighteen, *any* act on children of age sixteen and seventeen would have been illegal, so any kind of sex with them would have been considered criminal, and no rape case would have been necessary to prove.

Equally, groups of teenage bullies will be able to under this law - and no doubt someplace already have - homosexually rape teenage members of their own gender, and because of the difficulty in bringing these things out into the light and proving lack of consent, will get away scot-free.

This law incidentally was brought about on the grounds that the heterosexual age of consent was only sixteen, and this disparity was howled at as "injustice" by the gay activists.

Perhaps therefore the better solution would have been to *raise the heterosexual age of consent to eighteen*.

For, let us ask ourselves, if anyone truly needs to have sex *with a partner* before the age of eighteen in a *civilised* society?

Fifty years ago it is doubtful if more than a small percentage of the adult population had done so, so why could people restrain themselves then and not now?

And probably a large unsung percentage of modern adults still do not have their first proper sexual encounter until a later age than eighteen *whatever the supposed statistical surveys say*, so why cannot the vast majority be expected to do that now?

And probably a large unsung percentage of modern adults still do not have their first proper sexual encounter until a later age than eighteen whatever the supposed statistical surveys say, so why cannot the vast majority be expected to do that now?

That is – as school and college generally goes on until eighteen anyway, surely children and young adults have got plenty of important things to do, before having to rush into a sex life, and causing in the UK, the highest teen pregnancy rate in Europe amongst other badges of honour we hold?

So let us be clear, the agenda here is *the destruction of the traditional family, the destruction of innocence, the destruction of males as fathers and teachers caring for children, and also as husbands and sexual-partners*, and this is all being done by feminists in power, such as high court judge Mrs Blair sitting in nodding approval as Mr Blair pushes these likely thoroughly undemocratic, and not-publicly supported laws through.

But let us suppose we put that point to Mr and Mrs Blair. They would say – *but the opinion polls say people think that is OK now, it's what the people want!*

Supposing it is an honest poll, perhaps it is *now* what the people “want.”

But resistance to these ideas was enormous only a decade or two ago. So the population has not changed so much in that space of a time, so why have so many changed their ideas?

The reason is that they have been gradually persuaded to by the use of all this propaganda such as a first airing of the lesbian theme, in the cult series *Prisoner Cell Block H*, which has graduated over a decade or so to the onscreen nudity and sex acts of *Tipping the Velvet*, with the respected actresses making lesbianism look so nice, when in reality, sex of either heterosexual or homosexual kind is not typically a nice spectacle, except for those directly participating it, who in actuality fact, *do not have to watch it themselves*.

So what we must see, is that *people are gradually being hypnotised by television* to accept things they would never otherwise have accepted, generally by showing them a very “rose tinted” and glamourized view of the reality of the often sordid thing they are supposed to accept, just as *real violence* is horrible and traumatic, not at all like the “fun” screen beatings up and killings we enjoy after a “justifiable vengeance” scenario has been set up for us, when the “bad guy” or “bad girl” finally *gets it*.

Thus, Mr and Mrs Blair’s claim that the polls support what they do in government is not really true, because in the instances where they *are* gaining approval, they are only getting it from *the hypnotised and ill informed masses*, which is therefore not genuine consent at all.

But speaking now in terms of the heterosexual relationship in general, research and common experience has shown that women generally speaking take much longer to become sexually aroused than men, and many men do not have the ability or desire to take the time and trouble to fully stimulate their wives, since for them, sexual stimulation is typically easy, and the whole experience of “making love” can be over even in seconds, if not minutes.

Many women freely admit they have never – as far as they can tell – experienced orgasm, and the pursuit of the female orgasm has become the focus of a whole industry which sells magazines, video materials and sex aids in millions.

Many women have even become fabulously rich, such as the UK *Ann Summers* sex merchandise founder, by satisfying this increasingly shameless campaign to enhance women's sex lives.

One has to say that frankly, if woman's goal in life is the pure physical sensation of orgasm, it may well be best achieved by other women helping them than trying to get it from any man, whose sexual agenda is typically very different – i.e. mainly to get rapid relief from the pent-up sexual tension built up inside him over a period of time.

But the question seldom asked is - *just how important is orgasm to the average woman, as compared with the average man?*

That millions of women have apparently gone for large parts of, or even their entire life, without ever having one, shows that the *biological* importance to women of orgasm is comparatively low. A woman is fully able to have children without ever experiencing orgasm, whereas for a man it is impossible to do so.

The more surprising thing, when compared to the feminist pro-orgasm lobby propaganda, is that many of those women honest enough to speak openly – and modern TV and radio talk shows have made this phenomenon relatively easy and common – of the millions of women who have never had orgasm, a large proportion say that *they don't care all that much about it*.

Our biological survival dictates that men *must* have orgasm to distribute their seed, but women's biological need is to produce children in a protected and secure environment, for which purpose orgasm is wholly unnecessary.

If truth were told, men *do not much want* women to be howling with orgasm.

They frankly could not care less if women much enjoy the experience of sex, and the effort that women have to make to take part in sex is comparatively little, as compared to the frantic feverish efforts a man has to make to become aroused enough to pass on his seed.

It can of course be more sexually exciting for the man, if the woman is clearly aroused and desiring of the act, but such behaviour in his woman is for him a dubious event.

That is – if the physical sensations of sex are so important to her – that then depends on his ability to satisfy her, which puts a pressure to perform upon him to satisfy not only himself, but her, which for most men if they are honest, is going to make the sex act into a chore, in which he resentfully has to work hard to please *her*, when above all else, this is perhaps the one act in his otherwise frustrating life, in which he is most desirous to please *himself*.

In all the “sex therapy” that goes on, in typical feminist double-think style, this *fact* is completely ignored – i.e. in sex, a man *does not really want to please the woman, because he is one hundred percent intent on pleasing himself*.

In fact, the very universality of the after-sex question – *how was it for you?* – shows that if truth be told - *as is our goal* – that neither party knows or cares too much about what the other is experiencing in the frantic efforts of the act.

It's *impossible* after all to know what someone else is feeling, especially when one is so totally wrapped up in sensations that are overpowering one's own self.

The other point is again, the very *fact* that so many millions of women freely admit to having faked orgasm, proves that they not only find it far more difficult to achieve orgasm, but many times, they do not really care for the sex act, and are just “putting on a performance” for the man to please him and make him feel good about himself as a sex partner.

So if the woman goes into paroxysms of orgasm as well – *without him making any special effort to cause it* – he may well see that as a bonus, and feel some dubious pride, but more likely, he will find it somewhat threatening if he is a more thoughtful man.

That is – if his woman is as sexually motivated and generally speaking *addicted* as he is himself, he has got the problem of satisfying *her*, which he did not have in former times, before she got so involved with her quest for “the big O.”

The question then arises – if this means so much to her – and he is unwilling or unable to summon up the energy or ability to satisfy her on a regular basis, what will she then do?

Will she find another man who is “a better lover” than him, which obviously is a horrifying threat to his feeling of personal security in his relationship with her? Or will she even ditch him altogether for sex, if she finds a lesbian lover who is much more skilled at satisfying her, as quite likely many women are?

So let us get to the truth – most modern men are trying hard to sexually satisfy their women, not out of *love*, but *out of fear*.

This is reflected in the obsession with penis size, and there are of course huge industries which seek to fleece men of their hard earned cash to help them deal with this largely manufactured insecurity.

Because let us ask ourselves perhaps for the very first time just *why* a man needs a large penis?

It is not necessary to have orgasm or to father children, as no significant cases of such problems exist.

So the *only* reason why men are being tormented with insecurity about what is virtually impossible from them to change without some bizarre kind of physical therapy or blood curdling surgical operation, is merely *to satisfy womens' sexual demands*.

The huge debate over whether *size matters* and the humiliation of men with smaller than average penises, which if we think about it logically is obviously *fifty percent of all men minus one*, is wholly driven by the hypnotically implanted message that men must have big penises in order to satisfy *modern* women's sexual demands.

That is, modern men have been brainwashed into pleasing modern women sexually, when formerly all they had to worry about was *pleasing themselves*. In fact, even more than that, it was formerly considered *a woman's duty* in marriage to have sex with and therefore please her man.

So we have established that women have been largely brainwashed into having the desire for orgasms that they didn't previously or in many cases currently, even much care about, and secondly, men have been brainwashed into believing they must provide them for women, and that they must either get their penises enlarged or live in fear if they cannot.

*What mugs we men have become!*

So there are two issues here. Is it fair to expect men to try to satisfy women sexually?

As it appears women's *natural* interest in *the physical sensations* of the sex act is relatively weak when compared with the desperate urgency of the male, is this an issue which really should concern men much at all?

We might add a third – why have humans evolved with such a sexual mismatch?

That is, man seems to naturally function sexually in a way that is unlikely to produce female orgasm during the sex act.

Feminists may want women to have orgasms, but apparently a million years of Nature doesn't care much about it, and neither apparently do a lot of women, especially before the current campaign of brainwashing carried out by magazines such as *Cosmopolitan*, and TV shows such as *Sex in the City*.

It is a generally admitted formulation of the sexual differences in that for men, sex can be perfectly satisfactory devoid of any emotion, whereas for women the sex act is generally interpreted by them – when they freely consent to it – as *an act of love*.

Women in general – please remember, we are discussing the general case, the rule, not the exception – desire the emotional closeness of sex more than the physical sensations of sex.

Paramount for them is *being desired and loved* and this makes perfect evolutionary sense, because being desired means that men will give them what they *really* want from a biological point of view – not an orgasm, but the seed of a man they desire, and his protection of her, which will come from his feelings of love and desire for her.

For if the man finds her sexually desirable, he is going to stick around, and possibly father more children to her, and be available and willing to protect her and her children, simply in order to be able to continue to have the sex with her he desires.

Thus from an evolutionary and biological point of view, what a woman really wants and needs is *love and sexual desirability*, but not necessarily orgasm, and this is confirmed by what so many women say.

For example, it is extremely common for women to remark that they find the hugging and intimacy *after sex* the most satisfying part of the whole experience. That is – it tells her *he wants to stick around*, it makes her feel *loved* and therefore *secure*.

For all we know in fact, it is possible that the female orgasm is the last vestige in modern women of the powerful incentive that was required to persuade her less evolved and emotionally developed ancestors into mating in the animal sense.

Supposing that was true, that might explain why the present population has a mixture of women, some of whom seem to be far more sexually inclined than others, which would explain also women's own generally ambivalent attitude to sex – i.e. they say of men negatively – “they only want one thing”, or “he has a one track mind.”

Thus we have different kinds of women, some of whom sex is a powerful animalistic desire for, and then the more evolved kind of women, who though still desiring of and able to enjoy sexual stimulation, do not accord it the same importance, but tend to want to live on a more intellectual and emotional plane.

Books like Jane Austin's *Pride and Prejudice* have no overt sex in them whatsoever, yet this book was recently voted almost at the top of the all time great novels in one poll, clearly *by women*.

Women in general do not seek out pornography and instant sexual gratification as men do.

It is clear, that their sexual natures are different, and this seems to have an easily decipherable biological and evolutionary basis.

The female orgasm is not necessary for most women, certainly not on the regular basis that is felt unavoidable by men, and not necessary for the production of the babies they want and have.

So the answer to the question of whether men should seek to try to help women achieve orgasm, must from the point of view of women's and men's own best interests be – *only if it really matters to her*, or otherwise not at all.

Man's important task is to love and protect her and any children involved, not to give her orgasms, which with or without the help of modern sex aids she can quite happily provide for herself if that is so important to her.

If she is not satisfied with such a solution, it might honestly be better for her man to agree for her to have a disease free female lover rather than another man who is a threat to his security and family unit, and the media suggests that this is a route that some couples seem to be taking, when the woman is sexually unsatisfied with her man, but otherwise happy with him in a general way.

However, this it not to recommend any such practices, but to give a logical perspective on the possible scenarios which are now current, and it is felt that the necessity for this kind of solution will disappear, once the brainwashing of women to become more sexually curious and active than they would naturally be is ceased.

Referring again to the evolutionary theory of kundalini, introduced in an earlier chapter, there may also be sound reasons to do with creativity and mental health why women should not become so sexually awakened, as according to this yoga theory, creativity and health are best served by using the sexual energy in the body sparingly.

That is, if this yoga theory is correct, and women are given this information that they can slow ageing, fend off diseases and keep their mental health and balance and creative powers at optimum by having only moderate sexual activity, they will soon decide if they think the achievement of orgasm is really worth the trouble.

But let us not argue about this yoga theory fruitlessly – let us have some research – let those who have the scientific and medical opportunities to do so, make surveys of people's sexual behaviour – how frequently they have had powerful sex experiences over a period of time, and see how this correlates with their health record and current status.

Let the experimenters see how IQ, biological age or other parameters correlate with sex behaviour over a period of time. Let the experimenters question people anonymously about how soon they started sex activity – i.e. achieving orgasms – and see if that has impacted on the progression of their subsequent life.

On the observational level of research we can all easily perform, the *Sex in the City* culture appears to have created a lot of women who are sexually awakened, but whose long term relationships do not work out.



Because their focus is on their sexuality and men's, they frequently fail to recognise, that not only are most men looking for a sexually desirable partner, they are also looking for a kind-hearted and interesting person who will be their comforter and friend.

Men do not wish to have in that role a lady who is constantly having affairs, any more than a woman seeks a man who behaves likewise.

Not only that, there is another negative to the woman who trades more or less completely on her looks and sexual aura – as she ages, she will have little to attract men or women, and she can look forward to a lonely and miserable old age, as we see in the case of many ex-female models and actresses, apart from actresses of the serious kind who possess real talent and depth.

Equally, in the over-sexualisation of women, it is not recommended that they put sexually overt behaviour before men.

Why again?

Man's sex desire is strong enough already without further stimulation, and if she in fact succeeds in making him sexually more addicted than he likely is already, she may find that excites his interest not only for her, but for other women, which hopefully, she does not want.

There are other consequences too of this over-sexualisation of women, illustrated in the innovative movie, *Pleasantville*.

*Pleasantville* is an utterly fascinating movie from the psychological or sociological perspective, as it has this theme of women's liberation and the chaotic social order that has been created as a consequence.

Whilst the film makers and writers of this movie seem to portray the change from the relatively innocent era of the pre-rock and roll 1950s, to the sexually liberated 60s and 70s as a positive, they also bring out a seedier aspect of that transition.

The mother in the TV soap which is at the basis of this drama, appears to be happy in her family life with her husband. But via a fictitious time warp created for the purpose of the fantasy plot, suddenly finds she has a modern daughter and son on her hands.

Interestingly, the son, played by then future *Spiderman* actor, *Tobey Maguire*, is at first delighted with the 50s lifestyle he has now entered, whereas the rebellious teen daughter is horrified, and soon gets to corrupting all the youth and teaching them to have sex, whereas previously, they thought it the greatest thrill just to get an innocent kiss in "lover's lane."

Eventually this teen rebel from the future, actually teaches her own mother to have an orgasm by stimulating herself.

But is this sexually awakened mother then happy?

She deserts her family duties, leaves her puzzled husband for an affair with the local soda shop keeper, and even allows a painting of her naked he has done to be displayed in his shop window.

Havoc ensues, rocks are thrown and his place is smashed up.

And the staggering thing about this piece of fantasy fiction, is that this all pretty much is a parallel model in miniature of how our real society has gone since women started pursuing orgasms instead of their family responsibilities.

But the dark side of women's sexual liberation shows itself also.

She is at one point, trapped by a bunch of teenage boys, all sexually desirous of her, looking as if they are about to commit gang rape of their middle aged school friend's mother, until he intervenes and actually has to punch one of them to protect her.

Such gang rapes by young men of mature women have already happened in real life, and if women continue to display their sexuality so openly, no doubt the frequency and intensity of such attacks will get worse.

But the feminists are blind to all this – their answer is always that women should be allowed to dress and do whatever they like, and men should just learn to behave and control themselves – a thoroughly unrealistic view of reality, as we have already explained.

We even see this theme explored in TV advertising – one boy who brings his school friend home and is sharing a meal at the dinner table, sees his school chum ogling his mother and says “Hey! You fancy my mum!”

Mature women have now been made – or made themselves – fair game for the pursuit of in fantasy or even real life, the sexual hunger of teenage boys.

The savage rape of one such woman by a teenage gang depicted in *Anthony Burgess's A Clockwork Orange* shows the direction society is going, when youth is corrupted in this way, and learns to disrespect its adult members and let its children run wild, as is now happening.

This is the point that the feminists and women's liberators miss – in liberating women sexually, and allowing them to dress and behave provocatively in public, and show images of nudity and sex in the media, women are becoming the very things that the feminists claimed not to want – *objects of sexual desire and disrespect*.

And neither do children want their mothers to be sexually overt. Sons and daughters are embarrassed even by the idea that their mothers and parents could be having sex.

Why?

It is disturbing to their sense of security. The sex act is about being animal, wild and out of control from the point of view of an innocent observer – i.e. a child.

They *do not* see it as about *love*, but an unhealthy passion, in which it can almost appear like the two parties are trying to attack or eat each other to an innocent observing mind that doesn't understand.

Thus sex should be kept out of children's view, and there is no good reason for confronting adults with images of others having sex either, which only either disgusts them or stimulates their own desire to an unnatural level.

The movie or TV drama image of the child, left alone, while the mother goes off gallivanting with her lover is also familiar, and in that image is shown always the disapproval or discomfort of the child.

For example again, the hilarious scene in *Forrest Gump*, when his single-parent mother has sex with the head teacher, to persuade him to accept her backward son in his school, and as he emerges from the house buttoning up his pants, the young Forrest looks at him disapprovingly and mimics his grunting during the sex act.

Finally, we should look at another element in this destruction of the female gender that is being put forward as yet another element of "liberation."

That is – the widespread culture of female swearing.

First let us point out a few *facts*.

If *Her Majesty, the Queen of England*, stepped out *in public* and turned the air blue with four letter words, *everybody* would be horrified. Some who care nothing for royalty, might well laugh in derision.

But what *everyone* would think, is that - *she is common, she does not deserve the respect accorded to a Queen any more.*

Up until around thirty years ago or so, the only women who swore were *the commonest of women.*

So why are women all doing it now?

Because of course, the birth of the "aggressive woman", the "girl power" phenomenon.

What is in reality a foul mouthed, low and aggressive display, is regarded by them as "empowering."

But what should be pointed out, that it is "empowering" only in the sense that it is a standard part of every bully's "tool kit."

Swear words are used by men to intimidate other men. Anyone who swears a lot comes across as tough, regardless of whether that is the reality or not, and swear words are often used and exchanged as the prelude to violent acts.

Nice people don't swear, nasty people do.

Suppose a nice girl is in a group of girls who all swear. Again, she will feel under "peer pressure" to join in this habit, and if she doesn't, she might well become the one picked on, the one bullied, like in a *Prisoner Cell Block H* scenario.

So ladies and gentleman – look what we are doing when we are encouraging a culture in which women swear. We are encouraging the formation of violent gangs of girls who will bully other girls.

We are encouraging aggression in women, and their descent into an animalistic mode of living.

The solution?

Let us be aware that to swear is a violent and bullying act, an act of intimidation and aggression towards others.

Let us discriminate against all those who swear *in that manner*, disregarding those who can't help themselves but mean no harm, and just have it as a normal and ingrained part of their speech.

But let everyone of either gender realise – it is not welcome at the any Queen's table, and to do so marks us out as *common*.

So the message of this chapter, is mainly that in general, the sexual rise of a woman, signifies her fall as an asset to her man, her children, to the social respect normally accorded to her by society at large, and ultimately to herself as a human being, and surely therefore *should not be encouraged*.

## **Chapter Twelve – How The Feminist Influenced Woman Damages Her Male Children**

Part and parcel of the *sugar and spice and all things nice* myth of women, which is unfortunately at least nowadays, largely untrue, is that women are angels with regard to children.

Gladly, it is slowly coming to light that women can be as abusive or more so than men, but the female abuse is often far subtler than the typical kind men tend to carry out, which makes it far harder to detect and identify, or at times, even to understand.

Women in general tend to take two approaches to controlling men, and that transfers onto children also – *seduction and bullying*. In the case of children, the evil of this, is that unlike the adult male, the child has little chance of escaping her influence and control.

Where do these fairytales come from, of the “wicked witch” in *Snow White*, *Hansel and Gretel* or *the Wizard of Oz*?

The common factor is the *jealous and destructive woman*. Out of envy (*mirror, mirror on the wall, who is the fairest of them all?*) she is prepared to give Snow White the poisoned apple to stop her marrying her Prince Charming, and it is important to note, she carries out this most despicable act of attempted murder *whilst all the time pretending to be her comforter and best friend* e.g. a kind old lady offering a poor hungry girl an apple.

In real life, this tactic of one woman or girl sabotaging another girl's true love, is common, and men have got to know about it, as have any women who are wise enough to wake up.

Many times, an attractive and virtuous type of girl will have a less attractive and typically less scrupulous friend.

Though the virtuous “star” type girl believes the other less spectacular girl is her “best friend”, there is inevitably an envy hidden, and this shows itself when a “prince charming” appears on the scene whom the star girl, referred to hereon for convenience as *Snow White*, desires.

The “wicked witch” girlfriend will then pretend to encourage the relationship, but in reality she does everything in her power to make sure it doesn't happen by playing on the fears and insecurities of Snow White.

Nearly all men over the age of maturity must have had experience of this phenomenon, of never being “good enough” for the best friend or friends collectively speaking, of the Snow White girl whom they desire.

The reason for the behaviour of the less attractive girl is that she is deriving her identity from the star girl, who is everything she would wish to have been, but can only bask in the reflection of – again, a kind of narcissistic merging occurs.

Every princess and queen has her less spectacular courtiers, and in the defence of the lesser girl, the princess too may enjoy the feeling of importance and value which comes from the admiration and loyalty of inferior friends.

But such relationships can become extremely clingy, and the Snow White girl can become emotionally blackmailed to the extent that she feels to have a boyfriend or man whom she really loves, is a kind of betrayal of this “special thing” the two girls have together.

The point and problem is, that after living in the shadow of her fabulous best friend for so long, the lesser girl will feel like nothing, if the princess goes off with Prince Charming and has little time for her anymore.

This kind of relationship, which in some cases can obviously transmute into lesbianism, has to be recognised and understood, as it is really a block on three people finding love – the Snow White girl, the lesser girl, and the Prince Charming.

None of them “lives happily ever after” while this unhealthy over-dependent relationship persists amongst two girls or women.

One may recall the movie *Basic Instinct* in which the suspected murderess played by *Sharon Stone*, lures detective *Michael Douglas* into one of these lesbian love triangles, and Stone's lesbian lover attempt to murder him when he becomes her sexual rival.

But the main subject of this chapter is how this “wicked witch” mode that an envious woman can slip into affects her children, particularly the males.

Whilst Freud talked of “penis envy” such an immature concept of female psychology no longer holds good. The envy is not of the sexual organ, which is not the most attractive appendage any human can have, as neither is the female sexual apparatus, however much we pretend how pretty it is, as a woman herself tries to do in the ridiculous *Vagina Monologues*.

But female envy of men is an obvious reality, which comes to full fruition in the feminist philosophy, and has been around since time immemorial – just consider that bickering 1960s hit song (originally 1940s) which is a jazz and cocktail lounge standard - *Anything You Can Do, I Can Do Better*.

In terms of the envious woman, this translates into dominating her male children.

She can either verbally bully and traumatise them, or excite them unduly with teasing behaviour - for example persistent tickling games, which are actually considered by the child as an unwanted trauma causing insecurity in children, as do the other, unpredictable and threatening actions of the mother.

Understand that this kind of stimulation of children as in tickling, is to make *the mother* feel better, *not the child*.

For example, most women will still smack male children, which though arguably justified as a right tool of discipline, if used in a whimsical manner can create an atmosphere of fear and insecurity in the child's mind.

That is, if a woman smacks a child only when it is doing something wrong, then the child knows that as long as it behaves itself it is safe from physical threat from her.

But the abusive woman will smack or threaten, or verbally bully in all sorts of situations where it is inappropriate or not required to keep order, and this obviously sets a child up to become a visitor to the lady with the boots and whip in adult life.

If we consider the tactics of the professional dominant lady, we can easily see, these are the same tactics as those carried out by the abusive mother, and so it is clear, that the male is hypnotically living out in fantasy the abusive torments he endured as a toddler or young child at the hands of his mother – and you see *will probably not even recall*.

The various fetishes that men are attracted to, all this behaviour that is laughed at, should be viewed with a serious and discerning eye, as originating from childhood experiences of one kind or another, some of which are clearly *abusive*.

For the fantasy to work, as a physically strong adult who is typically quite capable of resisting anything the professional dominant lady might do, he has to be tied up or chained, so he is just as helpless as when he was a child.

But why would any adult male – and some women too, gravitate towards being abused in submissive roles – wish to relive their childhood traumas?

It is a sad fact of human psychology that though logic suggests that the rational mind would take steps to avoid the abuser and situations of abuse, especially when as an adult it has the power to do so, in reality, abused people are *hypnotically* drawn back to situations of abuse, just as it is said, the criminal is drawn back to the scene of the crime.

So by abusing a child, we create a child that will seek out abuse in its adult relationships, and will likely also inflict similar abuse on its own children when that opportunity arrives.

These obsessions with domination and submission are the activities of a mind which has lost its balance, which is damaged. All the well known gangsters and criminals who enjoy inflicting pain on others, learned their tendencies in this way.

Powerless, insecure people feel good when they get the opportunity to boss others about and even inflict pain upon them. Balanced people don't. They recoil from the horror and sickness of such acts.

That is not to say that an element of “slap and tickle” in a sexual relationship is a pathological disorder, but clearly, when it grows to the level of a sophisticated obsession that encourages many men and some women to part with huge sums of money to put themselves in degrading and humiliating situations, including being beaten or even defecated upon, it cannot be considered a normal psychological status.

Children need an atmosphere of love, peace and security to grow up in.

If discipline needs to be applied from time to time, it must be done consistently, and without taking any satisfaction in it, so that the child has a proper framework of what the boundaries are, and that its parents are just and fair authorities over it, rather than sexually motivated abusers.

Otherwise, parents, and especially mothers – as they have the most care over children in their formative years – are creating the kind of children who on the one hand, will willingly line up to be tortured or murdered in the gas chambers of a cruel dictatorship, or on the other hand, will become capable of inflicting cruelty upon other children and indeed adults, which we read and hear about daily in the media news.

The fact is, if our child grows up to be either a bully, criminal or on the other hand, someone who seeks out to be abused, self-harms, drug addicted or even kills themselves, rest assured that *we*, as parents, have created that mentality and situation.

Not necessarily by something we *did*, but just as likely by something we *didn't* do – i.e. having a father around to impose fair order and discipline and doing so ourselves.

If we are a rich lady or man, and left our child to the nanny, well, then yes, the nanny has screwed the child up somehow, and the result is what we see.

That is not to demonise all the parents who unwittingly have made these mistakes, but society must become aware of how fragile and delicate is the process of raising children to a balanced, healthy and disciplined state, and men in particular, must learn to detect if their wife is trying to create the sort of male child which will be hypnotically programmed by bullying, over-excitation, or abusive and inconsistent discipline, who will thereby grow up to be confused, insecure and end up in destructive relationships with his women, and likely with an irrational desire to humiliate himself at the feet of abusive women who remind him of his abusive mother.

The message to men, is we have to observe a lady's behaviour over a long period of time in a wide variety of different situations before we ever do anything likely to cause pregnancy in her, or say the words that would make her a marital partner.

If we don't, and allow ourselves to be seduced into causing an unplanned pregnancy, quite likely we will lose all rights over the child, or be unable to stop our wife or girlfriend hypnotically destroying the fragile mind of the child.



Impatience alone, as a typical quality possessed by every unbalanced woman, will over a period of time create a confusion and insecurity in a child's mind, which will stay with it all its life, causing all kinds of regrettable problems in its adult existence, which generally speaking, all the therapists in the world will be virtually powerless to do anything about.

## **Chapter Thirteen – Sex in the City – Making Boys and Men into Pavlov's Dogs**

The typical fear, devotion to and feeling of dependence upon women that the average boy learns from an early age – *but should not* – continues into adult life.

Ideally he should leave his mother's apron strings as time goes by, and develop an identity as an independent being.

But this doesn't really ever happen in most cases, because as his mother's influence gradually diminishes as he enters his teenage years, he is passed over to the influence of girlfriends and adult women.

If we have ever been present at a teenage party (with no adults allowed) we will witness how the vastly more mature girls of fifteen or sixteen can virtually pass most of the boys of the same age around like rag dolls, such is their mesmeric influence over these young and inexperienced males.

In the current scenario, this process of women leading men around by the nose – *or something* – is being conducted throughout their entire lives.

Men are controlled by the promise of sex, the feeling of pride they get from having a girl or women on their arm, and by the feeling of security they derive from the mere presence of an authoritative female, who acts for them as a mother substitute, yet has the added attraction of being able to provide at her whim the additional delight of sexual experience that a law abiding and morally proper mother never could.

The pressure on boys and men to have sex is immense both from their contemporaries and from the hypnotic suggestions constantly fired at them from the environment which ask them the question unceasingly “are you getting *it* every day?” and “have you had *it* today?”

The male desire provided by Nature is already powerful enough without it needing any extra help. But help it gets, all day long, with the result that the vast majority of men in the Western world are female fixated and sex obsessed.

The male sex desire is such a powerful force, and must be so, or the human species would not have evolved and survived throughout the long ages of hundreds of thousands or even millions of years.

So it arrives to us men like a thunderbolt in our late-preteen or teenage years, and our life can never be the same again. Women and even other men frequently joke that person X or Y is led around by, or thinking with, his sexual parts, rather than his brain.

This cynical attitude in itself is a great crime upon men, as firstly it is blaming them for an overpowering sexual proclivity that they never asked for as boys, nor can they easily control as adults, and secondly, as virtually all men are to a lesser or greater extent helpless before the power of this desire, it is utterly hypocritical of their fellow men to use it against them, and very immature of women to mock what is as serious and unavoidable a problem for men, as is the monthly menstrual cycle of sexually mature women and girls.

But as usual, from women and other men we receive mockery, not sympathy, and aside from the consideration that perhaps it is about time men stopped being traitors to their own sex, but true “brothers in arms”, this negligent failure to seriously acknowledge the problematic powerful sex desire in men, is leading to havoc in our whole society.

Like guns or nuclear weapons, the male sex desire has got to be taken very seriously, handled with care, and given the most serious thought how to keep everybody safe from the negative possibilities of.

The average man would happily sleep with a different women every day of his life if possible, which is proven by the behaviour of the fortunately relatively small number of celebrities, such as *Playboy* founder *Hugh Hefner*, who claim to – and likely have – more or less achieved this dubious honour.

The reason for the use of the word “dubious”, is because - are they really to be admired, or are these men, though even rich, rather just spiritless addicts, incapable of forming proper relationships with even one woman?

The more significant point of course, is that because men are generally extremely possessive of their women, and everyone feels entitled to have at least one, were men in general to attempt to behave in such a way, there would certainly be social chaos, and murderous crimes of passion by the thousand, until a state of one-woman-per-man order was restored.

The other corollary of such behaviour is that men and their children become uncertain of parentage, which also can lead to unwanted problems, such as bad feeling and rejection from a male parent if he finds out his “son” is not his own, and likely break up and destruction of the entire family for that reason.

For example, many times do we hear of the men who mysteriously take a gun or axe or whatever and kill their wife and children, and finally themselves. The man is assumed insane, but isn't it more likely that there is a more logical reason for his crimes?

In such cases, do they for example ever check the DNA of the children to see if there has been “a cuckoo in the nest”? (ornithologists tell us that some cuckoos are in the habit of laying eggs in other birds' nests, which the nest's residents are then obliged to look after without realising the deception).

So then the man's seemingly bizarre behaviour, though not excusable, becomes understandable – in his fury at his wife and the uncertain parentage of his children, possibly under the spell of further mockery and humiliation from her, he has produced the abominable act of killing his whole family, as the only way he feels he can make sense of the situation and get back his self-respect, even if it is his last living action before his own death.

The above paragraph does not suggest permission or justification for such an act from the objective moral point of view. The point is, it shows how seriously some men may take sexual infidelity of their women, it is merely an illustration of the *reality* of cause and effect.

That this sentiment is common in men, is echoed by the popularity of the dark *Kenny Rogers* country music song about the disabled Korean War veteran who is driven to thoughts of murder by his *suspected* unfaithful wife – *Ruby – Don't Take Your Love to Town*, which was based on a real incident also.

The telling line is - *if I could move, I'd get my gun, and put her in the ground (Oh, Ruby...don't take your love to town!)*

And whilst the feminists may say there is never any excuse for men to feel this way, women can show exactly the same violent and homicidal tendencies as men when they believe they have been betrayed – as the *Bobbitt* case, and its “copycat” follow-ups have conclusively proved – and frequently, their “fuse” is far shorter.

Equally, celebrity men are stalked by women, just as celebrity women are stalked by men, so these largely imaginary differences between the possible criminal behaviours of men and women need to be dismissed, if there is to be any proper justice and order in society, and protection for children and men.

The assumption that a woman is always innocent until proven guilty, and a man is always guilty until proven innocent, has got to change forever. But as usual, the “double-think” of the feminists cannot accept that their so called “equality” can possibly be allowed to extend that far.

Legions of male police officers, chiefs and judges have been and continue to be brainwashed by the feminist propaganda into taking the woman's side all the time, as if “butter couldn't melt in her mouth.” Sad though it is, fortunately, the rise of undeniable female criminality throughout modern society is now proving the case against female infallibility and innocence beyond any reasonable doubt.

There are even numerous TV shows depicting these criminal women in all their unfeminine, unsavoury vainglory, such as the long established *Prisoner Cell Block H* from Australia, and the more recent and equally sad *Bad Girls* in the UK.

But as our theme is principally *men's liberation* we need to look at what is causing men to go wrong. And one of the principal causes of that is the saturation of the environment with sexual signals from women in one form or another.

Women are used to sell absolutely everything in the Western society – as *Joni Mitchell* says in *Sex Kills – sex sells everything*.

A single advert or billboard alone, showing a woman in some state of undress can hypnotically charge a male fantasy, particular that of an inexperienced young boy, just like the nude painting in the window of the mature mother in the *Pleasantville* movie, which almost got her gang-raped by a bunch of teenage boys.

In every workplace, office, bar or other public place there are numerous temptresses, who dress in a sexually provocative manner, using all the tight, revealing and enticing forms of dress – or lack of it – which have appeared since the early 1960s – when the relative modesty of former times was suddenly and seemingly permanently discarded.

Man is obviously genetically programmed to find the contours of the female shape exciting, or else he would have no sex desire. There is no sexual excitement experienced by men seeing a tree, a herd of cows, or *generally speaking* another adult male or a female child.

It is definitely those female adult attributes – mainly the adult curviness and swollenness of breasts, legs and bottom or hips which excite him, and of course, these are the three parts of a woman's anatomy which women seek to put on maximum display to tease and seduce him.

So like Pavlov's dogs, men are being encouraged to salivate at the sight of these parts of the female anatomy and her generally curvy shape, and this piece of hypnotic programming is being used to control him at every turn.

A girl or woman who wants a job from a male employer may well display herself sexually in this way, or with even more subtlety, by appearing to discreetly cover up – though her general shape will still be discernible – but dressing and wearing her hair in a variety of ways which convey some kind of message which she is trying to put across regarding herself to make him pick her, even to a large degree as if he were selecting her as a lover or mate rather than an employee, which transition is after all not an uncommon occurrence.

There is even an advert on recent British TV which depicts exactly this – a girl going for a job, who sees three almost identical clones of herself waiting to be interviewed, and then goes to “the powder room” and sexes and spices herself up, to make sure she is the one who gets noticed, and gets the job.

Just from seeing the shoes she chooses to wear will tell him what kind of a person she is, or is portraying herself to be.

Obviously high heels suggest a more extrovert, sexually forward person, and lower heels indicate reserve, but combined with all the other thousand and one compendium of dress options available to a *woman* – e.g. an ankle chain visible beneath her stockings or tights, or on her bare legs – she can get the job based on some piece of hypnotic trickery alone, which her employer may not even consciously register in the tension of a job interview meeting.

But even this, though clearly an unfair and unsuitable basis upon which to be appointed to a job, is not the main problem with modern women's sexually overt dress and behaviour.

The average mixed-sex office will inevitably be a hotbed of gossip and intrigue, and the most fertile ground for extra-marital affairs which destroy marriages and leave children lost and wounded in the war between parents, and typically fatherless.

Countless TV dramas show all the extra-marital activities going on in mixed-sex work places, such as *Alley McBeal* in the US, and the hospital drama, *Casualty*, in the UK, and typically by the end of a series or two, almost all the characters have had what were once described as "conjugal relations" with everyone else, which not only is ridiculous and unrealistic, but obviously is a hypnotic suggestion to the viewers of these programs – *mainly women, you will note* – that they should be doing the same.

But even though marriages and long term stable relationships are wrecked by these "workplace romances", causing untold agony to both parties *and their children*, the feminists insist that women should be entitled to dress and behave however they want, and men should instead learn more self-control.

This view however is not realistic, because the sexual programming in men runs too deep, and is being emphasized at every turn.

That is, imagine a man were placed naked in a room, in which an endless succession of attractive women filed in and out of in various states of undress or even nakedness, and that the man was instructed for the sake of experiment not to become aroused.

How long would it take for him to do so?

He would go crazy after an hour or two of such treatment, and sooner or later likely need to be restrained from molesting one of the ladies unfortunate enough to enter the room when his resistance finally cracked.

Yet *this* is precisely what is being done to the average man who works in a mixed sex environment on a daily basis, because of women's needlessly revealing dress and sexually suggestive behaviour.

An attractive secretary who bends over a desk or office filing cabinet in full view of a man, is putting before him an image of her female sexuality that is implanted into him a million years deep.

He is programmed to be aroused and desire sex with a female who displays herself in such a manner, but modern civilisation says he is not allowed to do so under the duress of accusation of rape, unless he goes through an often lengthy and tiresome process of dating or courting her.

Since as likely as not, she does not desire him, he is thus tormented day after day, until he finally cracks and commits some act of molestation or even worse, rape, and has his life as he knows it permanently wrecked.

Such behaviour is often done by women with full awareness of the effect they are having, and surely this is a form of "entrapment" which renders a man not wholly responsible for his actions.

When such a man who loses control says desperately in his defence "she was asking for it", he means *his sexual instinct overpowered his conscious mind*. Thus this is not a pre-meditated act, but *if sufficiently tempted* is like a magnetic pull he is unable to combat.

For example, many times we are forced into close proximity with skimpily or tightly dressed shapely women on a tube train, bus or in a lift, where the constant temptation to touch what we find so pleasing to the eye, could for many men be very hard to resist.

Or for example again, we see in many shops and stores now, that women shoppers or shop assistants will bend over and display half-naked bottoms, in low slung jeans covered only by the skimpiest of thongs.

Are we supposed to be grateful for this vision of sexually provocative ugliness or beauty (depending on the woman), neither of which we are allowed to touch?

Are we supposed to be surprised if some men lose control in this atmosphere of torment and commit some sexually motivated criminal act?

As usual, the feminists deny female responsibility for these *extremely common* kinds of behaviours, and as usual men get all the punishment and blame.

That men get all the blame, is obviously thoroughly unjust and unfair, but that you see, is of course the perfectly normal perspective and conduct of the abusive lady with the leather boots and whip, whom men have been hypnotised into obeying and serving for so long now – so long, that we have been made to feel it is normal, when it sure as hell isn't, and up until the last few decades of the twentieth and twenty-first century surely never was.

So again, these incidents of men being ruined, due to women in general being allowed to tease and torment men in the work place or public places, are a wake up call to all men to start to seriously consider these issues and start resisting and objecting.

In Arab states, the normal behaviour of the average Western woman as to her dress and sexually provocative behaviour would result in her being put under curfew, or maybe even flogged in the public square.

Though of course that seems wrong and extreme to our Western society, perhaps we should ask how that came to be. Why should the Arab cultures find it so threatening, and feel the need to dress women in such a fashion that their physical form and beauty is almost invisible to the eye?

This is assumed by the feminists and most Western women to be abuse and disrespect of women.

But on the contrary, the Arab view seems to be, that women are veiled because the hidden sexual power of women, if let loose, *is a power that can destroy the whole world*. It is out of the *legitimate and real* fear of the sexual power of women that they are covered, not out of slavery or disrespect.

And is this destruction not what we are seeing in the deterioration and destruction of our current society? Women have been “liberated” but it seems like the gates of hell have also been simultaneously let loose.

And incidentally, the human form was forbidden to be depicted in Islamic art – at least partly one assumes, to prevent the development of the blatant sort of pornography we now have permeating our entire Western world.

They *knew* that by forbidding these powerful images and having their women covered up, the only way to stop *a very significant proportion* of men succumbing and committing some needless animal act, was to *stop tempting them*.

Women have got to learn to stop tempting men sexually, anywhere but at the right place and time – i.e. in the privacy of the marital bedroom – because anything else is resulting in the destruction of men, the insecurity of women due to infidelity and fear of attack, and the consequent breakdown of the family and society.

Even the non-feminist hardened women are resisting of this idea, as they are using their sexual display as a mating tool, and also to get their own way in various situations in the external world, as for example the girl or woman who dresses sexily to get a promotion or job.

This is unjust for society as a whole – because, not only a man, but the average looking modest lady should have an equal chance of getting a job or being served in a restaurant, as the stunning or overtly displayed one.

Women should not be allowed to jump any queues by flashing their sexual attributes, that is, if it is a *just* and *civilised* society we are trying to build, with theoretical equality for all.

Of course, men will always choose – other things being equal – the most attractive women they can get as mates, just as women will always choose the most desirable males they can attract.

But that process of selection needs to be done in a sober and organised way, so that the emotional trauma of rejection, harassment or violent dispute is avoided and we can have peace and security in social life and society as a whole.



Likewise, jobs should be given only on merit, not by seducing men into giving career chasing favours, so that women's teasing sexual display is then viewed by society in general as a negative attempt by them to get what perhaps they do not truly deserve.

Equally, the insecurity and vanity which motivates women to dress and act provocatively, just to see how many men they can wrap round their little finger and get high in the process, needs to be addressed, and men have got to stop being so grateful to witness what are usually in the final analysis frustrating and dangerously provocative displays of female anatomy in public places, which sometimes no doubt have even caused major traffic accidents, and quite likely a considerable number of deaths thereby.

In fact, a recent survey has actually revealed that around *ten percent* of all men in the UK claim to have had a road traffic accident cause by ogling a woman whilst driving, which obviously and shockingly means *millions* of such accidents.

This is surely something that urgently needs to be addressed, though the current UK government is interested apparently only in punishing *male* drink drivers, and citizens in general using a vast army of robot "speed cameras" they have introduced in the last few years, a policy so irritating, that *Rowan Atkinson* even made a point of gloriously destroying one with a rocket in the recent *James Bond* spoof, *Johnnie English*.

The suggestion here is not to cover women from head to toe and veil them, but that they should dress in an attractive, but sensible way, like traditionally the Indian women do in saris.

Any woman can easily wear loose fitting garments, which while still attractive and comfortable, are not figure hugging, and therefore *not sexually stimulating*.

That is, women can still be *beautiful*, but they can do that *without being a tease*.

Similarly, if sane women, would discourage the less balanced from taking their clothes off in one format or another to gain attention, money or fame, rather than giving them approving mantras like "if you've got it, flaunt it", but rather make it a *self-respect* issue to not do such things under any circumstances, these undue sexual temptations on men would cease, and women in general would feel more secure in their relationships with the men they have, as well as feeling safer to move about in public places and on the streets.

Women should consider very seriously that the most likely outcome of such a "de-sexualising" shift in their approach to dress and social conduct, would truly give them from men and children the *respect* and *security* they currently lack.

Thus, the need for women to tempt men in public as they do should disappear, and maybe then we can finally satisfy the demand of the feminists, that men should be able to view women in general, not as sex objects, but as equally valuable human beings, and maybe even *friends*.

## **Chapter Fourteen – Women, Women, Everywhere, and Not a Man Does Blink**

There appears to be no occupation or place in society that a man can call his own any more, where he can abide at least temporarily without having to live in anxiety of the often unreasonable demands upon him, or the on the other hand disturbing temptations, coming from women.

Perhaps in a monastery maybe, but then he may run the risk of being a victim of homosexual men who have installed themselves there, posing as “apprentice holy men.”

Or else in these “enlightened” times, there may well be “awareness days” with trips from coach loads of visiting nuns, who at heart, have as much intention of devoting themselves to a life demanding a ninety-five percent covered body and celibacy, as the *Sound of Music*'s heroine *Maria*.

Peace is not to be found one suggests, by running away – there really is no place in a modern society for a man to hide. The hand of woman is waiting to either slap or caress him everywhere.

She peers at him from every TV screen smiling seductively, and even when he searches for his favourite piece of music or art upon the Internet, some window of the naked and lascivious female form pops up, reminding him that wherever he looks, she is still there.

But on the whole, as men are obliged to work for a living, the unavoidable meeting point with women is at work.

If one is in one of the male dominated trades, one may be spared this dubious pleasure, but even then it isn't easy.

The drunken labourer falls out of the bar, and there she is on the corner with short skirts and high heels, waiting for him enticingly, waiting to promise him pleasure, but really wants only to steal his money, and leave him helpless and unconscious in some dark back alley.

But the problem for the caring and responsible male who wants a wife and family, is that likely he is in competition with some woman or girl for the job that he needs to support that family life.

And so many men, who would have succeeded in former times, before feminism arrived, are now sidelined and beaten to the post by some egotistical girl or woman hell bent on “empowering herself” as a “liberated woman.”

She gets her own flat, and car, and proudly feels she is a “success”, and in an ideal world there is little wrong with that. Especially if she is doing something which actually makes the world a better place, like being a good teacher, doctor or suchlike.

But the problem is that good jobs are still hard to find, and women are taking more and more jobs away from men who are then unable to marry and have *stable families* – just the room she occupies in her single person flat, and the road space she clogs up with her car is now becoming a burden on society in every Western country in the world, and if the feminists get their way, it will be happening soon in every Eastern country also.

This point is made not only against single women, but also single men.

Just why do so many single people need to take such a large share of resources in a society and world that is rapidly running out of them?

The answer is largely one and the same as the theme of this book – the destruction of the family, mainly by destruction of the male.

Traditionally, in almost every civilisation before our current feministic one – which though it has been running as an experiment for only about the last forty years, those who live in it think is the only way to exist – girls would not leave home until married, and quite probably boys would not do so either.

Of course that requires adequate space – every adult should certainly be allowed a private room of their own, which is completely their own space – but that there is now a condition of literally millions of single people living alone in every Western nation is just a reflection of how egotistical and intolerant we have all become.

There is a Sufi saying (*Sufis* were in ancient times, Eastern holy men):

*ten Sufis can sleep under the same blanket, but two Kings cannot live together even in a whole country*

No doubt the same applies to queens too, as England's Elizabeth I proved when she cut off her rival, *Mary Queen of Scots'*, head.

We thus see that the *Red Queen* shouting "Off with her head!" regarding *Alice*, in *Lewis Carroll's* fantasy, is far more than fiction.

Many times a teenage daughter cannot live with her mother any longer for the same reason – they have become rival queens. So tell me now, please, how it is that this myth of glorious caring love between women – even mothers and daughters - is true?

The point of the Sufi quote is that these holy men had grown beyond their egotistical natures, and become calm, patient and tolerant and wise – clearly a feat which their behaviour indicates most modern women are extremely far away from.

The go-getting modern women who drives a car, has her own flat or house and successful career, thinks herself to be a striking success as a human being, but somehow she discovers her relationships with men don't work.

A million magazines are out there, to comfort her, tell her “how to find her man”, “how to seduce her man”, “how to keep her man”, “how to get her man to do anything she wants”, always, the “how” and always about possessing and controlling some poor defenceless specimen of man.

Here however, we must give a sigh, and acknowledge the millions of decent well behaved women, who have sincere difficulty finding a man, yet surprisingly don't seek to dehumanise, dominate and manipulate him, as these over-materialistic, self-obsessed, male scalp-hunting women do.

As discussed earlier, not many women can handle authority well, especially authority over men, as anyone who has witnessed their behaviour for a significant amount of time in positions of authority in the workplace knows.

Their style of management tends to be petty and authoritarian in comparison to the more laid back and tolerant style of most *real* men. They demonstrate the over finicketyness and obsession with rules, that is common to those who feel insecure in their position and feel they must do *something*, merely for the sake of something being done, when it would have been better to be tolerant and leave things alone.

Equally, in time, their double-standards become obvious, and having been given a position of adequate authority, they feel they can shamelessly indulge that tendency, and judging by the collective experiences reported, they certainly do.

Cases of male officer workers who have been made to sweep the floor – a cleaner's work – or perform other inappropriate tasks to degrade and humiliate them are not rare.

The motivation is just the same as in the case of their humiliation and abuse of male children – to dominate and traumatise, in order to be made obedient to female authority, and satisfy the egos of the female despots in power.

It is typical also to see male criminals violently object to being “manhandled” by a female police officer, though they will grimly accept the same treatment from a male without such protest.

Men want respect, and women will not give it to them, so then resistance and violence arises. Or at least so you would think.

But on the whole it appears that women are slowly taking away all men's jobs and rights without them even blinking an eye, or raising a word of protest. Female empowerment is everywhere, but there is little concern for the consequent fate of men.

It is possible for a man to write a hundred job applications to one hundred male run firms, and have them all rejected without a man ever looking at them, as his secretary or female assistant or manager has weeded them out. She writes “pp” and signs the rejection letter, which though allegedly from him, she herself has written and signed, and he has never seen.

It is debatable whether what this book terms as a *real man* can ever find any self-respect working for a woman. If one such finds himself under one, he will tend by nature to challenge any decisions she makes he does not agree with.

Then in typical female paranoid style – he will be first threatened, then formally warned, and then kicked out, to be replaced either by another woman or a submissive, spiritless and obedient male – that is, again, just another slave of the bossy woman with the leather boots and whip, just another degraded, humiliated and depersonalized man.

Women, thinking and acting under the feminist influence, cannot understand why the male – either as child, boyfriend, husband, or employee - is rebellious to her “loving regime.”

She cannot understand that every man in his heart is a *Spartacus*.

He *wants* to be free, he does *not* want to be a slave.

Ultimately, he will choose death rather than slavery as *Spartacus* did, and sometimes, women should be warned, he may take the woman who has enslaved and disrespected him for so long with him, should he lose all hope in his degraded life.

From time to time, we hear of or read about horrific attacks carried out upon women by men, and sometimes also upon their children, who then often kill themselves or stoically refuse to explain why, and we never know what their reasons were, and presume them “insane.”

While possibly some are, in the sense of being brain damaged, or whatever, likely the majority are just very upset and degraded people who got pushed too far over the edge. For when we treat a human being as an animal, it is surely no surprise when he or she starts behaving like one.

Some otherwise extremely decent men have been driven to a single desperate and violent act, by the deceitful and hypnotic antics of a woman, with whom they could not cope.

Any man who has witnessed women's psychological torture of men, knows that it is stealthy and private. They can appear to be the pillar of their community while they are secretly torturing their man or suitor or some unfortunate stooge in their workplace whom they have entrapped in their web.

Even their friends don't necessarily know what they are up to, they can disguise it so well.

The movie *Dangerous Liaisons* springs to mind, as does *Fatal Attraction*, both films depicting the sort of stealthy and manipulative deception and cruelty of which not just a few, but the greater proportion of women are capable of, given the opportunity.

We here emphasize again, that the use of popular culture as “evidence” is for the purpose of familiarity and illustration, but real-life counterparts to these supposed fictional characters can easily be found by studying the newspaper or law court reports, and even by taking an *honest* survey of family and friends.

All men should watch these two movies as part of their basic education, not as an entertainment, as they depict the behaviour of women they are likely to meet in the real world.

You never know just what a witch is capable of - *until she gets you under her spell.*

And as women are given more and more places of authority – in business, in the police, even in the Church as “priests”, in the public services, and in government, if they are not noble high-minded people, these are yet more opportunities for them to take men’s jobs, repress men, and generally cause confusion and mischief.

For example, one real-life company director of a large corporation approaching early retirement, found himself suddenly beneath a female boss who had wormed her way in somehow.

Though he was a confident man, and well-liked in his company generally, she managed to make his life an absolute misery, with the result that he was forced to resign eventually on nervous health grounds.

What was her motivation? Was she trying to get another female or even male friend in his place? Did she just enjoy destroying another person, as bullies and sadists usually do?

We will never know, but for certain, this is a man who would have otherwise entered a happy and graceful retirement, had this ambitious and cruel lady not appeared and soured the last years of his glittering career.

And did not *the Queen of Sheba* even bring down *King Solomon* if the Bible story is to be believed? And did not likewise, the jealous *Queen Herodias* and her sexually provocative daughter *Salome*, conspire to manipulate the king, and thereby successfully demand the chopping off of *John the Baptist’s* head?

No wonder so many women don’t like religion and the Bible. They don’t want us to look at the history of their deeds!

When we look at women in positions of high power, we rarely see the peace which the feminists try to assure us would ensue if women ruled the world. The truth is, they are largely ruling it now, through their puppet men, such as Tony Blair and Bill Clinton, and what we certainly do not have is *peace*.

When the average wife or girlfriend gives the average husband or boyfriend no peace, why on earth would we expect that if we put the average ambitious woman (that is, not the saintly woman – the *Snow White*, or *Mother Teresa*) into power, we would obtain it then?

No – what we will have is a petty authoritarian regime, full of paranoia, surveillance, pointless, irritating and unjust rules and regulations, which is what we have now got in the major Western so-called democracies.

The way women will rifle through their husband's pockets and try to invade every last sanctuary of a man's private world is just being magnified now into the law of the land.

Men in general are viewed just as the paranoid wife does – presumed guilty until proven innocent, and when transferred to government, this kind of mentality is seen in the reckless military expeditions to find for example “weapons of mass destruction” that aren't there, on the basis of unsubstantiated rumours, gossip and outright lies.

Wildly hypocritical acts – such as a British top woman legal minister caught speeding at over one hundred miles per hour on a motorway upon which the legal limit was only *seventy* – are overlooked in this free-for-all of double-standards, but the slaves and the subjects must do nothing wrong, and are treated by the court system with disrespect and disdain.

A woman-dominated system of government demands that everybody must do every last petty thing right – for example despotic treatment (“zero-tolerance”) for petty offenders such as litter-louts is introduced – and attempts are continually made to interfere in every act of private citizens, such as the right to discipline their own children in a reasonable way.

It is ultra-authoritarian, in that the woman at the centre of it – like for example British former prime minister *Margaret Thatcher* – is the absolute dictator and accepts little input or disagreement from anyone else.

i.e. she *will not tolerate* dissension to her tyrannical rule. It is like Elizabeth I and the fictional Red Queen before her – *off with their heads!*

This seems also to be true of the current UK prime minister, Tony Blair, who appears to be under the control of his more enterprising and, so he says, more capable wife – a high court judge and barrister who had an alcoholic father who deserted her.

Mr Blair has been labelled a “control freak” even by members of his own party, and has acted consistently against public opinion as registered by the polls in what is supposed to be a democratic country.

We see this same attitude in mainland Europe where for example, recently the “European Constitution” has been rejected by referendum, and the governments have been considering just amending it and referring it back to the people again and again, supported by reassuring propaganda - *until they get the answer they want.*

Equally at some French schools, they now hand condoms to children at the school gates, when in the “good old days” on hearing the news that his young lad had been interfering with someone else’s underage daughter, a caring father might give him a firm slap and say “I’ll bloody kill you if you do that again.”

That doesn’t mean he was an abusive father, and he didn’t really want to kill his son and have sex with his daughters, whatever the more bizarre theories of the Freudian philosophy seem to suggest.

The purpose of his disciplinary action was that he simply wanted his son to grow up as a responsible and caring man he could be proud of.

But this kind of simple straightforward reality, the intellectual warped and biased feminists cannot understand. But it is *they* who are now dominating the minds and decisions of women and men, and so the chaos goes on.

The term *chaos* is used deliberately, because again, this shows the contrast between the personalities and modes of behaviour of women and men.

As elicited for instances in the works of best selling Australian couple, *Allan and Barbara Pease*, backed up by research including the known differences in the brain, men and women are really very different creatures.

*Most* women struggle with visual spatial perception tasks which men breeze through, and *most* men do not easily cope with a number of tasks simultaneously as women can, but are superior on focussing on *one thing at a time*.

This explains why most of the great artists, scientists and composers have been men, and not the “no opportunity” and “restricted gender roles” feminist propaganda explanations, that have little support from biology, history or reality.

The deeper reason for this, is that whilst women are centred more on, and are more expert upon, the day to day often trivial transactions which hold the social fabric together – a *vitaly important task, please understand – real* men tend to be more solitary in their behaviour and thinking, and tend to obsess on things.

In art and science, we see men’s never ending attempt to discover and create *order* in society and the universe.

Even the so called great female writers, with few exceptions – perhaps the *Star Trek* authoress *Dorothy C Fontana* is one – tend to focus on the traditionally “women’s issues” of social manners, and fantasies of romance, such as “Jane Eyre” or “Wuthering Heights.”

There is little or no female equivalent to *Shakespeare*, *Goethe* or even *Ray Bradbury*, because you could argue that even female writer D C Fontana was a follower rather than a leader, with such novels and stories by *Jules Verne*, *H G Wells*, *Edgar Allan Poe*, *Bradbury* and others to base her work on, and movies like *Forbidden Planet* to use as a model for the *Star Trek* series, which after all was *created* by *Gene Roddenberry*.



But this order is particularly apparent when we see woman in action in the domestic environment in the home. She has a kind of order that perhaps works for her, but tends to look like chaos to the average man.

But the vital point is not how she decorates or organises her domestic chores, but *how she relates to and disciplines the children.*

And unlike most men, she will happily join in cake throwing and fooling around sessions, and live in an atmosphere of chaos that men will not tolerate for long.

Even when her "little darlings" smash next door's windows or vandalise someone's car, she will say "they were only having fun" and "boys will be boys", and make other excuses for their out-of-hand and chaos causing behaviour that a *real man* will never tolerate.

We are seeing this chaotic female "discipline" in society as a whole now.

Teachers in schools have no power to discipline children, and what is the result? – *chaos.*

Many teachers spend the majority of the lesson trying to keep order, and surely most of us have witnessed something like this, even in the days of corporal punishment, when a weak willed teacher was placed in charge of a class.

Vandals, hooligans and criminals in society are not punished or reformed in any convincing manner – *more chaos.*

As long as they are feeling proud about their jobs, cars and houses, and worship from the emasculated men in their lives, women carry on amidst this chaos as if it didn't exist, at least until or unless it suddenly touches them personally.

Then they hit the paranoia button, totally overreact to whatever has happened to them, and demand draconian measures for whatever little isolated area of trouble they have been hurt by.

For example if they had their jewellery stolen by a mugger, they want flogging brought back for muggers – while totally disregarding the wider picture, and the underlying real causes which have brought society to this state – the failure of families to work, with a present father, who is able to impose proper discipline, particularly on his male children.

A further example of the limited and unrealistic thinking of the female approach to discipline, is in the constant campaign to ban smacking of children by their parents as a disciplinary tool.

Anyone who has witnessed or been placed in charge of a group of lively young children, realises that they have a war on their hands.

If not controlled, these children could literally murder each other, their neighbours and burn down the house.

A recent case of two children trying to hang a baby from a tree in the UK shows what some of these “little darlings” are capable of once let off the leash.

But all the feminists can do as soon as a *measured* disciplinary hand appears near a deserving child's thigh, is cry “Child abuse! Lock the (usually male) monster up!”

When this undisciplined child subsequently goes on to murder its playmates, or some helpless old lady, they have *nothing to say*.

More chaos.

Then instead of allowing sensible discipline of children, they have so called “experts” and intellectuals with BAs, MAs and PhDs after their names, write endless volumes suggesting solutions that clearly don't work, or else society would not still be in such a mess.

So therefore, there are many jobs – particularly in policy making – which are generally speaking better done by men than women.

Because of women's obsession with status, they wrongly attach more importance to these jobs, such as being a government minister. When as we have demonstrated, the hardest, most skilled, demanding and rewarding role in the world is to be a good mother, which they now despise and neglect.

But likely, the feminist women and their followers do not have what it takes to perform that role successfully, and so live on the mantras “I am a respected professional”, “I am good at my job”, etc.

And fine, if they are a respected Nobel Prize winning brain surgeon, what man can argue with that ?

But how many women have such jobs?

Women excel in the jobs that use persuasion and seduction, such as sales. There are a very large number of such jobs, because the capitalist structure depends upon *sales*.

Many things that are produced, people really neither want nor need. Then people must be hypnotised by sexy adverts and sexy women to feel they want and need them, or else *they* as human beings will be “left on the shelf.”

What motivates women to buy that latest sofa, holiday, dress, pair of shoes or car, or take up that expensive new craze?

It's because *Joan Collins*, or *Jennifer Lopez* or *Brittany Spiers* or *Madonna* has it, or is doing it, and if they want to be viewed as *in*, rather than *out*, they must follow the crowd likewise, and plastic card in hand, sign upon the dotted line.

Most women neither possess nor demand the individuality that men do, and those few who do, are usually like say *Grace Jones*, genuinely bizarre. Where is the female equivalent of *Andy Warhol*, or *Picasso* or *Dali* or *Henry Moore*?

There is none.

There is only for example, the likes of *Bridget Riley*, who makes geometrically interesting pretty patterns, somewhat reminiscent of a dress designer in a clothes shop.

But let us be fair – they *are* some very talented women for example in the music industry, such as *Kate Bush*, *Joni Mitchell*, *Annie Lennox* and *Tori Amos* – but this genuinely creative spirit in women is very rare, and none of them apart from perhaps *Joni Mitchell*, who shows strong masculine traits anyway, and seems to identify herself somewhat with *Van Gogh*, has made the kind of impact on even popular music as male artists like *the Beatles*, *Jimi Hendrix*, *Pink Floyd* or *Bob Dylan* have done.

And equally, though there are many fine women classical pianists, where are the female equivalents of jazz maestros like *Oscar Peterson* or *Keith Jarrett*, or in 70s rock music, where are the equivalents of *Vangelis*, *Keith Emerson*, *Jean-Michel Jarre*, or *Rick Wakeman*?

Well, we have *Enya*, but she is not really the same kind of innovator as those fiery individuals, but a far gentler and more traditionally inclined spirit, as her female sex dictates, as is the talented jazz song interpreter and pianist, *Diana Krall*.

Equally, we now have women who (supported by modern equipment and technology) have climbed Mount Everest or sailed around the world, but are these women really *explorers and adventurers* like *Scott of the Antarctic* or *Columbus*?

Or are they just trying to prove a point, or make names for themselves?

For example, a very young British round-the-world yachtswoman has recently been made a *Dame*.

It takes women public servants or highly accomplished theatre or film actresses a whole life-time to gain such an honour – to say nothing of countless private individuals who live lives of the greatest service to others, yet never get a mention – but they have bestowed this grand title of the British Empire on a twenty-something girl, who has no other claim to fame.

So what is the explanation?

It is simply that it is a major triumph *for women*, as it supports the feminist theory of female equality or supremacy to men, and so the feminist controlled current British government has given her this totally disproportionate and premature reward in its whimsical and chaotic rule.

Should we doubt that the current UK government is feminist controlled? Well, if so, why are they compiling *women only lists* to fill candidate vacancies, rather than basing selection entirely on merit, as would be the case if they were seeking only true "equality?"

Lastly, there is a new breed of woman whom all men should be aware of who it appears at first sight are *beyond* all these petty considerations of material status and celebrity and egotism. So it appears.

She is the new age "mother goddess." She claims to be non-materialistic, does yoga, meditates, fools around with crystals, *Feng Shui*, aromatherapy, tarot cards and all the rest of the paraphernalia of "mock spirituality" (while *Buddha* and *Christ* and *Mohammed* are of course *the real thing*).

But don't be fooled.

Most of these kinds of women have simply transferred their egotistical pursuits into the so called "spiritual field" as admittedly have some men. Underneath all the chanting, mantras, and affirmations, they are still growing a selfish ego, there is still a wilful, stubborn, reality denying spirit there which will not surrender to reason, nor in particular to any man.

The very fact that such women would probably be furious at reading the above paragraph, especially when it is clear it is written by a man, proves the point.

A truly spiritually enlightened person could not possibly be offended by the above paragraph or any mere words, since they would be secure in their identity in relation to the cosmic plane, if such exists.

But offended *they are*.

*There* is our proof of their true status.

Many of these women also run a business out of past life regressions, mediumship, and the like, so really, they are very much like Christ's money changers in the temple whom he kicked out, but no one in modern life either cares or dares to do.

They are making a business out of the holy, though in their ignorance, if there is a God, we can assume he is merely amused by their antics, done in ignorance.

Of course, they don't believe in a male god anyway, but some kind of female "mother goddess." As we can see, they try to export the battle of the sexes even into the spiritual world.

Is there no refuge of sanity that women will not try to invade?

Women wish to become priests in the belief that their immature ideas will set society in order, and they simultaneously want to prove they can shower their love on everybody and make everybody's life all right.

It's an ambitious goal, when they don't really know even what it is that men want – i.e. not to be loved as women do, but to be free, and to love and *explore* as they choose, and create an order in society that is beautiful in an impersonal way – without getting too touchy feely about it, and going round hugging a lot of people who don't really want to be hugged.

In any event, no doubt we will see these women priests in droves getting married and the demands of childcare will be so great, they will find themselves unable to carry out their priestly roles, unless they are willing to neglect their children also, just like most of the rest of their secular flock.

Women have got to realise once and for all that they were – with few exceptions – designed by nature to care for children and for men in a physical way, and to hold the social fabric together on a daily basis. Not to set aright the wrongs of society as a whole in a leading or philosophical role, which the current female control of society is now so emphatically demonstrating.

None of this is at all to suggest that women are inferior to men. They are in some ways superior to men, in some ways inferior.

The sexes are different, and equal in the sense of equally valid as human beings, but this does not mean they should have the same roles in society, just for purely biological reasons, such as woman's more complex and vulnerable body, which is required intact for child rearing as well as her own health.

Thus she should not really go in for boxing championships or front line roles in military service or police.

As time goes by, commonsense and realism must return to the thinking about the right roles of women and men, but until that times comes, men must do all in their power to see that women do not take over any more inappropriate and harmful roles.

## **Chapter Fifteen – *Givus a job* - men's battle for the dignity of labour in the feminist society**

Because throughout recorded history, work has been such an intrinsic and essential part of a man's life, both for economic reasons, and as part of his identity as a self-respecting man, it is necessary to dwell on this subject further.

One issue that must be made clear is that this quest for *suitable* work for all men who need or desire it, must be fought not only on a gender level, but on a political level.

In Britain, during the term of the Thatcher government which first got into power in 1979, men's jobs were taken away *en masse* by Mrs Thatcher's deliberate policy of smashing the unions and destroying most of British industry, which has since that time progressively been transferred to the Third World nations, with the result that millions of men in the UK, and no doubt the other developed Western nations, have been more or less permanently denied the kind of work they were *by nature* suited for.

Simultaneously, of course, jobs for women have increased dramatically and in most countries in the West there are now almost as many working women as there are men, but tellingly, only a small fraction of these women work in the manufacturing and building industries – the traditional work places for the non-professional mass of men.

Whilst admittedly, many women are in part-time work, this does not mean they are any less important as statistics, because many jobs which were formerly full-time have been cunningly recast as part-time jobs with overtime when required, to avoid paying full-time salaries.

Again, because of women's general subservient to authority "please pat me on the head and tell me I'm a good girl" mentality, they are willing to suffer this abuse and indignity which their unemployed male counterparts would complain and organise against.

Due to Mrs Thatcher's destruction of the male-led powerful unions during the 1980s, union power no longer exists as a real force in the UK to demand the rights once so hard fought for and obtained.

Unfortunately it is necessary to point out that *some* wrongly motivated union leaders were unwittingly co-responsible for this downfall.

In the UK, powerful unions like the coal miners and public utilities unions, demanded pay and terms which were unnecessarily high, and by resorting to strikes which left the whole country paralyzed, such as regular electrical power cuts, they turned the general public against them, empowering the government to *act* against them.

For example, the coal miners should not have demanded huge salaries for their dirty and dangerous work “in the bowels of the earth”, but *better conditions*, such as improved health and safety, shorter working hours, and early retirement and improved pension plans.

They sabotaged themselves by their envy of the rich, when they did not need the high salaries requested to support an adequate family life.

The result was that whole communities were put out of work, and combined with the similar destruction of many manufacturing industries, such as the British automotive industry, many men were driven to despair and even suicide, as highlighted in 1982 on TV by a landmark BBC drama called *The Black Stuff*, featuring in particular a former road labourer called *Yosser Hughes* who underwent a mental breakdown and went round aggressively demanding “givus a job.”

It appears to be no coincidence, that Margaret Thatcher, the first ever British woman prime minister, presided over this destruction of male work and identity, driving millions of men into despair, suicide, or the humiliation of having no social status, which traditionally since history began, had been accorded to a man by his job or role in society.

Many millions of men have since Mrs Thatcher's destruction of traditional male work descended into mental illness, unable to find a place in society any more, which of course has disempowered them from either marrying, or if married, from having a respected role as head of a family, forced to watch dismal daytime television to pass the hours, whilst unsuccessfully trying to be mother to children, and waiting for their proud and self-righteous working wives to come home.

Now she has the purse strings, the upper hand, and as he is not fitted by nature to do the work and child care she used to, he can be condemned as useless by her on all levels, and frequently is.

Many men even lose the ability to have sex under these conditions, as a reflection of this “emasculatation” and “social impotence”, and the reason for this, is that a man cannot really function as a man, whilst he has in his heart these feelings of shame.

He can of course resort to using *Viagra*, a likely dangerous drug, which like *Thalidomide*, the true long terms side effects of may not be known for many years.

That is just to say – the verdict is open on *Viagra* for now – but if the cause of man's impotence is *psychological* – to put it simply, depression because he has no job or role, and he is socially disempowered – does it really make rational sense to pump some drug into his body, whose side effects may be unknown, but can cause an unnatural state of erection that may last even hours?

We submit to you that except in rare cases, for example as a fertilisation aid, this is madness of the highest order, and quite likely downright dangerous for his physical and mental health.

This is partly stated in the light of the aforementioned yoga kundalini theory, which indicates that moderation in sex is to be desired for health and vitality, and his body should not be chemically supercharged to produce erection on demand, when his sexual disinterest may be for all we know some kind of survival mechanism which comes into play during depression or the disempowerment with which he is faced.

That is to say, if the kundalini theory is correct, and sublimation of sex energy can lead to increased vitality, surely that a man loses interest in sex would be *a good thing* in such a situation, so that with the eventual increased functioning of his brain created by the transmuted sex energy enlivening his brain, he may be able to find some creative solution with which to rise above his disempowered state.

One piece of evidence given by Gopi Krishna regarding the health benefits of sexual moderation is that of the fate of castrated bulls, which apparently become flabby and weak once their sex system is no longer available to produce the energy which he claims rejuvenates the body generally when not overused as reproductive fluid.

This is clearly an area for biological researchers to investigate and either disprove or confirm.

The definite implication of the kundalini theory is therefore that certainly *more sex*, provided by Viagra and similar drugs in such a situation, would be likely to deplete his powers of body and mind further, and send him down into a deteriorating spiral, which may well sooner or later end in his debilitation and death.

To some degree this may also be true of the HRT (*hormone replacement therapy*) which is sought out by so many women now, though only time will tell. The excuse for “supercharging” middle aged women to make them into youthful dynamos and “sex goddesses” again, is that this treatment is supposed to relieve the unpleasantness of the menopause.

So while that may be true, it may also have many other effects, and the *I ching* says on this subject

*to put fresh life into an old tree only hastens its end*

So perhaps some women would be better to “grow old gracefully” for the sake of their own *long term* health and sanity, rather than “disgracefully”, as so many are now choosing.

Again, this is theory – just like you see, the *unproven Big Bang Theory* of Hoyle or other scientists on the origin of the universe – but needs research and observation which for the moment, like men's health problems in general, is extremely unlikely to be carried out.



What is certain is that, if the presiding governments of Western nations saw it as their duty to ensure *suitable* work was provided for all adult male members of the population requiring it, we would not see the deterioration of men's mental and physical health, addiction to drugs, sex, gambling, and descent into crime, which we are now seeing, even amongst the relatively young.

In the UK, simultaneous to the criminal destruction of the manufacturing industry, was destroyed the "apprenticeship system", which continues to disempower and destroy millions of young males by its absence.

That is, until the late 1970s there was basically a two tier system in British education – the *intellectually inclined* boys went to "grammar schools" where they were expected to achieve academically, and prepared to be trained for professional and other work with their brains rather than their hands; and the *manually inclined* boys were sent to "secondary modern" schools, where they would acquire the basic literacy, numeracy and science and technical skills required for *work with their hands*, either as tradesmen or craftsmen in the manufacturing and building industries.

So the jobs for the latter category of boys have mostly disappeared, under the malformed idea that they would be suited to the "newer technologies" such as computers, and other hi-tech occupations.

The critical and frankly astoundingly obvious flaw in this ill-thought out plan, was that to be competent in hi-tech occupations generally requires the ability to be able to carry out fairly serious academic study – such as that needed to learn the subtleties of computer science and electronics – which leaves the millions of teenagers and men unable to jump through these pre-requisite hoops, totally sidelined.

It is necessary to point out here, that before the industrial revolution, the vast majority of men in the Western world were employed on the land, in some kind of agricultural related occupation, in particular as farmers.

*As Elton John sang in Goodbye Yellow Brick Road -*

*I should have stayed on the farm  
I should have listened to my old man.*

And later

*Back to the howlin' old owl in the woods  
Huntin' the horny back toad  
I've finally decide my future lies  
Beyond the Yellow Brick Road...*

Or as Gerry Rafferty said several years later in *Baker Street*

*I've got this dream about buyin' some land  
Giving up the booze and the one night stand*

*And then I'll settle down in a quiet little town  
And forget about everything.*

This latter song is especially important in its message, which is really to say, we men (and even some women) are unhappy with our imprisonment in the technological society, which is forcing us to a meaningless sex, drug and alcohol obsessed private life.

*This city desert makes you feel so cold,  
It's got so many people  
But it's got no soul*

*And it's taken you so long  
To find out you were wrong  
When you thought it held everything.*

But for the moment, because of the more than six billion humans progressively filling up every square inch of the planet, such a "back to nature" transition is not plausible to achieve. Without the ships, trains, heavy lorries and technologies which ferry our food and fuel around the roads to millions and billions, we would starve and fail to survive.

So for now we have to accept the technological structure as it is, with a view to reforming it to an environmentally and human friendly status as time goes by, or else we would all end up living in caves and mud huts fighting over the next rat or rabbit that passes by.

Thus for now, we must continue to train those who can manufacture and maintain the building blocks of our complex world, and as most of these occupations are still *manual*, and many of these require much physical strength or endurance not even possessed by a sizeable proportion of men, they are principally most suited and best done by men.

So *Ms Out of Your Mind Feminist* who is currently ruling by proxy most of the Western governments and society – can we *stupid men* have our jobs back please?

Because if the manual and manufacturing jobs are not restored to Western males, they will create a havoc unparalleled in human history with their "idle hands" and idle minds.

The will deal drugs, they will burgle, they will steal cars, they will murder, they will rape women and girls, they will do by *illegal means* all that is forbidden to them by legal means under the prevailing social structure which is unfairly denying them.

Above all, they will fail to make the awkward transition from somewhat rebellious teenager to adult male – to be integrated into the society of their fathers and older brothers, and thereby preserve and maintain the civilised social structure of men, which must be based on cooperation, respect, and above all the young giving due respect to their elders, so that in time they too may be given respect by their own children and younger apprentices in turn.

This *respect* issue has become a buzzword in the UK now, as raised by current prime minister Tony Blair. But more cynical commentators question exactly who this *respect* is being demanded for.

This issue comes to a particular flashpoint in terms of the adult male, especially of mature years.

For example, supposing a man who was for many years a *respected* tradesperson or manual worker, such as a coal miner or factory worker, has his workplace closed down or transferred to the Third World where labour is dirt cheap.

He is then forced to exist under the charity of his wife, or more likely on welfare benefits. Then those running the welfare benefit system demand after some time that he must find work, or his benefits may be threatened or stopped.

But the work in his trade, which he had taken so many hard years to master, or at least by his service in, had given him respect, is now unavailable, and he is frequently confronted with only humiliating or unsuitable work.

Does not such a man have a *human right*, due to his age and experience, to be allowed to refuse work which would degrade or humiliate him?

This is not currently the view of the government, who administrate and control the welfare system, and also have taken the decisions which have led to his factory or workplace being closed down, and his job being taken from him in the first place.

They say after a due time he must be willing to take *any* work, or else risk losing his benefit payments and quite possibly end up living on and begging on the streets, as an alarming number of people – currently at least *four-hundred thousand*, and almost entirely *men* – are now doing in “merry England” and the UK generally speaking.

As mentioned earlier in this work, one fifty year old male in the UK recently appears to have shot himself dead in an armed police siege, after being threatened with his welfare benefits being cut.

So a mature experienced man, who put in years of effort to acquire a trade and the status of respect that accorded him, may in theory end up – should he cooperate – as a cleaner in a kitchen, or with a silly hat on in a burger bar, being bossed around by some ambitious teenage boy or girl.

Or more likely, if he has clerical skills, he may be at the tender mercies of some bossy girl supervisor, barely out of her teens, who though he is a mature, experienced and physically powerful adult male, maybe with sons or daughters of his own who are older than she, is ordering around and disrespecting him, as if he were a child.

So the feminist influenced minds behind the scenes know all this, but they clearly do not care, because that is precisely what they want – the subjugation and humiliation of men, though they also do not care that it is thereby destroying the whole structure of family life and respect, which is *essential* to enable us all to live in a civilised society, where teenage boys grow into gentlemen, and not yobs who bully and steal and rape.

There are some absolutely horrific things going on in this society which the feminists, lost in their narcissistic delusions of grandeur, are like an “Empress Nero”, ignoring and denying the reality of.

For example, one pleasant, respectable and intelligent lady, out walking her child in a pushchair on a quiet country lane was in the UK recently, for no apparent reason, attacked by a maniac who has not yet been identified, and put into a hospital bed, paralyzed, and only able to blink an eye.

This is what happens when the social structure breaks down, and there are tens of thousands of malcontent males roaming the environment, drunk, drug addicted, mentally unstable or otherwise not adjusted and properly accepted, by being given a proper *respected* role in society, which gives them a feeling of full membership in the civilised human world.

But what is the feminist answer to all this social chaos?

More rules and regulations, more surveillance, more “drug therapies” and “treatment programs”, and “awareness campaigns” – that is – ever more draconian and bizarre “sticking plaster” solutions to the problem, when they never address *the very simple cause*.

*i.e. the breakdown of male authority in society, which takes young boys in hand, and gradually ushers them into the civilised adult world*

So let us men be clear about the daunting task that faces us.

Those in government are not going to solve our problems for us quickly, if ever, because they are being led by the feminist mentality down the wrong road.

It is no accident that the current British government has more female members in it – many of them relatively young and inexperienced, and therefore totally unfit to hold such responsible and ruling positions – than ever before.

The reason for this, is that as in the workplace in general, women are more cooperative to an authoritative regime, and carry out their orders no matter how stupid, without questioning them too much, or attempting to fight their superiors, but instead are seeking the aforementioned “pat on the head.”

Fortunately, in England, there are a few female dissenting voices in parliament, such as *Glenda Jackson* and *Clare Short*, but those few voices alone, though welcome, are not perhaps enough to save the day.

We as men are in the position of Mahatma Gandhi, faced with the subjugation, humiliation and abuse of his people by the mighty power of the British Empire, probably the greatest Empire in terms of its scope, which the world has ever seen

We have to start objecting in any way we *safely* can to the wrong that is going on.

The word *safely* is emphasized, as we must not go doing bizarre and ridiculous things like throwing ourselves in front of horses as the early feminists did, or anything else likely to damage our own personal or family security in a permanent way.

But where protests and *choices* are possible, they must be made.

For example, if as a male employee of a female boss who is abusing us, we have the opportunity to work elsewhere for a male boss, let us do that if we possibly can.

Let us demand the right as an employer to employ all men if we wish, and if a woman employer wishes to employ all females, let her have that right also. Because many women in such positions of power *are* doing this already.

An *honest* survey would reveal that many employers – both male and female – would say of various occupations – *I'd rather employ a woman doing that job.*

Again, an obvious example here, is that high-powered males in business or government will generally choose a *female* secretary, just for the glamour and prestige of it, as a measure of his status, to see her obediently walking alongside him carrying his briefcase, making him look like a great and powerful man.

Again, we do not hear the feminists and equal opportunities authorities protesting over *that*.

Or a cunning businessman may know that a sexy woman working for him as a representative, may use her seductive powers to reel difficulty-to-see clients in, that a man trying to do the same job would never even get past the door to meet.

That is - a bright young man, briefcase in hand goes into the huge foyer of some mighty multi-national company and asks politely to see the managing director or the purchasing manager, and he gets fobbed off.

But if the secretary mentions to the big boss – or if he is really well equipped like a *James Bond* villain, he spots her on his security camera – there is a stunning blonde with a short skirt waiting outside his office to see him, not unlike *Marilyn Monroe* or *Sharon Stone*; what man, no matter how busy, is not going to “drop everything” just to have the pleasure of having a good look?

Where is the so called equality my friends? But “life's not fair”, the feminists may say. Well in that case, why should we have “equal opportunities” laws for *women*?

The truth is, that when it suits the feminist agenda, so called “equal opportunities” laws cease to apply. After all, what *real* man wants a job in the traditional female roles of nurse, waitress, chamber maid or school dinner cook?

The equal opportunities laws are there *only for women* to take away men's jobs when they see fit.

If a lesbian or feminist lady wants to employ only females – *rest assured she will.*

Not only that, the so called “equal opportunity” laws, are really an attack not only on the *freedom* of men (and *theoretically* women) to choose to employ whomever they please, but on *Nature itself*, because as long established brain research has shown – mens' and womens' brains are significantly different, and these differences predispose *most* men and *most* women to be best suited to different roles.

Both the human world and Nature should surely be best served by us using only one sane principle to base the allocation of jobs – *solely on merit, based on the applicant's personal qualities and intrinsic suitability and nothing else.*

That is – how dare the feminist influenced authorities interfere with the free will of a man or woman to *choose the person they think is best for that job*, regardless of male or female, young or old, or black or white.

Equally, employers *must* have the right to *reject* people on the same basis. That is – they must be free to say – *I am sorry you are too white, you are too black, you are too female, you are too male, you are too young, you are too old.*

It's up to *them*. They *created* the business, or gained the qualifications or skills necessary to do their jobs, and it must be freely given to them to have the power to use *their own judgement*, unbiased by undemocratic, dictatorial and inappropriate *government interference* to decide whom they want, on *whatever criterion they see fit.*

Otherwise, we are moving ever more rapidly, into a completely state monitored and controlled regime, in which a bell rings insistently until we get out of bed, and some bossy man, or more likely woman, bangs *from the inside* upon our ever switched on TV screen, and says – “get up now, it's time for your exercises, and number one million, three-hundred thousand and forty two – yes, *you!* - get with it, and don't slouch!”

*Discrimination* is a fact of life. We cannot *ever* legislate against it successfully. That is, we have discovered that some men discriminate against women – that's a fact. And some women discriminate against men – and that's a fact too.

As we cannot possibly plant a little police officer in every place in the land, to watch what's going on – even George Orwell's *1984* society could not do that – we have to *accept reality*, and to within certain limits *trust people* to run their own lives, and get on with their jobs.

We *all* discriminate all the time and must be free to do so.

For example, if we ask the average *modern* Western woman what she wants in a man, she will say – tall, dark, handsome, rich, powerful, brave, and maybe even add with a full head of hair, a large sex organ and white.

So thereby she has discriminated against – the short, the fair-haired, the ugly, the poor, the weak, the cowardly, the bald, those men with an average sized sexual organ and the non-white.

All those who lack her *demands* may object, but that is life, that is *her right*.

Everybody wants the best they can get, and that *is their right*. We only have peace, when society is ordered so that everyone has a realistic goal of what they can get out of life, and a realistic means of obtaining it – and therefore *security*.

Even if it isn't *rational*, for which one of us is fully *that?* – not even the fictional *Mr Spock* – if we don't like person X or Y, that is *our right*. Perhaps there is something wrong with *us* to feel that way. Perhaps there is something wrong with *them*.

But the right way to deal with this discrimination is not to try to set up an infinitely tangled web of rules and regulations to try and stamp it out, but to *humanise and order society*, by the correct discipline and education of children, by the correct ordering of national and international relations, and setting a framework for the conduct of correct relations between men and women.

It is above all, about according *respect* to the right people.

Not to selfish people, even if they are entertaining celebrities or the powerful and rich, but to the “good citizen” – the caring, responsible man and woman who take only what they need, and do not damage the rest of society by wresting away from others what they do not actually *need*, but merely due to hypnotic media and advertising influences and insecurity driven greed, decide that they *want*.

This is simple and undeniable *logic*. If we want a society composed of “good citizens”, we must make the good citizen the ideal, which any fool can see is certainly very far from what we are doing now.

As rights are being taken away by the courts, even to some extent now that of free speech, they must sooner or later be given back in the courts. Unjust and interfering and dictatorial laws must be amended or repealed, cases must be overturned, so there is much that any legally inclined man or *sane* woman lawyer can do to restore the balance in this respect.

For example, suppose a man objects on mental health or religious grounds to having a woman boss, for example in a welfare benefits case, where he has refused or resigned work due to being bullied or sexually humiliated by her.

That *test case* must be fought and won.

Equally, women and girls should have the right to refuse to work for men bosses, if they feel that will compromise their dignity or honour, or sexually threaten them.

*That* is the answer to the problem of sexual harassment, not to put businesses and organisations under a financial cosh, if some neurotic or paranoid girl – or more likely a mere conniving opportunist – seeks to fleece her employers on some dubious or wholly untrue allegations of molestation or abuse.

Because this so called *equal opportunities* is in fact unwittingly giving the *opportunity* to abusive men. Surprised? Well read on.

For if there was no pressure upon him to do so, and a man was found to be employing pretty girls with short skirts all the time, when their male counterparts could do the job in question just as well, society would look at him and think twice. We would then know *just who is who*.

Equally, currently in British *male* prisons there could be as much as one third female prison guards, and apparently, large quantities of male guards are allowed to be in women's prisons also.

Surely this is wrong?

Is it right that there should even be an opportunity for some leering man to hold the keys, locking up women in cells, and go home fantasizing about them, feeling his sexual power?

Clearly not.

This is *reality*. This is a temptation on men *too far*.

Equally, is it right that the already humiliated male prisoner should have some smirking female peeping through his cell bars, maybe even when he is on the toilet, or in desperation at being denied a life without women is pleasuring himself?

Clearly not.

This is *reality*. This is the mischief that is allowed to go on in a disrespectful, degrading and chaotic, feminist controlled society.

And according to twentieth century “kundalini guru” *Gopi Krishna* – this chaos and defiance of Nature, is the very reason that the nuclear missiles, those ultimate symbols of aggressive male potency and authority, are standing by.

After all, who made these nuclear missiles?

*Men.*

And, why did they make them?



To protect society?

Or maybe *the real reason* is because now their power is gone, now they are so utterly humiliated, dehumanized, and depersonalized, perhaps they are just so upset they want to end it all.

Ms Feminist, feeling so smug and secure in your icy man-free zone castle, please think about *that*.

## **Chapter Sixteen – the Princess Diana syndrome – the distortion and rejection of true love**

English aristocrat *Lady Diana Spencer*, was a leading role model for modern Western women, ever since her first appearance on the world stage in 1980, and subsequent rather speedy marriage to Prince Charles in 1981, at which moment was bestowed on her the title, *Diana, Princess of Wales*.

It is incidentally, another interesting anomaly in this “sexual equality” we have all heard so much about, to note that by marrying Prince Charles, had she lived long enough, Diana could, and almost certainly *would* have become queen.

Whereas when a man marries a royal princess, he becomes a “consort” with some rather non-descript title, such as the current British queen’s husband – the *Duke of Edinburgh* – who even though *he was a prince in his own right* as a royal Prince of Greece and Denmark, amazingly was obliged to renounce this title and allegiance in order to marry Princess Elizabeth, the now current queen. What such a man definitely does not become is *King*.

It appears the moral of this story is, do not marry a princess unless you are a *presiding royal prince*. Again, we see that real life is not quite like in the fairy tales.

The life of Princess Diana has had so much impact on global culture, especially upon the behaviour of at least one generation of women, that her story requires some detailed analysis for the purpose of our quest for male freedom.

Leaving the titles aside for a moment, *Diana Spencer’s* life was clearly a rather tragic, though privileged one, and for that reason alone, like all abused human beings, she deserves our sympathy.

What follows here therefore is not so much a condemnation of the lady herself, who like all of us had her good and bad sides, but of the culture built around her which sought to deify her, and to simultaneously demonise Prince Charles, which unfortunate trend has also led to largely undeserved hostility being directed at Prince Charles’ recent new wife, divorcee *Camilla Parker-Bowles*.

The other reason to make this exploration of the life of Princess Diana is to bring into focus many of the issues concerning man-woman relationships raised in this work, in a most visible public way, so that the reader may learn from it, and in future look beneath the superficial view usually offered by the mainstream media, and also the gossip surrounding him in his own private life.

Firstly, we should note that Prince Charles showed his love for Camilla Parker-Bowles in his early youth, but this was interrupted by his royal duty to do national service, and it appears that perhaps as originally a “commoner” rather than member of the aristocracy, she was considered unsuitable and the relationship discouraged.

Yet this relationship was all known to Princess Diana long before they married, and she was aware of the continued interest in Camilla from Prince Charles, even when the marriage took place.

There was a long tradition of British kings having extra marital affairs, and in fact, Camilla's grandmother had been allegedly the illegitimate child of a mistress to King Edward VII.

So we have to ask ourselves, when the intelligent and aristocratic *Lady Diana Spencer* consented to marry Prince Charles, could she possibly have been naïve enough to not understand her principal role as producer of a royal heir, to a Prince already in his thirties under great pressure to marry and do so?

The probability is that Princess Diana, who later showed herself to be an astute manipulator of the media once her private and public battle with Charles began in earnest, was well aware of "the other woman" in the marriage, and the implication therefore that Prince Charles with his classic admission of "in love - *whatever in love means*" was not really properly in love with her, as any woman in her right mind would demand and expect as she walked up the aisle on her wedding day.

There is yet another fascinating aspect to this marriage ceremony, which is that the then Lady Diana Spencer had *insisted* that she would not say the traditional marriage vow – she expressly refused to say the phrase *to honour and obey*. In fact, it was specifically the word *obey* that she had the problem with.

This fact is never reported in any known documentary on the life of Princess Diana, of the many hundreds which surely have been made since her marriage got into difficulties, and her subsequent premature and supposedly accidental death.

But surely a more thoughtful man than Charles would have seen what was coming based on that single act of tradition-breaking independence.

It appears however, that even if he did, he didn't care, as it seemed that this was merely an unavoidable duty being imposed upon him by the royal protocols, when he would apparently have been quite happy to have remained a single, childless man for a considerably longer time.

We might also compare the two marital partners just as human beings, regardless of their social status.

And we see that Lady Diana was a precocious and vivacious star, good at sport and most other things, whereas Prince Charles was a significantly less charismatic and *winning* figure, something of a repressed personality, which is the typical unfair and unfortunate lot of so many of those forced through the British public school system, and thereby separated from family love at an early age.

So we have to very seriously ask the question whether Diana married Prince Charles for *who he was as a human being*, knowing he was not in fact even wholly in love with her, or whether she was merely enticed by the power she would get as wife to a man who *on paper* was the most eligible bachelor in the world, and become future Princess and likely Queen, who knew that her children would undoubtedly be *royal* princes and princesses of one of the most powerful countries in the Western world.

That is to say – Princess Diana's enormous and fanatical supporters club, condemn Prince Charles for *betraying the fairytale story of true love*. But it appears that quite likely she herself did not marry him for love, simply based on the probability that as a man he did not measure up to her on any objective standards, if his worldly title and status is taken out of the account.

This seemed to be confirmed, when Diana herself confessed to having an affair with a handsome, dashing cavalry officer, *Major James Hewitt*, who though theoretically a commoner, seemed to naturally possess as much breeding and aristocratic poise as any member of the Royal Family.

Though allegedly she only did this in response to Charles' renewed affair with Camilla, since Diana was aware of this "simmering old flame" from the very first day of their marriage and before, she may well have known it could have been only a matter of time before Charles' passion reignited.

Any intelligent psychologist could have seen this coming, because as an emotionally damaged and needy adult, Prince Charles was inevitably drawn back to the motherly love of his lifelong supporter and long-term lover, Camilla, which could not be supplied by the young immature, *primadonna*-like and theatrical Diana.

Though we can never know the full details amongst all the allegations and counterclaims, Diana's alleged anorexia/bulimia was a clear indicator of an insecure, unduly attention-seeking personality.

Her constant complaint against Charles and *the House of Windsor* generally speaking was - *I am unloved*.

But again, surely, anybody in their right mind with the obviously penetrating intelligence of Diana, whose real motive was *love*, would not have chosen the emotionally repressed Prince Charles to marry - who in any case she knew not to be fully committed to her, due to his lifelong interest in Camilla – and the concomitant membership of the rather cold and duty driven Royal Family generally.

Why did she not choose the love of any number of eligible, mature, and understanding *alpha males*, such as James Hewitt, whom she had the affair with, and admitted in front of millions on national and international TV to have been besotted with?

After all, what man in his right mind would have turned down the beautiful, tall, talented and titled Lady Diana Spencer?

Obviously, very few.

To solve the mystery of Diana, all we need to do is look at her childhood.

She was really from a broken home – albeit an aristocratic one – and was witness to her mother and father's constant arguments, due to her highly-educated mother being drawn to the excitement and glamour of city life, whilst her father was a rather repressed country gent.

Clearly, her father was not unlike Prince Charles himself, who seems at his happiest walking in the solitude of his country estates – which theory is confirmed by his having written a children's novel, *The Old Man of Lochnagar*, about a hermit living in a Scottish mountain cave.

As ever, novels may well reveal the secret fantasies or inner selves of the author.

By age seven, Diana was deserted by her mother, who had effectively run off with a rich, glamorous man for the exciting life that brought her.

Her mother's behaviour must have been considered fairly appalling, as the court actually awarded custody of Diana to her father, but this distant, repressed man proceeded to finish the job of abuse and destruction of Diana's personality by sending her off to boarding school at age nine (utter cruelty!) and marrying a bossy self-centred woman who became Diana's step-mother and whom she hated.

So it appears Princess Diana was being hypnotically driven back to a near carbon copy of her abusive childhood, by marrying the repressed Prince Charles, who like her father, would later betray her for "a wicked stepmother", Camilla, with a distant, undemonstrative mother-in-law, the Queen, and then as is typical, she transformed into her own party loving and social butterfly mother, who had left her to the care of nannies after the divorce from her father, and run off with a glamorous man.

It also appeared that to complete the carbon copy of her early life, in her relationship with rich playboy *Dodi Fayed*, son and heir of millionaire *Harrods* boss, *Mohammed El Fayed*, she was considering a similar course to her mother, had the tragedy in Paris not intervened.

We do not need to go into greater detail in this analysis – we just need to note that Diana had no *Virgin Mary* or *Snow White* type mother figure, full of pure love and kindness, but an argumentative socially-hyperactive witchy type – one might say "liberated woman" - who created conflict in the home before this impressionable and ultra-sensitive child's eyes, and eventually deserted her for a passionate love affair, and glittering social lifestyle with a glamorous man.

So this was clearly *abuse*. Diana was an *abused, neglected child*.

So thus we see her rejecting the likely genuine and sincere love of eligible men like James Hewitt – whom she later coolly cast aside, according to his version – and *hypnotically* gravitating back to the “scene of the crime” – a similar scenario in which she can replay out the drama of her own abuse, and also take on the personality of her abuser – her mother – whom of course we find was also a distant, estranged *Snow Queen*-like figure in Diana's adult life.

As US radio chat show host and “relationship guru” *Roy Masters* says, whose unparalleled psychological expertise inspires substantial parts of this book –

*by resentment of someone, they “get inside us”, and we hypnotically become them, we become the person we hate (or grew up hating)*

That is, by having hated and blamed her mother, she internalized her “spirit”, allowed her to *literally* “get under her skin”, and thus reached for the same solution as her mother to being unloved.

No known mainstream psychology work explains this phenomenon, but you will find that it is a fact – many women will admit this openly, that they have “become their mothers”, including all the aspects they didn't like about them, and it horrifies them.

The reason is this same hypnotic process, being emotionally drawn back “to the scene of the crime” as occurs in any situation of abuse.

For this same reason, battered women cannot easily leave the men who abuse them, they are like a moth attracted to a candle flame, because their emotions pull them back in, even though all *logic* tells them they should leave.

They cannot understand why they cannot leave or get away from such a man, because they do not understand that by becoming angry, judgmental and emotionally upset, instead of *detached* and rational, they further strengthen the chain links to the person abusing them, which original attraction resulted from them being abused to some degree as children, and are therefore playing out hypnotically the same “psychodrama” from their childhood.

Such women should look at the meditation technique offered in the appendix to this book, so they may gradually untangle themselves from their “complexes”, though no speedy success is guaranteed in such a deeply convoluted psychology.

As with *all* psychological problems, the principle thing is *to become aware* of the mechanism of our thoughts, what our mind is really doing, rather than to become lost in conventional analysis which always ends up as futile, as it doesn't change the actual hypnotically embedded patterns of our thoughts, feelings and reactions.

For example, the excuse given by battered wives for staying – *but I still love him* – is as irrational as it is pathetic (in the *tragic* sense of the word, not the judgmental one), and obviously is one of these hypnotically embedded barriers.

These powerful hypnotically ingrained emotional ties prevent such women from seeing the sensible perspective that the man to stay with is not *one whom you love*, but rather *one who loves you*, in the true sense we have already described, which does not, we should in kindness explain to these ladies, include raping you, kicking you in the stomach or beating your brains out.

Diana's father obviously did not satisfy her mother on any number of levels, just as Charles did not satisfy Diana – whom we saw on TV beating the other kids' mothers in a school open-day foot race, and could apparently expertly play the piano for example – and that solution, was to be a social butterfly, to try to attain a *group love* like any celebrity, rather than seeking it in one special relationship, as relatively normal, non-traumatised and secure men and women do.

Again, this identical *modus operandum* to her mother, is confirmed by Diana hopping from man to man after the divorce from Charles.

And in her famous TV interview, when asked if she thought she would ever be queen (this was *before* the divorce), she answered negatively, but said she wanted only to be *the queen of peoples' hearts*, with her big sad eyes moistening and her eyelashes fluttering wistfully.

Again, we see this psychological manoeuvre of substituting the concept of one-to-one man-woman love, with *the love of the crowd*.

The desire to be caught up in and if possible *at the centre of* a social whirl, as a compensation for the failure to find any single satisfying love is a general strategy of the celebrity classes and the insecure, unloved woman.

It is suggested, that though not likely fully consciously aware why she had gravitated back to a loveless family life by marrying Prince Charles, she was sure that by the unparalleled opportunities it gave her as a celebrity, she could then seek attention and get the worship of crowds as a compensation, all over the world.

As she had seen her own parents' marriage deteriorate quickly into war and divorce, it is doubtful that from the outset she had any real expectation that her own would last, and seemed to deliberately pick a man whose love was in doubt, to in fact engineer that very same situation.

But she didn't care too much about this irrationality, because her solution was not the love of any one man or even woman, but *the worship and adulation of the crowd*.

We see celebrities stand on stage blowing kisses at the public and saying "how much they love us all", and it is of course a totally fake relationship, as neither party has any real first hand knowledge of the other, especially of course, the celebrity themselves.

So really, it's an egotistical narcissistic existence, which uses the public and media as pawns in its game, just as in his own demented narcissism, the *Emperor Nero* could apparently sing songs and play his lyre while Rome burned and many of its citizens died.

Anybody who doubts this kind of at face value, illogical behaviour, should read the books *Games People Play*, by *Eric Berne*, MD, who founded a branch of psychology, known as *transactional analysis*, which was based not on bizarre theories of motivation like Freud's, but rather *on what people actually did in their relationships*.

This "reality-based" theory showed that peoples' behaviours were not in fact generally *rational*, but based on some kind of "game" in which they would get a "pay off", even if that meant being abused.

For example, a game called "Hit Me" could be played by a woman, in which she deliberately riles a violent man, until he eventually does hit her, and then her "payoff" is that she casts "judgement" on him. That is, even though he hits her, she gets as "reward" the emotional satisfaction of feeling she is a morally superior "good" person, and that she is *right* and he is *wrong*.

This sounds crazy at first sight, but we see these are the warped realities of the behaviour of abused people who play these "psychological games", which is to some extent all of us.

The goal of transactional analysis is that we become *game free*, but though this therapy may well *identify the problem*, we put it to you that finding a solution is quite another thing, and would require the support of the kind of meditation technique as described in the back of this book, which is basically an *awareness exercise*.

None of this chapter therefore, as already explained, is meant to be a personal attack on the memory of Princess Diana, who clearly deserves our sympathy and if felt appropriate, our prayers, but a necessary close encounter for us of the psychological reality of someone who in actuality was a fairly typical modern woman.

If Princess Diana truly has something to offer to the whole world, surely it is the understanding of her tragic story, such that we should learn from the neglect of her in childhood caused by two warring parents who failed to demonstrate love between one another, and offer her the proper care, attention and security that would automatically follow from that, which every child wants and needs.

Had she received such a secure and sensitive upbringing, quite probably by now she would have been a contented, mature lady in her mid forties, with a handsome, loving and courageous husband like James Hewitt, watching her fine young sons and daughters growing up.



If we are observant, we will notice any number of these attention seeking *Princess Diana* clones fluttering round our society, and leaving a trail of havoc and broken hearts – including their own – wherever they go.

If we should as a man find one, we are going to have to love her with the patience of a saint, and also be realistic enough to know that in the final analysis she may not really understand, but reject our love, as it is something that having never know it as a child, she cannot necessarily recognise as an adult.

Such ladies as Princess Diana however, have another card up their sleeve.

They also like to imagine themselves as sources of love, and go round hugging little children and picking up stray men, to shower their “love” on, sometimes even *forcing* such imagined love on others who do not in fact even desire it, or else due to having some awful incurable disease, are unable to be satisfactorily helped by a kiss, cuddle and pat on the head, no matter how magnetic and famous a personage it comes from.

What they fail to realise, is that a love which is given to others to make oneself feel good, is not love at all, as it is just *a compensatory behaviour for feeling unloved* using others who are emotionally or otherwise needy for one's own ego satisfaction.

The author himself confesses to long ago having had the care of two young girls, and when holding one of the child's hands during a game, having it pointed out to him by *her* that this was unnecessary, and then he realised in embarrassment, he was doing it to make *himself* feel good and “caring”, and not for the sake of the child.

But people like to live on myths and images like that of *Florence Nightingale, the lady with the lamp* in the Crimean War, so millions willingly buy into this hypnotic cult of worship of icons and celebrities like Princess Diana, and imagine that if she even touches them with her hand, they have touched greatness.

And so the madness, insecurity and lovelessness in the real sense goes on.

Jesus Christ allegedly healed the sick, made the blind see, and changed the water into wine.

Perhaps if we cannot do the same, we should not place ourselves on any great pedestal, for worshipping crowds to adore.

The huge outpouring of emotion that followed Diana's death, was really not about Diana at all, whom as one can see from this analysis, the public clearly did not understand hardly an iota, but rather about the seemingly callous destruction of *the fairytale fantasy romance of love*.

The truth was, that a woman none of us really knew died in a car crash, but as *Don MacLean* sang in his *American Pie*, it was really *the day the music died*.

In this frustration of the principally female public's childhood desires, Prince Charles and Camilla Parker-Bowles became the villain and villainess, repressing and abusing the supposedly helpless and naïve Diana.

Which by now we can see was very far from the truth, when in fact, Diana's complex and confused, attention seeking personality, caused a whirlwind to pass through all their lives, that they neither expected, asked for, nor understood.

As far as one can see, if Prince Charles had been allowed to choose freely, he would have married Camilla in his youth, so actually both he and Camilla were sabotaged from being happy together, by the royal protocols and demands.

Camilla even played a significant part in choosing Diana for Charles, we are told, which would appear to be a very unselfish piece of love from her, or was she far smarter than we realise, and did she do that, knowing that it would not likely last?

Who knows? – but the media who fawned all over Diana, have largely demonised Camilla, who seems to be an easy going, fun loving, but practical and down-to-earth type.

She does not, unlike Princess Diana, seek out the limelight, and is happy to support her man and let him take centre stage. He is apparently extremely happy since his very long awaited – from their point of view – marriage to Camilla.

But millions of women hate her, and a sizeable sector of the media still attack her long after Princess Diana's death, and her marriage to Charles being a *fait accompli*.

One incident in particular indicated that Camilla is really the sort of more broad-minded and sensible woman we *as men* should encourage and tolerate.

When rudely asked by a scrum of reporters after the engagement was announced, “did Charles go down on one knee to propose?” she paused to look at them all briefly, and then with a smirk said “Of course!”

When what likely she was really thinking was “don't be so bloody ridiculously, we're nearly sixty years old, and we've been lovers on and off for the past thirty or forty years – do you think I would really put him through what is by now a meaningless ritual just to satisfy my vanity, when I am a mere commoner, marrying the heir to the throne of all England?”

This incident showed a great deal of humour, tact and tolerance, sorely lacking in the over preening, self-obsessed and unsupportive modern feministically inclined woman.

So please, let us be more tolerant and forgiving of this more traditional and supportive type of lady, who has a broader and more wholesome perspective on her own status as a woman, and a sensitive understanding and consideration for her man.

For those still addicted to the fantasy of Princess Diana worship however, it is suggested that the only real way to honour this unfortunate lady, who not really believing in the concept of family and marital love, exchanged the love of the crowd for the love of any one man, is to give her what she always sought and never received during her life – *the understanding* of her personality as revealed in this chapter, which if available during her childhood and life, might have prevented her marrying the wrong man, and deteriorating into a tragic, insecure figure, forever searching for love in all the wrong places, but finding in the end only a lonely death in a foreign land, with not a member of her parental or marital family in sight.

But the lesson we need to learn as men, is that abused women like Diana, are not necessarily the loving figures they try to portray themselves as.

For example, after her own painful experience at boarding school, might she not have tried to object to her own children undergoing the same?

But no, she was off at parties and “official engagements” while they were undergoing that process of traumatising – *just like her mother*.

Again this is not a real attack on Diana, but merely pointing out that a person who is so emotionally needy, cannot truly love others in the sense referred to in this book, because they are obviously too wrapped up in their own insecurities and needs to truly deny themselves for the sake of another.

It is suggested, that when choosing a suitable woman to marry, men observe and probe her to see what her feelings are on her father, as well as the relationship with her mother, to see what is likely to be *really* going on, behind the scenes of her bright eyes and beautiful smile.

And if we think we have found one who bears all the hallmarks of *the Princess Diana syndrome*, why not let her read this chapter, to see how she reacts?

## **Chapter Seventeen – I don't love you any more – the horrors of divorce**

Like that of Charles and Diana, currently in the UK, around two out of three marriages are expected to end in divorce, and when we base our lives on *or are under the hypnotic influence of* the antics of celebrities, and role model scenarios like *Sex in the City*, we should hardly be surprised.

Why is it that bad example spreads so rapidly, and good ideas take so long to set in?

The answer to that is simple – destruction is always easy, creation and the establishment of order and beauty is hard.

Only someone with great skill and patience can build up a huge house of cards, but any idiot can come and knock it all down, and frequently does.

The term in modern physics for the degree of order in a system is *entropy*. In a sense it would seem that man is a being who seeks to create and worship order in the Universe, if you like – *a negative entropy machine*.

He stands before the pyramids or the sight of a giant redwood tree in admiration and wonder. He is sad if someone chops down that beautiful tree, that took Nature thousands of years to grow, or knocks down that pyramid, which likely took the labour of thousands of men to erect.

But he only feels that way, *when he is in his right mind*, which currently on the whole, *he is not*.

Then he goes dull, and registers only a blank stare in front of the most incredible man-made or natural marvels, which even if he cannot personally visit them, pass in their dozens every day on the TV before his eyes.

He no longer even bothers to look, and changes the channel over to the sport or the macho man movie, or maybe subscribes to that new sex channel available via his satellite dish.

He rarely admires great skill any more, either of man, or arguably of a God, whom he no longer believes in anyway.

For his gods are now his woman, his drink, and the hypnotic power of the TV screen.

He rarely possess any great talent or skill, such as the great artists and craftsmen of old, who created the fantastic artistic and architectural remnants of the civilisations gone by, or even that of the scientific and inventive minds of more recent history, like *Edison*, who created the marvels of the current technological society.

The truth is, he is not really a man *in the true sense* any more, and even more sad than that, is that his woman frequently knows it, and doesn't care.

So under the spell of the bright glow of youth, we mate with a beautiful girl who when the lust finally clears, seems to transform into a plain, bickering nag, and ties us down with her endless demands that we become better than we are.

She lures us into sex until she gets the children she desires, and then we are yet further down her list of priorities and needs, and quite possibly she even decides she doesn't want sex with us any more, because she has a headache or is too tired.

We try to discipline our children, to make them into civilised human beings, but she objects and harangues and threatens us until we stop. Then we surrender into meek and submissive silence, or we escape into our drink and football game.

We see it's really the children she loves, and her crazy friends who she somehow finds time to gossip to all day long on the phone, and we see it's them she loves and cares about, and not us, and a day comes when we can't take it any more.

We have an affair perhaps, to try and find some love out there we have despaired of getting at home with our wife. We are guilty and scared, and fear she is watching our every move for signs of betrayal, but for a surprisingly long time she doesn't even notice, so we feel emboldened in our escape and we continue.

And then one day, on one of those routine checks on our private things, searching through our pockets or checking our joint bank statement, she finds something wrong – a golden strand of hair maybe, when hers and ours is brown – or she rings a phone number we wrote down and left lying around in our pocket in a forgotten moment, and hears a young female voice answer.

And then we are done. We are traitors, we are brutes, we are “all the same”, we are not fit to be with *her* children, we are shouted and screamed at and maybe even attacked, and finally we are ordered out.

She doesn't even stop to think what such a ferocious display of fury and disharmony is doing to the watching or listening children, out of sight, she sees only all *her love*, and all *our betrayal*.

We once loved her so, we devoted our life to her, but we never expected the “beautiful love” to turn to dust, we never expected *this*.

And not a court in the world can understand us, nor will listen. They don't understand what she has done to us – she who promised us the world, but gave us only sorrow, nagging and disrespect.

And maybe it was our fault, for not being a better man, not standing up to her, and fighting for our rights, not demanding she behaved as a woman should by *honouring and obeying* us as maybe once marriage vows meant her to do.

But now it is too late. Just as the mischievous passer-by can in a second demolish our carefully built house of cards, she has in one moment knocked our whole world done, doesn't love us any more, and wants us out.

So where did we go wrong?

Chapter Nineteen, *How to Court Your Woman*, will deal with the psychological aspect of that, but here, we address the problems of those for whom it is too late, and have as *Shakespeare* said, *done what can't be undone*, and how by acting with more realism might have avoided it happening to begin with, or in some cases, should they decide to remarry, what to do *next time round*.

Marriage is a contract, and nobody should forget that, but if we ask a woman about that subject, she will tell us that this particular contract should be based entirely on what she calls "love."

Of course, when she refused to have sex with us any more, she clearly didn't count that as a betrayal of "love", but as usual with most women, their description of what love is, depends not on some abstract indefinable emotional state, which may or may not really exist, but upon what – like a clever lawyer – they want to interpret it as meaning at any particular time.

*Howard Jones* asked in his catchy hit synthesizer anthem *What is Love?*

*does anybody love anybody anyhow?*

And 70s rock star, *Todd Rundgren*, asked:

*until we find the true meaning of the verb "to love" – what does it mean?*

So great artists like those didn't know, but apparently *every woman does*.

So my brothers and friends, let us not allow this deception any longer, let us look at the truth.

Love can be measured only by *actions*, not words, and it is commonly known to linguists that many languages other than English have a multitude of words for the different types of love – but alas, English has only one – and that fact appears to be *not a many splendoured thing*.

For we are deceived by words, which turn to dust when we want to see the reality that we believed was behind them.

The reality is that the use of the word *love* by a woman is really very much a weapon. That phrase – *do you love me?* – is really the most dangerous question in the entire English language, or any other.

Because like in Bryan Adams' song, it is interpreted by women if positively answered as – *that means you will do anything I want*.

But we see that to have a proper relationship with a woman, we must at times refuse or deny her *what she wants*, if we think it's not good for her, or unfair on us, or for any other persons involved, such as any children we may have.

So we should not be blackmailed by that phrase, and it is suggested we should put our devotion and admiration for our woman in any of a thousand other ways, because once said, those words are used as a weapon *against us* – it is giving her *carte blanche* – that can never be defeated or taken back.

We have to learn to give women what they *need* and not what they selfishly *want*.

We have to *love them* in our own way, rather than just say some words, whose real meaning can never really be ascertained or agreed, and which will just be used against us like a stick to beat us with, if we defy a woman's interpretation of what she takes for granted, if she has managed to entice or cajole us into saying those words.

We can say if we like – *I love you in my way* – but that will likely not satisfy her, because she wants *no conditions or limits on our devotion to her*.

A woman in her right mind might settle for – *will you not accept my actions as proof of my love for you, rather than those mere words?*

If a woman won't say OK to an offer like that, it is suggested that a man should leave her and find someone else, because that really means, she will settle for nothing but *unconditional devotion and obedience to her whims and all that entails*.

For such a woman we must *die for her* if that is her whim, and we have to be honest, and say that except in the most extreme circumstances, in these day of so-called "equality", that is a price that no man should be expected to pay.

Applied to the marriage *contract*, this means that we should not be bullied into accepting all kind of "terms" which we will later regret.

If a man and woman who care about and are attracted to each other, really hope to last, especially when the children arrive, it seems logical to make a very long and detailed list of terms indeed, perhaps even written down and signed by both parties, as "unromantic" as that may seem.

Ideally, of course, this should not ever need to be done, because a moderately long courtship – suggested length to get to know each other *properly*, at least two to three years – should enable each party to know the other so well, they know how each feels about every important matter, even to a fine level of detail.

But with an unstoppable wave of so called "love" – really passion and infatuation – all this commonsense and realism gets washed away, and we end up with two engaged or married contestants on some TV game show, who when asked about each others' views and feelings on a variety of subjects, frequently astound one another at their ignorance of each others' true attitudes and beliefs.

The entertaining movie, *Green Card*, was an interesting illustration of such a “getting to know one another” process, in which a rude immigrant composer played by *Gerard Depardieu*, and a pious, tree-hugging, do-gooder played by *Andie MacDowell*, had to pretend to be man and wife to obtain the aforementioned *green card*.

But the trouble is, that couples often get to know one another on just a superficial level, such as favourite colour, pop star and holiday destination, rather than dealing with the *behavioural, ideological and philosophical differences* which are eventually, if not in harmony, going to tear the marriage apart.

A simple example is that a woman who has got no belief in God, is probably going to have a serious problem with a man who does.

So for example, a woman might legitimately feel she must reject all Muslims, Christians and Orthodox Jews on that basis, or they are in for serious disagreement, for example when it comes to deciding where to send their children to school.

And yes, that means, doesn't it, that such a woman *must* practice *discrimination* against Muslims and Christians and Jews, if she wishes to be true to herself, and have a harmonious marriage. She must surely find an agnostic or atheist like herself, who relates to the world as she does.

So laws forbidding the right to disagree with – even publicly – religious views cannot ever be allowed to pass, or else you are placing *that man, woman and her children* into an ideological minefield and battleground.

Let us therefore have extremely detailed discussions between men and women who would contemplate a life together, on every important issue that might crop up, and see if agreement can be reached, because otherwise it is odds-on that if they marry it will all fall apart.

It is vital to understand that as a man, we may have to *initiate* these discussions, or else a woman may simply keep quiet and assume that once married, and these ideological “flashpoints” arise, we will agree with her, and she will get her own way.

Let us replace romanticism with *realism*, because surely, if it really exists, such precautions cannot destroy *true love*.

The same applies to so called *pre-nuptial contracts*.

When the man is rich, or even if he isn't – he still may have his expensive home or car or other assets to consider – a woman will say *pre-nuptial contracts are so unromantic*.

Well, she would, wouldn't she? But the divorce statistics show that a man is a mug to imagine that he can put his faith in any woman's *love*.



But *our love* is the exception, the most special one that has ever been, she will assure us, so it simply isn't necessary in *our case*.

And by now, our budding wise male hero will surely be realistic enough to accept that *none of us is that special*. Otherwise you see, our lady will clothe us in *the Emperor's New Clothes*, which every good salesman and saleswoman knows, *only the most special of people can see*.

We should be aware that this kind of *vanity* is a weapon that can be used against us in countless situations in life. That's partly why all true religious scriptures emphasize the value of modesty – not only it is a more civilised way to be, but it's also the ultimate form of psychic self-defence.

That is – *the man without vanity (i.e. delusions) cannot long be deceived*.

So let us reconsider this pre-nuptial agreement, from another point of view – from a *man's*.

Why cannot he say to the woman “if I ensure with this contract that should you turn against me, you cannot take all my possessions, surely it would only prove your love for me all the more, should you still wish to marry me, knowing that?”

Because the *reality* is that every man who owns more than *Kwai Chang Caine* from *Kung Fu*, i.e. more than rags, has got a problem that the law says if things go wrong, the woman can take a sizeable part of his wealth, even if there is no love on either side any more, including the family home, perhaps any man's greatest possession – for he is then *a king without a castle*.

Just by taking even a third, let alone half of a man's assets, a woman could so seriously damage his finances that he is forced out of business or brought even to bankruptcy.

He may never recover his position again.

The more wealth a man has – like some of the wealthy movie actors and rock stars who are paying alimony to any number of women – the more secure he is that he can carry on *in some fashion*, but the trouble is, the more he has got, the less likely he is to be sure that any prospective woman in his life really wants him *for himself*.

If we are a wealthy man, it would be best for us to pretend we are a tramp, like *Charlie Chaplin's* silent screen hero, and if the lady still wants us then *on our own merit as a human being*, it is a fair bet to say that we could really call that *love*.

But does anyone truly think we see such fantasises played out in real life?

On a gypsy caravan site, perhaps.

The sad fact however is that pre-nuptial agreements have no legal power in many Western countries at present, such as the UK, and their legitimacy varies from state to state even in America.

And why is this? – again, because *women do not want things that way*, as it disempowers them, and men are too naïve to notice and do anything about it.

The question is – are we going to trust ourselves – be masters of our own life – or are we going to fold on issues like this and *put our trust in her*?

She has got the choice – she doesn't have to trust us, but is that not what we would wish for and expect of someone who loves us?

We get words saying she loves us, but we don't get *her trust* as neither did *Steve McQueen* get it from *Faye Dunaway* in the original *Thomas Crown Affair* movie, who having already worked that out, devised a clever plan to ensure that if she really loved him *and* trusted him, she could join him in the safe location he was flying to with the loot from the second robbery he staged. Whereas if she betrayed him, as it turned out she finally did, she could still keep the money and the Rolls Royce.

What poetic justice!

But the tragedy is that though Faye Dunaway solved her case, she lost Thomas Crown in that process, so though he kept his freedom, they were both *losers* in “the game of love.”

So instead of letting finances ruin a relationship, why not put such a contract to her if possible that says – as long as she stays married to us, she will get the full benefits of our success and wealth, but not if she divorces or leaves us?

And if after a long happy life together, we die before her, she will inherit our wealth and thus be secure in her old age.

Is that not enough for her?

It is fully enough, if she has no plans to deceive and betray us, and if her love and respect is *real*.

And there is no hypocrisy in this, because if the wealth and property is that of the woman, she likewise should be able to protect her assets from an unscrupulous man, who might have wormed his way into her life on false pretences, and promises of *love*.

The law however is of course a minefield – no contract is ever incontestable and secure – and the reality is, if we let a person into our lives of a malevolent disposition, we can never fully guarantee that the law will not favour them, or they will otherwise find some route to get their own way.

This legal doubt applies particularly to the question of *children*, which so far, no pre-nuptial or pre-marital agreement can decide the fate of.

There are legions of disempowered men worldwide, who are protesting about the usual presumption that the woman generally gets the custody of the children in divorce, but as many men are not in a position to properly care for young children due to work demands, there are grounds for the validity of this position.

The famous movie *Kramer versus Kramer* explored these issues up to a point, and the male "hero" of the film played by *Dustin Hoffman*, is seen begging for a job which he is overqualified for, but is less demanding, so he has sufficient time to care for his child.

But the court still awards the *male* child to the mother, and it is suggested that as far as this movie is concerned, *there*, reality ends.

In the movie, the fictional mother played by *Meryl Streep*, repents, and accepts the father-son bond, but real life cases do not support such behaviour in women, except in the smallest minority.

Throughout the long and stony history of the law on this subject, there does not seem to have been considered a very simple idea, to base this presumption of custody upon.

That is: why not give the presumption of custody of *female children* to their mother, and the presumption of custody of *male children* to their father?

For surely, a girl must have a female role model and mentor, and a boy must have a male one?

Perhaps male activists in this sphere could campaign on this issue, rather than the frankly unsound suggestion that a man should have *sole* care of a female child, whose biology he is often not even properly equipped to understand.

That of course, is on the assumption that the mother of the child actually *wants* her own daughter, though if she does not – *like Princess Diana's mother who deserted her at age seven* – the male, hopefully supported by a female helper such as mother, sister, aunt or new wife, should surely be given his own daughter into his care.

But what of the man disempowered from contact with his own children under the current feminist led anti-male and anti-father regime?

The first question to be asked is – is he really a good man? If a man is an alcoholic, a drug dealer, violent criminal or an addicted gambler, it may be best for the children if he is not around.

Unless such a man can reform himself, and prove it to all concerned over a substantial period of time, perhaps he had better do like the father in *Johnny Cash's* classic song, *A Boy Named Sue*, and disappear into the sunset, leaving the boy's mother to do the best she can, and perhaps *an old guitar*, but hopefully not *an empty bottle of booze*.

It would be better for such a boy, if he believed his father was a dead hero, and the greatest act of love such a man could then do, might well be - *to never show up*.

But for the decent man, who has been cheated out of his parental rights, all that he can now do, is whatever he can within the bounds of the law, and protest to reform it.

The only real grounds a man can have to get custody under the generality of Western law is that he can prove the woman unfit, or insane, and this may be a legitimate route in a number of cases, if tyrannical, abusive or negligent behaviour by a woman can be proven – remembering, there are mentally ill, sexually abusive, drug addicted, alcoholic and criminal women, just as there are men of those kinds.

Another possible route to be explored might be if a child is subjected to the presence of the custody winning or contesting mother's new boyfriend, husband or lover, whose likely uncaring presence – he is there because he loves or wants the woman, not her child – could be argued successfully to be damaging to the child, and therefore make the lone father a better choice.

But generally, men should campaign for the right to have custody of male children – especially those of school age or over – on the grounds that they need a man as a role model, and that due to weakness, the mother may be incapable of controlling and therefore imposing some kind of needed discipline upon a boy beyond a certain age.

An *honest* statistical study of the fate of boys brought up by men alone, as opposed to those brought up by women alone, may support or even prove that case.

We are not really being controversial here are we? Cannot even the hardened feminists see that all we are saying really is that – *a girl needs her mother, and a boy needs his dad?*

Again, it seems appropriate to point out, that the preceding analysis is based on a long study of real life cases and anecdotes, rather than the just the fictional and movie examples of situations, which are used merely as a common possession of our culture, to make the reading easier, and illustrate the point.

Such anecdotal information may not always be *statistically significant* from a strict scientific point of view, but it obtains its value and significance, as it is based on first hand and reliable “eye-witness” accounts, in short, it is *real life*.

Should the law fail him, as is currently likely, the best a man can do is to *be a good example*.

If the mother agrees to limited access, but tries to rile us into arguing each time we pick the child up, we should be brave and stoic, and show the child out patience, and not play the game of condemning the mother to the child. That way, at least we teach the child the most vital thing in life – to be tolerant and patient and self-controlled – and in time, if we are the better human being and parent, the child will see that for itself sooner or later.

If we are creative, we can use whatever remaining trace of love that was obviously once there in the mother for us, to find some way into the child's life.

For example, she might agree for us to exchange letters with the child, or have phone calls, even if she will not let us have face-to-face contact with him or her, so she feels that she is still in control.

If we build trust patiently and slowly, we can show by our good example that we deserve more.

But all this advice is directed at a good man. If we are not sure in our heart that we are such a person who will enrich the child's life, if we realise that maybe it is us who seek love from the child, and not the other way round, if we can be so honest, it is better that we assign that child to its mother, and leave well alone.

As long as we do nothing to prove our guilt, one day, when the child grows to have a mind of its own, and is free to do so, if we have good things to offer it, it may return to us of its own choice, and we may be able to be a friend, adviser, and supporter to it in adult life, should we truly deserve its respect.

## **Chapter Eighteen – Molestation, indoctrination, humiliation? – not the proper way to educate a child**

While as we have already pointed out, the current feminist influenced society obsesses on the male child molester, it perhaps focuses too much on the possibility of molestation of a child's body, when the subtler and perhaps more important issue is maintaining the sanctity and purity of a child's mind.

The word "sanctity" may seem unusual a usage here, but as twentieth century Sufi guru, *Hazrat Inayat Khan*, points out, unless we start seeing a child's mind as literally a holy place to be kept away from evil influences of all kinds, and to have only the most honest, kind and saintly visitors to its precincts, we will never raise the kind of child who is going to make the future world into a wonderful place for him or herself to live in, a paradise for all.

For example, have we never been in some group outing, perhaps a school or works trip, and found suddenly all the barriers between high and low and our everyday rivalries at least temporarily disappear, and we glow in a feeling of togetherness and see everyone around us as brothers and sisters and friends, instead of looking at our neighbours and people we meet in the street in fear of what they might do to us next?

That could be *the whole world, every day of the year*.

Can you imagine what a joy it would be to live then, knowing that everywhere we go there are only kind people and friends?

All that is required is that we base our society on *cooperation and kindness* rather than the *competition and aggression* which we see the feminists are really encouraging now in a thousand ways.

Human beings have got the potential to do that – and if we don't believe that somewhere deep inside us, it seems logical that we may as well give up now and do the world a favour and go hang ourselves.

But it all has to begin with the protection and right education of and good example shown to our children.

Because a child's mind is like a sponge. It absorbs everything it sees - good and bad.

We are astounded at the intelligence of children, which as adults most of us no longer possess. Every single child, no matter what its supposed IQ, successfully learns a language with no teacher and no school, in only a few short years, whereas few adults can ever learn another fluently, even throughout their entire life.

In a dentist's waiting room was seen a poster which had some real words of wisdom upon it:

*Show a child anger, and it learns anger*  
*Show a child patience, and it learns patience*  
*Show a child cruelty, it learns cruelty*  
*Show a child love, and it learns love*

And so on.

The child is as malleable as clay, but when the potter's wheel spins, if we don't have the pre-requisite skill, we might make a very distorted and ugly pot.

That there are countless "parenting" magazines and advisers available, shows us how scared parents are that they will get it wrong,

If the child did not have any natural intelligence of its own, clearly it could never be any better than its parent. Thus, as all parents make mistakes, we would see a degradation of children and their adult counterparts, leading us all progressively down into a state of pre-human development, likely lacking coherent speech and powers of mind and communication.

So the thankful reality is that, children grow to the power of intelligent communication and understanding of many aspects of life *despite* adult efforts to educate them, and not necessarily *because of them*.

However, that is not to deny the vital importance of good parental example, and the validity of a good teacher, either in the home or school, enriching that process manifold.

It is also not to deny the ability as hinted at above, of the bad parent or teacher to damage or permanently destroy a child's mind, especially in the finer expression of its higher powers.

For as has been pointed out earlier, a child lacking self-discipline will never become a great artist or scientist. For example, if it desires to play the piano well, it must be willing to practice a few scales and finger exercises, which it will not, if it is unable to apply its mind to any one thing for a substantial amount of time.

Likewise in schools, to become fluent in literacy and numeracy skills, it must have the ability to adapt to a certain amount of *disciplined* rote learning such as the "abc" and arithmetical tables.

We are seeing the growth of generations of children tutored under a "feministic" oriented *no discipline, no rote learning* system of education, which has resulted in huge number growing up without the basic literacy and numeracy skills which have been taken for granted by many generations of their ancestors, since free schooling for children began in the West hundreds of years ago.

Not only have the time tested systems of learning been dismantled and destroyed, but the ability of teachers to maintain discipline with the threat of a mild slap or a mere "ouch" level swish of the cane, has been taken away under the paranoid abuse fears of the feminist regime.

Few people who lived through the era of corporal punishment in schools, were seriously damaged by it, and most will recall it hardly ever being used even when available in the latter part of the twentieth century at least, except by a few abusive teachers, who clearly were not there for the right reasons, and should never have been allowed to teach.

Indian philosopher and allegedly “spiritual teacher”, *J Krishnamurti*, who has written voluminously on the subject of right education, and founded several schools of his own, even reported having no recollection whatsoever of his school days, which according to a master who taught him whom he came across in later life, included regular, almost daily beatings with the cane.

So unless Krishnamurti is telling lies, how was this miracle accomplished, that what would now be regarded as severe child abuse, had apparently made virtually no impact on this man's life, nor prevented him from becoming an extremely well disciplined, extremely creative individual, who was a bestselling author of a multitude of books, and respected lecturer the world over for many decades?

Even the likes of martial arts genius, *Bruce Lee*, paid tribute to and incorporated Krishnamurti's thought in his own philosophy, as revealed in at least one TV interview.

So the message here is not so much about advocacy for the reintroduction of corporal punishment and the cane to keep order – though that may still be an option, particularly in schools with large classes – but that *some kind* of effective discipline must be available to parents and teachers to enable children to become properly civilised, and also *highly skilled*.

The never-ending clamour of parents to get their children into the “best schools” is indicative of the fact, that everybody knows that a child who does not have the capacity to become highly skilled in this modern world, is not desired in adult society, and counts for little or nothing.

His or her only recourse then is to become a criminal or an outcast, who does not attempt to participate in mainstream society in any significant way, but in the case of girls however, they find another alternative – as entrants to the “sex industry” or as teenage mothers, who are uneducated and perhaps illiterate, and are now raising their children as the same, unable to pass on to them what they themselves do not know.

But despite this ever swelling illiteracy, school exam results we are told are *improving*, and millions of children are now regularly achieving grades their parents never attained. Yet, we find, on closer inspection that many of these “wunderkinds” who get top grades, cannot even properly add up or spell.

So what is going on?



What is going on, is that, now the feminists have dismantled the disciplinary structure of schools and time-tested methods of rote learning, they have created a dumbed-down generation of ne'er do wells, only able to type incoherent messages on mobile phones, and communicate with one another with a woefully small vocabulary, composed of phrases such as "that song is wick-id" and "you dun my head in" as the limit of their expressive powers.

But the feminists cannot admit their failure, and so they have resorted to doctoring the exam results and creating league tables of schools, who are then obliged to doctor results on their behalf to avoid the unfair shame of being at the bottom of the table, which of course *inevitably someone must be*.

With this amazing piece of "double-think" they are placing upon us, we might say they are following *Hitler's* agenda of *misinformation*, which had as its slogan

*If you are going to tell a lie, tell a big one.*

That is – children cannot spell – there is even a recent order from on high in the UK that examiners must not mark children down in, believe it or not, *English Literature exams* for poor spelling – so that means children are getting less educated and stupider.

But *no* – according to official statistics, they are getting *better* exam results than ever – which of course means children are getting *more educated and cleverer*.

So that's it – they are getting stupider and cleverer all at the same time! Of course - now we understand! That is "double-think" for you!

In this educational madness, of course no real male teacher could survive, as could no real woman teacher. The wonderful teachers of both genders, whom most of the older generations will remember at least one or several of, are cracking up mentally under this chaotic and insane regime, and leaving the profession in droves.

Those who stay are being sworn at, attacked or battered by little children, or these little monsters' own parents, and the law is not protecting them. So they are on *Prozac*, or in therapy, or have killed themselves, or if they are wiser, simply left the profession and put their extraordinary talents into service *for themselves* elsewhere.

Many men do not even dare *consider* being a teacher of children under the age of eleven, or even sixteen, for fear of the total destruction of their lives and careers that a single *unsubstantiated allegation* of abuse could bring.

We have seen how they have tortured and nearly persecuted *Michael Jackson* to death, after all. Though his fame and millions may have saved him from imprisonment, it didn't prevent him being hounded and tortured for months on end, and having his reputation as a human being possibly destroyed beyond repair, so what hope for the little male school teacher about whom nobody much cares?

That is to say – the argument is nearly at the stage due to feminist paranoid propaganda – *what's a man doing with children in a school anyway? He must be some kind of child molester for sure. Why else could he possibly be there?*

This kind of argument is based on the myth of men as monsters – the feminist lie.

They cannot believe that a man can love children in a non-sexual way, as quite likely Michael Jackson does, and certainly many teachers have done through the ages.

It really is *Goodbye Mr Chips* nowadays.

The result is that a bright child will now go to school and quite likely have his or her mind and confidence utterly destroyed by some really mediocre and ignorant teacher, who has filled the vacancy left by the real teachers who have been hounded out by the feminist culture, which threatens them with being branded child molesters.

And then what remain are only *bad teachers*, and many times, one single bad teacher has brought a child down, who was otherwise well on the road to academic success.

As Krishnamurti points out

*(true) teachers are the most important people in society, the most noble people*

as they give their mind and heart and soul to awaken the minds and hearts and souls of others (author's words).

For that great doctor or nurse who helped us in our time of need, or the great writer or actor or musician who entertains us and makes our life worthwhile, or that great scientist who found a cure for our disease, or invented the car in which we drive or the aeroplane in which we fly – they all had at one time or another *a great teacher* who inspired them somewhere.

Sometimes that great teacher was a father or mother. Such mothers *do* exist, and did more so in the past, before feminism set in and made them feel ashamed of their wonderful role.

So that is why teachers are so important – *there is no real civilisation as we know it without them.*

Without good teachers, we all would degenerate into savages in a low-minded gangster-like, every-man-for-himself society, and live in caves, like creatures from the Neanderthal era – which is pretty much what is happening now in large parts of the developed Western world, apart from the *caves* part.

So what to do?

Real teachers *must* protest. They must expose the lies of the educational system, and its doctored exam results.

They must demand traditional teaching methods and *effective* means to discipline children, even if that means placing them in solitary confinement in a rubber room, so they can't hurt themselves, until they are willing to behave.

Because if we don't stop the rot soon, we are facing *the end of the world* - a descent into chaos, in which the few remaining brains will be put into the service of mad dictators, who will eventually use weapons of mass destruction to destroy the world, or sufficiently large parts of it, leaving some kind of *Logan's Run* or *Mad Max* post-civilisation order as all that remains, and any real civilisation will take centuries or millennia to rebuild.

Parents can also protest about how their children are miseducated, and take them out of school and even educate them themselves.

Sufficiently capable parents can even come together to create their own schools, and in many places, the laws are surprisingly lax on what are required as qualifications, as long as minimum standards of education are reached.

As to legal action, though feminist influenced teachers are not allowed to hit children, there may be grounds for bringing cases of "mental abuse" if children can be shown to be damaged by their neglect, and the effect of the chaotic atmosphere that takes place in so many schools.

Governments should not hesitate to protect teachers from threat and physical attack with the most powerful of laws, so that teachers are as respected as police officers, which used to be the case.

As there are no real life commonly known examples, we will resort to a fictional image once again, to show what is meant by *male love and education of children*, which is exemplified by the popular 1970s *Kung Fu* TV series.

This series showed how the orphaned young half-cast American-Chinese boy, *Kwai Chang Caine*, was raised by kind and wise teachers in the temple – in particular the enigmatic *Master Kan*, and the chuckling, blind *Master Po*, who amongst other things taught Caine to hear his own heartbeat and the grasshopper at his feet.

Those are the kind of men who should be teachers and parents to every child, as should their female equivalents – should they truly exist – such as the wonderful female martial artist *Hsui-Lien* ("shu lien") played by *Michelle Yeoh* in the movie *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon*.

What man would not wish for a woman like her as his mother, teacher or wife?

Beautiful, softly spoken, dignified, intelligent, kind, powerful, noble, brave, modest, wise, and loving and respectful of her man.

If indeed, there were real women like her somewhere, surely no man would wish to be liberated from them, but like the movie's hero, *Li Mu Bai*, could feel as one with her.

The miracle of that movie, is to convincingly depict a beautiful love between a heroic woman and a heroic man, which was never once required to become sexual, or have anything but even one parting kiss to make the love story true and great.

It is the love not only of the body, but the spirit, and must surely be a model of the noble love of the future that will make men and women into real friends, and equally cause children to honour and worship their parents and teachers with obedient respect, which only adults who themselves are worthy of respect, like those fictional heroes, will ever find.

And with the mere presence of such parents and teachers, that is in essence all the education they will ever need.

It is the absence of such parents and teachers, many of them male – who to whatever degree they do exist have been removed and disempowered by the current chaotic government interference in the educational system – which has destroyed the possibility of children being properly educated, and thus able to grow rightly in intelligence, creativity, harmony and love.

## **Chapter Nineteen – How to Handle a Woman – Finding and Courting Our Woman**

In the 1967 film musical *Camelot*, *Richard Harris* assures us in song that how to handle a woman is to *love her – simply love her*.

So he tried this prescription out as best he could in the role of *King Arthur*, but he discovered that she had deceived him by having an affair with the dark, bold and handsome *Sir Lancelot of the Lake*, who is supposedly every woman's dream.

So where did King Arthur go wrong?

We could offer several possible answers, to this age old problem, the first of which is – *perhaps he just chose the wrong woman?*

Or perhaps again, he failed to love her properly?

Perhaps he should have studied up on his sex manuals and learned to give her “the joy” that she seemed to be getting much more of with Sir Lancelot.

And frankly, this is about as far as your modern agony aunt and TV psychologist will go.

But these answers won't do, any more than they worked for even King Arthur, so what hope for mere knights and pages, what hope, my brothers in arms, for you and I?

Any man who has persisted in reading this book so far will understand by now that the mythical version of woman with which he has been presented since his early youth is inadequate, inaccurate and immature beyond belief.

It is from a mentality when the world was still believed to be flat, and many boys and men imagined that children came not from women, but were found deposited under dock leaves by a stork.

If we believe in such a fantasy of woman, our own mentality is more representative of the childish enthusiasm of the *Beverly Hill Billy's* naïve *Jethro*, rather than the seasoned *hold on, now* realism of *Uncle Jed*.

To pursue this analogy a little further, the reality of woman is more like the appearance and cute tease of *Ellie May*, with the stubbornness and belligerence of *Granny*, and the ambitious deviousness of *Cousin Pearl*.

A pretty girl like *Ellie May Clampett* or a gorgeous, sexy mature woman like *Samantha* from *Sex and the City* melts our heart and our resistance, if we have not learned by experience that the enticing velvet glove of a woman or girl can very quickly and unexpectedly turn into a whip hand or hammer fist.

But we can be further fooled by the dizzy, but more sophisticated and eloquent cuteness of an *Ally McBeal*, thinking that she is really an angel from heaven and to us personally, a kind God's gift.

Those males who lack substantial first hand experience of women will not hardly believe a word the author of this work says, but those who have had "close encounters with women of the real kind" instead of fantasy creations like *Ally McBeal*, will see things differently.

Even a cartoon laden, bookstore "self-help" book, *Boys' Dating Guide to Girls*, on a very early page, and written by a *woman*, no less, pointed out "you may be surprised to find out that the girl who loves you, also *hates* you with just as much passion."

What on earth is going on here? She loves us and she hates us at the same time? Aren't these supposed to be opposites? Not in a woman's mind apparently!

Which is the sort of thing which prompted Freud – "a great psychologist" we are told – to say in dumbfoundment, "just what do women want?"

So we need to answer the question again, more thoroughly than the brief analysis with which this book opened, now we have laid some proper foundations.

What a *normal* woman – i.e. one who is not so far gone she has transformed into a man-hating feminist and perhaps lesbian – wants above all, is *to be loved*. In that sense the Richard Harris song was right.

But the question is – *how*?

*Love* is just a four letter word for an abstract concept which has never been adequately defined, by our culture, at least.

Women attempt to define it for us on a daily basis, in terms of "if you loved me, you would do A, B and C for me, but you wouldn't do X, Y or Z."

That is – they define it in terms of their demands upon men, in terms of what they decide they want from men.

But this generally translates into love meaning a man should give them *anything they want*, whether it's good for them, the relationship, and their children or not.

We see how much women love *us*, when we won't cooperate, and fail to supply what they demand. Then instead of the velvet touch, and the seductive smile, we get the tantrum, the humiliating sarcasm and complaints, and if we are willing to put up with it, we get the threats and whatever punishment – e.g. withholding of sexual favours – they are able to inflict upon us.

Of course, this makes servants and slaves out of men, and if we ever had any self-respect, we soon lose it after enough doses of this kind of treatment.

The greatest tool in a man's armoury against women's attempts to dehumanize and enslave him is the word *no*.

She may say "let's do something crazy – let's just get in the car and go to New York, or Paris or Venice."

So if we are just married or going on a honeymoon, we can say *yes*, but generally speaking, unless we are an oil millionaire, we are obliged to say *no*.

Equally, if it means we are going to have to work like a slave – more than is good for our sanity and health and happiness – to fund a thousand other things like holidays abroad, a more glamorous home or car, or she spends a fortune on clothes or other extravagances that we cannot jointly afford, we have got to keep saying *no*, until she gets the message.

But the truth is, if we have hooked up with this kind of woman, who has a lot of material demands, it is probably far too late already.

Long *before* even getting so seriously involved, we have to observe her for some time, to see what matters to her, and if we can accommodate it.

Generally speaking, a man can only court a woman who is at least slightly inferior to him, because if he tries to court an equal or superior he will get into a war that he probably can't win.

Having a successful relationship with a woman that is intended to lead to a long term partnership – a marriage of some form with children – won't be possible if she is not willing to let us be the boss, which many women will not let us be.

We have to find a horse that wants to be tamed, in exchange for us giving to it our lifelong care and love.

Horses were meant to be ridden by their riders, not the other way round, and unless a woman in her heart accepts this idea of male authority, regardless of whatever she says before she has trapped us, we will come unstuck.

We have to have a battle with a woman – a *non-physical, psychological battle* – *before* we commit to her, and have any children.

Otherwise she will appear fun and wonderful during our whirlwind courtship and transform into our bullying boss once we are married or otherwise in her grasp, especially if children soon appear, as is typical.

When we try to create the *order* that we see the real man seeks, be he *Newton*, *Einstein* or even *Sigmund Freud*, she will stop us inflicting our brutal male discipline on the children, and then she will rule over them and us, and we will be just a sidelined spare-part in the human drama, letting our children be ruined by her, while we go into a meaningless sexual wasteland, which she offers to us as "love."

But this so called “love” she offers in return for our slavery is just the possessive and dominating love of *the Snow Queen*, who holds the little boy prisoner in her icy, loveless castle, while she forces him to spell out the word *eternity* from some impossibly jumbled tiles.

The meaning of that is – she has taken our soul *for eternity*, and we are a prisoner forever in her icy, loveless *queendom* from our concept of true love with the Snow White type girl we imagined her to be and still desire.

In this process of battling with a woman, we will have to understand that she doesn't love us and may never do so, in the same way as we love her. Like Princess Diana, she isn't capable of it, because her mind is full of insecurities.

She *desires us, maybe even worships us*, just as she loves a beautiful and strong horse, but she doesn't hesitate to dig her heels in and take the whip to it, to get it to jump over some fences for her, though afterwards of course, she may reward us with a pat on the head and sugar lump of sex.

Many modern women will of course try to get us into bed as quickly as possible if they are really set upon possessing us. The purpose is to enslave us to having sex with them, so they can control us and get us to do whatever they want.

So if we want to be the boss, as much as we would like to jump into bed with her, we must say *no*.

If we want to have sex with women whom we don't intend to marry *or have children with*, that is our own business, and a different matter, but then the thing is to be careful not to make her pregnant, or supposing we are unsure of her promiscuity, make sure we don't get some horrible disease.

We have to realise that even the Snow White woman might try to seduce us, just to see if she can, and that therefore if she can do it, other women probably could too.

If she succeeds in getting us into a willing state, she has her answer, and she knows that she likely cannot trust us to be faithful unless she foolishly believes – as many vain and unrealistic women do – that she is the only one whom we could ever love in this way.

It's an illusion on the part of any of us to think we are so special that we are “the only one.”

Everyone of us would in theory like to go to bed with at least ten persons we have known, or know from the celebrity world, and if such an unlikely opportunity presented itself, who knows in reality what we would do?

For this reason, the marriages and relationships of the famous rarely last, and even when they appear to, quite likely there are affairs on the side for one or both parties which don't necessarily ever see the light of publicity.



The most we can hope for is that both partners have strong reasons for staying faithful to one another, but we cannot necessarily demand that if the other partner is, due to our neglect or other reasons, presented with enough temptation, they will not succumb.

But many women and men *can* be faithful, so we need to spend a long time getting to know a prospective partner *without having sex with them*, because if we do, we have shown that we are unlikely to be faithful to them, as quite likely we could be seduced just as easily by the next attractive woman who comes along.

And why should we do this, endure this torment of restraining our sexual desire?

Because it's really about the only chance we have got of being secure and loved, and creating that same secure atmosphere for any children who may appear.

The ideal woman for an intelligent, civilised man should not be a brash and sexually overt *Madonna* type (the pop singer, *not the mother of Christ*), or even a smart, cute but man-hungry and over sexually overactive *Ally McBeal* type, but a modest, *Katie Holmes* of *Dawson's Creek* type, who allegedly (so she says) will remain a virgin until her wedding night.

The world really needs to be full of virginal and loyal young women like her, and the kind of principled *Mark Darcy* types from *Bridget Jones* who would tolerate their foibles in kindness, and be equally loyal to them.

The society and man-woman relationships then can become harmonious and beautiful instead of the ugly, tortuous, sex-driven, and insecure encounters they are now.

Women's problem is that they think they want Mark Darcy, but in their insecurity they get *Hugh Grant* (that is, *his onscreen persona*, he might be a very nice man in real life for all we know).

Contrary to what women think, men have great feelings of love inside them, but we cannot dare let our feelings overtake us, or show our hand too soon, or they will use those feelings against us, to torment us.

What we fail to understand is that the woman's greatest need is not our feelings of love, but her own feelings of security and *being loved*, and she feels that only with a man who is both in control of *himself* and therefore *of her*.

Our relationship with a woman is going to be *psychologically* either a daddy-daughter relationship in which we are the boss, leader and principal carer, or else a mummy-son relationship, where she is the boss, leader and carer in the female sense of us being her slave and child.

We have to be realistic and pick someone we can handle, pick a mare that we are man enough to tame, and is not so wild it will unseat us and trample us to death in that process, which only time and experiment will show, though a study of her *type* as explained further below, will enable us to make a far safer estimate in our choice.

Whatever a woman does with us, we must remember – *it is a test of our powers of self-control, however unfair and illogical it seems.*

To win the trust of a sensitive, intelligent, educated modern woman, is a very difficult task.

Millions of women, as illustrated by the fiction of the *Bridget Jones* movies, are looking for a *Mark Darcy* who is up to the job – that is, who is able to stoically cope with all her insecurities, paranoid episodes and tantrums, and deal with her in a kind, patient and loving manner, but without being a doormat and tossing his principles aside for her approval.

For example, in the movie, when Bridget is imprisoned in the foreign jail, and she throws tantrums at him, believing he has deserted her, he quietly moves heaven and earth to get her out, without her realising he has done this all for her behind the scenes, and that's why she is free.

*That* is the heroism and devotion which a real woman would describe as real love.

*That* is what the real discerning woman wants. She couldn't care tuppence about his penis size – how ridiculous and pathetic that assessment of women's motivation is!

The evidence is before our eyes – attractive, intelligent women do not choose men with big penises. They choose men who are educated, good looking, sensitive, brave, talented, and preferably successful too.

And what is the principle basis of their choice? They are trying to produce the best children they can. Everyone – man or woman – is trying to mate with the most attractive and intelligent member of the opposite sex whom they can get.

Material success does not necessarily matter that much, because the woman is looking principally for the man with good genes. Equally, the prince or king will marry the scullery maid if she is genetically – in terms of looks and brains – what he is looking for in his prince or princess heirs.

But many women pick wrong men, due to the brainwashing now prevalent in society, making them have sex before they are ready to make a wise choice, or for other psychologically convoluted reasons.

So as men, let us please understand what is going on.

Our prospective woman's strange behaviour is to test us out, and also because she is to some degree emotionally damaged, just as inevitably a man is himself.

If we have any hope of winning her trust, we must learn patience, tolerance, self-restraint (especially in the sexual sense regarding her), and display this to her over a long period of time in the manner of an old fashioned courtship ritual.

Forget the modern ways of mating – we'll get skinned alive and tossed upon the scrap heap by her, and unable to gain access to our children, if we follow the currently recommended routes of “whirlwind romance” and sex before marriage.

We've got to become as close as we can to being *Superman* – both in his modesty and his strength.

We should learn some martial arts as well as marital ones, so we can feel confident enough to physically protect her, and fend off any bully who may be hanging around trying to steal her from us, when his inferior genetics and behaviour say he has no right, so she would therefore never be satisfied with him in any case.

Remember – we can't really expect a beautiful woman to accept a coward, unless he is very rich, and can afford bodyguards, and most bullies are only confident when they think their opponent is not brave enough to fight back. So if we look to him like we can and will, the odds are there will never be a fight.

Or a different way of looking at this, is that a real man such as *Mahatma Gandhi* – whom we regard as *a real man* because he is brave and fights for his principles and freedom even though he has no big muscles – never threw a punch in anger, though he had some physical blows reigned on him now and then.

But even though he was a small, physically insignificant little man, he defeated *the entire British Empire* and caused them to hand back India to the Indian people.

However, the bully is currently only there as an obstacle between us and our woman because society has lost its way. The preferable means for man and woman to meet would be by *properly conducted arranged marriages* as happens currently in some form in various cultures, though not necessarily for the right reasons.

Many modern women object to this, on the grounds that women are forced into unsuitable marriages in the Asian or Arab world. But this is likely due to the corruption of the system, and the women concerned not being introduced to men of their own type and class.

If we compare it to what we have got now, we see that men and women enter chaotic and unsuitable relationship which soon end in divorce all the time in the West – yet we condemn these age old traditions without probably understanding them or considering their value.

And some may say – what is this arrogant assumption of genetic superiority which decides one man's right to a woman, and rejects another?

It is worth pointing out that in the most revered Hindu scripture, the *Bhagavad-Gita*, a simple system of determining the inclinations and motivations of men and women was outlined, giving four basic types of people based on three elemental qualities which may be loosely translated, as *spirituality*, *desire*, and *dullness*.

There are then four types possible, as *spirituality* and *dullness* are by nature incompatible qualities.

1. *spirituality* dominates, *desire* is secondary
2. *desire* dominates, *spirituality* is secondary
3. *desire* dominates, *dullness* is secondary
4. *dullness* dominates, *desire* is secondary

These groups are obviously broad categories to place a huge spectrum of human beings into, but the point here is determining *the predominant quality*.

For example, if a type 1 woman marries a type 2 man, she is focussed mainly on spirituality, whereas he is focussed mainly on desire. That suggests he will wish to impose sensual desires on her against her wishes, and so there will be conflict or disharmony in the relationship.

Similarly, her focus on spirituality will probably irritate him, so he will become discontent with her also, and possibly seek an extra-marital affair, which when she discovers it may terminate the relationship, especially as spirituality and therefore honesty is so important to her.

Or again, let us suppose that a type 1 man, marries a type 2 woman.

Equally his focus on spirituality is likely to annoy her – she will desire him to be out doing ambitious and active pursuits, when he desires solitude and meditation, and she may wish for him to be more sexually focussed, and in that respect she will be unhappy with him also.

He will be unhappy with what he may consider her needless material pursuits for the luxuries and pleasures of life, which he considers relatively valueless in his spiritual quest. In this case, it is likely that she will become the frustrated party who has the extra-marital affairs, but either way, this relationship cannot be held as satisfactory.

So these two examples, show that men and women whose basic philosophical tendencies do not match, will not likely have a successful relationship, and these differences will become even more pronounced and troublesome when children appear.

The problem with the present, is that we frequently have intermixture of these basic “castes”, mainly because the spiritually inclined women have been influenced to desire a more ambitious kind of man than their underlying nature would suit, or on the other hand, the materialistic focussed women have seduced and trapped a spiritually inclined man into using his brains ambitiously, to satisfy her desires.

But the latter does not happen so often, and usually the more evolved men who would satisfy the more evolved women, are being sidelined, because they are not so willingly to perform the ambitious and aggressive behaviour of the go-getting macho man who ends up as a sports hero, or tough guy movie actor, or alternatively, the aggressive and wheeler-dealer business tycoon who is presented as the current ideal.

This kind of man is with his equally ambitious woman, dominating and ruling society, and the only thing wrong with that is that because neither of them are spiritually focussed, they are not intent on creating the kind of justice in society which the spiritually developed man – the Mahatma Gandhi, or the fictional *Kwai Chang Caine* of the *Kung Fu* series – tries to bring about.

Thus we have corruption in high places in society, for reasons of *pragmatism*.

People in the West are materially satisfied, because that is what the current leaders focus on, but emotionally and spiritually starved.

It is as important that women understand this as men, so they can see what is really at the root of our global and interpersonal problems.

But as to our current topic – the selection and courtship of female mates by men, the average man should now have a basis for determining what kind of woman would suit him.

He has to determine what her *focus* is. Is she a “material girl” like *Madonna*, with ambition and grandeur a major, and spirituality a minor? If so, he had better be focussed on the same.

Or is she a really spiritual type, like some high-minded lady doctor or teacher, whom he can therefore successfully be partner to, if he is the same?

But even correctly identifying this essential level of motivational and philosophical compatibility does not necessarily relieve a man of his courtship duties, and the tricky psychological battle that he must fight and win in his conquest of the woman, not in a sexual sense, but in the sense of earning her respect and therefore allowing him to be the ultimate boss at the decisional flashpoints which would otherwise result in intractable ideological conflict, and then cumulatively would likely end in divorce.

If he achieves this task correctly, though the courtship may at times be difficult and stormy – and therefore we see, must not be complicated by sexual relations – he will have a marriage which is largely harmonious and based on cooperation.

If he does not, he will have the typical bickering relationship which is disrespectful and humiliating to a man, and will force him to either accept a marriage of meek servitude or break out of it in divorce, largely leaving his children to the complete control of his ex-wife.

Then in her anger at his refusal to allow her to dominate him, which she will explain to her family, friends and supporters as weak-willed desertion by him, she will become bitter and twisted, and turn her childrens' minds against him, against men in general, and against the possibility of a lasting man-woman relationship in particular.

This is really a game of psychological and social chess. But what women do not see is that if they win, it is only a victory of the same order as that of nuclear war between two superpowers. It leaves both sides devastated.

The woman may be in charge, but she is not capable of handling the family situation successfully alone, and thus we see millions of women from failed marriages or relationships left alone with their children, with only the state as their collaborative parent in the raising of them, and millions of children who grow into damaged adults, who in most cases, do not understand quite what it is they have missed – that is, an atmosphere of properly ordered family life and pure love – which alone would have given them the peace they now lack, and will throughout their lives suffer for the absence of in a thousand ways.

This is the task of the real man who cares – to find a woman who still has enough heart and spirit to be worth rescuing, and to in cooperation with her, restore the love and harmony to family life, and hence, ultimately the world.

## **Chapter Twenty – Commercial Sperm Donation and Other Crimes Against Men**

In the wonderful movie, *The Truman Show*, is shown the fate of a man who has been cheated from birth out of his true identity, and made to believe he is living out a real life, when actually it is all a fantasy world which has been created around him, composed of actors pretending to be his real life associates and friends, inside a giant film studio so large, it is boasted to be visible from the moon.

So *Truman*, played by *Jim Carrey*, in what likely would have been an Oscar winning performance, except it was depicting *men's liberation* perhaps, is forced like all modern men to fight for his true identity amongst all the subterfuge and chicanery that surrounds him, including most poignantly of all, the betrayal by his "best friend" *Marlon*, and his seduction and domination by his wife.

The character of Truman is a fabulous creation as he shows what happens to any man who tries to break free from the prison of the society he has been unwillingly forced to remain in, that is, as he says at one point during his efforts to escape, he is *blocked at every turn*.

Apart from the fact his mother is of course not who she seems to be, but an actor pretending to be so, and therefore *a wicked step-mother*, he is also the product of a one-parent family, because his father has been "killed off" in the plot line when he was only a child.

Like every man, as a boy, he dreams of adventure, but Truman is told by his teacher, that "he is too late, there is really nothing left to explore!"

When he talks of travelling and exploring, his fake wife tells him his plans are unrealistic and immature, and that surely having a baby is enough of an adventure for him, and that he should face up to his responsibilities.

He is also trapped in a job he hates, and his boss even threatens him with dismissal if he doesn't increase his sales as an insurance agent.

But even though the adult Truman is "a good boy", doing what he is told by society and wife, even when he is out mowing the lawn, she humiliates him as she passes, pointing out he has "missed a spot."

Worst of all, he has been cheated out of being with the woman he loves, who was written out of the script because she was a fellow freedom-seeker who would have eventually exposed the deception of Truman's imprisonment and fake identity, leaving him to be quickly seduced into a marriage with a woman, whom though sexy and attractive, due to her humiliating treatment of him, he feels dominated by and hates.

Does any of this sound familiar?

We suggest that this is a fairly good model of the average modern man's life in the feminist world – trapped with a woman who humiliates him, doing a job he doesn't like for people who abuse him, having no one he can really trust, feeling alone and in despair, and *blocked at every turn from freedom and true love*.

The cleverly directed film portrays the adult Truman from the outset as a boy. He dresses and behaves boyishly, his wife treats him like a child, and he goes down into the basement and looks at his old trunk of boy's toys trying to escape from her.

He has no father figure in his life, except the invisible TV show director, *Christof*, who has been planning every step of his life for him without him ever knowing.

Truman's journey is to become a man, which we see means *finding the truth about who he is and deciding how he wants to live*.

Interestingly, the millions who watch him in this ultimate "reality soap opera" on the TV screen, do not really care about his fate, for even when he is almost drowned, they show only the concern due to a soap actor, and not the real human being.

This again, is a reflection of "real life." Others do not really care what happens to a man unless he is rich or famous. He can live and die an imprisoned slave and no one notices or cares, not even his so called "friends", like *Marlon* in the movie.

His wife cares only for Truman, because she is a successful star in her own right by being his onscreen wife.

That is, she makes a good living out of him, just as so many real life women do, but she does not care that he is a prisoner and a victim, she does not care that he never gets his freedom and finds his soul. All she wants from him is a baby, and then her ownership of him is complete.

At the end of the movie, though it nearly costs him his life, Truman escapes. The real message of the movie, in the context of this work, is that if any of us men want to be free too, it may quite likely almost cost us our own.

Each of us lives in a social prison, in a world in which currently it is the women, and feminist influenced ones at that, who are making the rules. This is clear, because when we study womens' "rules", we find it very evident, that there is always one rule for us, and quite another one for them.

If we take a few days off work for genuine sickness, we are cissies or weak. They can take as much time off as they like, and all they get is sympathy, and if we dare ask what was wrong – it was *women's problems* – that ultimate excuse, which puts an end to all further enquiries from a man.



We might ask ourselves who will sit in the captain's chair of the *Starship Voyager*, should *Captain Janeway* be suffering from women's problems too. The obvious answer is that a man will be put there temporarily, and afterwards blamed for anything that goes wrong, or *ever did go wrong*.

In his heart, every man wants to be a "true-man", he wants to be an explorer and adventurer, *like the Great Magellan*, as the boy Truman says. Adventure stories of far away lands and bold daring exploits always fascinate men and boys of all ages.

But part of being a true man in a civilised society, is surely to at some stage accept responsibilities, and prepare another generation to live and dream.

So every man, unless there is something seriously wrong with him, should have *the right* to marry and have children.

If one looks at Eastern, Asian, orthodox Jewish or Arabic societies, because the social structure is very strong, it is more or less assured that a man will have that opportunity to marry due to some form of arranged meeting or marriage (though things are changing now, for example in China, where many men cannot find wives, because they have run off to the big cities to pursue the "American dream.)

But in the mostly secular West generally, that is very far from being the case, and many millions of men, even some very handsome and intelligent men, do not ever get that chance.

Many famous and brilliant men of the past, such as *Van Gogh*, *Isaac Newton* and *Hans Christian Andersen*, never married, so we are looking at a problem which has been around for hundreds of years in Western society, long before the current feminist era, but has now, for reasons it will become clear, got a whole lot worse.

For the problem modern men in particular have, especially brave, intelligent and handsome ones, is that they feel that the indignity of the modern dating process is unacceptable, due to the humiliating treatment that women are now allowed – unlike their better behaved mothers and grandmothers – to inflict upon men, apparently with little or no remorse.

A beautiful woman thinks she is the centre of the universe, and that all men should bow down before her as inferior beings. But a man who is a great artist, scientist or sporting hero, might well ask himself if she is as rare as he.

And if that answer is *no* – that for every man as talented and athletic as *him* there are a thousand pretty girls, why is it that *he* should do the begging?

So many men are too proud to ask for dates, and be rejected by women who at heart they justifiably believe they are doing a favour to, as there are so few men like him to go round.

For the infuriating thing, he finds, is that girls and women reject and torture such decent men who are interested in them, and then usually end up submitting to brash bullies of whom they are scared, or else slimy seductive men who charm them into bed or deceive them by false promises, which the self-respecting man will not make.

As explained in the previous chapter, that means that quite often, women are surrendering to and marrying the wrong men – that is, men not in their own *caste* or *class* – which eventually results in the majority of cases ending in divorce, as we see before our eyes.

And then when she is a single parent family, she discovers far too late, that even the kindest of men think twice about being a step-father to another man's child, and even though attractive and intelligent, she may never have the same chance again to get a man she really wants and would otherwise have found.

This of course, can lead to more hate of men, and even abuse of them at work, as she can easily then slip into a mode – really *due to her own mistake in picking the wrong man* – of blaming and taking out her frustrations on the entire male gender.

The arranged marriage system was *originally* a correct mechanism which ensured that *suitably matched* people met.

Women reject this now, because they say they want a *love* marriage.

But if that system is working so well for them, why do millions of single and one parent family women, have the *Bridget Jones syndrome*, that is, cannot find a man who will satisfactorily love them and whom they love in return?

That such a fantasy as *Bridget Jones* is so enormously popular amongst women, proves conclusively that millions of aging women – into their thirties and forties – cannot find a *suitable* man.

So what they perhaps are not aware, is that millions of good men have given up trying to find a woman, permanently discouraged by modern women's abusive behaviour, and the amount of undeserved rejection and humiliation they are faced with when they try to court a woman and declare their love.

It seems really the most barbaric act imaginable to a young man, which unlike in the *Bobbitt* case he feels he has done nothing to deserve, that when he declares his love to a woman, who all the signs have told him actually *wants* it, that she then proceeds to trample all over his most sensitive and tender feelings of love, when we juxtapose that with the fact that women so often turn round and call men unfeeling and “insensitive brutes” for either not declaring or not possessing these very same feelings.

So here, boys and men must understand what is going on in this woman or girl's mind.

Why is it that she seems to so callously and cruelly reject, what it is that all logic and media propaganda tells us that she really wants?

The reality is she *does* want this love, very much so, but *she also wants to be boss*.

Let us explain further.

In the autobiography of *Irma Kurtz*, a long-time writer and agony aunt for *Cosmopolitan* magazine, we find her explaining her philosophy on men, quite possibly more honestly than many women ever do.

She said basically, that in the early stages of courtship, the truth is that both boy and girl are in love. But what she went on to say is that they are both in love *with him*.

That is to imply, the woman is in love with the man, and the man is in love with *himself*.

That is, he is so high on the flattery he is getting from knowing he is admired by the woman, that this just intensifies his egotistical love for himself.

Women say in such situations "he thinks he is *god's gift* to women."

Whereas, any man who has been in the position of feeling love for a woman, and having it rejected, would say exactly the same in reverse.

That is, he is in love with her, but it is *she* who is getting high on the attention she is getting from him, so that actually in such a case they are both in love *with her*.

So what is the truth here?

The truth is that in many cases they are both in love, but there is a battle going on, to see *who is boss*.

Take the ubiquitous female anthem, *I will survive*, made a hit by *Gloria Gaynor*, and later sang so enthusiastically by millions of women at *karaoke* evenings.

The first lines are the ones to note

*First, I was afraid, I was petrified  
Thinking I could never live without you by my side*

So that is the *true state* of the woman in love. She is afraid, she is petrified. This man she loves can absolutely decimate her with rejection. He can make her feel like nothing. So how does she deal with that?

She does her very best to "cut him down to size." She pretends she doesn't care, his love means nothing to her, and she tries to reduce this person she is actually terrified of losing, who has her heart in his hands, to a gibbering wreck.

She cannot grab him by the scruff of the neck, and make him do what she wants, because as an average woman she does not have the physical strength of the caveman wearing the bear skin with the club, who supposedly once gained the cooperation of the female of the species in that way.

So she uses against him, the only weapon she has got – *the denial to him of her acceptance and love.*

Once he is reduced to the state of a whimpering child, once she has him begging, and desperate for *her*, then *she* is the boss, and if he begs convincingly enough, she will then accept him.

As most men, even if they have a physique like *Arnold Schwarzenegger* in his prime, are emotionally immature, a sufficiently large dose of cruelty will soon have him whimpering – we are of course back to the lady in leather with the whip and boots again – and then when he whimpers enough, she can take control, and feel secure.

So we see that her love is not quite the same as a man's!

A man's love for a woman goes something like - *you are the most beautiful thing I have ever seen, my heart leaps with joy when I see you -- as Sting nicely puts it – every little thing you do is magic – and I just want to be with you, touch you, hold you, protect you, for the rest of my life.*

The point we have to understand is that *man's* principal desire is *to love*, *woman's* principal desire is *to be loved*.

For her, the man she sets her heart on is something like a beautiful and powerful horse she admires, like that in *Anna Sewell's* novel, *Black Beauty*, which story has captivated generations of girls.

It is what *Black Beauty* can *do* for her, that she is so thrilled by, how it can make her feel when she jumps those fences and rides.

Above all, she is thrilled with and seeking of *its loyalty to her*.

For example, during the heights of *Beatlemania* in the sixties, millions of girls screamed at any public appearance of the Beatles, and many fainted with excitement.

Why did a girl do that? She didn't even know them personally. It was because of *those songs* they sang, which made her feel so great.

Women are seeking a man who is going to whisper those sweet nothings in her ear, and make her feel so special.

Do we understand? It is about *her feeling loved and special*, not her loving *us* and making *us* feel that way!

We seek the love from her that our mothers once gave us, and likely she will – *if a good woman* – give to her own children.

But we suggest, that despite everything one has ever been told and heard and been led to believe, none of us men as adults will ever get that love again, and here is the crunch – *neither should we seek nor expect it.*

Our job as *real men* in life is *to love, not to be loved.*

And thus when we present our fragile hearts before women, and they get trampled upon, that is the lesson they are teaching us.

They *cannot* love us, they *are not capable.*

Yes – they *can* love us in an animal kind of way, patting us on the head, caring about our health, and feeding us well, and they can admire us greatly, bus this we see, they do also *with their horse.*

*Esther Vilar, of Manipulated Man* fame loves us, you see, but she is as already stated, more or less, like the Virgin Mary, *a saint.*

If we want to be true men, we have to accept our girl or woman is mostly – *psychologically* – a child we are taking care of, and therefore *cannot possibly be expected to take care of us.*

But because we see her looking so grown up, and she scares us a little with her big beautiful, shapely body, and consequent sexual power, we think she is *psychologically* an adult, like us.

So this book, might at places seem to be angry with women, but it really is not. It is angry only at the spirit of rebellion that has been stirred up by the feminists, which is frustrating *our love for women.*

*We* should be teaching *them*, not the other way round – but because the feminists are busy brainwashing women in general, that they are the ones who should be teaching men, and because so many men have been traumatised by inadequate upbringings without fathers present to help them to grow up, and thus have remained emotionally immature, their illusion seems to be true.

But when women meet a mature man who is their superior, they see him as some kind of a monster who is an aberration to the male sex, they get very afraid that he doesn't roll over and let them tickle his tummy just like all the other men and dogs do, and tragically for both parties *they frequently reject him.*

That is to say, the aforementioned *Irma Kurtz of Cosmopolitan* also stated in her autobiography:

*What a woman is really looking for, is a man to reform.*

This starts out with the assumption that the female is the superior sex, and that man is an immature creature whom she has to mother and tame and civilise.

This illusion has become to a large extent true, because women – especially when no father is around – by failing to provide correct discipline, make boys into irresponsible woman-hungry and confused creatures, who in adult life, are hypnotically attracted to the same kind of dominant woman to whom they then impetuously submit, at least for a while.

Shall we put it simpler.

Boys are deliberately raised by women in a spoiling manner, which ensures that they never grow to be real men. Then women complain that all men are boys, and so Irma Kurtz comes along telling them, that is how men are, and they should be looking for one to reform.

But then there are the relatively small number of men who have actually been raised by a *truly* caring and understanding mother, who did not traumatise them, and teaches them in such a way that they will grow to be *independent*, and not forever *dependent* and attached to her apron strings, and when the vast majority of women meet such a man who can stand on his own two feet, and doesn't need to cry to his "mama", they think he is a madman, or a monster, and reject him.

That is, they reject the civilised and decent men, and accept the immature whom they can mother and manipulate, with whom they can carry on perpetuating *Irma Kurtz's* slogan - *men are immature, and we women should in our kindness find one to teach and reform.*

And let us answer *Irma Kurtz's* problem, which she did not clearly understand.

What she is actually describing, when she talks of - *they are both in love with him* - is the "status mismatch" situation.

That is, if a woman picks a man who is "out of her league" she may just flatter his ego, but because he knows he can do better, her feelings will not be returned.

He may well find her attractive, and use this as an opportunity for a conquest, to satisfy his ego and sex desire, but he will not *love her*, as he will do the woman *he* desires.

Thus, we can legitimately say in that situation, *Irma Kurtz* is right, he is in love with himself, and so is she.

Of course, a decent man in that situation, should not take advantage or feel high on the admiration he is receiving.

But this can equally work the other way round.

Suppose a man sets his sights on a woman who is really by objective standards "out of *his* league."

Then *she* gets high, he may be below her mentally or morally, but she may still love the attention and flattery, and so though she does not love him as she would love the man of her dreams, that then becomes a means of *her* getting ego gratification, and then it would be equally legitimate to say – *they are both in love with her*.

So the sensible thing here is obviously for some third party or “matchmaker” to bring together *only* parties who it is checked out behind the scenes are *serious about each other*, i.e. mutually interested, able to as far as possible satisfy each other's dream.

Then they are *in love with each other*, and *Irma Kurtz's* slogan does not apply.

But in the absence of such a scenario, as we have already seen, many millions of women will out of the vanity of being admired by someone beneath them in attributes, accept them anyway, also under the other part of *Irma Kurtz's* feminist theory of women believing that it is their job to find an inferior man to mother and reform.

The trouble then, as already explained also, is that they find out in horror that this inferior being they have mated with, they are unable to change, and after the sexual thrill is gone, and he proves himself maybe unfaithful, or abuses her or her children, or fails to satisfy her on other levels, it is all too late.

She has this man's child, but she doesn't accept what she later discovers to be his brutal insensitive nature around her or her child, and then comes divorce.

So millions of relatively mature, self-possessed men are rejected on this basis, in favour of the immature men whom women can at least initially understand and manipulate, but generally speaking later come unstuck with.

But to the mature, self-possessed men, these same women are like the “young pretender” in *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon*, who steals male hero *Li Mu Bai's* sword, *the Green Destiny*, and when he takes it back from her, and shows his superiority, in reply to his offer to teach her, she rebelliously and arrogantly says “*keep your lessons to yourself*” and runs away.

So many decent, wise men are rejected, and one sickening consequence of this situation, is that because many women cannot find a man, by having rejected men they should have accepted, or because they marry someone infertile, they are resorting to using sperm donor banks to have children by artificial insemination.

And because there are so many millions of unmarried or childless men, many of them short of money also, a surprising number are taking this route of donating their sperm.

The movie *Made in America*, with *Ted Danson* as a sperm donor, who accidentally becomes the father of a half-caste girl who turns up one day, is a comic exploration of this theme, which in real life is typically rather less funny.

But this is absolutely a feminist's dream – to be able to have a child of her own completely without the nuisance of having to submit to, have sex with, or even talk to a man!

For the same reason, an unknown number of lesbian women are going down this route, and are attempting to impose a lesbian relationship – i.e. two lesbian women parents – on a girl or boy child.

No judgement is made here upon gay relationships of either sex, except that if two lesbians want to have a child, they should surely at least have the consent of the donor that this fate of what is fifty-percent *his child*, is acceptable to him?

And further, we might ask such a couple – if they think they are adequate to bring up a male child without a man, do they also think that two gay men are adequate to bring up a young girl?

Ah - *but men can't have children, you see* - they might say. Oh really – well suppose they use *a surrogate mother*?

But in the general case, we put it to men that they should never willingly participate in the anonymous donation of their sperm in any case, and *especially* not for such a paltry and pathetic sum of money.

We suggest as Sufi philosopher *Hazrat Inayat Khan* said:

*a man's seed is his most precious possession in the entire world*

Because let us look what when a man donates his sperm, he is really doing. The process itself is shameful enough, in that some likely smirking woman hands him a sample bottle, and tells him where to find a “girlie magazine” and go behind a screen.

Let us compare this method of creating a baby – *that's what the man is doing after all* – with the dignity and respect that is accorded to a newly married man who glows proudly beside his beautiful bride, in her white wedding dress, surrounded by admiring relatives and friends.

And then, he gets to have *sex* as well, with the beautiful mother of the child, which we imagine is rather more satisfying than sitting in a stuffy office, looking at some shameless tart pleasuring himself, while the self-righteous, mildly amused – *here's another pathetic mug* - lady in the white coat at the desk waits impatiently for him to “finish.”

Perhaps when he gets to the desk with his sample bottle, she will even complain he has not done enough, and ask him to go back and “do some more.”

And why is this man in this humiliating situation in the first place?

Because the feminist society has fixed things so he can't get a wife.



The previous chapter on *courting a woman* depends upon being able to “make the connection” with a woman we want.

But now there is no proper system of introduction such as *properly* arranged marriages – which means a *match* is made, rather than a *mismatch*, as described above – we are in a serious dilemma.

This is of course a problem for women too, and equally, there are millions of decent *single* women who cannot get a man.

But in practise, we find that unless we are lucky enough to meet a woman through friends or work, where no further introduction is then necessary, if it is the lady in the bar, or the street, or behind the counter in the bank we wish to court, we have a serious problem on our hands.

She already has her circle of friends, we don't know her family, and we are not slimy enough to try to sneak our way in.

After all, there is something unmanly and shady about pretending to be interested in people whom we are not – her family, colleagues or friends – so we can get access to her, which kind of behaviour is only justifiable to an honest and self-respecting man if he were a spy in wartime on a secret mission, pretending to be someone he is not.

Long experience shows that sooner or later, since she is desirable to us, we find there is some man in her circle, who wants her himself, *regardless of whether she wants him*.

And then, as an outsider, if we make our interest known, we become a target for insult, vengeance and hate.

Because most women are very vain and insecure, they are quite happy for men to fight over them, even though it is very far from being civilised. A thousand movies explore this theme, and really, the superhero like *Spiderman* who can knock seven bells out of the bully without breaking sweat is popular primarily for this reason.

All those of a certain age will recall the *Charles Atlas* adverts which offered us a training program to build muscles, so we didn't stay as the “seven stone weakling” ashamed to wear swimming trunks on the beach, who gets sand kicked in his face by the muscular bully, while the passing girls laugh and deride him.

So we have to look at this issue *without humour*, because it is ruining our lives, and though they have been mostly too dumb to figure it out so far, it is ruining women's lives too and those of their children.

Put simply, because women find out too late that the guy with the muscles, unlike *Peter Parker*, is unlikely to have the *brains* to go with them.

We have to observe, that in the movie, *Mary Jane* loves Peter Parker, even before she knows he is *Spiderman*, because he makes the effort to understand and care for her *without using or molesting her* that no man in her life ever did before.

Women need to understand the difference between *weakness* and *strength*, and it is not in a highly organised society, mainly about muscles, but strength of *spirit*, power of *understanding*, and of *mind*.

Hitler was of small stature, as was Napoleon, as was Mahatma Gandhi, as likely even were some of the scientists who made the nuclear bomb. None of these leaders or masters of their science attained to their positions of incredible power by fist fighting and having big muscles or even showing great skill with a sword.

The beings who got to the top by those kind of skills, like *Al Capone* or *Attila the Hun*, or *Genghis Khan*, come from either a savage era of past history, or a gangster world, which unfortunately still exists in the present one.

Women have got to decide what kind of society they want. Do they want a *civilised society* which is safe and secure for them and their children, or do they want a savage gangster-like society, in which it is safe for *nobody*.

Unfortunately gangsters themselves never learn this, and as happened to Al Capone, they sooner or later come to a sticky, and frequently premature end. As the saying goes – *those who live by the sword, die by the sword* - and it is surely true.

So let us look at what is really happening here – civilised men who are attempting to court women are threatened with violence by uncivilised men. And then the civilised man backs down, the *real Peter Parker*, who never gets bitten by a spider and never develops superpowers, and then in *real life*, the bully wins.

So do you ladies see what you are doing by allowing this to carry on?

You are encouraging and accepting violent men, who produce violent children, and then later, when they turn their violence against *you* – which too late, you discover they *can* – you have to either submit in terror, or run away and hide from them, or have them thrown out of the home by the police.

Then you live in fear that they will turn up someday, or even though you have barred them by a court order, that they will hunt you down and take revenge,

And even if you are safe from him, you are still left alone to fend for yourself unsupported, with an out-of-control and problem child, which when it gets to its teens, will likely turn on you just like its father.

If women want a peaceful and civilised society they must discourage *from the very first moment of their appearance in their lives* the bullying and violent types of men.

Let them find someone else on their own gutter level, and leave you safe and unharmed.

And collectively, women must start rejecting violent men *en masse*, rather than worshipping them, as is happening now.

Is this fiction?

We have just said – *women worship violent men*.

Where is the proof?

It is everywhere. The most watched drama in the UK, is *Eastenders*, which is really a watered-down gangster saga, set in the East End of London, supposedly depicting everyday life.

Up to fifty-percent of the adult UK population has watched this deeply destructive program regularly, which has been shown almost every day of the week for the past twenty years or more.

Such a well organised *mass hypnosis* program has perhaps never been conducted before in history, or does anyone still really believe that people are not being influenced by what they see on TV?

Not influenced you say?

It is well known now that a sizeable percentage of the population, not only are influenced, but they actually *believe that the characters are real!*

Not rarely, the actors in these dramas have been shouted at in the streets for some act they have done onscreen. It's incredible, but true.

The human brain is programmed to believe in what it sees – that is the fact, and therefore it is not really safe to show such things on TV which may be interpreted as real, by at least some of the population.

And of course, the advertisers don't believe that TV influences anyone either, which is why they put annually countless billions of pounds and dollars into putting their message onscreen, so that no one will take a blind bit of notice, *of course*.

Does anyone really need to read *Vance Packard's* epoch describing work, *The Hidden Persuaders*, to have confirmed this power of advertising and hypnosis, which is staring us all in the face?

So it is clear that this particular TV show's regular depiction of bullying, violent and criminal behaviour is influencing millions into the same kinds of behaviours which they might not otherwise do, were they given a moral and caring example of family and community life instead, something perhaps like *the Waltons*, or preferably the more manly and believable behaviour of *Caine* in *Kung Fu*.

Would any of us really like to live inside such a society as we see onscreen in these low life and gangster sagas? Or as an inmate in *Prisoner Cell Block H*?

Of course not – it is *horror*.

It is not healthy, but this naturally hypnotic fascination with violence, horror, and fear, which is used by the entertainment industry to get our attention and money, must cease.

Because do we not see what is happening?

On the one hand the entertainment industry is hypnotising us all into accepting a violent, near gangster society, in which justice is the exception rather than the rule, and *nice guys finish last*; and then on the other hand it offers to console us the superhero movies and magazines, which give us *the illusion* that we can be like *Spiderman* and *Superman* too, and defeat the bad guy, and get the girl.

But the superhero is not real – we live as powerless in a world, in which the gangster is the only person who gets what he wants, and the bully always wins.

So can we change this? Can we go down to the gym, and learn to do martial arts like *Bruce Lee* and defeat the bullies that way?

Well perhaps some of us can, but probably most of us cannot, because we, the more intelligent people in society, are not violent by nature, and do not generally have the physique of the typical bullying Neanderthal type man, who still abounds in our “civilised society.”

So women have got to see where this is going, or as we have explained, *nobody* will be safe.

Al Capone is in reality just waiting for the day when one of his younger, fitter gangster rivals comes and *puts his lights out for good*, and if you want to be a female gangster or moll of one, you will be awaiting the same. *There's no security in it*.

Psychopathic gangster, *James Cagney*, in *White Heat* goes to prison, and while he's inside, *Ma gets it in the back or belly* from one of his jealous gang members, “on the make”, who wants to take over his operation.

This point cannot be emphasized too deeply, because it is clear this worship and fascination with the gangster culture is pandemic – for example, in poll after poll, *the Godfather*, is always voted “best” film, and the perennial gangster actor, *Al Pacino*, the best actor.

And these polls are voted for mostly by *millions of women*.

In the UK, year after year, the “sexiest” man title, goes to whoever is currently playing the nastiest, meanest, most deceitful of gangsters on TV.

So we see clearly – *the great mass of women are addicted to and admiring of violent, ruthless men.*

Why is it that the sociologists and psychologists *never* raise this issue, which surely is glaringly obvious, and staring them in the face?

One suggests, because they are in denial of this *reality* – *women admire and respect violent men and disrespect the law abiding and civilised ones.*

So what can we law abiding and decent men do about this?

If we can't get those muscles down the gym, or that martial arts *expertise* – half measures won't do – we are going to have to be very clever in our pursuit of the female sex.

We should avoid all situations where we can be physically threatened, and not show weakness of any kind, which will only invite attack.

The answer is not to be aggressive, but to be quietly confident.

Remember as *Sun Tzu* said in his famous *Art of War* - *the greatest general wins the war without ever fighting a battle.*

All literate men should read the above mentioned book at least once, because there are women around who seem to be born knowing instinctively everything that *Sun Tzu* ever wrote, and *using it* in their efforts to dominate a man.

A woman may look weak, but she has friends, she has relatives, she has the power to make false accusations to the police, so we had better realise this is a war we are in, *if we want to master her* you see, rather than being her little boy and slave.

For example, many women may try to tempt us into fighting over them with other men, and we should resist any such attempt at manipulation.

We should attempt to meet women *only* in civilised environments, such as night classes, religious or spiritual functions, or other *organised* social events, in which we are secure as being a member of the group.

Women behave differently in groups – the point to understand here is, because they are concerned about how others perceive them, in groups *they behave.*

Whereas if we accost a woman in bar or even worse, a night club, we are entering a game whose rules we cannot know, and the opponents in, we cannot easily estimate.

We must be aware, that even though we may manage to get acquainted with her in a safe way, she may later try to draw us into more dangerous situations, where we could be compromised, in her efforts to get *the upper hand.*

For example, suppose she says – *oh, I have an old boyfriend, you might like to meet, you don't mind if he joins us do you? He's really a nice man.*

We have got no idea whatsoever what this man is like, but as her “old flame” the odds are he is going to be hostile, so we say –

*If you want to see an old boyfriend, see him. But not with ME. Who is it that you want to be with – him or me? Make your choice.*

And if she doesn't accept that, *we walk away.*

A man must always be prepared – *before marriage* – to walk away from a woman who is trying to abuse him, because if he doesn't teach her this before they marry, she is going to carry on and do even worse afterwards.

She might be more cunning – we are delighted when she invites us round and we think she is alone, *but he is there*, and she has done it quite deliberately.

We then say – *I'm sorry, I didn't realise you had company. I will come back another day.*

She then says – *don't be so silly, you'll like George, or Charles, or Guy, or Zebedee* or whoever else the hell she has conjured up.

We then say – *if I want to see George, I'll see George, but you had led me to believe we were going to be alone, and now you're not, that's not what we agreed, and not what I want. No offence intended to you or George, but I must go. Goodbye.*

Why? Because it is a liberty. She has invited us to what we believed would be a beautiful intimate meeting with her, and then she has put “a dog in the manger” to sabotage our plans and make us feel insecure.

But remember always – *patience.*

She is trying us out, to see what she can get away with and what she can't.

So this is the time for us to teach her that, or else we will *live to regret it* and if we stay with her on those terms, we will be forced to live with this sort of humiliating treatment *for the rest of our lives.*

But we must not resort to shouting at her, or worse, beating her, because that's not the action of a dignified and self-controlled, civilised and secure man.

So our only real weapon is *the veto.*

Secure in the knowledge that she really wants *us*, we have to be able to say *no* to her, we have to prove that though we care, we will not be emotionally blackmailed, we will not be humiliated and abused just because we care for her and she knows it.

If we want to someday live with her, we have to prove to her that we can definitely *live without her*.

Otherwise, we will end up sooner or later as her abused and bullied slave, which we will then either have to accept, or divorce and end up alone in some either cheap or not so cheap flat or apartment someplace, leaving her likely with our children and home.

And to return to our theme of sperm donation, the legality of this, except in cases of genuine infertility, is surely an abuse of man and a crime, robbing him of his precious seed for a mere pittance.

The authorities who allow this may say “nobody is forcing him”, but actually, many men are so desperate for even a small amount of money – for example *gambling addicts* – that they imagine the few pounds or dollars they get is a good deal.

But no.

It's stealing his most precious possession – *his seed* – so some woman he will never know can have a baby – and he doesn't even get the pleasure of her body for having sex.

A man does something absolutely wonderful, gives perhaps the greatest gift he could give to a woman – allowing her to have a baby – and he gets a few dollars.

As *Hannibal Heyes* from *Alias Smith and Jones* might say – “you call *that* a good deal?”

If men had any dignity and respect in society, if they really wanted to donate their seed for money, surely they should be selling it to the highest bidder on *Ebay*?

If a man has an IQ of 145, can run a hundred metres in 10.2 seconds, and is an astrophysicist or something, how much shall we start the bidding at, so a woman who is too selfish and disrespectful to have sex with him and love him can have a brilliant and athletic child?

One million dollars maybe?

Let women fight *over him*.

But let's look at this another way. If we *as a man* fathered a child, would we abandon it to an orphanage or leave it in a carrier bag somewhere for some other person to find?

That person who finds it might be a monster, and sell it into slavery, or abuse or torture it, murder it, or otherwise destroy its life.

So how can we do that *please*? How can we give a baby – that is what we are doing! – to some woman we don't know anything about whatsoever.

We could be selling *our child* into a life of misery, slavery and abuse – and for only ten dollars or pounds or whatever the current “going rate” is.

Surely, this is not a civilised way to deal with the problem of the infertile husband, or the woman who has or wants no man, and wishes for a child.

If a woman wants a child by a man, she should be obliged to meet him. Even her *commonsense* should demand that she does that, because who in their right mind would want to have a child that might be ugly, because its father was ugly too, but never met him, so she didn't see?

If a number of men were happy to solve the problem of the childless woman, there could be a database of men created, who would meet the woman and then give that *permission* for his seed to be used in that way.

And would it be really too much to ask that she has sex with him – when he is giving up the greatest thing he owns, and is giving her the most important thing in her life?

Why humiliate him with a sample bottle and a pornography magazine for such a kind action, which surely would be cheapened by *any amount of money* exchanged, or *are babies really for sale?*

And it may also be that, though modern science does not know yet, there may be definite advantages to conceiving a child by the natural method, rather than with a test tube, which will only come to light in future research.

Again, kundalini expert, *Gopi Krishna*, alleges this to be the case, based on his understanding of energies in the body.

Next, let us turn our attention to one of the worst crimes against men, which is the fate of male prisoners.

Such movies as *The Shawshank Redemption* and *the Green Mile* demonstrate the long existing culture of cruelty and bullying in prisons that is apparently still very much alive.

It is seemingly not enough, that for example, a murderer is denied his freedom and ever having a woman again for the rest of his life – a very severe punishment indeed if you think about it, for any heterosexual man.

But not only is a man – who may even not have committed any violent crime, or even be guilty of what he has been convicted for – subjected to loss of freedom and banishment from the society of women, he is liable to be bullied, beaten, gang raped or even murdered.

This is especially true, in that a convicted murderer who will never be released, really has *carte-blanche* to commit any crime he can *inside the prison*, as society has no further means to punish him whatever he does, except in those countries where the death penalty is still allowed.



Such a man however, need not be *murdered* by society, but should merely be placed in such a secure location, so that he cannot perpetrate such acts on his fellow prisoners.

Why is it that all society turns a blind eye to this? And of course there are *some* such abuses in women's prisons too, we must be fair, as the fiction of *Prisoner Cell Block H* indicates, together with the real life cases.

Modern prisons are the most secure environments ever created, or could easily be made so, where they currently are not. There is absolutely *no excuse* for these kinds of mischief and abuse to go on.

If we have really troublesome and violent prisoners, we simply put them in a single person cell, but *not* with some weak and relatively innocent man, who may only be inside because he swindled a few thousand on a charity fraud or something.

Similarly, in their desperation, or simply due to natural inclination, many male prisoners turn to some kind of homosexual practice.

Well, surely, to protect the rest, all that needs to be done is give them their own wing, and keep them away from the heterosexual men?

Why not simply *ask* them if they have these tendencies when they are first admitted to prison, and if so, segregate them to protect the rest, or do we really have a right as a society to have men beaten and gang raped as well as imprisoned?

And so why do these obvious simple precautions, to prevent savage acts beyond any legally authorised punishment being inflicted on them whilst serving their prison term, not happen?

We put it to you, that this is a feminist controlled society, and those women in charge of it *do not care*, and in fact, worse, even secretly delight in the fact they know this kind of abuse regularly goes on.

The kind of thinking goes like – *women get raped by men, let's see how they like it for a change.*

But even the ordinary non-extremist women don't seem to care. They care about cervical cancer, but this abuse of men they do not care about.

Thousands of women in the UK in the late 1970s protested outside Greenham Common in England when American cruise missiles were placed there, and lo and behold, they were removed!

Why did they protest?

Because for once, they realised, that should a war come, it was not just going to be *men* who got maimed, traumatised, tortured and slaughtered any more - *the chickens were coming home to roost* - it was going to be *them, and their children* who would burn and die.

So about that they protested in their thousands, about *that*, they cared - but not about this unending abuse of men.

Then finally, there is the other consequence of millions of men being denied a sex partner by being bullied or cheated out of the possibility of marrying – the unprecedented rise in pornography and prostitution, which is not only degrading to women, but also to men.

Any *decent* man who is caught using pornography is embarrassed, or even if he isn't, if he was discovered doing it by his mother, sister or his wife, or work colleague that would certainly bring scorn and disapproval, generally speaking.

And the tragedy is also that thousands of decent women are being lured into this, due to financial necessity in some cases, and again, it appears the prevailing feminist controlled authorities do not care.

Which means what exactly?

They do not care about our forty-something mother if she is forced to become an “escort” and get raped and beaten by some sadistic “client”, because she got herself into tens or thousands of pounds or dollars of debt, as is so easy to do these days, with all the credit cards that are handed out to women to buy things they don't need but are hypnotised into the insecurity of believing they do.

The wickedness of this, is that getting women into debt – which is happening everywhere, is the classic means to compromise them – the classic excuse for the wicked landlord to chase the damsel round the table, is that she cannot pay her rent.

So this trend is likely to get worse, as thousands of desperate women in debt are discovering the only way they can cope and get fast money in adequate quantities is by selling their body in one form or another.

Maybe our sister or girlfriend or even daughter has been struggling to support herself through college, due to government funding cuts of higher education, as happened recently in the UK, and decides in desperation to do similar, or take off her clothes for some magazine or sex video.

A recent TV drama showed a wealthy middle-aged businessman who booked a twenty-one year old escort girl, whom when he arrived at the meeting place, he found out to be *his own daughter*.

Surely the same has already happened some place in real life?

Well, if it isn't our daughter, it is someone else's, so please let us all think about that.

But it's easy to try and blame everything on government, and pass all of the responsibility for what's going on to them, even if it is mostly true.

Yet no one talks about these issues in politics, even in the UK, where there are well over one hundred and twenty women MPs in parliament. When such issues are ever raised, it's always in the context of blaming and demonising men.

Nobody ever says - *has anyone considered that cutting student grants is causing some young girls to become part-time prostitutes or pornography models?*

Or that handing out credit cards like confetti to shopaholic women, is causing them to be forced to do the same? These proud feminist influenced women MPs obviously do not care, and so the only question remaining is, *do we?*

Surely it is the duty of every decent man to avoid the use of women in the sex industry in any form, so that women and girls may cease to enter these degrading activities due to *lack of demand*.

Should we men be willing to do this, we would certainly regain respect from women for such a heroic act of restraint.

And then perhaps in their restored respect and admiration of us, women would be willing to give us a *real sex life*, which when given in genuine love and desire by them, would be far more satisfying than anything that the exploitative and degrading sex industry can ever offer us, not least because it would then include us retaining our dignity as real men, and therefore our *self-respect*.

## **Chapter Twenty-one – Luck be a *lady* tonight – saving the male gambling addict**

While the title of this book indicates that it is on the subject of men's relationships with women, for a sizeable proportion of men, gambling is destroying those relationships, and is many times resorted to as a pastime in the absence of a proper relationship with a wife and children.

It is also a common weakness in many men, which could destroy any existing relationship they have, and for this reason, this chapter is included.

Male macho hero and Hollywood actor, *Marlon Brando*, frightens us in the 1950s musical *Guys and Dolls*, as a man who is willing to bet on anything, and is tricked into making a bet with an unscrupulous craps game operator played by *Frank Sinatra*, that he can seduce a virginal mission girl, played by *Spartacus* heroine *Jean Simmons*.

But his plan goes sour, because he “falls in love” with her, and to impress her, he ends up betting against a whole pack of gamblers and gangsters, who he will either have to pay off handsomely if he loses, or should he win, will be obliged to pretend to be sinners wanting to be saved, to prevent *Jean Simmons'* mission from being closed down.

As he rolls the dice, which may determine the fate of the rest of his life, he prays to “lady luck” and sings:

*luck be a lady tonight*

The plot of this movie shows how crazy life can become when gambling becomes central to it, and we find the fate of the relationships of the two central male characters depend entirely upon the roll of a dice.

In the movie, *Sinatra* has been engaged for fourteen-years, but he never has any money, as he loses it all in his gambling exploits, and whilst *Simmons* and *Brando* are on a date out of town, he uses *Simmons'* mission hall to run his craps game.

The movie of course ends with *Simmons'* and *Brando's* characters getting married, but here, we submit, *reality ends*.

The most telling part of the movie, is that the two cheated and insulted women, who both seek marriage to their respective gambler men, have a discussion together, and decide that they should just marry their men despite their gambling problems, and worry about changing them *afterwards*.

As has been pointed out earlier, this is the typical deluded mindset of the woman who imagines she can change a man who has gone wrong, and any woman who has spent enough of her time or perhaps tragically even her whole life on a gambler, eventually find this out.

Other examples of men being destroyed by gambling abound in popular culture, and in the classic *Gregory Peck* movie, *The Great Sinner*, based on a short story by *Dostoevsky*, we see how the unholy power of gambling can captivate and destroy even an intelligent, civilised man, who in the movie is shown alternately contemplating murder and suicide, when as inevitably happens to all gamblers, his luck goes down.

Again, we find that the war which is at the conclusion of the Indian epic *Mahabharata*, was originally caused by the loss of a kingdom *in a dice game*.

In this story, the ancient Indian *King Yudhistira* is tricked into the game, and cheated when he plays it, and not only does he lose his kingdom, but his own sons are also lost into slavery, and finally he loses even his wife, who is stripped naked in front of the court for the pleasure of the victor.

That is to say, not only does he lose his kingdom, and his sons, but he also loses every last iota of pride and self-respect, when he had at the start of the game between a revered king of a kingdom, with a wife and family who respected and adored him.

That is how deep this awful addiction goes – that it can destroy a man's whole life and self-respect utterly, and cause even a war.

True statistics on this addiction are hard to find, because the number of so called "problem gamblers" who actually sign up with *Gamblers Anonymous* or some other "support group", are only the tip of an iceberg that goes millions deep.

That is, for example – a working man who earns five hundred pounds or dollars a week and spends half of it gambling, will not come into this category of statistic, as despite the fact he is labouring mainly just to support his gambling habit, he can still live autonomously and make ends meet, *but not support a family, one suggests*.

So the truth is only really to be found by ignoring official statistics and keeping our eyes and ears alert to what is going on around us *in the real world*.

For example, every town in England has huge numbers of licensed betting shops, and if we keep an eye on our local environment we will see that typically the number of casinos, amusement arcades and bingo halls is increasing rather than decreasing, as is the number of "one armed bandits" or "fruit machines" in the bars and clubs.

Then there are the "national lotteries" in every Western country, offering fabulous prizes we could not even earn personally in several lifetimes, the highly addictive "scratch cards", the TV phone-in shows, where thousands or millions of viewers are lured into making expensive phone calls, in an effort to win some prize, such as a car or holiday, they could not otherwise easily afford, and to top it all, we now have the most pernicious form of gambling ever invented – *online gambling* on the Internet, in online casinos and betting shops.

That is to say, a man with a drink problem, could come home from a night out at the bar, log on to his Internet gambling account, and with his credit card, whilst in a stupor, gamble away his entire savings, and wake up in the morning without a penny to his name.

So we might think that the feminist controlled government would take measures to prevent the spread of gambling, but on the contrary, including with the still relatively recent introduction of the national lottery in the UK, they seem to be encouraging its forever expanding tentacle-like reach, ever more.

For example, a few years back, the UK lottery company was given permission to hold two draws a week rather than the original one, betting tax on horse bets has been abolished so as to make it appear the “punter” can win more, and there are plans afoot to make Lancashire town, Blackpool, which has been for generations a tame, traditional British seaside town, into a casino complex – a kind of miniature British version of *Las Vegas*.

All this is being encouraged whilst millions of single parent women are getting inadequate maintenance payment and benefits to support their children, and many men are having their lives destroyed by gambling addiction, which might otherwise go to making such payments, or better supporting their children under voluntary means.

So clearly, any man who has a gambling problem cannot call himself a true and free man who could be possibly trusted by a decent woman, as his “hobby” is a threat to the financial security of any possible family situation.

Thus we see, that the spread of gambling addiction amongst men, actually supports the feminist agenda of their destruction and demonization, by keeping them out of having a respected role as father and husband in family life.

Like the aforementioned saturation of society with sexual images and signals to compromise and addict men, the ubiquitous opportunities to take part in gambling are placing a temptation before him, which for too many millions is too great, and again, is why such forms of behaviour have been completely stamped out in the diminishing Muslim controlled world.

It is this simple – the owner of a gambling house of any kind does not want his shop closed down – he wants the mugs to carry on losing forever and ever – and if a caring government does not act to stop temptations being presented to us everywhere, millions of mainly male gamblers will continue to be destroyed in this way.

The arguments being given in defence of allowing this destruction of men to continue are that the gambling industry creates jobs in “rundown areas”, and as adults we should all have the right to make an adult decision and have a *choice* as to whether to gamble.

Thus it seems we are sensible enough to make decisions regarding gambling, but not sensible enough to make decisions about smoking, which the government therefore is forced to intervene upon, and ban us from doing in so far as it can.

Gambling is perhaps the worst of all addictions, because unlike most other addictions there is absolutely *no limit* to the amount one can lose doing it, and it can thus comprehensively ruin one's whole personal security and life.

Unlike in a bar run by a sensible bar tender, no bookie or casino owner ever says to a gambler for his own good – “*that's it, son – go home now - you have had (lost) enough.*”

The gambling establishment is not in fact satisfied until we have lost every single penny or cent, and many gamblers who started out the day wealthy and dignified, have by the end of it lost everything they have spent their entire lives trying to build.

This situation can be facilitated and its awfulness compounded manifold when we mix alcohol into the equation, which obviously blurs a man's judgement.

That is, a man who is “merry with drink” may have a small bet – a “flutter” as they say – which if he were sober he would accept the loss of with little qualms.

But when under the influence of drink, he may become upset at his loss, and take the tragic step of *trying to win back his loss*, as does King Yudhistira, in the *Mahabharata* epic tale.

And then, in his inexperience of gambling, he may go into a vicious cycle of continually losing, and making progressively larger bets to try and cover his loss, which typically will result in him losing every penny he once owned.

Many men have lost huge sums in this way, had to sell asset after asset to pay their gambling bills and debts, and thereby destroyed their entire lives.

Thus no truly caring government would allow this situation to continue, and so we can only conclude that it is permitted to do so, as it is a problem mainly affecting and destroying *men*.

Why are there no women gambling addicts one might ask?

Well of course there are some, such as *Death Wish* director *Michael Winner's* mother for one, who virtually gambled her film director son's inheritance away.

But these few, tend to be such privileged kinds of women, who are likely gambling only their husband's money away in any case, having fallen in love with the ambience of the plush casino lifestyle, as in *Monte Carlo*, or some other rich people's “paradise.”

But few modern women, or those of any other age, have been interested in *serious high roller* gambling, because women seek security, and unlike the typically risk-oriented men, they rightly don't see any security in a situation whose outcome is by definition so uncertain and unpredictable.

Leaving the government's abdicated responsibility aside for the moment however, we put it to the male readers that the reason that men cannot solve their gambling addiction, is because this desperate act of "going for gold" and "trying to hit the big time" is a compensatory behaviour they are carrying out due to loss of manhood in the feminist society.

The male gambling addict is something of a *Princess Diana* in a male sense. That is, he seeks a life of glamour and respect and acceptance from "the crowd" which he fails to find in his normal occupation, or his relationships with his friends and family life.

Surprising to those who have never seriously gambled, is the information that this gambling obsession is rarely about *money*.

The vast majority of gambling addicts *know* that the pastime they have, is *never* going to make them rich, they *know* that they are always going to lose sooner or later, and a good number of them are able to earn a comfortable living already by other means.

Part of the reason gamblers cannot get away from their habit is because they are part of a culture, a lifestyle, which give them feelings of membership of a society – that is *an identity* – which they cannot otherwise obtain.

In short, they are *players*, significant members of a strange kind of elite, visible only to others who are in that same world, which appears to everyone outside of it as a totally illogical and destructive realm.

That is, to put it simply, there is a kind of respect for one another amongst gamblers as "brothers-in-arms", fighting against the common enemy – *the bookie, the house* – which is not otherwise available to them in their everyday life – it is therefore in a sense, a kind of rather costly and self-destructive "walk on part in the war."

Of course, there are strong physically addictive sensations and ritualistic behaviours which become part of the gambling addict's life, which make it even harder to give up, such as the release experienced on winning after the tension of watching their race or laying their bet, which in some cases could be so intense it could lead even to a heart attack.

This *excitement* is really the key to understanding the addiction, because like all other excitements it is *hypnotic*. We are driven back to "the scene of the crime" again and again, to get the same "release" and "relief."

Even *losing* is hypnotic. We become equally as addicted to the sensation of losing as winning – we are *emotionally* charged by the story of *the one that got away*.



The *if only*, the *what might have been*.

And really, this is the key to the gambler's whole life.

All addicts are such, because *there is something missing in their life* which has left a void which their addiction plugs.

There is no easy escape from gambling addiction, because it really is a problem of a person's whole identity.

The only way the gambling addict will ever be able to give up *permanently*, is by *finding an alternative way of life which satisfies him, gives his existence meaning*.

For example, most UK betting shops are only open during working hours and at weekends, and so a gambler who is too busy working for a living and taking care of his family duties will simply *not have time* to place those bets.

So the real truth is that because the feminist regime is denying men a truly meaningful role in society, by taking away suitable and secure employment, and their respect and acceptance by women as husbands and fathers in family life, they are driven to such escapes as gambling and drugs.

In short, men are searching for their male identity, and not finding it in society, but as *Pink Floyd* said in *Wish You Were Here*, finding only – *the same old fears, year after year* – they are driven to seek out a sense of meaning from these destructive pastimes, which thereby disempower and humiliate them even more, in the true sense.

One of the fascinating aspects of gambling and drug abuse, is that they are in fact also *escapes from women*, and disapproved by women as such.

The world of the betting shop is largely a male world, as is the “high roller” world of gamblers in general.

The *Cincinatti Kid* is a man.

There is no female *Cincinatti Kiddess*, to *Steven McQueen's* “card sharp”, just as there is no female equivalent to *Paul Newman's* pool shark, *The Hustler*, nor *Steve McQueen's* motorbike riding macho hero in *The Great Escape*, who is also a gambler of sorts, since he risks his life and limb in his daredevil *Evel Knievel* type antics.

These are male worlds, where men are trying to find their lost identity.

So as we cannot stop men trying to seek an identity, unless we offer them a better way of finding one, they are going to spend their whole lives carrying out destructive hobbies that try to *win* them their sense of maleness back.

Thus as we cannot stop men seeking their male identity, unless we give it back to them, we cannot stop them becoming gambling addicts, if that is the best they can do.

The effort of “support groups” like *Gambler's Anonymous* does not address this fundamental issue, which is *the loss of man's respected role and male identity in the feminist world*.

We see that every role Steve McQueen ever played was about *getting respect*.

In the *Cincinnati Kid*, he is a low life card sharp who has to escape through rear windows from thugs whom he has outsmarted, and want to take their losses back by force, just as in *the Hustler*, in which a similar bunch of thugs break *Fast Eddie's* thumbs after he “hustles them” using his superior pool playing skills..

But *the Kid* is on a quest for respectability, he wants to be *the Man*, the *Edward G Robinson* character, who lives a life of high class hotels, and no longer plays with hoodlums, but makes his living fleecing millionaires, who part willingly with their money, just for the *honour* of having played with him.

So can we see now what all these addictions are about? The *disempowered male* is simply trying to be *a man*.

But to be a real man, takes qualities of heart and mind and self-discipline and understanding, that generally – due to an insecure upbringing – he likely hasn't got.

Thus, the only way most men are going to escape from this addiction is if the governments act to put a stop to the opportunities for us all to become enticed into this evil and socially destructive habit.

A first step would be to ban advertising on gambling, just as has been done with cigarettes, so that the UK at least is no longer *Marlboro Country*.

Secondly, alcohol should be removed from every place of gambling, so that the punter at least has a sober mind with which perhaps to escape his downward descent into disaster, progressively making bigger and bigger bets, trying to win his money back, before it's too late.

Equally, gaming machines should be banned from all pubs, clubs or other licensed premises, so that those who would never otherwise seek out gambling deliberately, are not surreptitiously drawn into this addiction, whilst under the influence of drink.

The National Lotteries which abound in every Western country, including their highly addictive “scratch cards”, must be disbanded, as they are giving false hope to people, including many poor women who also play them at the expense of their children, and really they are largely a “stealth tax” on the poor, to fund things that should be paid for more honestly by direct taxation.

So these measures would really amount to a progressive ban on all forms of gambling, but let us be realistic and civilised about this, and give those who are engaged in the gambling industry the opportunity to move into other more *human friendly* forms of enterprise.

It would be in the interest of society to pay off those who own these gambling empires, or persuade them to reinvest in other more socially beneficial industries.

The governments who seemingly are so willing to interfere in every other area of our lives, but allow us freely to fall into such addictions, have to accept that in certain aspects of life, all those but saints, do not have the self-control to resist temptations beyond a certain level, and thus *we need protecting from ourselves*.

That is, if pornographic magazines were not available in newsagents shops, *men would not buy them*.

Likewise, if betting shops were not available on every high street, *men would not enter them*, and if casinos were not available in every town, *men would not join them*, believing they are buying into some kind of glamorous and sophisticated *James Bond* lifestyle, when all that will really happen to them, is they will be fleeced of their cash and have their relationships and futures destroyed.

There is an argument constantly used by feminist influenced governments which says – we cannot go banning things, *because that will only drive the problem underground*.

Whilst this may be true of abortions, which must sometimes be carried out legally to save women's lives, who would otherwise go down such a "backstreet" route, there is no similar "life and death" risk involved in the case of those who gamble or buy legalised pornography.

In Victorian times, there were "underground" problems with these things, but they were only *a minority pursuit*, not a mainstream pastime of *millions*, destructive to the society as a whole.

This argument is very much the same one as - *it's no good forbidding children or people from having things, they'll only want them the more*.

No, they will not!

Not if it's done *in the right way*.

If we do not place temptations before people, they will not have the opportunity to succumb.

If tomorrow morning, all women decided *never* to take their clothes off, for a theatre or movie performance, or a pornographic magazine, that would be the end of that!

There would be *nothing* men could do about it!

They would grumble and howl for a while, but then they would go back to being satisfied with “a well turned ankle”, which was all that in the Victorian era was allowed to be on display *in public*.

When a child howls for a candy bar it doesn't need and shouldn't have, we *must* let it howl till the cows come home, until it understands – as women like to say as a mantra about would-be rapists or boyfriends or husbands trying to force sex on them against their wishes – that *no means no*.

More than a decade ago in the UK, smoking was banned on buses, whereas it had previously been allowed on the top deck only, which was at that time a smoke-filled chamber of coughing, spluttering addicts, with a few poor non-smokers suffering in their midst.

Were these addicts unable to control themselves, forced to defy this ban, and desperately reach into their pockets for a cigarette?

No – the ban was almost one hundred percent effective, and smoking is now almost never seen on a British bus.

So the same should and *could* just as easily be done with gambling – *progressively* – using creative solutions.

For example, limits could be set upon the bets allowed in betting shops, which people could easily afford to lose.

Or card games and even casinos could be setup limited to equally small bets or using worthless *buttons* so that serious gamblers could be gradually encouraged to stop throwing away all their *real* money.

Or preferably, we could just persuade problem gamblers over time to take up a more worthwhile hobby – such as learning to *ride* a horse, rather than losing all their money on one, or learning to play the piano, or god knows what else.

If we make such destructive hobbies *as invisible and unglamorous* as possible, a few hardened addicts will still seek them out, but *the vast majority of ordinary people will not*.

If men are not constantly enticed by what they see walking into a newsagents shop, or on television by having images of naked women and sex acts thrust unwillingly in their face at any time of day or night, again, only a few hardened addicts will continue to seek pornography out, but *the millions will not*, just as they did not before the widespread mass production and distribution of pornography which started only in the 1960s, because *it simply wasn't there*.

Like in the movie *Pleasantville*, instead of expecting oral sex on a first date as modern men might do, encouraged by such mischievous dramatisations as those shown in *Sex in the City*, boys would again be thrilled with an innocent kiss on *lover's lane*, or preferably just even *the holding of hands*.

Those men aghast at such suggestions, who are used to regularly bedding any number of girls or women in the modern “permissive age”, should read this book thoroughly to see why that really is not a good idea, for the sake of their own health and sanity and prospects of ever having a family life.

They might consider that such a stable family life would include children and a wife who love them, and are therefore willing to take care of them in their helpless old age, rather than shoving them into a “care home” to be abused and tortured by strangers, who are resentfully forced to do such a job for the miserable pay they likely earn.

For that is the fate now of *millions of* men in the Western world once they hit their old age, which more and more of us are likely to achieve, as medical science finds more and more ways to prolong our life but *not to protect its quality*.

In the current society as it is however, the advice that can be given to anyone reading this book who has a gambling problem, is that like every other problem, the fundamental thing is to *be aware*.

For example, if our woman knows how to “push our buttons” to get us annoyed, and we are not *aware* that she is doing this deliberately, because *she knows how*, and she sees that *we don't know how* to resist, we cannot rise above it, we are forever a puppet under her power.

And if we do such things, we must remember that if we respond with the same *anger* which we do to losing a bet, that makes us come back for more. The anger is a hypnotic emotion, drawing us back forever to *the scene of the crime*.

If that happens, we must again, just become *aware* of our response, watching what is happening in our mind, as if we were watching the passing clouds in the sky – that is, *with detachment*.

Every conditioned response we become *aware* of in this way, we can eventually overcome.

The meditation technique at the end of this book explains this further, and those who are unsatisfied with even that admittedly brief explanation, should study some of the works of Krishnamurti, to better understand their own mind.

The other issue however, is that we have to address the whole state of society.

Young males growing up without the chance to establish a proper male identity – that is, *of dignified labour* and *respect as father and marital partner* – are never going to stop seeking that lost identity in these destructive ways.

So by neglect of jobs and rights for men, is set up the stage for their destruction as addicts of gambling and all other kinds.

As the addiction to gambling and drugs is at its root, both the same, we will deal with the "cure" or real solution to this problem simultaneously in the next chapter, to avoid undue repetition of the same principles over and over again.

But for the moment, let us affirm the sentiment of the desirability of deserting our gambling pursuits and addictions.

As *the Eagles* sang in their fine country and western ballad, *Desperado*:

*Don't you draw the queen of diamonds boy  
She'll beat you if she's able  
The queen of hearts is surely your best bet*

*Now it seems to me some fine things  
Have been laid upon your table  
But you only want the ones that you can't get*

*Desperado, why don't you come to your senses?*

## **Chapter Twenty-two – Drug abuse – a road not to heaven, but to hell**

Similarly to the last, this chapter is included, though not strictly speaking about women's psychology, is still such an enormous problem for society's men, and destructive to their relationships with women, that we feel some light must be thrown upon it.

*Timothy Leary* and others arguably have a lot to answer for. But as this ex-psychology professor, and basically decent and well-intentioned man, who turned to "prophet of LSD" is now dead, perhaps we should not be so cruel to his memory.

For like many others, he postulated the chemical road to enlightenment, also pursued by others, such as *some* of the followers of *Carlos Castaneda*, whose "journey" was somewhat explored in *Ken Russell's* movie, *Altered States*.

Please let us not argue about the details of *Castaneda's* philosophy, as that would be to miss the point, which is – *the use of drugs to get "enlightenment" and "higher states" of consciousness.*

What drugs definitely can do is help us get "high."

The current thesis however, does not wish to pursue *the morality* of using drugs, but *the biology*, in the light of Gopi Krishna's work on kundalini and the evolution of consciousness.

He explains that higher consciousness is a property of the brain, and can only be developed and maintained by slow, long-term transformation of the brain, in its subtler structures.

Anyone who wishes to understand this in detail should read his autobiography *Kundalini, the Evolutionary Energy in Man*, or some of his various other works.

That is to say – do we imagine that we can take a tablet to grow muscles and become like *Charles Atlas* or *Arnold Schwarzenegger*?

Of that if bitten by a genetically altered spider, we could like *Peter Parker* really wake up with a powerful physique we didn't possess the night before?

Though exciting fiction, this is obviously all nonsense biologically speaking.

A man must work out in the gym for weeks or months and eat appropriately to grow those muscles.

Likewise, a developing child's brain, which remember starts from the single cell fertilised in the reproductive act, takes months to grow in the womb, and then years to reach a level of maturity where it achieves adult intelligence.

So do we think that we could give a baby a table to give it the brain and understanding of an adult?

Equally, of course not.

Or again, do we think there is some drug or tablet which will instantly change the mind of an average person, into that of an *Einstein* or a *Beethoven*?

Since nobody as far as we know – except those who had the talent to begin with – has ever produced a great work of art or science under the influence of such drugs, clearly not.

But what we do get is people *believing* under the influence of drugs that they have *discovered the secret of the universe*.

One very intelligent investigator, who experimented with LSD, thought he had achieved this feat, and hurriedly and excitedly wrote down this “secret of the universe”, which he believed he had discovered on his drug “trip”, lest he forgot this supremely important information.

When he came back to his normal consciousness, he then re-read what he had written:

*Higamous hogamous, man is monogamous, hogamous higamous, woman is polygamous.*

Though there may be *some* kind of truth hidden in this perverse statement, we surely could not describe it as “the secret of the universe”, as it is hardly any more satisfactory as an answer than *Douglas Adams’* famous 42.

So it is clear that during such drug experience, what we get is *an impression of meaning*, but when we return to our “rational mind”, we find that the state is only productive of nonsense and delusion.

It only “expands” the mind in the sense that those under it, temporarily freed from the bounds of rationality can imagine all kinds of realities, which seem to hold wonderful significance to them, but when they sober up are found to be only *castles in the air*, which upon waking, turn to dust.

In dreams, after all, we can do *anything* – we can have sex with the greatest harem in the world, we can fly, and we can do any number of *impossible things before breakfast*, as *Lewis Carroll* put it.

So the drug, frees us from the prison of rationality, and allows us to go off into such fantasy realms, whilst because it destroys our rationality, we may find that it might take us all day to make a cup of tea or cross a road – a very dangerous task, whilst in such a condition, it is pointed out.



But what this experience is definitely *not*, is any kind of enlightenment, as experienced by Christ, Buddha or other prophets and saints, because such a genuine experience of *samadhi* or “cosmic consciousness” allegedly transforms them *permanently* as human beings, and they then go on like *Moses* or whomever to “set their people free” or produce a code of living which transforms society.

That is – let us look at *Christ*, a man born in a stable, two thousand years ago.

He has transformed the world, billions at least in theory follow or believe in him, and do we really think the same will be true of any of us on our LSD or mushroom trips?

So we get an *illusion* of enlightenment, and that we know what others do not, in that, for example we find that we can cause or observe colourful firework displays in our brains, just as we might see upon our television screen, if we were to perhaps pour treacle into its circuits so that it malfunctions.

But what we do not know is – *what it is doing to our brains*.

What Gopi Krishna's work in particular explains is that *our brains are very sensitive and delicate organs*.

Miniscule, almost microscopic amounts of drugs like LSD, can produce huge changes in consciousness.

Recent brain studies have also shown that a bang on the head causing very minor brain damage, can in some cases produce large changes in personality, as also is evident in the behaviour of awakening coma victims.

For example, one coma victim shown on a recent TV documentary, though previously a caring father, was sexually propositioning his own young daughter, unable to remember who she was. He generally was displaying a lack of emotional and moral control, and seemed fixated on sex in a way he was not previous to his accident.

So this clearly requires a lot of serious further research, but the message to readers here, is *let us not play with the biological and chemical constitution of our brain*, and imagine we are sure of the outcome, which might take even years or decades to show itself.

We cannot possibly know the consequences of such powerful drugs on our body and brain, because the brain is so little understood by science, and these drugs have not been around long enough in mass usage, for us to properly research their long term effects.

Philosopher and “guru”, J Krishnamurti, for example, alleges that such experimentation with drugs like LSD can cause genetic damage, which may only show up as deformities in our grandchildren, and a number of scientists have supported this theory of possible genetic damage caused by such drug use.

Most if not all of the rock stars who used to indulge in these various drug habits have now renounced them, including *Eric Clapton* and *Todd Rundgren*.

So if these drugs were a path to happiness or enlightenment, why did they stop?

Timothy Leary himself also renounced drugs in his later life, and took to working in artificial intelligence with IBM.

But the addictive power of drugs like heroin and crack cocaine is real, and the only way to deal with these things is *never to try them even once*.

Supposedly “safe” drugs like cannabis, are claimed not to be addictive, but if this is the case, why do so many users sit round in groups smoking them all day long looking at their big toe?

If anyone claims that cannabis is not addictive, let us see him or her try to give it up for six months, and see *if they can*. Then we will see *the truth*.

This is not to condemn those who are addicted to such drug use.

But it is to say that it is only felt necessary by them, due to other problems in their life, with which they are not able to deal properly.

A real life *Kwai Chang Caine* would never use drugs, as neither would a Mahatma Gandhi. He would consider it both an unnecessary distortion of his consciousness, with which he is already happy, and a weakness.

Do children need drugs?

Would we give LSD or cannabis or even alcohol to children?

Our answer would be *they don't need it*.

It is because as adults we have lost the brilliancy of our original consciousness, the clear functioning of our brains, and got buried in a rut of repressions, complexes, and relationship failures that we reach for these chemical crutches.

Clean living, adequate rest, and developing confidence in ourselves by become *truly* understanding and mature human beings would kick *all* these addictions into touch.

When we have lost *our self-respect*, we can never get it back by these means. If we got our self-respect back like Gandhi, or Kwai Chang Caine, we would not need or care for these expensive and likely brain damaging pursuits.

Have we not noticed for example, that many people under the influence of various of these drugs, have difficult getting their words out, and slur their speech?

How do we not know that some residue of this obviously temporary at least *brain damage* does not persist long after the experience of the drug has long gone?

We hear of “flashbacks”, that is – brief drug state episodes intervening long after the original dose – so how do we know what we may have done long term to our brain?

For example, let us recall the case of *Syd Barrett* of *Pink Floyd* fame, who after a lot of heavy drug abuse, had some kind of mental breakdown which required him to be hospitalized, and as far as one can see, has *never been the same again*.

We could argue that such highly strung and creative beings are likely to have such an episode anyway, without drugs, but that is hardly a safe bet, and it is the definite opinion of the author, that those who have higher powers of intelligence and creativity, above all others, should steer clear of those kind of drugs.

On this subject, we feel obliged to report that in the view of kundalini expert Gopi Krishna, the only safe recreational drug to use, and even then only *in moderation*, is alcohol, the simple chemical that actually occurs in Nature as a product of natural fermentation on fruit in certain situations, and apparently also *can even be manufactured by our own brains*.

Gopi Krishna's argument for this is also that it has been around for thousands of years, and has not damaged the *genetic* pool, which created for example the geniuses of the Renaissance, such as *Leonardo*, *Michelangelo* and the rest, despite widespread use at that time.

Whereas, on the other hand he said that based on hundreds or thousands of years of use of “hashish” in India, traditionally such drug users were never trusted or considered as reliable people, which is pretty much the view that a modern decent woman would take on this issue.

We know of many women who have also been sucked into these drug addictions, often along the slippery slope that begins with the not obviously harmful cannabis use, but have progressed to using the widely acknowledged as harder and more dangerous drugs such as heroin and cocaine.

For example again, some users of crack cocaine say a single dose can be like having “a thousand orgasms.”

So when men are almost universally addicted just to the sensation of *one*, who is it that could resist going back to that experience time and time again, *should they be crazy or unfortunate enough to try it even once?*

The broader issue, is that we have to realise as *Hazrat Inayat Khan* points out, that we are basing our lives on *the pursuit of sensation* instead of the pursuit of *harmony and peace*.

That is, we could sit quietly listening to one of *Bach's Brandenburg concertos* or fugues, or one of *Pink Floyd's* albums, and we could with our normal, undrugged brains drift of into a place of calm and wonderment.

Afterwards we could just switch it off and go and play with our children or have a conversation with our wife.

But if we feel we can't do that without a drug, firstly, we tend to risk neglecting children and wife, and likely also most of our other responsibilities, which if correctly carried out, make us feel right about ourselves as a man.

And secondly, if we use the drug, we generally have to go down some seedy back alley or bar to buy it, and though the man who sells us it seems like a nice guy, he knows someone who deals something harder, who is maybe not so nice, and carries a gun, and then some day when we are a little high, on top of the world, and think nothing can bother us, he says to us - as rock band *10cc* did in their song *Dreadlock Holiday* -

*would you like something harder?*

And then we are done, we are in the world of serious drugs, and the grip of an addiction we can maybe never put down again, or only after years of suffering which even rich and famous people such as rock guitarist, Eric Clapton, have undergone.

So the message to those who *desire* to break free from drug addictions is – we have got to start becoming an understanding person and facing up to the problems in our real life.

We have got to do as did the character played so brilliantly by *Bill Murray* in the movie *Groundhog Day*.

He had a thousand tomorrows without ageing to reform himself and grow to be a mature man, whose accomplishments and selfless humanity then eventually impressed the woman he loved.

But unfortunately for us, we only have a limited time, to learn to face *challenges*, develop understanding and *inner peace*, instead of hiding from life in a self-made prison of drug experiences, only getting ever more familiar with our big toe.

But the challenges we face, should be *those of our own choosing*, based on our own concept of being *a man*, and not those imposed upon us necessarily by women's materialistic demands, or those of the misguided society in general.

For example, the bossy woman in our life who looks down on us in our addiction, may say "go get that job shining shoes, or putting caps on toothpaste tubes in the factory."

But that might well be a humiliation of us, not commensurate with our roles as men.

We could study for a more dignified occupation or profession, or we could maybe learn to fix cars and run our own repair service, or trim hedges, lawns and cultivate gardens as self-employed; or a thousand and one other things that involve us becoming more free, and independent, and more masters of our own life and destiny.

Then that judgemental woman who scorns us would have to *show some respect*, or in fear that we are now *above her*, she might even run for the hills to find another pathetic mug to mother and enslave, leaving us to seek out *a real woman* instead.

But the goal is not for us to become a *Rockefeller*. It is only to carve out a little piece of territory of our own, no more than we need, but in which we can find some dignity and self-respect.

Whereas the drugs we take, which keep us forever enslaved to them, and to the likely judgmental women in our lives, who feel superior to us because of them, ensure we never become free, we never become real men.

So the solution suggested here in summary, is that no therapy or psychiatrist or support group can cure our addiction, as it is at root about our whole identity *as men*.

Only *we* can change our lives, and learn to rise above the barriers that imprison us, and push us always back to the drug.

In such an “escape to victory” we have to become deeply understanding people, as well as gaining some dignity and independence in the material sense.

Instead of becoming a member only of the society of drug users, why not seek to become rather a member of the society of brothers and heroes, who despite all being against them in this world, still aspire to become *real men*?

## **Chapter Twenty-three – Bullying – a game without frontiers, a war with real tears**

Here we are going to quote, not from some feminist inspired manifesto or so called “initiative” on “fighting bullying”, but the wisdom of ages as expressed in the famous *I Ching*, from hexagram 12, *P'i*, meaning *Standstill* or *Stagnation*.

*Heaven and earth are out of communion and all things are benumbed.  
What is above has no relation to what is below  
And darkness and confusion on earth prevail.*

*The dark power is within, the light power is without.  
Weakness is within, harshness is without  
Within are the superior, and without are the inferior.*

The present time, is suggested as that described in this hexagram. The *I Ching*, not an easy book to use or understand, and therefore to be viewed and employed *with care*, is based on the concept of “the inferior” and “the superior” man (or woman).

That is, the superior man has *his focus* on justice, unselfish love, truth and spiritual values, as in *Plato's Republic*. He or she is our *type 1* from chapter 19.

Whereas the *inferior man* has *his focus* on attaining worldly position, egotistical love and material values, and often that by dubious or *pragmatic* means, as in *Machiavelli's Prince*, and is the *type 2* man or woman from chapter 19.

So as we have already pointed out, if we put *the superior man* in charge of society, he brings world peace, whereas if we put the *inferior man* in charge, he brings the conflict and chaos, darkness and confusion mentioned above.

Which it is suggested is more or less what we have got now.

This chaos and confusion is visible in a thousand ways – the environmental pollution and rejection of recyclable technologies for financial reasons, wars which need not be fought if fair negotiations were carried out between nations to resolve disputes, the general physical and mental breakdown of society and family, and the consequent individual descent into addictions and escapes.

For example, security experts say that current British prime minister Tony Blair, will even when he steps down, likely never again be able to freely circulate in public as the majority of British citizens take for granted as their right.

By his actions, which have rightly or wrongly caused tens of thousands to die, including many of his own countrymen, he has built prison walls around himself, behind which he will forever have to hide, which it is suggested, no man in his right mind would really do.

Would any man in his right mind want to take responsibility for so many deaths?

Perhaps if he were to publicly apologise and confess his error, he would be forgiven and therefore safe from harm, but we see no signs of this happening, and in any case, we have to seriously ask ourselves – *would his wife let him?*

None of us knows how far this “war on terror” will go, But Mrs Blair too seems to be showing a certain lack of sense of reality, despite her alleged academic brilliance and high IQ, since as his wife, surely she too must be a potential target, of those who might feel justified in taking vengeance, whose own children or parents have died in this war he supported and sent British troops to.

The author of this work does not however support any such acts of violence or vengeance, which would tend to make those who ideologically oppose Mr Blair into fighting evil with evil in return, but seeks merely to point out, that our current leaders seem to be so far detached from reality, that they do not even properly consider the potential personal survival consequences for themselves.

The reason put before the reader, is that in a sense, our current leaders are not entirely to blame, because they have been placed in jobs which by nature they are unsuited to.

Most people in society are egotistical to a greater or lesser extent – that is not a condemnation of anybody, but *a fact of life*. The question is – *should we put principally self-seeking, egotistical people in charge of our nations and world?*

It is necessary to be very clear on this issue, because our current *party* politics is dominated by an argumentative mud slinging war, composed of claims and counter claims, which in the final analysis are really saying to one another - *you and your party are unfit to rule, whereas we are fit*.

For example, in the American religious-influenced sectors of society, accusations of infidelity and sexual adventuring will be sufficient to make candidates seen as unfit to stand for or hold office, and in modern Britain, proven allegations of child abuse would certainly do the same.

But the issues are rarely that clear, so a far more complex game of attacking the views, morals and alleged hypocrisy of the other side goes on unceasingly.

For example again, in the UK currently, any attacks on immigrants’ or womens’ rights are enough to put a man’s reputation as a credible leader down.

In particular, we see this constant tactic of discrediting *the person, rather than what the person says*, as a means to silence others, and ensure they are not believed.

Before you, we would wish to place one single piece of evidence, that demonstrates both the truth of this statement and the underlying mentality behind the current British regime.

In the early days of prime minister Tony Blair's rule, he was challenged by an adult male MP (that is, *a minister of parliament*, freely elected by his own local people) on some controversial issue, and though the MP was wholly within his rights to do so, Mr Blair made the following astounding reply to this adult democratically elected representative:

*If you are going to be naughty, we won't let you speak again.*

The great irony of this, is that now, some perhaps ten years later, he is talking about the concept of *respect*, when clearly the above quote, which would likely not have been believed by the author himself, had he not himself witnessed it personally on live television, is a shameful master-class in demonstrating the kind of disrespectful attitude that we see addressed to men in general in this feminist controlled society, but is doubly harrowing when we see it coming from a political leader of a nation to a fellow male adult *democratically elected* representative.

The latter point is emphasized deliberately, because what that really means is, that when Mr Blair silences and disrespects *our representative*, he is likewise silencing and disrespecting *us*.

So how did this man feel under such an insulting and inappropriate attack? He of course felt humiliated and *bullied*.

And that is why we have chosen to include this brief incident – apparently long forgotten by almost everyone – at the outset of the chapter on this topic.

The feminist led media talks about this issue of bullying as if it were just something that happened between immature children in schools, but clearly, the reality is that bullying is taking place downward through all levels of society, *right from the very top*.

But as usual, in the feminist “double-think” system, the *totality* of the problem is not addressed.

That is, “task forces” and “committees” are set up to tackle bullying in schools, or bullying in the workplace, but no task force is set up to address the problem of the bullying by the prime minister of the lesser democratically elected members of his party, and the bullying of us all by a government which acts consistently against the opinion polls, into having rules and regulations and political and social agendas imposed upon us, that we never asked for and would otherwise never accept.

For example, as we have already pointed out, instead of the sane solution of providing proper welfare benefits or caring husbands for lone female parents, millions of single women are now being bullied into trying to work, while their children are abused or neglected by child minders or in group nurseries.



And then we have examples of bullying behaviour such as in the gangster movies and TV shows constantly thrust in our face, which therefore appears really to be a hypnotic method of getting us to accept and respect these *uncivilised* behaviours, that is, to encourage us to accept these cruelties and injustices as a normal feature of our everyday life.

On a recent TV talk show, when a male panellist stated that some matter or other *wasn't fair*, a feministically inclined lady panellist replied to him sarcastically:

*Didn't your mother tell you John (or whomever), that life isn't fair?*

So we are in fact, encouraged to accept that society *is* unfair, and that to object and reject to this status quo is *immature*, and therefore in fact, to *accept* that the only way to gain respect, is *to become a bigger and better bully than everyone else*, just as the gangsters do.

And do we not see the same in international affairs?

The smaller nations have a limited voice on the United Nations voting system, and we see America using its superpower military status to bully Arab and Muslim nations in the Middle East, as do we see Israel bullying the Palestinian people with its also awesome military might, when all that is required is to fairly share out some mostly desolate strips of land in what is largely a desert environment, under the collective administration of a properly empowered United Nations.

So in fact, hardly an individual or country in the world believes in justice any more, but rather seeks to become yet another strong bully, which is why there is a never ending quest amongst the lesser nations to acquire weapons of mass destruction, as was allegedly at the basis of the Iraq war.

Thus, let us be clear – bullying is not something that just happens in the playground – it is a global problem which touches every part of our lives.

So then we might ask *what is bullying?*

And the answer is as the *Maharishi* put it - *when might is right, rather than when right is might.*

That is, ultimately *physical force* always will govern the world as a means of law enforcement, and only in a truly civilised society would its use mostly disappear.

So for the moment, the issue is merely:

Is “the force” with the side of *right*, or of *wrong*?

Which bring us back to the question of who should rule us? So the answer logically, can only be *the superior man*.

That is, the *idealist* who believes in truth and justice, rather than the *pragmatist*, who believes we should be happy with bread and circuses, whom we have got now.

So then the next question is

*How do we determine who is the superior man?*

According to kundalini author, *Gopi Krishna*, rulers in the ancient Indian truly civilised times, such as the original *Indus Valley* culture, were not allowed to have any personal possessions and were kept watch upon to ensure the sanctity of their habits.

He suggests that the current, if somewhat modified, media can fulfil that same function, of keeping an eye on government, if it functions in the right way, instead of just supporting the egos and agendas of the rich and powerful as often happens now.

But we have to look at the criteria upon which those with a voice should carry out their “guardianship” occupation.

That is – what qualities should they be looking for in worthy leaders, and condemning in unsuitable ones?

What they especially cannot allow is *the character assassination of good men and women* who would bring justice to society at large.

For example, though less effective now, the main way to destroy potential adversaries was by “digging the dirt” in some kind of sexual scandal, as was unsuccessfully tried out on current California governor, *Arnold Schwarzenegger*, whether or not we think he is a good man, and better than the governor before him.

But as sexual infidelity and a little colourful riotous living in a man's former life, is no longer a reliable way to destroy him, the goal posts have moved on to something more sinister – allegations of drug or child abuse or any kind of paedophilic tendencies, which are enough to knock *any man* down.

Let us focus on the accusations of paedophilia in particular, by which such mostly decent people as *Pete Townshend* of the rock band, *The Who*, have been criminalised, and likewise, the likely good-hearted, though a little eccentric, *Michael Jackson* was nearly done the same to.

What is the truth about this totally obsessional preoccupation in our society?

Firstly, the cases of paedophilia known to each one of us personally, are comparatively rare, or simply non-existent.

*Forget the statistics*, we simply know from personal experience over many years, that these cases of *serious sexual abuse* are comparatively rare, and in those cases, where they are not, they are usually perpetrated by *a family member*.

Just as the media, by being able to show millions of us simultaneously the smiling face of some suddenly rich national lottery winner, gives us the illusion that it can happen to any of us – which is of course ninety-nine point nine percent recurring a total lie – by continual stories of child molestation, or in this rumour-mongering society more likely *alleged molestation*, we are encouraged to believe that these monsters are living on every corner and hiding under every rock and stone.

Whereas the truth is that “the bogey man” figure, who ends up if caught, on a “sex offenders register” and has his life destroyed, is largely a fiction.

It is undeniable that there are a large number of images of child sex abuse currently on the Internet, but again, we would suggest that this is still a small fraction of the entire population – a few thousand proven cases amongst the several billion internet users – and again, it is most likely that these cases are being perpetrated by the children’s own parents and families, especially in some of the less civilised countries rather than mainstream America and the UK, where the greatest obsession with these issues currently is.

Again, the problem with the statistics – and please remember *Darrel Huff's* earlier mentioned work on how to doctor these – is that the supposed huge proportion of people who can report *some kind of possible sexual encounter* with adults, possible a single occasion of patting on the bottom or something, is not the *serious systematic abuse* which wrecks personalities and lives.

What certainly cannot be placed into this category of abuse, is the number of adults, who have had accusations or actual charges put upon them, like *Pete Townshend*, who have likely never harmed any child, but have merely for research reasons as he claimed, or else a genuinely unhealthy addiction likely originating from their own abuse, have downloaded some such images onto their computer over the Internet.

Most of us have some kind of fetish, large or small, because that is how the human mind works in regard to sex.

For example, in our first sexual encounter – which remember, may be with pornography rather than “real life” – we can *hypnotically* associate some item of woman’s clothing or body part with the intense physical pleasure we are experiencing at the time.

Thus, a very deep “associative” or “hypnotic” link is formed, so that like one of Pavlov’s dogs, we can have our sexual nature triggered by the reappearance of the object, and thus a “fetish” is formed.

So though the mechanics may not be fully clear, it is likely that somehow the adult who finds children exciting must have developed this hypnotic response, by some kind of childhood incident, perhaps *long-forgotten by him or her*.

The point here is, that a good hypnotist, could train us to feel sexually aroused by showing us some object such as a plastic cup, just as Pavlov trained his dogs to salivate at the sound of the bell, after first creating the association between food and the ringing of the bell.

So it is suggested that many men may have formed this hypnotic association somehow in their minds, and then, *be unable to dehypnotise themselves*.

This explanation does not seek to be anything more than a theory requiring further research, but as clearly from the evolutionary point of view, sex with children has no biological advantages, we surely have whilst protecting society from those who have these inclinations, to look at these men with *pity* rather than demonising them, as having a kind of mental illness which is beyond their control, which quite likely they themselves do not want or do not know what to do about.

So *why* - women in general, and the feminists in particular, might well ask - should we care about such men, who are a direct threat to our children, when we could merely label them as monsters, castrate them and hound them out of society and have them beaten by vigilante groups, locked up permanently in maximum security prisons, or made so in fear of their lives that they commit suicide?

Apart from the fact that in a *civilised* society, we should treat *all* human beings with respect, the point is, that let us suppose that such a man who has these paedophilic tendencies is really himself afraid of his own feelings.

What is he currently going to do?

He would not dare expose himself to public attention, for fear he would have his life destroyed, and likely put under permanent harassment and death threats, as has happened apparently to our lady author and heroine *Esther Vilar*, of *The Manipulated Man* fame, for writing openly about women's unjust subjugation of men.

So he will have this desire fester inside him, and go into torment, and then one day eventually, he may just crack under the loneliness and strain and actually carry out some real horrific act on a child, maybe *yours*.

(please do not imagine that the author knows all these things from personal experience – he just has *a very powerful imagination* and has done *an awful lot of research*, as many authors do).

Whereas, if society could for example start an *anonymous counselling program* for such men, they would be enabled to come forward and seek voluntary treatment, for what appears at heart to be a mental health problem, *before they ever commit any crime*.

For it is an accepted fact that most abusers were themselves abused, and though no abuse has been proven of him, we can place Michael Jackson into the category of someone whose childhood was so brutal, that by his own admission, he is a damaged and abused person.

Of course, we must not then make the paranoid assumption that *every* person abused, will inevitably become an abuser – he or she might just as likely for all we know – like UK comedian, *Billy Connolly*, become someone who campaigns to a lesser or greater extent against it.

So really, we can see that the abused adult, who was left unaided by society while he or she was himself abused, because of our paranoid judgmental attitude, becomes unable to get any proper support to prevent him or her becoming an abuser in adult life.

So mere *logic* dictates, that we should not have the “witch hunts” we do, as that is driving all the abusers underground, and then we will not be able to help them control themselves and find a way to live without abusing others *until it is too late*.

A recent report of a clearly out of control European man, who has raped a number of girls, is a case in point, who might have been prevented by such an understanding and realistic societal attitude towards his kind.

Then we must point out also that the current governmental approach to the problem of child sexual abuse, seems to be concentrating entirely on the criminal and crime, and not *on the causes of the crime*.

And whilst, we have mentioned the “genesis” of the male or even female abuser, we have overlooked the other essential element in the commission of his or her crime, which every lawyer knows – *opportunity*.

That is, how are young children *ever* placed in the situation where a malevolent stranger has access to them, without which *there can be, and would be no crime?*

And the answer is – *women themselves are neglecting them*. Those of us who grew up with a caring full-time mother, knew that she was there for us whenever we needed her, she was a safe refuge whom we could be with in the home at any time.

If we had a problem, *we could tell her*, and also because we knew she loved us, we were never tempted to wander off with some stranger offering “a sweetie”, as unloved and neglected and unhappy children are, and historically speaking, always *do*.

They may be fifteen years old, when they run away with the abusive stranger, but if like Princess Diana, they are unloved and neglected, run off with some kind of abusive stranger sooner or later in one guise or another, they *do*.

So all woman have to do to make sure their children don't get molested is

a) *put them into the hands of nobody who will do such a thing, and therefore not at all, if they have the slightest doubt*

b) *by caring for them properly, instead of running off to work and neglecting them, their children will have a sense of loyalty and security, that will trigger their own alarm bells when placed in a situation of harm.*

No mother, however careful, can be *everywhere*, so a child's only real protection from these occasional periods of unsupervised potential danger, is that its "sixth sense" is functioning, so it recognises malevolent people when they appear.

But by tossing children aside to hired nannies, or childminders, and then putting them into a competitive, bullying environment, which though it looks sweet and secure to you, is what the average group nursery is really like, you short-circuit the growth of that sense of security in them, you sabotage that protective *sixth sense*.

So not understanding or apparently caring about this, the current governments insist on bullying women into neglecting their children, whether they want to or not.

In essence however, the simple message of this chapter, is that *molesters and bullies of all kinds will disappear when we stop creating and supporting them.*

But for this to happen, we need the sanest, wisest, most caring people in power, to instigate a civilised means of government and administration, rather than a bullying one, from the top down, and that is not what we have got right now.

So again, how do we identify those people to put above us all, since the current democratic system, which in England has voted a majority government into power on little over one third of the vote, is currently not working?

They should obviously be caring, and not greedy people, but let us beware of demonising them with scandal, because they too will inevitably have some natural desire for sex.

Remember, wise *King Solomon* for example, reputedly had a harem of perhaps a hundred wives.

Gopi Krishna suggests that quite likely the more developed man or woman will have a *more powerful sex desire* than average, as a side effect of the increased functioning of the kundalini mechanism in more evolved men and women.

But he adds, that such a being, then has a greater duty to keep it under control.

For example, we apparently see the high-minded and idealistic President Kennedy, having many extra marital affairs, because he has a powerful sex desire, that perhaps his wife was not adequate for him to satisfy.

But surely, if a man does not force himself on women, damage the relationships of others, or neglect his children in the process of having hopefully a relatively small number of extra-marital affairs, is that really a legitimate ground to do him down?

When he has shown apart from that, such heroism and wisdom that perhaps he has even saved the whole world from nuclear war?

So the leaders of the world will not for some time yet be composed of total saints, and we must be clear that the question is of *emphasis*, not of unrealistic *black and white* images of prospective leaders, that show neither side in their *true-colours*.

Tony Blair is not a demon. He has a good side, and a not so good side, and whilst that makes him perhaps suitable to be a lawyer, it perhaps does not qualify him to hold the fate of nations in his hands.

President Kennedy likewise was no saint.

He had his sexual proclivities, but when his motives were right in deciding the fate of millions, when he had genuine care to support the common woman and man, as for example, in his unfulfilled plan to supply interest free loans to farmers and others, that says he is the right kind of man for the job, as being the best known available candidate at the time.

Then there is the issue of *competition*, which is really yet another arena of bullying.

We are brainwashed into accepting *the competitive world*, and countless businesses and factories are closed down, even long established prestigious ones, like the British *Rover* car factories which have recently been closed down, on the grounds that *they are uncompetitive*.

So then England buys Japanese cars, and British workers are laid off. This makes no sense, it is an environmentally damaging waste of resources to import across the sometimes perilous seas and oceans from a far continent, technology that can easily be produced at home.

This lie of *competition* is yet another form of bullying, and props up the bullying society which is based on it.

We can *never* have peace with a competitive society, because obviously it is setting *man against man* and *woman against woman*.

The excuse is that this is all “natural”, this is *Charles Darwin's* “survival of the fittest”, but if that is how we want things, let us restart Hitler's eugenics campaign, and root everyone out of society who is disabled, old, low in IQ, with bad eyesight, or with other genetic defects we consider “inferior”, and have them all put down.

Where will we draw the line?

Similarly, in schools, children are bullied into competing with other children, which as Krishnamurti explains, destroys their intelligence, because they psychologically retreat into a permanent state of conflict, by being made to feel *inferior* in comparison to someone else.

And of course we are *all* inferior in comparison to *someone*, and so such a destruction of confidence and self-esteem could happen to any of us.

A society without competition? That's madness you say.

Whereas the truth is, that if people *focussed* on doing what they can to the best of their ability, there would be no need for competition at all.

So what about job interviews you say?

Of course people must be assessed for fitness for work, but each person could be given a suitable job commensurate with their *true ability*, and then there would be happiness and security for all.

Whereas the current obsession with competition, is destroying *every* country's work force and citizens, and benefiting really nobody at all.

If people did not compete, you say, there would be nothing to drive them on, to make them achieve!

Whereas we say – no, people would do the jobs and studies that they are *truly* interested in – and not merely do things they are unsuited for in order to impress others, and compensate for a loveless and insecure childhood, as is too often happening now.

For example, let us witness the behaviour of the current female Russian tennis star *Maria Sharapova*.

This pretty, statuesque Russian girl is undoubtedly a very fine tennis player. But she is also a prima donna who grunts her way aggressively through her games to win the championships, and we ask, apart from the obvious enjoyment of the sport of tennis, what is this obsessional never ending quest to be *number one* all for?

Because it applies not only to her, but to academics, sports people and professionals everywhere.

We cannot all be the best at everything, and quite clearly, most of us can be the best at *nothing*.

So therefore, in this competitive culture, which reveres *only* winners, the also-rans and runners-up – that is, *almost all of us* – must live a life of humiliation and unfulfillment.



But we see that people like Miss Sharapova, even though at the top, are not really themselves satisfied. Just a casual glance at her worried expression on the tennis court, when she is having a difficult match, shows that she lives permanently in fear of being knocked off the top.

Her whole identity, is based on the idea of being *number one*, which her primadonna like behaviour – for example, in keeping a packed Wimbledon Centre Court and officials waiting for the presentation ceremony while she phones her mother on her mobile phone – confirms.

That is, she has gone up to the stratosphere of celebrity, where she is one of the queens of society, who looks down on us all. As she leaves the court after her victory, she “kindly” signs a few autographs for we lesser mortals, who watch “the goddess” display her rare tennis skills and gracefulness in awe.

She is yet another “goddess”, and we stay downtrodden slaves. But even then, she is an *insecure* goddess, who must forever strive to stay at the top, or else her identity is gone, she will no longer be “the belle of every ball” and invited to the most elite parties, which is currently guaranteed by her status as number one.

The egotistical fist shaking, and emotionality of sports stars in general also confirms that these competitive pursuits are now about a lot more than just sport.

This egotistical celebration of success, seen most readily in sport, is a confirmation that such sports even as tennis, are not played by “gentlemen” nor “ladies” anymore, as confirmed by the antics of *John McEnroe* and countless others who followed him.

For example, what will such a person do, if they get a serious injury to the hand, and are no longer able to dazzle us with their fantastic skills?

Will they then be finished as a human being?

So this obsession with competition is madness. It is really making losers out of us all, who are then mocked and *bullied* – for not being *winners* – by society at large.

The only solution is to make the *cooperative* rather than *competitive*, and considerate, caring and sharing man or woman into the ideal, and then only can there be kindness, peace, love and *respect* for all.

As to the current situation, of for example, bullying in schools, in such a desperate situation, perhaps desperate measures are called for.

The sad fact is, that as even rich American chat guru hostess *Oprah Winfrey* once said:

*Others walk all over us because we let them*

That is, bullying continues, because nothing is done to stop it.

For example, suppose we put a bullying officer in each school – a big strong man, who won't take any nonsense, somewhat like *Arnold Schwarzenegger's* persona as a teacher in *Kindergarten Cop*.

When incidents of bullying are reported, he gets both parties and puts them in a room.

They are sat at a table and the bully is made to explain his or her bullying behaviour to the victim, and the victim, is enabled – *under the watchful eye of Arnold* – to complain and ask the bully why they are doing what they do.

We put them together long enough so that they can express their point of views to one another – refereed by our indomitable Arnold – and if that doesn't work, and the bully persists, we put the bully in *a rubber room*.

They don't get to come out of the rubber room until they have given up bullying, until they have repented.

That bully may scream and shout and protest and call for his or her mother or father, because he or she is made to feel the pain that the bullied person is feeling.

Each day, they come to school, they have another chat with their victim, and until they learn to *show* and *mean* respect for that other person, they are put back into the rubber room by the strong muscles of Arnold S.

Does this sound inhumane, to put the poor bully into solitary confinement till he or she repents, as many of these feminist types would say?

Well the answer to that is, firstly, he or she is likely going to end up in prison anyway, if her or she does not give up these bullying ways.

Secondly, what of the *victim*, who like many modern boys or girls, has been callously put into the rubber torture room *by the bully*, and endures months or even years of torment, and maybe finally takes their own life?

So all these trendy feminist inspired ideas wish to evade such stern and *realistic* treatments.

But the truth is that people who do *wrong*, *must* be *broken*. A good person doing right should *never* let their spirit be broken, of course.

Yet that is what happens now – the good person is broken, and the bully gets their own way and grows ever more powerful.

A caring and devoted male teacher was shown recently on television, who had been severely attacked by his pupils and now was on a drug treatment programme to cope with his traumatic experience, and feared he might never work again.

So if you reject this type of male authoritative solution, where is yours please?

You have none, and so every year bullying gets worse.

In the *I ching*, a five-thousand year old book of wisdom, still popular today, is said

*there is no more difficult or easily avoided task than the breaking of a child's will*

That means, as previously explained, being able to firmly stamp out this egotistical *want* in a child's nature, before it takes root deeply and becomes a rapist, gangster, drug addict, or a monster like *Emperor Nero* who slays thousands at his whim.

Again, the feminist mothers and educators do not understand this, and so children never become *obedient* to adults, as they should, and the madness continues and gets worse.

The simple question we would have a parent ask him or herself is – *are you in control of your child, or is your child in control of you?*

It's either one or the other – there is nothing in between!

Of course the exact details of how such reformation of bullies is carried out, needs to be developed in the course of time, but what is certain, is that bullies will never be reformed by any strategy that results in us *giving in to their unreasonable demands*.

## **Chapter Twenty-four - New Age Spirituality – *Buddha turns in his grave***

Only fifty years ago, there was no such things as “the New Age.” There were no long haired hippies in brightly coloured clothes telling us that LSD or the peyote recommended by *Carlos Castaneda's* Mexican *shaman* were the paths to enlightenment.

There was no book read by millions called *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance* with a lotus flower transforming into a spanner on its cover, while the book that, in title at least, preceded it, *Zen and the Art of Archery* by *Eugene Herrigel*, was seldom opened the cover of.

There was also no book called *The Bridge of Love* by *Jonathan Livingstone Seagull* author *Richard Bach*, which told us how a very talented man, who liked to fly aeroplanes, decided that “spiritual enlightenment” for him, amounted to having a very emotional and bossy lady actress as his seductive teacher, ruling his life.

No doubt those of the same persuasion, or women who cannot cope with a man with a mind of his own – which is frankly at present *most of modern* women – will label the author as a woman hating *misogynist*, which of course is a million miles from the truth.

For as careful readers of this volume will easily see, we have throughout continually taken great pains to acknowledge the talents of *honest, intelligent and decent women*, who are not so insecure that they can feel whole only by enslaving and dominating a man, such as our heroine and inspiration, *Esther Vilar*.

The reason for the apparent attack on *woman as teacher* is that the role of *man as teacher* has been denied in that process, and we have *as adults* descended into being, psychologically speaking, perennially male children again, with a now bossy and then alternately seductive female as teacher directing our lives.

Many men, whilst firmly under the thumb of such women, imagine that by chanting a mantra, or studying and being able to parrot the recorded works of *Buddha* or whomever, they are going to get *liberation* that way.

But how can a man who is a slave *to anything* ever consider himself free, particularly, when that slavery is to another unenlightened human being?

Amidst the chaotic, warring, crime-ridden, competitive society, we live in, the New Age religions and pursuits look like safe havens of hope, and that by daily saying some “affirmations” or staring at a *yantra* or *mandala*, we can gain inner peace, and become “enlightened” like the Buddha too.

Any trip to a bookshop will show the staggering growth of the so called New Age culture, as will a survey of the Internet.

The question we would ask ourselves, is whether all the books we have read and all the meditation and other techniques we have long practised have given us that peace and satisfaction and “enlightenment” we have sought, or if we have not personally been down that road of “meditations” and mystery hunting, have we noticed this liberated and wise quality in anybody who has, whom we know?

Then, there are a thousand “self-help” guides and “life coaches”, all with their agenda of empowering us as a successful, fulfilled and enlightened woman or man, the vast majority of which *motivators* appear to be *women*.

Whilst we do not doubt the good intentions of many of them, we suggest that they are collectively still a distraction from the real arena of modern battle which we must fight – that with *our own egotistical nature, and between woman and man*.

These two things are really what *the Buddha* and other *true gurus* talked about.

And these “traditional religions” and scriptures, such as the Christian gospels of the New Testament are now rejected and sidelined, in favour of some newer, trendy “spiritually empowering” philosophy.

As men, we must realise that this is largely deliberate, and we see progressively that the old “male religions” requiring self-denial and discipline, have been replaced by more “female ones”, which gravitate towards the concept of a “mother goddess”, and do not require the strict adherence to rules and regulations that the traditional faiths all previously demanded.

We see renewed interest in black magic, and “witchcraft”, and a number of women actually describe themselves now as “white witches” who cast spells.

The *Harry Potter* phenomenon is relevant here, because that too is perhaps not as harmless as it seems, but encouraging belief in and pursuit of powers, as are other series watched by millions, such as *Charmed*, which features several girl witches, and of course *Sabrina the Teenage Witch*.

The point is - *why should we be encouraging such unreal fantasies in children at all?*

It is interesting again, that most of this centres around empowerment of girls, and of course, even though Harry Potter was a boy, female authoress J K Rowling has become a fabulously rich icon, and one feminist was heard to complain whilst expressing general admiration for her success, that “it was a shame the books could not have been about *a girl*.”

More *sugar and spice and all things nice*, we appreciate.

It is interesting to note also that J K Rowling’s personal fortune, which at last count was well over £400m - well over half a billion dollars! – could if shared out more fairly have provided an income for thousands of authors who will never get published or famous, with which they too, like single parent Jane K Rowling, could have used that money to support a family life.

But let us not follow “the politics of envy”, though this is pointed out merely for *justice's sake*.

So let us look objectively what is going on in the broader sense.

Old fashioned male oriented religion is being done away with, as are its male priests, and we are being progressively feminised and converted to belief in the power of female witches, and a general unhealthy obsession with *psychic powers* and the occult.

And let us assure ourselves – the pursuit of psychic powers and black magic *is dangerous*, and that is not to express any opinion on the reality or not of such powers and practices.

The point is – though we on the one hand wish to divest ourselves of a traditional belief in a Jewish, Christian or Muslim God, we are in this way, surrendering and regressing back to the kind of superstitious blind beliefs, that if applied in black magic practices for instance, can be used to make ritual sacrifices of innocent people, as portrayed in the classic *Dennis Wheatley* novel and movie, *The Devil Rides Out*.

Or again, we think of this kind of horrific “pagan belief system” which makes a human sacrifice of subsequent *Equalizer* star, *Edward Woodward*, in the movie, *The Wicker Man*.

As *Stevie Wonder* said in his wonderful song *Superstition*:

*When you believe in things you don't understand, you suffer  
Superstition ain't the way!*

Equally there are still some horrific things going on in various underdeveloped countries of the world, who still hold some of these primitive belief systems.

So when we see this re-emergence of blind belief in these ritualistic kinds of practices, let us be assured, this is not a good sign.

What we are really seeing in the rebirth of these kind of “dark ages” religious practices, is *the desire of disempowered people to gain power*.

We see this sort of thing portrayed also in *Stanley Kubrick's* movie *Eyes Wide Shut* and the atmospheric *Roman Polanski* effort with *Johnnie Depp* - *The Ninth Gate*.

So whilst in all efforts at understanding and gaining power over Nature, we may learn something, it is suggested, that in this modern scientific age, this kind of primitive ritualistic dressing up and chanting of magic spells, is no way for a civilised, scientifically educated man or woman to behave.

If a man wants sex with women for example, let him achieve something in the real world, even for example learning to play a musical instrument properly, and become thereby the kind of person that a woman would love.

Though of course, one sees, if the sensible *arranged marriages* practices were re-introduced in some form into our society, the kind of loneliness and lack of acceptance and denial of a sexual partner, that so many men now face, would not be there to lure them into these fantasies and games of power.

That is, put simply, all forms of black magic, and search for psychic powers are only happening in the male of the species because *we have been disempowered as men*.

In the female of the species, these preoccupations are again, the unhealthy pursuit of unloved hearts and minds, who are attempting to gain power by these ritualistic means.

That is – a pretty girl with good manners finds any number of men wishing to date and marry her with ease. But what of the fate of the less “crowd pulling”, the “wicked witch” who is envious of *Snow White*?

Like a boy lost in his superhero comics, she too can become lost in fantasies of female empowerment, supported by such pure fictional programs as the aforementioned *Charmed*, and *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, who weekly gets to kick men around, under the excuse of them being *vampires*, you see.

So whilst the author does not seek to personally attack those engaged in many of these “New Age” beliefs and practices, it is suggested that they are in most cases, not really the empowering things they seem, but a disempowering fantasy distracting one from making best use of one’s precious time, and thereby becoming a success in one’s real life.

For example, were the participants in these kind of new age “cults” to have their numbers come up on the lottery, would they still want to go out into the woods, and dance around naked, praying to some middle-ages goddess or god?

Or would they rather buy a nice house, get a *Jaguar* car and a lovely blonde wife?

Whilst none of this is trivial, the serious point is that just like our fantasy TV shows and movies, giving us *dreams* of empowerment, if we wish to continue in such basically immature pursuits *in spiritual terms*, we may do so. That is our business.

But as men, it is suggested that we realise that much of the New Age show that has been put before us, is really a hypnotic distraction from us ever getting to follow a *true path* of spirituality, and *having a real life*, that is a life with self-respect, suitable employment and family to be cared for by and to love.

For *that dream* would be attainable by *us all* if it had not been stolen from us by the feminist dominated society, who have via their undue influence on governments, taken away our jobs, our male rights to life and liberty, and the pursuit of happiness with a suitable woman.

The author of this work subscribes fundamentally (and that word is not used in the sense of a *fundamentalist*) to the basic viewpoints of *Buddha, Mohammed, Moses, Christ, Confucius, Lao Tzu* and modern kundalini author *Gopi Krishna*.

That is – *true spirituality* is about self-mastery, not dubious egotistical pursuit of “powers” over others, such as those sought out by black magic practices, and some other kinds of cults who impose a hierarchical exploitative structure on the free individual.

It is about being true to oneself, about taking only what one needs from society, rather than what one egotistically wants, and about as Christ said, treating and loving one's neighbour as oneself in so far as one realistically can.

The point of this, is that as Gopi Krishna has for the first time perhaps explained, this is not a mere “do-gooding” philosophy, but has an unalterable *biological basis*.

That is – the kundalini power is evolving our brains, and without the attainment of control over our emotions and passions to a sensible moderation, we can become unbalanced and mentally ill as individuals, and as a society, malformed.

As explained in the *Yoga Sutras of Patanjali*, the first steps we have to take are learning morals and self-control, without which we can never go further.

The *Tantric Yoga* practices for example, can according to this same theory be a great danger to us, by depleting our reserves of sexual energy in the body, and for that reason, are not deemed desirable or necessary for any *authentic* spiritual path.

For example, Gopi Krishna explained that one exercise in *true Tantra* was for an initiate to sit inside a circle of fifteen naked women and *not become in the slightest aroused*.

This was because as in “the temptations of St Anthony” he would need to have an iron-willed mastery over his sex impulses in the dangerous transition between normal and higher consciousness, because the sex energy is at that time required to stabilize the brain, or Gopi Krishna – based partly on his own experience, we appreciate – says that madness or even death can occur as a result.

This is all clearly not what the average modern Tantric Yoga practitioner currently believes and practices.

Those who think that by sexual stimulation without orgasm they can *increase their spirituality*, do not understand that sex stimulation causes the fine energies in the body – which can in their pure form go up to the brain in a positive way – to deteriorate into a gross form which can no longer be used for evolutionary purposes.



This is what Gopi Krishna and *most* older and likely more authentic yoga texts say, and as so many religions and spiritual traditions have suggested sexual restraint or even celibacy, this interest in *Tantric Sex* would appear to be a spiritual dead end, set up to entrap those who would otherwise evolve, using the tantalising, ever-dependable lure of sex to keep them stuck in a state of immaturity.

For according to these same ancient authors also, along the *true* spiritual path, there are many such pitfalls and side roads, which we can get caught up in, such as pursuit of psychic powers, and this obsessive focus on sex.

So to be liberated as men, we must take a calm and stoic eye when we are confronted with this “circus” and “fairground” of New Age paraphernalia, and know that for our development as true human beings, like Buddha, Christ and Mohammed, none of this – much of it currently female inspired and dominated – compendium of mystery hunting and false spirituality, is necessary for us to take up a “spiritual path”, if that is our desire.

Rather, we should see that most of it, with few exceptions, is yet just another avenue to bamboozle and disempower *Esther Vilar's* modern *Manipulated Man*, and fool him into thinking he has a meaningful and free life, when he quite clearly does not.

Like *Caine* in *Kung Fu*, we don't need bizarre philosophies and magic tricks, we need rather to learn to *see through such false delusions of power*.

We need to become well developed and skilled human beings, who are many-sided in their viewpoints, educated in as many arts and sciences as possible, having a deep understanding of women and children's psychology, moderate in our material and sexual demands, and above all, pure and honest in our hearts.

We are instead being offered these complex and inscrutable answers as great mysteries only visible to “the wise” – like *the Emperor's New Clothes* – but the real path is simple, though *arduous*, as outlined in Patanjali's yoga sutras for example.

For example again, suppose we cannot cure our drinking, or gambling or sex addiction, or habit of cruelty to others we use to make ourselves feel empowered.

How is it that we can then think of ourselves as masters and enlightened beings?

There are no “hidden mysteries” or “secret formulas” which can take us to a higher state, as that would be to contravene the laws of Nature, in the same way as an idiot being able to take a tablet which could instantly turn him into a genius, would equally upset the whole structure of reality.

The reality is that we have to control and discipline ourselves to a moderation in all things – *Buddha's* so called *middle way* – and we have to properly face up to and understand our relationships with our women and children, as Krishnamurti explains, and as has been described throughout this book.

So called “meditations” and “spiritual practices” are only secondary considerations in comparison to this primary goal, which is why the works of great prophets such as *Christ, Moses, Mohammed, Confucius, Buddha, Lao Tzu* and others, were almost entirely focussed on *moral philosophy*, rather than on the mystery mongering and hunting with which the New Age culture is currently now obsessed.

*That* is the only route to heaven, and it is suggested to us by these great spirits, that everything else we have heard is quite likely a road to either nowhere, or to hell, which should we stubbornly insist on following, as we may, sooner or later we will find out for ourselves, perhaps at the cost of decades, or even our whole life.

## **Chapter Twenty-five – My *Unfair Lady* – Makeovers, Cosmetic Surgery and other tricks**

In the well known musical and movie, *My Fair Lady*, *Rex Harrison* in the guise of *Professor Henry Higgins*, an English dialect and phonetics expert who claims to tell a person's birthplace in any district of London to within a few streets merely from their accent, makes a bet with a gentlemen friend that he can take a common flower girl and coach her in speech, dress and manners and pass her off as a genuine "lady" in high society.

On the subject of the concept of the term "lady" we are reminded of the very old joke that it is now put to you contains a rather deeper psychological truth than we may have imagined at first hearing:

ACCUSATIVE QUESTIONER: Who was that *lady* I saw you with last night?

SOBER REPLY: That was no *lady*, that was *my wife*!

That is, to be crystal clear about the meaning here, the man's friend *who doesn't know her* regards her as "a lady" and the man himself *who does know her*, by now we presume thinks that the best description of her would be *in quite other terms*.

Again, we should observe that what we may have previously regarded as valueless "trivia" such as the above "wise-guy" joke, is based upon *the reality* of the direct experiences and knowledge of its creator.

That is, we find *the truth* of life is better understood and documented by the typically formally uneducated "comedian", rather than by the academically qualified psychologist and "researcher" who is forced to put his or her thoughts in a straitjacket of pre-existing conventions, which more often than not *obscure the real truth*.

We see in the media all the time, that "new research" has proven some glaringly obvious fact, such as *most women want babies*, or on the other hand, something we know to be equally glaringly untrue, such as *TV does not influence people*, and it is high time this kind of bogus "academic research" particularly in the psychological field, was dismissed for the nonsensical feministic propaganda tool it usually is, and that we refuse to accept *anything* we cannot see or verify for ourselves with our own *real life experiences* and *common sense*.

Of course, the movie and musical, which was incidentally based on Irish playwright *George Bernard Shaw's* work *Pygmalion*, was really a whitewash and con too, in the sense that the "flower girl" part of *Eliza Doolittle* was played by possibly the most high class and refined actress in Hollywood history, *Audrey Hepburn*, who more appropriately went on to star in *Breakfast at Tiffany's*.

So we see that in actual fact we had a very posh and classy girl, *Audrey Hepburn*, not wholly successfully *pretending* to be common, whereas the movie was trying to persuade us of the exact opposite – *that a common girl can be turned into a lady*.

We put it to you that the whole of Western society in particular, is currently engaged in this sham effort, and that in a sense, this is a deception that has been put on men since time immemorial.

*Esther Vilar*, in the classic 1972 work, *The Manipulated Man*, points out that a bald naked man and a bald naked, makeup-less woman are in many cases not such very different beings physically to look at, *particularly as far as the face is concerned*.

One of the few truly educational things that pornography in general and Internet pornography in particular, has proven conclusively, is that most people, including women, look an awful lot more attractive *with their clothes on*.

For that very reason, women spend *billions* on seductive clothing, shoes, underwear, cosmetics, make-up and now *surgery* in an effort to create a ravishing beauty out of what was often previously a very plain looking or even arguably ugly woman.

The trouble is well identified by the brief conversation *Jim Carrey* has with his young son in the movie *Liar, Liar*, in which he plays a lawyer who is for a whole day cursed into being able to speak *only the truth*, caused by a wish this son had made blowing out the candles on a birthday cake that came true – a concept incidentally which must be horrifying to any number of *real* lawyers around the world:

YOUNG SON (PUZZLED): But my teacher said that *real beauty* is on the inside?

JIM CARREY AS “WISE DAD”: No son - that’s just something *ugly* people say.

Thus if a woman is born with less than what seems her “fair share” of physical attributes identified as “desirable” or “beautiful”, why shouldn’t she be able to use “every trick in the book” to enable her to compete with the more glamorous “naturally endowed” woman?

Well, it is put to you that – *right at this very moment in time* – there are *any number of good reasons*.

For example, any kind of surgery is generally a very costly procedure. When there are so many *starving millions* in the world, and other people needy of much more important operations which are “a matter of life and death”, can all this fabulous expenditure and operating theatre time really be justified?

Since this then means that many millions of old people who are unable to walk or see properly wait long period of years perhaps for hip replacements or cataract operations, so that some insecure young girl can buy herself a pair of 36Ds, or alternatively some ageing woman who refuses to grow old gracefully can have her face pulled as tight as the *Joker* in *Batman*, and thereby often look equally ridiculous.

Another issue is that because except following birth defect, accidents or war injuries, this kind of surgery, due to its typical substantial costs, is largely *the privilege of the wealthy and rich*.

So that is to say, if you are a poor man or woman, to put the finishing touch on you good luck, you can be ugly as well, under the healthcare provisions of this merciless class ridden and wealth worshipping society.

This phenomenon also shows itself in terms of dental care, so that the rich can have a gleaming white smile, and quite often the poor cannot many times even get the essential dental treatment they need.

That is not to say that there should *never* be any use of cosmetic surgery, in extreme cases, or after accidents for example, but that somewhere along the line, someone with sense has got to say *stop*, because there is no real need.

The obsession of course with “getting something done” is being intensified manifold by the as usual endless and *hypnotic* TV features on the subject, and series like *Nip Tuck*, starring British actress, *Joely Richardson*, who it is put to you would have done better to have used her acting skills to draw attention to more humanely important issues like her campaigning mother, *Vanessa Redgrave*.

We liked her however in *Loch Ness*, with wonderful *Gullivers' Travels* actor *Ted Danson*, so we forgive her this time.

The irony is of course, that as usual, the classiest and most beautiful actresses like Ms Richardson who don't actually themselves *need any*, are used in such dramas to sell us the message *cosmetic surgery is good*.

Undoubtedly however, the program makers would deny that they are showing anything but a balanced view of the industry, exploring all “the issues”, as they like to say when justifying their exploitation of our fears and primitive emotions.

But it is of course like doing a documentary on gambling or any other vice – it doesn't deter anyone except the self-controlled who probably wouldn't have done it any way, but rather encourages the manipulable and insecure less well-endowed women into *paying gold to get them ther' hills*.

Despite the risks, like their implants blowing up inside them in a high altitude air flight, as usual, the punters always imagine the bad luck won't happen to *them*.

Again, we see there are two motives behind all this, which are the usual ones governing our current world – *capitalistic and feministic*.

Ignoring the financial side of this however, it is clear that the feminist authorities are supportive of this unprecedented widespread use of cosmetic surgery on the grounds it is “empowering women.”

And there is no doubt about it, it is empowering *some women*, but it is argued here, that is very much *at the expense of other women*, and also of men.

If we look at many of the leading actresses and other celebrities now, we see that huge numbers of them have had it done, and many have had it done so surreptitiously and quietly, that even their colleagues and rivals in the celebrity sphere may be unaware.

For example, if we look at famous *Austin Powers* actress, *Liz Hurley*, without making any specific allegations one way or the other, her appearance now is so significantly different than when her acting career began, she appears to be not even the same person.

The point was that she was still a pretty, natural looking girl, in her early career before she likely made the “alterations”, but now she is we see cosmetically transformed into *a goddess*.

Without going to the dreary lengths of assassinating actresses and celebrities one by one, it is suggested to the reader, that by checking out a range of photos of these celebrities from earlier in their careers, we will see many examples of women who were really *very plain indeed* but have managed to pass themselves off as “glamour pussies” and icons, using these cosmetic surgery and “makeover” techniques.

We are not saying that women should not “make the best of themselves.”

But what we are saying, is that once this “masking” of a woman’s natural attributes goes beyond a certain point, it becomes not only extravagant, wasteful and ridiculous, but *downright dishonest*.

That is to say, a boy or man is attracted to a girl or woman on the basis that she looks pretty or attractive – because biologically speaking, he is trying to choose a partner to mate with who has the genetic features he desires to produce the best quality offspring with.

He picks *her* because he wants *attractive* children.

On the issue of whether she has brains or not, he can tell by talking to her, and *possibly* what job she has, or other talents, but his primary method of selection is currently based on *what he sees*.

But what we are now seeing is women who are not naturally beautiful, are learning to *look like they are* via these sophisticated cosmetic surgery and makeover techniques.

Every man should be warned, that even without surgery, the results of transformation by restyling hair, makeup and clothes, are frequently astonishing, and thus quite possibly what he is seeing in the apparently “glamorous” woman he has just met is *in the genetic sense, not real*.

Thus a man who has a child to such a visually “remastered” woman, who appears beautiful to him, may well be shocked to see the child is very plain or average, by comparison.

That is, all these techniques are really being used *to deceive men*.

It is therefore suggested to men that they take the opportunity to see this girl or woman they are idolising without make up, with her hair up in a bun, so they can see the shape of her head and facial features properly, and in some kind of clothes and shoes that allow him to determine her *true* height and shape.

It is further suggested that he see some old photographs of her, over a period of years previously, to be assured that what he is seeing is a “genetic reality.” If such old photographs, proceeding from even when she was a child, seem to be non-existent, or somehow “cannot be found”, this would seem to give genuine grounds for suspicion, as a typical attractive and therefore *photogenic* girl will usually have plenty.

Does this kind of “secret service” mission seem unfair or harsh on the less photogenic and conventionally attractive girl?

We do not think so, because the principle in life must be *each to his own*.

That is, if society is properly organised, we will all find someone on our own level of intelligence and good looks to pair off with.

But a woman who uses surgery to alter her genetic characteristics, is really deceiving a man, in making him think that she is a true beauty who will therefore produce beautiful children for him, when she likely won't.

A lady might argue however, that say she is relatively flat-chested, she would feel more confident with larger breasts.

Apart from the dangers of this kind of surgery, many of which for all we know may still be unknown, an observation should be pointed out to women in general who would seek this route.

Though not universally true, there seems to be a tendency for the more intelligent and higher, more refined classes of women – for example the aforementioned Audrey Hepburn – to be smaller in the chest.

The kind of pendulous cartoon-like breasts we see on stars like *Marilyn Monroe* or many of the “page three” type girls (in the UK, there is a tradition of would-be celebrity girls posing topless on *page three* of certain national newspapers) seem to be frequently lacking in the more refined type of girl, especially one who is of a higher intelligence and sensitivity.

We certainly do not see the *Carry On* movie, *Barbara Windsor* type chests on the few girls and women who make it to university professor stage very often, do we, unless they are generally overweight?

It is further suggested to you that there may be an evolutionary basis for this.

That is to say, that the more evolved women are becoming less *animal*, and this shows in that the seriously big hips and bosoms seem to be the definite prerogative of the lower classes of women in general.

Whether or not this is true, which only a detailed and *correctly oriented and executed* research survey would show, what is certainly the case, is that if a man is in love with a woman, he will not be deterred by her lack of large bosom, because quite apart from anything else, large breasts tend to hypnotically attract the constant glances of other men, which though he may feel proud in the beginning of such attention, on the whole, in the long term he is not going to appreciate.

It is also to say, that a girl without a stunningly beautiful face may need such a generous endowment to attract men at all, whereas the pretty girl, whose sharpness of face often reflects her sharpness of mind, doesn't need anything more to attract a man, as for example flat chested nude scene actresses like *Sylvia Kristel* of *Emanuelle* fame proved amongst others.

This also is why the deceit of *major* cosmetic surgery – i.e. that which restructures the whole face – seems to be an unacceptable fraud.

We after all even recognise and judge others – their inner selves – by their faces, and so this kind of permanent “masquerade” these ladies are indulging in is really attempting to deceive us as to who and what they really are.

Not only that, it is creating a paranoid competition amongst women themselves, “upping the ante” all the time, so that they are forced to battle one another by buying more and more “attributes” to tick as many of the boxes of desirability as possible, in their competition with other women for attention, jobs and men.

It seems however, that a high proportion of these surgeries go wrong, partly because the “divine artist” or ageless force of Nature, who made the human face, possesses an understanding and subtlety that perhaps only great *artists* like *Leonardo da Vinci* or *Rembrandt* ever get near, and most mere *surgeons* sadly lack.

It should also be pointed out that a piece of research anyone can easily carry out, walking down any major city street will reveal that a remarkable number of well educated, successful and attractive men *do not choose beauty queens* as either girlfriends or wives.

As already hinted at, most men do not want the hassle of having a beauty on their arm, who attracts too many admiring and jealous stares, and even occasionally confrontations with some envious and not very high-minded man who may accost the couple in some public place, such as a bar.



If women looked at the *reality* of this fact – that quite often stunning looks are no barrier to getting a suitable man, who is often seeking other qualities not always found in “a princess” – they might then stop needlessly obsessing on their appearances, and spend their precious time on developing themselves in other ways – for example by expanding and educating *their minds*.

For instance, a man who gets ill will be much more grateful for the presence of a lady who has the skills of a trained doctor or nurse than some dizzy beauty, who may not even be able to successfully apply a bandage or sticking plaster without nearly killing her man.

As we have already said, we are not here in the business of naming names and pointing fingers, and Liz Hurley was only mentioned as someone who was adequately attractive *before* any surgery she may or may not have had.

But as things stand, *The Isley Brothers'* question - *Who's that lady?* - is really taking on a new and literal meaning to men that was not anticipated at the time of its first airing.

Not only that, we see again that this is yet another arena of battle between men and women in which the fair lady doesn't play fair.

That is - although there are huge stores and sections of stores in every town that sell the growing mountains of female cosmetic and “beauty products”, we men are mocked for our efforts to try to “pretty ourselves up” or roll back the hands of time.

Our efforts are very much limited to how we dress and style our hair, and the latter is somewhat of a problem for the growing number of bald men in society, many of whom are getting bald ever earlier than Nature might have planned, likely due to the undue stress that the modern feministic man-repressing society places them under.

For example, on this issue, balding men who comb over their hair to cover it up, as for example *Clockwork Orange* author *Anthony Burgess* used to do quite shamelessly, are derided for *being false*, and assured they should just accept Nature as it is and “learn to live with it.”

Of course, if women went bald naturally, as men start to do at age thirty, forty or fifty, we would no doubt see a very different perspective on the same issue, but anything bad that happens to men – well, they just have to learn to live it and *face hard realities* – just the opposite we see of every shamelessly evasive and reality-denying attitude and behaviour that women carry out when applied to their own appearance.

Even minor applications of cosmetics by men such as that to darken greying hair are mocked by women, and sadly we might point out, as usual also by our “comrades in arms” – *other men*.

If a man's god-given born facial features are not so great, or are fading with age, he can use no eyeliner, nor foundation, nor lip gloss, nor pluck his eyebrows and pencil in some false ones, or any of the other compendium of tricks that women employ.

It has to be admitted however, that many men do improve with age, in a way that many women do not, such as the ruggedly handsome *Pink Floyd* song writer *Roger Waters*, who has now transformed into being something of a Wild West hero type, as compared to his early days as a somewhat awkward looking and arty youth.

There is however, equally no reason, why women should not age well, if they also concentrate on *their character*, which will shine through their ageing features, rather than trying to re-impose a little girl prettiness on themselves which simply does not fit with advancing years and mature age.

Both women and men should accept that older age, is the time to principally develop their minds and enrich their inner life, rather than to attempt to wage a futile and vain battle with Nature's irreversible plans.

We should also note, as pointed out in relation to the kundalini theories of yoga as interpreted by Gopi Krishna, that moderation in all things would seem to be a far more reliable route to rejuvenation and reduced ageing for both men and women, than whole legions of so called "beauty products" could reliably ensure.

It is suggested also, that perhaps women should in general reduce their use of makeup to a bare minimum, as it is yet just another avenue of producing a fake reality to a man which enhances a desire that he doesn't need.

For example, painting bright red on lips and fingernails and toes seems to have a sexually exciting effect, which surely must originate from some deeply embedded instinctive urge, perhaps just as we find red colours of meat desirable, due to their connection with flesh and blood.

Another theory on this, is that some species of monkeys or apes show bright red parts on their sexual anatomy during the mating process, so this power of red painted on the female body may be a "throwback" to such a former evolutionary era.

Men should be aware that all these tactics which are not part of a woman's natural appearance, that are unceasingly explored and created by the fashion and cosmetic industries, are designed to hypnotically control him – to excite his desire for a woman unduly or whom he might not otherwise have even desired at all based on her natural beauty alone.

Women are allowed by current society to wear these elaborate masks, whereas men are not – women have to be allowed to see men *exactly as they are* – which is clearly another one of these many "double-standards" biased unfairly against men.

But both men and women should be aware that *the morning after* when perhaps the clothes are discarded and the makeup is faded away, they are both going to see one another as they really are.

And if neither then likes what they see, particularly the man, that relationship is unlikely to last.

So it is put to men that they should be careful to try to assess any woman in the real world he meets in terms of what lies beneath this glossy and superficial mask, she so carefully constructs each day before ever she leaves her house, and that women consider, that by using such masks, they are in fact creating a deceit which sooner or later will be found out to their cost.

It is also put to men that with very few exceptions, they are really indulging in a fantasy of the women before their eyes, rather than seeing the woman as she really is, which would leave them a whole lot less excited and sober in their behaviour towards her and women in general.

Wouldn't it be better, we submit to men, to find a woman who you love as she really is, and to women we say, wouldn't it be best to stop putting on all these extravagant disguises and find a man who will love you as you really are?

Modern society is very much built around this obsession with female beauty, which as they say is really only skin deep, and surely would be a far better place, if we concentrated our efforts in admiring and encouraging far less this superficial beauty of body, and looked far deeper to *the beauty of the heart*.

## **Chapter Twenty-six – Conclusion – What We Can Do To Bring The Paradise Of Men And Women Living In Harmony About**

First of all, don't think for a second that this has been a book attacking women, or intends any disrespect or hate to be directed at the female of our species.

As explained earlier, the whole of existence is an interplay of opposing forces and elements.

There are petals of a flower, and a stalk. The petals cannot take the place of the stalk and the stalk cannot take the place of the petals. Both parts are equally important, but it is only a lovely flower as we know it, when they are in their proper places.

Likewise, with women and men. Both genders are equally important, but must be in their proper places, to have harmony and beauty in family and society.

The proper places are generally that men should lead and be the head of the family, rather than be subservient and follow, as is the female role in marriage.

By subservience is not meant shame, or slavery, but being a worthy second in command on the voyage of family life.

The single woman can do as she pleases, within the boundaries of what is desirable for society, safe for her, and not threatening to the married man who is trying to support a family, and whose wife wishes to have the freedom from pressure to work and financial worry, to focus fully on the development of her children, and where time and energy allows, also upon her own free interests and pursuits.

If a woman realises that her role and greatest happiness is generally when in harmony with man and as guardian angel to her children, she will not be drawn to the ambitious roles in the outer world and material excesses which result from emotional and spiritual insecurity.

This will not prevent genuinely talented women from fulfilling their talents in non-family roles, if that is their true motivation and inclination, nor married women who are able when freed from the pressure of work, in following their natural inclinations in their hobbies and inner life.

But in order to bring this state of beautiful society and genuine true love and freedom for both men and women about, we must understand the discontent, trouble causing elements, which are generally represented by the feminist point of view, which stir up needless war between women and men, of whom all are the victims, especially the children, who desire the love, discipline and protection of men, regardless of what the feminist activists may think.

This restoration of order will not be easy, as we currently have a very damaged and misguided society, full of unhappy and uncooperative people, who have been hypnotised into seeking all the wrong solutions to their mental malaise.

Like the Roman Empire before them, the current capitalist leaders think that we, the people, should be satisfied with the bread and circuses which they currently offer us, but we have as a race grown too hungry for a deeper meaning to our existence, and a national and international social peace and justice, without which we cannot feel any real security or happiness.

Thus as little individuals caught up in this mess, we feel powerless and insignificant, but as *Mahatma Gandhi*, *Nelson Mandela* and many others have proven, a few brave and just men and women can change the whole world for the better, just as a few bad ones can lead it astray.

But few of us can hope to perform heroic deeds now that attract large crowds, as some of these heroes of history have done. Our battle and heroism generally has to be on a far smaller scale, with those around us, played out in our own little sphere.

Above all, we ourselves, have to become patient, wise and understanding people, and conquer the weaknesses and negative aspects in ourselves, before rushing to set others aright.

It's easy to judge others and condemn them, but difficult to be big-hearted and forgiving and suffer the pain others inflict on us, without giving the same back in revenge.

But that's the kind of spirit that it takes to win the hearts of both women and other men.

We are not alone however, and those who seek to do something good for themselves, their families, and the world, will find help if they look for it sincerely.

But it is necessary not just to be philosophical, but also practical. We have to be able to put our ideals into concrete terms.

Thus men have got to see that being seducible by women and excessively focussed on sex is a weakness not an asset, which will sooner or later disempower them as men.

We should not either force an unduly sexual role upon women, as this is to traumatize and threaten her security, if she is made to have sexual relations beyond her natural desire.

A man can after all, easily satisfy himself without troubling her, if the desire gets too strong to contain.

Whether we blame women or men for the current status quo is not the issue.

We can say it is a chicken and egg scenario, so in theory guilt could be assigned to either side. But we have to take the view that there is little we can do to change women except by changing ourselves and regaining the respect from women, that men have clearly lost.

Instead of complaining about the state of women, we have to accept that women are what we make them. They act like chameleons, mysterious and unpredictable, but that is only because their security and stability depends upon their need for our reassurance, and non-abusive love.

A troubled child is one which is uncertain of its parents' love, and the same applies to women. A child or woman who is loved by a man she admires, glows like an angel, she is the most beautiful creature on earth, and maybe even heaven.

That doesn't mean she has to look like a film star, but all women can radiate some kind of beauty when energised by love.

Do we want a caring society or a hateful one? We alone can decide.

But in the journey to this ideal, we may have to battle with devils, and sometimes the devils are inside ourselves, and sometimes inside our fellow woman and man.

*A Sheriff of Nottingham* on the throne oppresses both *Maid Marion* and *Robin Hood*. Peace and love cannot blossom until he is overthrown.

Likewise, a *wicked witch* can poison a *Snow White's* heart and mind, and see to it that she never finds her true love with the *Prince Charming* Nature intended for her.

So some fights will be necessary to put the good *King Richard* back into his rightful place, and put such wicked witches *in their place*, and as individuals, we must take up carefully and maturely these contests and crusades.

It is not going to be easy, and our heroism will be largely unsung.

For those of us who have the power as employers, consider these underlying issues in society, and where appropriate let us choose to support what we believe in, even if that means rejecting a woman you find pleasing and attractive and employing a man who is perhaps struggling to support a family, or even to make a life.

Let us also be aware that our female underlings may be conspiring to make our company into a feminist and female dominated haven, without us even realising it.

Let us not either fall for all this pseudo-psychology and New Age hypocrisy which talks of terms like "unconditional love", but is filled with money-grubbing, egotistical self-appointed experts and gurus who are often very far from being a genuine *Buddha* or *Jesus Christ*.

We should speak up for woman in her quest to be allowed to raise her children without financial pressure, and free from the slavery of a job which takes her away from them against her will.

Let us try to spread our hopefully new found understanding of women's psychology and true motivation to the ninety-nine percent of other men who have never had this education and information, and who despite all good intentions are therefore ninety-nine percent lost and confused.

In this way, we men, up until this point bickering and fighting amongst ourselves over our rivalries for women, money and jobs, can become friends, true brothers-in-arms, not in a battle against women, but in a quest for understanding and justice which will enable each of us to deal with his woman and family in a proper way, bringing social peace and harmony to all.

We should look for other help too, from more advanced beings like Krishnamurti and others, who can all teach us something we don't know, that can be of practical value in our daily lives.

Where safe and appropriate to do so, harangue the media protesting against the many negative images of men, which would never be considered acceptable if women were portrayed that way.

Look for these numerous instances of disrespect and injustice towards men, and ask where is this equality that men and women are supposed to now have.

Let us be cool and calm and collected when mistreated or insulted by women, as their continued persecution of us depends on them deriving energy from our visible expressions of outrage and hurt.

The bully – whether female or male – feeds off our hurt reaction, and without it is disarmed.

So where no effective protest is possible, let us learn to suffer in silence when rejected or mistreated by women, and find something in ourselves to rise above it all, and restore the joy within us, without female help.

Then my friends, shall we all be real men, bright lamps in the darkness of worldly sorrow and fears; independent, brave, free and not alone, but all one; kind and strong and gentle, yet not unloved, but all love.

## **Appendix I – a meditation technique which may help us gain control over our mind**

As pointed out earlier in this work, we are all to a lesser or greater degree “brainwashed” or “hypnotised.”

Like *Mel Gibson's* character in the movie *Conspiracy Theory*, we are likely at least ninety-percent unaware of our programming, in terms of what was done, by whom, and when, and thus the answer does not lie in the analysis of the psychiatrist's couch which probes only our accessible memories.

Why? Because, there are just too many, and they are too widely scattered and deeply planted to be resolved with “a session a week”, and an expensive one at that.

The meditation suggested here is not of the closed eyes, mantra chanting kind or of focusing on some object, idea or candle flame. That is not to deny the validity of some of those methods for some people at some times, but here is outlined something which we can use in our daily life at any time.

To be liberated, we need to be freed of the hypnotic influences in our mind, planted there by years of indoctrination and traumatic experience of one kind or another, most of which we can no longer recall.

We need a twenty-four hours a day method of ordering and unclogging our minds, which is simple enough to do anyplace at any time.

The method is just to practise a form of *awareness* of our feelings and thoughts, and is distilled from Krishnamurti's sometimes inscrutably difficult to follow philosophy, in a form that hopefully most readers can understand.

Krishnamurti explains that we cannot know ourselves in isolation. This is why probably lone meditation techniques cannot be completely successfully for re-ordering and liberating our minds.

We learn about ourselves *in relationship* and that is why we cannot know ourselves truly by hiding out in some little room alone.

We may think we know ourselves until someone does something, or some situation arises, which unearths submerged parts of our personality that we didn't know were there. We find this especially in our close relationships with the opposite sex, as they are accessing the earlier responses and characteristics we have gathered in our formative years.

That is, we see really mature and admirable men and women becoming like frightened or infuriated children after some encounter with their girl or boyfriend, or husband or wife. They suddenly exhibit all the tantrums and lack of control of a three or four year old, which shocks us to the core, if we have never witnessed adults behaving in this way before.



Thus, life challenges us in various ways, and it draws out what is inside of us, good and bad.

So we run to a therapist or self-help book to tell us what to do, how to deal with these powerful and confusing feelings and thoughts, or hope that our mantra meditation will calm our minds down and enable us to rise above these uncontrolled thoughts and feelings.

But those solutions rarely work comprehensively, as anyone who has tried them at length eventually knows.

We must learn as Krishnamurti puts it, to live each moment anew, seeing each new problem with a mind that has no complexes and problems of its own.

That can only be achieved by becoming fully aware of and accepting the contents of one's mind, *on a moment to moment basis*, and then seeing beyond that.

That is, for example – suppose we are out walking, minding our own business, and unexpectedly some stranger for no reason we can gather suddenly slaps our face.

What will we be? Angry, furious? Demand an apology? Until it happens *we do not know*.

So that is life, full of the unexpected – and the “meditation” here is – when that moment happens, which as we can see, is *each significant moment of our lives*, that is the moment to *watch the mind*.

We must watch the activities of our thoughts as if they were not our own – which you see, they really are not, just fragments of our past “conditioning” – and see what is there.

We may for example want to kill that woman or man who slapped us, so we see that. We watch that scene of vengeance in our mind.

We must learn to watch every moment of the day our automatic responses and then *rise above them*.

Many times, they can churn on for hours after some traumatic incident, and we are helpless to stop them, we just have to watch patiently until they subside.

The point is, we imagine we can egotistically *think* our way out of any problem. Technical problems we can. And sometimes human problems are a game of chess that we can plan and win.

But often there is no solution to our feelings, we are powerless before some situation, we are faced with situations we can do nothing about it seems. Then we have to watch the mind's endless efforts to solve problems it cannot.

(that is the *intellectual mind* cannot solve our problem, but possibly when that vain intellect has become silent, our *intuitive mind* can).

But our restless intellectual mind says we are going to give that person a good telling off, or whatever, we are going to put tacks under their car tyres, or cyanide in their mail – none of which we can do in the real world of course, without bringing greater harm to ourselves.

And as the days and weeks and months go by, we find by this process of watching without analysis, that we have a calmer, more peaceful mind.

The goal is never to find a technique, or discover a fact, or learn words of wisdom by heart, which when a situation comes up, we are unable to apply, but to create *a state of mind* - a contented, calm, lucid, quietly aware state of mind, that can see reality as it is.

This is but a brief explanation of such a process, which is a lifelong pursuit - read some Krishnamurti and you will understand this some more.