

Afraid of Women?

Sam Fryman

In the catchy theme music of the movie *Ghostbusters*, Ray Parker Junior confidently assures us that:

I ain't afraid of no ghost.

But there are much scarier beings on this planet by far than mere *ghosts* for us innocent and unwary menfolk, and they are known as *girls* and *women*.

So should we really be afraid of the female of our species?

Well the fact is, that countless men *are*.

If we watch the average movie, TV drama or soap opera we see boys and men in constant fear of asking girls or women out on a date or whatever.

Of course this *very real fear* boys and men feel often leads to a defiant state of denial, which leads to boasts of conquests of women, or swapping of chauvinistic and frequently vulgar remarks about the physical and sexual attributes of women to diminish them *in our minds*.

It is a typical strategy we all tend to use to try to mentally cut down to size those whom we fear, to mock them or make demeaning jokes about them, but though that sniggering and derision makes us feel better for a while, when we meet this scary person *in real life* whether it be a politician, a woman or whoever, we frequently find that the fear has not gone away.

In the case of women and girls whom we are “romantically” or sexually attracted to, many males experience a great deal of tongue-tiedness, and find it difficult to express their thoughts or feelings to this peculiar gender at all.

But we are not going to mock such males for experiencing that, because our view is that the danger is genuine, and that this is really a legitimate fear.

We also see however, how so many girls and women revel in thus knowing that men are afraid of them.

Many girls and women try to seek out especially the means to extract from men this experience they have when they see a “goddess” type woman, and get this so called “wow factor.”

It is a fairly rare woman or girl who first thing in the morning without make up and just wearing a dressing gown and slippers could give most men such a “wow factor”, but once the girl gets to her make up mirror and wardrobe and sets about creating this goddess, within half an hour or so she is able to transform herself into something that looks like it was out of a shop window or a glossy magazine.

And thus boys and men are held in fear of these dazzlingly beautiful mannequins who adorn our city streets, shops, social meeting and work places, just as we see so many girls in fear and apprehension if they meet big *male* celebrities like movie actors or pop/rock stars.

We see that the common factor that holds both sexes in thrall and fear is not *the actual human being themselves*, but the image in our minds of *who we think they are*.

Kings, Queens and Emperors and VIPs throughout history have used such props as expensive, spectacular and sometimes beautiful clothes and jewellery to show their superior status to the rest of the population.

But of course to even be able to afford fine clothes, let alone jewellery, in the past was far outside of the lot of the common man or woman, and so it was easy for such aristocrats and royalty to outdo the rest of us, by for example possessing and wearing a silk gown which would immediately mark them out as VIPs wherever they should go.

So understandably, in our status obsessed age, we still see countless men and women up to such tricks.

It is fairly easy to tell by looking at how most people dress to see what “class” they are from *financially speaking*.

There is also the question of *taste*. Some people do not know how to match colours, and what styles look ridiculous and vulgar, they have no artistic sense, and constantly thus make themselves look silly by making tasteless choices.

On the other hand, of course, we can get a good measure of how egotistical people are by how they dress, of *how important they think they are*.

As we have said elsewhere, we see this quite dramatically displayed when all the leading movie actresses at the Oscars or whatever try to upstage one another with their dresses, to be “Queen Bee”, which leads some to even make almost pornographic displays of themselves, with dresses split up the side and held together only with safety pins, like the famous one that Liz Hurley wore not too many years ago.

So in assessing our fear of women, this illusion of *dress* is one element we have to bear in mind that is used to intimidate us.

The message is often – *I’m too expensive for you. You couldn’t afford me.*

Of course, when men become aware of this, this frequently tends to make them resent, despise or even unashamedly *hate* such women, who obviously think they are a cut above most of us, and whose likely targets are only the very wealthy, worldly successful and celebrity classes.

Thus, many such downtrodden men not in those elite classes find a great deal of satisfaction in stories such as that of Rasputin, who though an unashamedly blunt mannered peasant, due to his privileged position in the royal court and general mysteriousness was able to treat a lot of these aristocratic women with contempt and more or less sexually use and abuse them at his whim.

But more generally, this awareness of womens’ desire to make a display of themselves as “a lady” is intimidating to men to the extent that many of us are therefore on a mission to attain *status* so that we can equal that of the kind of woman we desire.

The higher classes (*materially speaking*, please understand) of women tend to hunger to be fashionable and “elegant”, and in our Western society and in the developing Eastern ones, to be fashionable and elegant generally costs *lots of money*.

No doubt this is part of the reason so many countless women are getting into truly awful and security threatening amounts of debt, trying to live the fashionable material life, which quite frankly most of them simply *cannot afford*, as indeed cannot most men.

For the fashionable men and women will spend on even one pair of shoes what might be the income of a jobless person or poorer worker for an entire week or month, and they will not be content with just one pair of shoes or even five or six pairs, but will likely wants scores or even in some cases hundreds of pairs.

So what is the answer to all this for we men?

Firstly, any woman who dresses extravagantly rather than just *nicely* is giving most of us a message *beware*, because regardless of who is funding those expensive clothes now, if we want her, sooner or later it is going to be *us*.

We can thus use this as a positive, because we can likely assess the amount of vanity and egotism any particular woman has got, judging by how she *chooses* to dress any time we see her, because this issue really is a very serious choice matter indeed.

As Mohammed (you know, the guy whose followers and philosophy the West currently seems intent on destroying and demonising) said:

Verily, the best of women are content with little.

And that most certainly applies to the issue of dress and *jewellery*.

But even if we are not dumbed down into fear and silence by a woman's spectacular princess, queen-like, or even sexually enticing dress, overcome by this "wow factor", we may simply be intimidated by her alluring beauty and sexually arousing curves and shape, which even without the clever dressing can have a wow factor all of its own in a good many cases.

The thing to bear in mind then is that, despite this sometimes spectacular façade, it really *is* a façade. There's *a human being* inside that enticing shell, and that is a serious point and illusion that we as men are all tempted to forget.

If like in some science-fiction quasi-utopia we had android type robot women, like perhaps the ones in the *Star Trek* original series episode *Mudd's Women*, who fulfilled all our sexual desires without the nagging and complaints, and indeed without us having to live in fear of *not satisfying them*, women would be the equal of our perceptions of them sexually speaking.

But of course, *they are not*.

This hopefully pretty face and beautiful body that makes us want to mate with it (to put it politely) unfortunately *has a human being attached to it*.

We are saying *unfortunately*, from the point of view only of our sex desire.

If we didn't need our women for sex, our relationships would surely be a whole lot better with them, because we wouldn't have to engage in the typically awkward and never ending negotiations with them that are generally required *nowadays* to get their cooperation in this sexual aspect.

For example, if we go to a football game, we pay the admission price and take our seat and wait for the game to begin. If the players walked out onto the pitch, and said, "sorry we don't feel like it today, we might entertain you instead next week, *if we are in the mood*", we would understandably feel cheated and annoyed.

But this is more or less *exactly* what happens to us in terms of our sexual relationships with women. Whether we get "lucky" or not, is dependent entirely upon *her whim*.

If she is not pleased with us, she may tell us to *go take a hike*, which for most of us would not be anything like as satisfying as truly consensual sex, and under such circumstances it is hardly surprising that so many millions of men – even or *especially even* married ones – are turning to prostitution and "online sex", because in the latter cases they know they are on *a sure thing*, and don't have to do any potentially tedious or humiliating *begging*.

Yes – *begging* – we have used that word quite deliberately, because in modern times, that is pretty much what a man's request to a woman for sex really is.

There was a slightly distasteful somewhat feministic hit song a few decades back, called *Only Women Bleed*.

One telling couplet in it was:

He's got the power

She's got the need.

But the truth it seems rather nowadays is: *She's* got the power (to say *yes* or *no*) and it is *he* who has the (typically desperate) sexual *need*.

So if we need sex, as most of us men do on a regular basis, it is at her whim, it is at the whim of the desirable and even not so desirable women in the world to either grant it us or not, *as they see fit*.

Now if this doesn't make man *the slave of woman* what on earth else does?

So to our younger readers especially we should and must explain *things weren't always like this*.

Oh, no. Many of our fathers and almost all of our grandfathers and their predecessors had a very different set of options on their sexual menu.

Basically they had at least *from their wives* virtually *sex on demand*.

It was a woman's expected *duty* to give her man sex whenever he required it.

And although it is not our view that men should ever force sex on women against their wishes, if a woman actually *loves* a man, and he doesn't ask her to do anything difficult or that she may find unpleasant or disgusting like in many cases *oral sex*, then our feeling is that as men do most of the hard work in sex, and it will still work pretty well for them even if a woman just lies back and thinks of England, Ireland, America, Russia, China or wherever, it shouldn't really be too much of a sacrifice for her, should it?

Bearing in mind as we pointed out in our earlier work *If Men Went on Strike*, he does all these things *for her* – you know, *dying* in wars and inventing and making and maintaining all her luxury and labour saving devices and cars, mobile phones and so on – *for no charge*, then is it really so much to ask that she should give him what he so desperately needs, without torturing him in that process, or using the giving or denial of sex as some kind of a weapon against him to enslave him and run his life?

So boys and men need to be aware of these issues.

They need to be aware, that if they want human happiness, dignity and self-respect, they should look at this “sex contract” between men and women in whatever relationship they are in.

And in particular, in that regard they should be aware that though women don't generally speaking need sex from men with anything like the same desperation that men need it from women, in one situation they are if anything even *more* desperate for sex from men, and that situation is the almost universal one amongst women of *when they want a child* (or *another*, or *yet another* one).

For in such a circumstance, we do not *then* see the boards going up, and “a headache” or whatever intervening between a man's desires or arguably needs; rather we see the sign of *business as usual* together with an enthusiastic and welcoming smile.

But now thanks to the feminists, things have changed for men *for the worse*, and if he dares to try to force himself even on his wife, she can easily cry “abuse” or “rape” and have him arrested and maybe even imprisoned.

In our view, as part of the “extended pre-nuptial contract” we suggested in our earlier work *A Men's Liberation Guide to Women*, 4th Edition, we should include the clause that neither partner should *ever* set the police or a social worker or any other

interfering official or authority on the other, or that will be taken as legitimate grounds for divorce.

For it certainly breaches the contract that is supposed to be based on *cherishing*, *honouring* and *respecting* one another, does it not?

Whereas, we are well aware, by “having our ear to the ground” that the *option* of a woman setting the police on a man is a common weapon in the armoury of women, and of course, it is not used merely for the legitimate cases of genuine abuse or unjustifiable violence (i.e. *that not in self-defence*), but as a threat to make against him when she simply *wants her own way*.

For example, suppose a man’s own child swore at him, and after a verbal warning continued to do so, and he in our view quite legitimately gave it a *measured* slap to induce in it some much needed *respect*.

Many *modern* women in such circumstances might object to such disciplinary actions, and describe it as *abuse* and ring the nearest social worker or police station to get him removed from the home.

So we have to know *for sure* if our prospective woman has got such ideas on her menu as what she deems “legitimate options” *before* ever we marry her or have sex with her with the possibility of causing children to be born.

Because if we don’t, we are putting that child into a position of potential abuse, and at minimum neglect, by likely growing up without a father, and for all we know, whether our child is a boy or a girl, its mother is going to get some beastly new boyfriend or husband who will seriously abuse the child, and likely because she is too scared of *him*, though she apparently wasn’t *of us*, she won’t dare try to stop such a person from abusing or mistreating *our little boy or girl*.

So we see, that as we mindlessly and thoughtlessly get enticed into a woman’s bed to do what modern society tells us is the most wonderful thing we ever could (and please tell us afterwards: was it *really* that good for *you*?), we are actually potentially condemning a new human being to a life of misery, of a life of unprotected and uncared about cruelty and abuse.

Women don’t only abuse their boy children, they also abuse their female ones, if only by cruel and bullying treatment. But because it’s not generally *sexual abuse*, but typically rather the mostly undetectable *psychological abuse*, we hardly hear a word about it.

Where is the *evidence* of such abuse the reader might ask?

The evidence is *unhappiness*, *insecurity*, which can be seen in children as young as five or even earlier if one has an experienced and sensitive eye. But in its adult form we see insecurity and unhappiness in both sexes, and not realising that this is a wholly unnatural and needless state of affairs, few adults equate their state with childhood neglect or abuse.

Shall we put it really simply?

Our considered opinion after observing the human condition in thousands of subjects over around half a century is that there are few people around who as either children or adults have felt really secure and *loved*.

It would be a most fascinating study therefore to see how much damage that this *sexual abuse* of children, which you know, is supposedly the most awful thing that can ever happen to anyone, “ruining their whole life” actually compares to what happens to the victims of systematic *psychological* abuse, you know, of the constant belittling, verbal abusive and humiliating kind that so many women are so very good at inflicting on not only their men, but also on their little girls and boys.

Of course fathers can be negligent and abusive too. For example, British comedian Billy Connolly admitted a few years back of having been systematically sexually abused by his father. But we aren't terribly convinced that he is any less happy than the next man who wasn't, and he is certainly a lot more *successful* than most, and apparently happily married for many years to a once very glamorous actress who appeared as the moll of the super-villain in one of the *Superman* movies.

The most serious abuse is almost undetectable at an early age – it is the destruction of somebody's intelligence and self-respect, it is the destruction of *their heart and mind*.

Though we are not remotely saying it is right, many children did not even realise that they were being abused until the social workers or “psychologists” explained it to them, so most seriously we ask – how much *real* and *lasting* damage did such *sexual* abuse do, when we are confronted by the media with this never-ending obsession about it almost every day?

It thinks that the media protests far too much about the alleged *physical* abuse of children *by men*, and *not half enough* about the abuse of us all *psychologically*, both as children and even when we get to be *adults*.

Because, whilst society may not be able to undo the abuse that has already been done to so many of us as children – as we have said, the vast majority of the abuse being *psychological damage to our personalities* rather than *sexual abuse* – it certainly could give us all an easier time *as adults* to compensate for any unfortunate start in life that we may have had, but *it doesn't*.

Is it not laughable and ridiculous, that this society goes wildly crazy about this tiny aspect of our lives *i.e. child sex abuse*, which only happens *in a major way* to a small minority of people; but then when we are adults, it's OK to treat us like garbage, cheating us and making our lives miserable and insecure in a thousand different ways?

For example, all these laws against men, making us all more or less suspected rapists or child abusers, have had the effect of scaring so many of us out of relationships and jobs working with women and children.

But the fear of women is being spread even more by the never ending propaganda war led by the feminist inspired media.

For example, in a recent TV reality show set in the Australian outback, a number of celebrity contestants were split into two groups of men and women and made to compete against one another.

No doubt some readers would regard this reality TV as nonsense, and whilst fundamentally we feel it is exploitative on numerous levels and ideally should not exist, we regard it as an intrinsic part of our modern culture, and thus it is influencing millions and therefore relevant to our debate.

But as an opportunity for psychological experiment and analysis it is quite useful, given that we are seeing *real life*, and not as so often on TV, mere pre-programmed fiction with adults convincingly pretending to be *what they are not*.

In this case, on two consecutive nights in order to win a prize, the *male* group of celebrities were asked two questions, one per night.

On the first night they were asked: *which sex has been proven by scientific research to be the most (intellectually) intelligent?*

And on the second night the question was: *which gender successfully passes the driving test more often at the first attempt?*

In both cases, these males concurred in giving the answer to each question as *women*, and were revealed as *wrong* in both instances, and therefore failed to win the prize, since in both cases the superior achievers were *men*.

But our point is – what on earth made these generally very successful celebrity men effectively betray their own gender, in the sense of downgrading it, and attributing to women likely superiority in both cases?

This is clearly a symptom of the mass brainwashing that is going on in our society, trying to blur and even reverse the gender roles, and denying the reality of the general differences between men and women.

e.g. men are generally superior at physical and visuo-spatial skills such as driving a car or flying a plane or whatever, and generally better at focussing on *one thing at a time*.

Our personal view, contrary to what many especially long term readers may imagine is that men are *not* superior in intelligence to women, but that intelligence generally speaking functions differently in men and women.

That is, women multi-task and their general life agenda more or less forces them to do so. They don't *desire* to focus on one subject as men do, and possibly the main reason for this is because they do not have to be the “chasers” after a mate as men do, they do not have to flaunt their success as men try to do as some kind of mating display.

The lowly scullery maid in the palace can *very easily* marry the prince, if she is pretty enough and adequately intelligent, but a prince (genetically speaking) who finds himself trapped in a servant's role will have far greater difficulty making the same manoeuvre.

So this desire to make a mark on the world that men throughout history have always had has motivated them to achieve in the world, to do great things, mostly to impress or win the rights to obtain women due to being dominant amongst men, you know – *alpha males*.

Thus because men *focus* on one subject or another, they become a genius or very capable in some field, whereas merely because women *don't focus*, they generally do not.

It has got little or nothing to do with “women's liberation.” Women do not become Einsteins or Steven Hawkings simply because *they don't want to, it's not their agenda*.

Whether there are actual limitations in the female brain preventing the vast majority of women from achieving such intellectual heights is pretty much a non-issue, for we must recall that the vast majority of men also do not reach the heights of the Einstein or the Beethoven type.

But women *are* focussing on one thing in this era of “women's liberation”, and that is not so much any particular subject, but on the concept of *success*.

Most women fifty years ago grew up with ideas of finding a husband and caring for children and learned how to cook, clean, sew and so on. They might work for a while at anything whatsoever, but generally speaking it was only a temporary measure, to be given up at marriage or childbirth, apart from those women who could not find a husband and therefore in many cases were *forced* to work, just to support themselves.

But now, what is in almost every young girl and woman's head?

She is thinking *I must study, I must pass exams, I must get a degree, I must get a career*.

But just so long as she is averagely attractive, the average woman *always* has an option that almost no man ever does – which is to marry, have children and let the man support her.

And nobody in the media ever talks about this.

They say “women must have equality.” But they don’t point out that the vast majority of women always have this *option*, that men generally speaking *never* have, so where is the equality?

Men *must* work all the lives unless they make so much money they can retire, or have some fortunate and almost totally unlikely lottery win or large inheritance.

This ain’t no equality.

But has we have seen, men have now even been conditioned to believe women are superior, even when such is not the case.

We see girl soldiers, girl round-the-world-yachtswomen, women who are billionaires and bosses of big businesses, women high ranking police and secret service officers, judges, professors, members of parliament and even presidents, and the general effect of this is to threaten men, threaten men’s sense of identity.

And if men voice this very real *fear* they have, that their territory as leader, as breadwinner, as *hero* is being taken away piece by piece from them by women, they are mocked and scorned by women and even by other men.

But these same “traitor” men, who currently may imagine they have a secure position in society, who laugh at the other men who didn’t make it because they were quite likely in many cases beaten to or ousted from the job they wanted by a woman or even a *girl*, they too will sooner or later surely feel fear as some woman or other starts to encroach on their employment territory also.

As usual, it’s just the same old bravado which in reality is just a process of denial, for men to deny that they are under threat from women.

Because if a woman marries a successful man she gets *respect* just for being his wife, and even more so if she has his children.

But if a man has no career, no worldly success, just what is *he*?

He is *nobody* as far as media values are concerned, as far as the elite and successful classes are concerned.

So what as men are we supposed to do?

Women are taking our roles away, and if we complain about it we are mocked and labelled as “cissies” and so on, not only by women, *who are therefore just using this as a dirty trick to stop any man resisting them*, clearly in this Machiavellian way, but also by the diminishing number of men in power, who are *in denial*, and all want to pretend that they are invulnerable and their jobs are not under threat from women.

So we see the depth of the cunning wickedness of the plan of the feminist women – to like any kind of totalitarian and undemocratic regime *silence all opposition*.

Well, let them know here and now, *they have not succeeded*.

And it may be that they may even some day silence your author, as some have already tried to do by objecting to us posting on one site or another on the basis of some excuse or other, such as that our works were unfit for consumption by some of the children who may visit the tracker sites.

(you know, that is so laughable, when the Internet is absolutely stuffed with the most perverse and sadistic porn from end to end, *freely accessible by most children*, and then we try to write something *debunking* the all powerful myth of sex, and *protect women* by cooling men’s sexual madness down, and we get attacked by *feminists* or similar types; thus we see the knee-jerk reaction, unseeing twisted logic

and utter *madness* of these people, that they even attack us for doing things they themselves endorse and therefore should be supporting).

But silence us some day *they may*. Then however Nature will likely take a hand, and it may even do it in the from of the current conflict between the Muslim world and the West.

The Muslim world is more or less the last remaining centre of true *male authority and male power in the entire world*.

The West is *currently* lost to feminism, to men being enslaved to the worship of women. If men don't believe in a God, which currently most Western men probably don't, then the only guiding force and motive in their lives becomes women, and some hazy concept of power through modern science, which does not currently seem to have the means to solve our global problems, and in our view *never will*.

Why do we think science will *never* solve our problems?

(apart from purely *material ones* of course)

Because our number one problem is *how to live peacefully together*, and when science offers us only the Darwinist theory which says we are just animals in Nature who are struggling competitively to survive, and only the "fittest" will prosper and thrive, if we have any genuine concept of logic in us, we will easily see that all that can ever lead to is ever more violence between man and man, and nation and nation.

And my god, now things have got so bad, not only have the mischief makers and tyrants of the world got man fighting against man, both as neighbour, "colleague" and internationally as war, but we also have this most unholy of battles between men and women, you know, the people who are supposed to be *loving one another*, because it is on the success and quality of that man-woman relationship that the whole future of the world and its children depends.

For let us be clear and logical. Those who attack the stability and structure of the family, attack the whole world, because the whole human world is nothing else but a collection of families.

The great debate that is taking place in the world now, is not merely about what should be the role of women, but what should be *the role of men*.

And as women take more and more power, and more and more neglect and emasculate their male children, we men will deteriorate ever more into a gender of weak, undisciplined addicts, emotional wrecks and ne'er do wells.

The young are already showing this in their droves, lacking proper care, attention and discipline as children, in their teenage years they are hooked on instant gratification provided by the porn, casual sex, and drugs industries, and even by computer games, which leave us fat and physically incapable, while girls and women go in for kick boxing and martial arts and work out in the gym.

And it's not only in the gym that girls are learning to "kick male butt" and again, *make boys and men afraid*. More importantly in fact, girls and women in their hundreds of millions are studying hard to get degrees, careers, jobs, whereas boys in their hundreds of millions are going wayward, disliking studying, and rebelling in self-destructive ways.

(please bear in mind this is *mostly* because boys who are not suited to academic study are being forced into undo amounts of it, when they should really be being prepared to work in industry, farming, trades and so on – i.e. principally *manual labour* based on mens' generally superior *physical and mechanical skills*).

And the girls and women are just revelling in this *fear* that they have caused in boys and men by trying to outdo them in every arena, even though the mere display of their sexuality already had most males in a tangle.

But when men are destroyed, when young men do not come through the ranks and replace their fathers to keep the world working, which really *cannot* happen without the work and intelligence and creativity of men, there will be no more geniuses, and a diminishing number of the truly skilled workers, thinkers and scientists and trades people who keep this modern world spinning round.

When men are destroyed – which is not far off – then the whole world will fall with them, as we clearly expressed and more or less *proved* in our recent work *If Men Went on Strike*.

Then women may *see* what an enormous and tragic error they have made, when the boy who should have become the man who fixes her car is banged up in jail on a drug charge, or has become a hopeless alcoholic who has no fixed abode, or a gambling addict who one sad day gets stabbed to death by a loan shark when he can no longer repay his debts and gets caught up with – they will finally see what an enormous, tragic and virtually irreparable error they have made to disempower men so, as they are currently so wilfully and enthusiastically doing.

So as usual, we are not talking merely for the sake of it.

We want to state *solutions* not merely *problems*.

So what do we *men* do?

What do we do about this state of fear that girls and women have got us in?

Well, the *long answer* we have given in our various works.

The short answer, is we do the same as the current most powerful nation in the world once did.

We declare *independence*.

It is time for men to once again become heroes.

We only fear women, because we don't understand them, or because we need them.

We need to correct those two situations.

We need to understand them, so they cannot confuse and manipulate us any more, and we need to learn how to live independently without them, if need be, or learn to live *with them* without being their sex-addicted slaves or perennial adult children.

Advice on how to achieve both the above goals we have given in our various works.

Girls and women are revelling in their new found power, they are to put it politely, intoxicated with it.

Anyone who has witnessed their antics in the workplace and observed carefully their behaviour in the political, social and celebrity spheres knows these truths.

Those inexperienced with women in any of these ways may perhaps be made even more afraid by our words.

But they should not be.

All that is required is to read and work with the words and explanations we have given, for example in *A Men's Liberation Guide to Women*, and *Understanding Female Sexuality and Porn*.

Then armed with what may at first only be a lot of "theories", watch women's behaviour in the real world, and gradually discover that what we have said is almost entirely, if not entirely the truth.

We would as men all like to believe that women are the wonderful angels that their appearance so often suggests to us, that they were always *sugar and spice and all things nice*.

But the truth is despite their alluring physical form, they are just human beings as are we. They are just personalities with desires and ambitions, and it is just what

exactly these desires and ambitions are *for* that makes them either *truly* beautiful or not.

That is, girl or *woman A* may well for example wish to become a lawyer, so she can feel proud of herself, make her family and friends admire or respect her, and have lots of money and drive a luxury car and live in a luxury home, wear the finest clothes and travel abroad and so on.

Whereas *girl or woman B* may wish to be a lawyer in order to fight for the rights of the dispossessed and to defend innocent people who are wrongly accused and see that they are not falsely imprisoned.

So we have to learn to distinguish between woman A and woman B, because the first is going to be only looking out for herself, and the second has got noble ideals and above all *a heart*.

So we need to distinguish the caring women from the uncaring, and we should not be deceived by the *fake* caring women, such as Hilary Clinton, who in their paranoiac obsession with protecting women and children are by their laws, policies and prejudices *destroying men*.

For we pointed out for example how millions of male youths are being destroyed by the wrong handling of them as children and teenagers in our earlier work *How the Feminists Stoles Psychology*.

Male children need *men's love* more than they need *women's love*, because women are generally speaking incapable of *teaching boys how to be men*.

A boy has got to see that role model of the stoic, self-denying, self-disciplined man, who knows how to restrain his desires, who follows *principles*, who is a *hero* of at least a small kind, who is capable *if he must* of playing out his role of *a walk on part in the war*.

Whilst we don't approve of wars, we also don't approve of weakness in men, and that is exactly what this society is creating:- an "army" of emotionally weak, psychologically stunted boys who may be great at playing video games, but are just being programmed to hunger for and worship women, and are likely incapable of functioning without the constant support and presence of a female.

That is as we said what happens when there is no *strong man* in their lives to show them how to be a man.

And we are not talking *John Wayne* or *Arnold Schwarzenegger*, we are talking of the ideal man as like *Kwai Chang Caine* out of the *Kung Fu* TV series, or indeed the Masters in the temple who taught him. We are talking *Mr Miyagi* out of *The Karate Kid*, we are talking the heroic lawyer *Atticus Finch* in the movie and novel *To Kill a Mocking Bird*, we are talking *El Cid* – he needn't be a *physical* fighting champion since for every man there is always someone better and stronger in that regard – but a man like Mahatma Gandhi who heroically sticks to his principles in the face of all opposition.

That is what we mean by *a real man*. A man who inspires idealism and heroism in his male children, and hopefully even female ones.

His daughter is then attracted as an adult woman to such a man of intelligence, principles and courage, rather than one merely with a big sex organ who gives her "great sex" as the utterly confused and brainwashed average modern woman is being hypnotised into being made to seek.

We are experiencing a mass persecution, and it is not the word *Jude* (i.e. *Jew*) that is being put up as the object of demonisation and hate, it is the word *men*.

But though men *as a gender* are being made to live in fear throughout Western society, as any racially hated group is, *because they are men* they believe they are just

supposed to take it, they aren't supposed to complain, because *women are telling them so*.

When the man's government closes down all his industries that he used to work in and therefore *takes all his jobs away*, he is not supposed to complain about that, he is supposed to stop whinging and find some other way to succeed.

Now if he fails to train for a high tech industry or other professional job such as accountant, doctor or lawyer – which the great mass of men simply don't have the aptitude for, they are *physical* and *technical* rather than *intellectual* – then he is told he must be a slave in a hotel for wealthy people, or a sales assistant in a burger bar, or alternatively if he is tough and ruthless enough he can become some kind of success in the business world, in which likely he is going to be forced to end up breaking most of his principles and religious commandments, in particular, the one of *treat thy neighbour as thy self*.

No, not *cheat thy neighbour rather than thy self*, which has indeed become the new commandment in this godless, Darwinist competitive world, which gives no security to anybody, and whose end point is the kind of semi-gangster world we have now – which is so evident for example in modern Russia – and whose likely ultimate destination is *nuclear war*, because when enough bad and stupid people get into power there is *always* going to be war, and now we have the nuclear weapons, no doubt sooner or later *if this continues* it is going to become to some extent a nuclear one.

And please understand, this has all come about because women have rejected *men of principle* in favour of *men of the world* who have power and worldly success, because our modern women want exactly those things – *power and success*.

The scientists are continually mocking religion and like famous Cambridge University biologist Professor Richard Dawkins, calling it *The Virus of Faith*, but they don't see that once these ideas of inner harmony – i.e. *inner success* – and fair treatment of one's neighbour introduced *only* by prophets such as Christ, Buddha and Mohammed are kicked out of the ball park, the only people left in the ball park are the exploiters and the gangsters, who will create mayhem for the mass of people, as their agenda as we see in the case of so many modern politicians is merely *looking after number one*.

Screw the people, screw the planet, all I care about is *me*, is their mantra. *Greed is good*, as Michael Douglas said in *Wall Street* playing the real life story of ruthless financier *Gordon Gecko*.

So where does this leave all us *good men and boys*?

Disempowered, obviously.

So as we have said, our *answer* to this problem of male disempowerment, and indeed we should not overlook, the disempowerment also of the *good* women at the expense of the bad, we have done our best to explain and express in our various works.

But it all hangs ultimately upon *understanding* and upon consequent self-discipline and mental and emotional self-control.

We have to be *warriors of the mind*.

When the girl or woman comes at us with her massive armoury of enticements and tricks trying to wrap us around her finger and enslave us, we have to see the real human being inside her – you know, the typically confused, emotionally desperate and damaged creature she *really* is – and smile at her politely and deal with her in a calm, considerate, but ultimately *dispassionate, objective* way.

We may be sitting at a table, and she comes and sits beside us and unexpectedly places her hand on our leg, a common manoeuvre amongst women when they want to gain some kind of power or influence over us, or just play at teasing us to see what kind of *reaction* they are going to get.

And our reaction is merely *a smile*. It certainly is *not* an erection, which we might in our inexperience or shock produce at such a manoeuvre, because after all, the sexual “come-on” is not generally speaking *real*, and even if *it is*, if we try to do something about it we will undoubtedly suffer for that short-term pleasure in the long term, and if any desperate youth is not yet convinced of that, well, they should take a good look at *older men* (whom you know, like their father, they might have little or no experience of, because their mother has *kicked him out* before he got into his teens – and don’t fall for that line “your father walked out or ran away when you were two”, consider *why* he “ran out on you” – was it that your *mother* drove him out of his mind, and he really didn’t *want* to leave you? - maybe she was jealous of his relationship *with you*, in which case you won’t ever get the truth out of *her*).

So whether we had a present father in our life or not, we need to look at the lives of older men, see what became of them at the hands of their women, let us for a change in this world of ever babbling women, both in private and on our TV screens, hear *a man’s side of the story* for a change.

For there are indeed countless millions of boys and men now who have never known their father, and consequently therefore never heard *his side of the story*.

And the result is, a boy grows up hating his own father. He grows up detached from the belief in the potential goodness and value of the masculine side of himself.

He lives in inner conflict. Then from that *cause* we see drug addiction, violence, crime, abuse of women and so on as *the effect*.

Little do the feminists realise, they are busy creating a vast army of near psychopathic men in denial of their feelings who may someday come to slaughter them, as he has lost his male identity which would have given him his *humanity*, and now set free from moral laws in a state of hate, he can murder, rape and commit savage violence at will, to temporarily *relieve the pain*, just like the “ultra-violent” criminal youths depicted in Anthony Burgess’s prophetic novel, later converted into a shocking movie, *A Clockwork Orange*.

But let us stay simple, let us keep close to home, to *the here and now*.

The greater effect of this emasculation of the male, of the decline of good fathers influencing their male children, is *the emotional dependence of men on women*.

Millions of women mock men as *little boys* who in many cases can’t even cook and clean for themselves, and take care of themselves generally speaking.

What is never explained is that this state of *meek subservience* and weakness comes from being *psychologically destroyed*.

A mother barks orders at a little boy like a dog, treats him like a dog.

“EAT UP YOUR DINNER NOW.” “TIDY YOUR ROOM NOW.” “DON’T DARE ANSWER ME BACK.” “DO YOUR HOMEWORK NOW OR ELSE.” “DON’T YOU DARE PLAY AROUND WITH YOUR SEX ORGAN, IT’S DISGUSTING.”

And so on and so on, with a few random and brutal physical smacks or actual beatings thrown in for effect from time to time at such an early age, when the mother is far superior in physical strength to the boy child, and isn’t therefore yet afraid that she will be hit back at.

Whereas, if a boy respects a mother due to the love and consideration she shows for him, though she must at times say don’t do this or that, on the whole he will obey

her because he trusts and loves her, and knows she has his best interests at heart, and therefore he will not need barking orders at.

On the contrary, he will trust her with his thoughts and feelings which she – the *good* mother – freely allows him to express, as she is ultimately *his friend*.

But millions of mothers do not have this *love* in them, and all we get is the traumatising and bullying process, the imposition of *her egotistical will* upon his innocent and defenceless mind and body.

And this inhumanity of mothers is directed not only against male children, but is generally worse against male children because women have got this unhealthy relationship with men, this desire to dominate and be the sole power in his existence.

Your author is not talking out of his “hat” in explaining these things. He is basing them on the reality of his *first hand experience* of observing mothers interacting with their children, especially their male ones.

We even see this reflected in the way mothers deal with their children in soap operas.

You know – if as we explained in our earlier work *The Myth of the Teenage Rebellion* – teenagers are wayward, do not want to do “the right thing”, then it is far too late to be barking orders at them then, for likely that will lead to only a greater rebellion.

Our basic point in that work, is that if a parent has an out of control teenager on his or her hands, it is his or her far earlier mistakes that have led to that situation, and for the parent then to believe they can now have any significant influence is mostly a mistake.

In fact, as we said in that work, the only possible influence such a parent can have is to *repent*, and *confess their own errors*, and apologize (but not in a grovelling way) for the mistakes they made, and urge the child to take responsibility for itself, to find its own way without further influence from them, except as the friendship and advice offered by one adult to another.

Of course the average parent is more or less incapable of doing this, as they are addicted to trying to control their out of control creation, they cannot accept that its problems are *their own creation*, especially but not only in the case of *mothers*.

But let us stay simple.

The greatest lesson that men have got to learn in regard of women is how to be patient, how to wait.

The media and the peer pressure of their “friends” bullies boys into trying to get sexually experienced at an early age, but this can be disastrous for the boys themselves on any number of levels.

A boy can be tricked into having children long before he is ready, and though the boy himself may not suffer greatly, the odds are *his child will*. Especially if it is a male child, its mother will resent that she picked an immature and unready and in many ways therefore *useless* male, and she will take those frustrations out on the male child; and in the case of her having a female child, she will just teach it to hate and distrust and disrespect men, due to the men in her life who have disappointed her.

What boys and men fail to understand, is that such a woman – even the likes of *Princess Diana* as we explained in our *Men’s Liberation Guide* – has *already* been “programmed” by her abusive past to seek out the kind of man who will disappoint her, and thus perpetuate this misery in the world, this unbroken cycle of abused men and women fathering more abused and neglected male and female children, who then go on to do the same, generation after generation, as if it were *right and normal*, when the reality is that it is the most utter madness and contempt for human life and the new

human lives who are the children we thoughtlessly and negligently create to “win our manhood”, or in the case of women, so they can have a child that loves them and whom they can dominate to *make them feel secure*.

This is the unspoken and awful truth.

An abused or unloved (it's pretty much *the same*) girl grows up with a mental conflict and insecurity, with a mission to be loved, and then disbelieving in the concept, she picks some immature boy or man and lures him into a sex relationship, so she can get the love out of the child that she can't get out of any man.

This is the *true* story and psychology of Hilary Clinton, who therefore was able to marry the kind of man whom she subconsciously knew would eventually betray her, and also of Mrs Cherie Blair, wife of Tony Blair, who we can see clearly due to her lust for power and status does not believe in the concept of genuine love from males, and no doubt sees her husband as a child to be mothered, in the cold, loveless and lonely private psychological woman's world, in which her likely only real confidante is some kooky girl friend, or even her own mother should she still be alive.

For what do we know about Mrs Blair's relationship with her mother or Mrs Clinton's should the respective women still be alive?

It is all done *in secret*.

We don't know who these people really are, what the machinations of their minds are, except we have here and elsewhere exposed the psychological *modus operandi* of such women, so the details in that respect do not actually greatly matter.

That is, the agenda goes something like:

- a) abused girl grows into unhappy ambitious woman who lures into her web abusive and immature man
- b) abused woman perpetuates myth that all men are abusive and immature and expresses this philosophy to all other women and makes plans to protect children from all men.

That is it. That is what Mrs Blair and Mrs Clinton are really up to, behind all the speeches and public performances. They are trying to create a world in which men are powerless, so that women and children are protected from and completely free of the influence of men.

They have a “token man” in the home, but he is not the boss. He is merely *tolerated*, even be he the Prime Minister of Britain or the President of the United States.

What is really going on in the private conversations between Mr and Mrs Blair and Mr and Mrs Clinton, in their bedrooms away even from their childrens' ears?

For that – please *wake up to this reality* – is where the future of the world is being decided, by this *pillow talk*.

It is utter madness.

We have put insecure, abused people in charge of armies, air forces, cruise missiles and nuclear weapons which can maim and murder us all and destroy the whole world.

We have to start putting *wise, caring* people into power very quickly indeed *before it's too late*.

So can we now see *why* we are afraid of women?

Women are dangerous beings. They do not know what they are. They do not understand their own motivations, but they are seeking more and more *power*, and because men also do not understand themselves and their women, but are just led

around by their emotional and sexual dependence on women, they are just meekly *giving the power* to women with hardly even a complaint.

Just individually, we find that if we naively “fall in love” with some girl or woman she starts acting crazy, she tries to dominate and enslave us, she sets the police on us, she sets her friends or relatives on us, and all the while she laughs and smiles, she is high on power and attention, she is out of her goddam mind.

And young boys do not realise this, and even many relatively mature men, blinded by their “love” and sex desire like to ignore these realities, these truths.

Because we see all these “loving couples” don’t we, pushing children around in prams and sometimes even holding hands?

Women and girls cannot really be as the author says can they? He must be crazy.

But what we *do not see* is this unholy battle and seduction process that typically the girl or woman has waged upon the boy or man to *get him under her thumb*.

Even Princess Diana is alleged to have weaved some kind of complicated web of intrigue to lure Prince Charles in, which few or none of the media documentaries and books about her *ever* report. It might get *one sentence*, the *real story* of how they got together, how she entrapped *him* in *her plans*, whilst all the time pretending to be the coy little, innocent and defensive and inexperienced girl afraid of the big scary world and this big scary royal man who one day would be King.

But then we saw *the truth*, and men must understand, she was just *a typical modern woman*.

She was in love all right, but not with Charles, but with *her own image*, her own reflection in the mirror, her own status as *celebrity*.

People who have been seriously abused are *incapable* of loving anyone else.

Their only agenda is *poor me, poor me, poor me*.

They *want* to be perceived as *caring loving people*, but they don’t even know what love is, because they have never seen it.

That is – love is *the sensitive acceptance and appreciation and nurturing and enhancing of the freedom and dignity of another human being*, and often that *at the expense of one’s own egotistical desires*.

i.e. to put it *very simply*, we have this child, or this boyfriend or girlfriend or husband or wife.

And we have two choices. We can either enslave it, dominate it, get egotistically high on possessing it, or we can sensitively and intelligently help it to be the happiest it can be, to be *a free person*, to bask in the sunshine of our true, non-manipulating, non-traumatising *love*.

So *look around* and find out how many women are making *the latter* choice, and how many *the former*?

Our personal assessment based on *very long* experience and reliable eye witness accounts and reports is that the vast majority of modern women are working on the basis of “plan A” (i.e. *domination, enslavement*), but here is the really “wicked” part, they are *pretending* all the while to men that they are actually carrying out “plan B”, i.e. loving and caring for him (LOL as they say in “Internet chat land”).

Thus, when we see this “cute girl” sidling up to us, giving us a seductive “come hither” smile, do we not have legitimate reason to be afraid?

So we have been at the greatest pains to explain to any man or boy who will listen that when they see a woman or girl who appears to be interested in them, they have got to stop looking at and seeing her as a sex object, and start seeing her as most likely “a case for therapy”, as a troubled, attention seeking and love hungry human being.

Of course, if we *ourselves* are troubled, attention seeking and love hungry, then we have got no chance whatsoever of therapising *her*.

Thus have we offered *therapy for men* via our various works, such that they may *therapise themselves, cure themselves*, so that they are then *armed and ready* to deal with and properly care for the girl or woman in their lives, which we are saying, simply put, certainly does not mean as is typically modern male behaviour *letting her walk all over us and worshipping the ground she walks on*.

We have to know all her tricks and be ready for them, and basically all her “tricks” are just efforts of one kind or another to make us addicted to her, which gives her *a false sense of security*.

Because after all, if she wrapped us around her finger so easily, how can she be sure that the next pretty girl who comes along won't take us from her?

The *only* security for women is when a boy or man *makes a choice*, and is self-controlled enough to stick with his choice. If he is *capable* of being wrapped around her finger, i.e. incapable of *resisting* her tactics, she cannot have any security, for as we have said, she has no guarantee that any of the countless other needy and desperate women out there won't do it to him also, simply *because they can*, and this *reality* we see in the countless millions of unfaithful men who are seduced by their secretaries and so on, who shamelessly revel in their power over such men, even though they well know this man has a wife whose life and family she is likely destroying.

These are the reasons why we need strong customs and laws like *the marriage one*, stopping these kinds of behaviours, because they are going to destroy families and make insecure miseries out of us all, as we have explained, when the woman starts taking her frustrations out on the minds of the children she has, because her man has failed her.

So when we hear of the likely *rare* cases of women being stoned to death or flogged or whatever for *adultery* in some Muslim or Arab country, though we don't approve of the barbarism which we feel is inappropriate to modern times, we can see what the original thinking behind such powerful taboos against these behaviours was, it was *to protect the family*, because once we destroy the family, we destroy the society and world, we get the chaos that we have got *now*.

And as the destruction of the *traditional* family, i.e. that with a dominant man in it, that the feminists are daily accelerating the pace of continues, so the destruction of the world likewise will accelerate, all our social and international problems will get worse.

The time may finally come when the “lunatics” with the banners proclaiming “THE END IS NIGH” will be *right*.

But your author is mostly an optimist. He believes – rightly or wrongly – that things won't get quite that far.

But they will not change back to sense and peace all on their own. We all have to wake up. Men and boys have to wake up to what has been done to them, in particular, what fifty or a hundred years of feminism has done to them.

How it has made them for example diagnosed as child psychiatric cases when it is merely the neglect and abuse from their parents that has caused the problem, or on the other hand, they are forced to take part in a bullying competitive society that their sensitive natures cannot stand, because our world is ruled by cruel masters and mistresses who are somewhat morphed into beings like Emperor Nero and Caligula and so on, who are hooked on power and delusions of grandeur, and obsession with their place in history, and do nothing to stop the world descending into addictions to sex, violence and gambling, but rather *do everything to encourage such addiction*.

If only they could *see* what they are doing, they would realise that when someday a *true* history is written, their names may well go down alongside such other villains of history as the above mentioned ones.

They have to see, as do we, as do our women, that in particular *materialism*, with its concomitant obsessions with *status and power*, is *not* the answer for any of us.

It can lead only to our current states of personal misery and competitive interpersonal and global war and strife.

So what can *we* do as individuals?

We can *protest* in whatever way we can.

We can become *understanding* people, and in so far as possible *sufficient and independent* in ourselves.

If the world says *bow down before Satan* (i.e. toss all your sensitive and noble feelings and principles aside and become ruthless and bloodthirsty) or else we will not give you “success”, we will even deny you a wife and sex life, then we have to be like Nelson Mandela or one of the Hundred Spartans who is able to live as a prisoner or suffer all these deprivations, while we fight for our rights.

As Arthur Brown put it in *Nightmare*, which was the prelude to his famous sixties hit *Fire*:

Why is it so cold out here?

So cold!

Let me in!

And the Devil answers him:

The price of your entry...

is SIN.

We are engaged in a global war, and that war is not merely military, it is not merely a “war on terrorism.”

It is a war between *the spiritual and the material*.

It is a war between concern only for the body of man and for *his soul*, his identity as a free thinking and loving human being.

And of course, the same applies to women.

What is important in life?

Is it having luxurious cars and living in palaces and “important jobs”, or is it having emotional security, peace in our neighbourhood and land, and a heart full of love and a soul full of bliss?

For the latter *is* possible.

We men foolishly imagine we will get it through surrendering ourselves to a woman. But then life usually teaches us that all we really get is being sexual and financial slaves of her agenda, like *Truman* in *The Truman Show* movie, or else when we try to assert our male role as loving and caring *leader* we get rejected or kicked out of the family by *her* egotistical desire to dominate and rule.

So we have to see this fear of women for what it is.

She wants to steal our soul, our manhood, our true love, like *The Snow Queen*, and replace it with her own perverse kind of love, which makes us forever a child in her Queendom.

She never wants us to be our own man, to be brave and free.

At least that is, until – in the cases where this *can* be achieved – we show her what a man’s love is really like. We show her how we can patiently tolerate all her antics, how she can’t wrap us round her little finger, and then one day like a little child she comes to us and takes our hand and puts her arms around us, not as a seductress, but as a “woman-child” in need of our protection and love.

Because it is either *her* who is going to be the child in the relationship, or it is going to be *us*, and we are doing our very best to point out to male readers, and even wise female ones, that society is now dominated with *the latter* scenario, and that is why our whole world is going to pot.

So do we see how what we need to do as men is almost *the exact opposite* of what the feminist controlled or influenced media is trying to make us do? i.e. thoughtlessly go to bed with the first girl who will let us, and when she gets pregnant, we get tossed aside, or kept around as a bullied slave and child care assistant, and maybe also financial and work slave, constantly encouraged to get more money, to ambitiously climb “the ladder of success” so that she can have better clothes for herself and her children, and a more luxurious car and home to show off to her friends.

This is what *countless millions* of Western and now Eastern women are doing to their men, and they don’t care if he dies at fifty or whatever through such a life of enslavement and overwork and over sex she has been feeding him upon, as long as she has arranged a very good insurance policy and transferable pension plan.

All we men have to do is *understand*, and though we may not get all our rightful roles and power back overnight, at least of women we will have no more *fear*.

For the warrior who has no fear, can ultimately never be defeated in the real sense. One man or another may fall in battle, but when such an army of fearless *spiritual* warriors as our future men are going to be arises – which will happen just as soon as *the truth* as we have expressed it here gets round – such vast legions of true brothers-in-arms who care not only for their women, but *for one another*, will *never* be defeated.

Also by the same author

A Mens Liberation Guide to Women 4th edition

An Innocent Woman's Guide to Men

How to Meditate

Kundalini - Preventing the Apocalypse

A Mens and Womens Liberation Update

The Myth of the Teenage Rebellion

What Is Intelligence?

Kundalini - A Personal Experience

Feminal Farm - a short satirical novel

The Innocent Persons Guide to Law

Understanding Female Sexuality and Porn

Freedom of Speech & Maitreya

An Innocent Persons Guide to the Da Vinci Code

How the Feminists Stole Psychology

Hearing Voices and Psychic Phenomena

The Psychology of Soaps

Is Competition Necessary?

On Drugs and Alcohol

The Importance of Thinkers

The Demonisation of the Innocents

The Psychology of Prejudice

Science and Fear

The Scientist and the Guru

Respect for Age

A Waste of Paper

Saying No to Peer Pressure

Smashing the Da Vinci Code

If Men Went on Strike

A Message to Readers

Why Size Doesn't Matter

All Sam Fryman's works are currently available free of charge via the link

<http://www.geocities.com/thmlplx/>

as .lit files which can be read with the free Microsoft Reader

<http://www.microsoft.com/reader/downloads/pc.asp>