

Ms. Patterning

**She's Making
MGTOW**

Warren Perkin

© 2024 Warren Perkin

Chapter Zero

Castles in the Air (which is only 0.04% CO₂)

We live in a western world where emotions and feeling have assumed primacy and dominion over cold, hard logic. With an ample supply of wishing on a star, sprinkling of glitter and an ability to believe that anything is possible, then, *ipso facto*, the desired outcome is guaranteed. While such a scenario may have had a certain charm when confined to Disney movies in the heyday of the studio, these expectations might prove troublesome in real world situations.... although our society is doing its best to accommodate, rapidly assuming diminishing resemblance to anything resembling a meritocracy. Or reality.

It's not so very long ago that we lived in the Industrial Age, an era where men retained significance and importance, just as was the case during the Agrarian epochs, and our earlier origins as a hunter/gatherer species. But, the 1950s saw the Service Economy overtake the Manufacturing Economy for the first time (1). The provision of services isn't so dependent on muscle and endurance, thus is more inclined to benefit a female skill set. Concurrently, the birth control pill put women firmly in charge of their own fertility, and they were encouraged, by feminism, to go out into that new service economy, earn their own money, and become more independent of men. All very laudable aims, so far, although with unprecedented effects on chasing asset prices higher and higher, escalating the cost of a home beyond the means of a single income family. So – the working mom became the norm, initiating a treadmill for women who were now forced to juggle work and family life.

Like any treadmill, there's a lot of energy expended, just to stay in the same place. And, what happens when conditions change..? Even in the late 1960s, it was anticipated that growth in the service sector wouldn't last forever. Fortunately, the Stanford Research Institute had already formulated an answer. When that happened, we'd throw money at spurious 'environmental' concerns (2), thus getting the factories going again. With a bit of Government intervention to skew the market, some legislation here and there, the consumer would slowly be denied any choice in the matter, he'd be 'encouraged' to dispense with his internal combustion engine car and his kerosene boiler. With legislative 'deadlines' the intransigent would be finally be forced to replace big ticket items which he already owned. That's just what's happening now, with CO₂ as the bogeyman.

Unfortunately, manufacturing has been ‘outsourced’ abroad in the interim. So, the factories making electric vehicles and domestic heat pumps will be situated in China and India. These new industries won’t create any domestic jobs, as we couldn’t manufacture these ‘green’ consumer products in a competitive manner, even if we wanted to. The ‘Net Zero’ regulations which generated the market for ‘green’ goods make it essential (if we wish to keep up appearances) to utilise ‘carbon-free’ methods of generating electricity or making steel. Meanwhile, China has 310 active coal-fired power stations, with a further 40 under commission. They’re happy to use coke instead of ‘green’ hydrogen as the reducing agent in the steel-making process. They use this huge competitive advantage to sell EVs and heat pumps to the west, at a price we could *never* match.

For 2022, the car maker MG posted UK sales which were worth more than £1 billion, courtesy of demand for electric vehicles – a market now manipulated by UK government legislation against the internal combustion engine. The MG brand, which was once a proud British marque, is now owned by the Chinese company SAIC Motor Corp. Heavy state-subsidies have allowed China to corner the market in electric car batteries. Strategic planning has given China dominance on the raw material supply chains for these batteries, stretching across the world. Now, they have their eyes on democratic Taiwan and its \$800 billion chip economy, which makes 90% of the advanced semiconductors required in electric vehicles. Having already overtaken Germany and Japan as the world’s leading exporter of cars, it would suit China to resume control of Taiwan. Meanwhile, they can sell us the cheapest electric vehicles on the planet, to a UK population brainwashed by its own woke values, and apparently unaware that the virtue-signalling Chinese EV they’ve purchased is inexpensive due to unrestrained pollution controls on the other side of the planet. For those who actually ascribe any meaning to such values, the UK produces less than 1% of the world’s CO₂. China produces 35%. Even the mighty USA can only muster 14%, only a little more over that of India (7%) and Russia (5%) combined.

And, there’s far, far more competitive disadvantage in the pipeline. Apparently unhappy with the exponential rate of our own decline, we hasten it still further by forcing square pegs into round holes for the sake of diversity quotas – then seem surprised when the outcome of decision-making processes are substandard. Especially since there’s one sex which always acts as its own special interest group, and they’ve made huge incursions into the arenas of education, politics and jurisprudence since their first faltering steps into the service economy of the 1950s... a service economy which is about to be obliterated by the

introduction of AI, and where there is no manufacturing renaissance waiting in the wings. Not in the west, at least.

In an ideal world, everyone would have the opportunity to do what he or she wants to do, and the chance to do it as well as possible. Here in the west, we insist that this *is* the case. The message is repeated incessantly on mainstream media, bludgeoning us into submission. Our biggest building programme in the past twenty years has been the construction of castles in the air. We are exhorted to believe in the values of Disneyworld, and its insistence that either sex can achieve anything. But, this is manifestly *not* the case. Even given equal opportunity, some will fail to excel. As was stated by William A Henry III, '*A fair society is one in which some people fail. And, they are likely to do so in something other than precise, demographically representative proportions.*' Sexual inequalities will persist, however much we may wish them away. The latest fairy-tale to 'explain' the differences is 'Patriarchy'. Under this belief system, women are 'socialised' into having feminine values, so that men can 'oppress' them into having our children, thus keeping them out of the workforce, and preventing them standing on their own two feet. It all seems somewhat counter-intuitive, and probably even offensive to the plethora of poor blokes who have been baby-trapped into a lifetime of social paternity by their girlfriends [who can be economical with the facts around biological paternity, and tell the truth around 80% of the time (3)].

But, fear not, there are solutions to the problem of this male oppression of females, and our evil plan to socialise them into being women. To weaken Patriarchy, just introduce job quotas, facilitating women's entry into the workplace, and make sure they receive accelerated promotion. This 'Equal Employment Opportunity' and 'Affirmative Action' hasn't made it any easier for men to get a job. So much for allowing everyone the opportunity to do what they want to do... it would appear that there are few tickets to that ride available for men. As most unemployed young men will discover to their dismay, no job equates with no possibility of a girlfriend... and, therefore, no opportunity for that young man to form a family of his own. This is the same young man who will, undoubtedly, be called upon at some stage to defend the values of a democratic Taiwan, when the west wakes up to the implications of a Chinese invasion.

Well, we can't say that we weren't warned. As far back as the early 1980s, Milton Friedman wrote these words in 'Free to Choose'. '*A society that puts equality – in the sense of equality of outcome – ahead of freedom, will end up with neither equality nor freedom. The*

use of force to achieve equality will destroy freedom, and the force, introduced for good purposes, will end up in the hands of people who use it to promote their own interests.'

Females are their own special interest group. They have a 4x 'in-group' preference for the views of other women (4), leading to outcomes which will benefit their own sex. On a decision making panel, female views will prevail, because, far from oppressing women, men will always *defer* to them (5). With 50/50 M/F representation, the male logic which gave us science and enlightened progress doesn't stand a chance. Feelings and emotions will take centre stage, rules and regulations will proliferate, aimed at promoting a spurious 'equality' which doesn't exist, and has *never* existed. Female behaviour, and its underpinning morality and ethics, are entirely at odds with their male equivalent, because, bottom line, their reproductive strategies are diametrically opposed. Male values evolved from a dominance hierarchy which males impose only *on other males* while we seek the status necessary to impress females and garner a mate, thus forming a reproductive unit. Men and women have been playing this game for the past 50,000 years, around 800 lifetimes. Fully 650 of those lifetimes were spent in caves. The work of Denise D Cummins (University of Illinois) has indicated that the continual need to survive within dominance (status) hierarchies conferred a '*deontic advantage*' in male reasoning (6), which eventually laid the groundwork for civilisations and Enlightenment. But, women can gain reproductive advantage by subverting the cognitive functions shaped by status hierarchies, through using deception to flout social norms. They tend not to worry unduly about the implications of these deceptions for men. Female morality tends to be *utilitarian* and *naturalistic*. There is a tendency for the ladies to assume whatever is beneficial to women is *therefore* good for humanity. This wasn't so much of a problem during the cave-dwelling period, or the Dark Ages, the Middle Ages, even all the way through to the early 20th century, when the domain of most women was in the home. But, from the 1950s onwards, women have been encouraged to make incursions into the previously male-dominated workplace, where they soon found fault in men being there. They weren't all that impressed with his deontic, idealistic morality either, as it conferred no female advantage. So – they set about altering this state of affairs. The results are coming in, and they're not good.

For the past human lifespan of seventy years, the male values which founded civilisations have been slowly eroded by feminism. This process is now picking up pace, a Fisherian runaway likely to plunge us into an epoch of the new Dark Ages. In this book, I'm going to try to understand the factors which have brought us to this unique singularity in our

history, although a tipping point may already have been reached. At least we may understand our predicament together, and, unlike our feminist friends, I'm going to deal only in facts.

It is a fact that men and women think differently. This occurred because their roles in life have been so fundamentally distinct and separate during nearly all of the previous 800 human lifespans which shaped us. It is also a fact that the human brain consists of two unique hemispheres, each with its own particular way of processing information. "*Why is the brain, an organ which exists only to make connections, divided in this manner?*" asks Professor Iain McGilchrist in his book *'The Master & His Emissary'* (7). Then, having posed this fundamental question, he does not answer it, presumably because he wishes to retain an academic career which is unlikely to withstand the censorious forces of the feminism we have allowed to flourish, these past seventy years. Interestingly, it is also a fact that the neurological origin of such censorship, an inability to accept the views of others, is a feature of the unrestrained left brain hemisphere (8). So, we must pretend that biological sex does not exist, in order to keep these creatures happy. We'll soon discover that pretence and outright denial are further left hemisphere specialities. All too soon, a pattern will emerge.

Chapter 1

The Battle for Our Minds

Like all mammals, human embryos begin life as females. Only by about seven weeks' gestation will the presence of the SRY gene on the Y-chromosome cause the development of testes in males. The new gonads must then produce enough androgen to allow maleness to develop, in an oestrogen-rich environment which is rather hostile to this mission. As a result, embryonic testosterone levels are enormously high at this stage, 4x greater than will be experienced during childhood. This steroid acts on the *prosencephalon*, a single midline structure, to induce an asymmetry (9), favouring development of the *right* brain hemisphere, and its associated, adrenergic circuitry. In the absence of testosterone, the brain develops as female-patterned, the default position (10). Here, the majority of processing is carried out by the oestrogen-sensitive, dopaminergic left brain, leading to real-world preferences markedly different to a brain which has been patterned by testosterone.

It is difficult not to conclude that, at a critical stage of brain development, some essential phases of nerve cell growth are influenced by male hormone, which prevents further progress along the female default lines. This causes gender differentiation, as the brain cells acquire a 'set' which is highly resistant to change after birth, and awaits adolescence for its full flowering.

Only a few days old, the typical baby girl already shows more interest in people and faces than *things*, whereas a baby boy will direct more attention to a revolving mobile toy. Neither he nor she has been *socially* conditioned towards their individual preferences. His right hemisphere has areas dedicated to spatial processing which will become advantageous in higher mathematical reasoning, scientific aptitude and pattern recognition. The academic shorthand for this is '*visuo-spatial ability*', and is a realm where males show clear-cut advantages. When children between the ages of eleven and thirteen are tested in this particular area (11), boys beat girls at a ratio of 1.5 to 1 on scores of 420+, out of a possible 800. At 500+, the ratio is over 2 to 1. At 600+, it is over 4 to 1. And, at the very highest scores, of 700+, boys do better than girls at a ratio of 13 to 1. This sex difference becomes even more pronounced as the sexes mature. Testosterone is found to enhance the visuo-spatial skills, while female hormones depress them. Differences in higher mathematical

abilities therefore become more marked when the boys reach full maturity. As his education progresses, he'll be more likely to find his niche in concepts and abstract relationships, while females will prefer occupations where they are dealing with people. The authors Moir & Jessel (10) ascribe the predominance of males in STEM subjects to be a direct result of the brain patterning induced by testosterone *in utero*, an environment where 'socialisation' to prefer such subjects seems an unlikely premise.

The brain patterning induced in the developing foetus by sex steroids results in noticeable childhood differences in patterns of preferences for both play and education. The school system takes little account of boys' hands-on, active learning style, dictating that they must sit still and be lectured to. This places boys at a disadvantage until adolescence, when the *in utero* brain programming finally finds full expression in a burgeoning sexuality, and an even more obvious polarisation of M/F preferences, abilities and sexual identity. Perhaps unsurprisingly, it is known that high oestrogen levels in the womb can cause feminisation of males and extreme feminisation of females, a phenomenon which became apparent as a result of medical practices in the 1950s and 1960s. It was known that diabetic mothers-to-be often suffered spontaneous abortions, as a result of low oestrogen levels, a side-effect of diabetes. The prescribed treatment was a synthetic female hormone, diethylstilbestrol. This solved the problem of miscarriages, but led to complications in the children. In boys, if the testicles had already developed at 7 weeks, these provided enough testosterone for the sexual equipment to be recognisably male in form and function. However, the onslaught of synthetic female hormone prevented the organisation of the brain into a male pattern. As children, these boys were less aggressive and assertive, often less athletic, and more willing than their peers to co-operate. On reaching adolescence, effeminate mannerisms became more pronounced and the young men found themselves attracted to other males.

Female children of the diethylstilbestrol mothers first showed an exaggerated femininity, playing with dolls to the exclusion of all else, imitating mothers in doing household chores. On reaching adolescence they became obsessive about pretty clothes, make-up and appearance. Often, they'd be ultra-romantic, dreaming of being married, yearning to have babies. They'd be first to volunteer for baby-sitting duties. Intellectually, they'd score around female average on verbal IQ tests, but in mathematics and spatial ability they'd be far below par. They'd have a very poor sense of direction, and, in extreme cases, as young children, would even find it difficult to find their own way to and from school.

Furthermore, synthetic oestrogen causes a marked decline in visuo-spatial abilities in male brains which have undergone puberty. This effect was first observed in cases of so-called ‘chemical castration’ of male sex offenders. More recently, it has been found prevalent where ‘trans conversion therapy’ has been offered to post pubescent males who wish to ‘transition’ to female.

There are other male-specific attributes conferred by the adrenergic circuitry of the right brain. It doesn’t fatigue readily, showing an absence of depolarisation even under sustained duress. This is obviously beneficial in an environment such as a battlefield, an almost exclusively male domain. By contrast, the dopaminergic processing of the left brain is subject to rapid burnout. Resilience towards ‘giving up’ goes some way towards explaining male dominance in the fields of science and technological achievement, often seen as ‘*one part innovation, nine parts perspiration.*’ Already, it can be seen that right-hemisphere processing confers advantages in areas where men *are fulfilling the expectations of society*, that they will provide for women through their boundless ingenuity, and will protect them, even under the most adverse and dangerous conditions.

And there’s more. Females don’t cope very well with stress, usually experiencing a very strong aversion to stressful circumstances. Stress is triggered by corticotrophin releasing factor (CRF), and there is a vast body of evidence pointing to high sexual dimorphism at the CRF-binding site. CRF and CRF-binding proteins are hugely affected by circulating oestrogen levels (12). **As a result, females are sensitive to low levels of CRF, and are completely unable to deal with higher levels.** It’s a situation which has evolved to promote immediate withdrawal of the female from stressful situations, preventing adverse effects on their fertility. By contrast, through exposure to testosterone in the womb, much higher levels of stress are required to trigger the corresponding male CRF-receptors, **which are quickly desensitised, allowing males to deal effectively with protracted, stressful situations.**

*

What about the converse, where female embryos have been exposed to male hormone *in utero*? Are there cases where this has occurred, and what do we know of the results? Testosterone was given to mothers-to-be who suffered from toxemia. This alleviated the condition, but had an effect when the child was a girl, as they’d often show little interest in typical feminine pursuits (13). But, more common are cases of androgenital syndrome, also known as congenital adrenal hyperplasia. This results from disorders of steroid hormone

production in the adrenal glands, leading to a deficiency of cortisol, and a surplus of androgen-like steroids. Sometimes, in expectant mothers, this kidney abnormality results in such a high release of male-like hormone that her genetically female (XX) baby enters the world with abnormally virilised sexual equipment, such as a large clitoris. As the baby girl grows and eventually reaches adolescence, although some might fail to menstruate, many such girls are fertile, and perfectly able to conceive. However, studies on mental strengths and weaknesses indicate that their brain has been male-patterned. These girls achieve significantly higher scores than typical females in tests which measure skills at detecting hidden patterns, or mentally rotating an object and describing how it would look from different angles.

In the female foetus, it would appear that the higher the concentration and earlier the dose of androgen exposure, the more the brain assumes a male structure, and the greater the improvement in spatial skills as an adult. These women often lack any semblance of femininity. They tend to be much more competitive, career-oriented, disinterested in babies and in heterosexual relationships, being sexually attracted to other women. The professional female tennis circuit of the late 1960s/early 1970s was full of them. Meet **Ms Patterning**. She is *not* a typical woman. The problems arise when she is held up as an example of what a typical woman should aspire to, because the typical woman has a female brain patterning, and she's going to play to type.

In fact, across the board, female ability to tackle spatial ability problems depends on the stage of the menstrual cycle, proving easier when oestrogen is at its lowest, and more difficult when at its highest. High levels of female hormones in women depress the skills which men are better at. The same high levels, however, enhance the skills that women excel in. Seems straightforward enough.... **so why can't we say it?** If we do, we're liable to have a charge of 'neurosexism' levelled against us (14).

Feminism isn't a movement noted for logic or a scientific devotion to truth. There is an urge to deny any sex-specific differences, on the grounds that accepting biologically determined differences might not advance the cause. This has reached absurd proportions in the work of feminist 'academics' such as Cordelia Fine, Gina Rippon and Lise Eliot, who insist that gender is a social construct, and seem to make a habit of reviewing each other's 'research' (15), (16). Fortunately, even some other feminists will sometimes call them out on the illogicality of their conclusions and practices (17), if only because an insistence that male

and female brains are identical may have contra-indications in cases where female brains are *known* to be more susceptible to certain drugs.

It's all beyond ridiculous really, and the fact that this feminist nonsense is tolerated within academia has more to do with the female way of doing violence by 'cancelling' an enemy, one of the many practices which women brought with them into the workplace (18). People don't speak out *because they are afraid to do so*, afraid for their jobs, afraid of the 'gentle' sex. The erosion of Enlightenment has already begun.

The truth, scientific truth, stares us in the face. In adults, the hypothalamus acts in cohort with the pituitary gland to regulate the flow of sex hormones. With males, these levels are maintained at a fairly constant level by a process of negative feedback. By contrast, women are under a positive feedback loop which causes vast fluctuations in these hormones, with corresponding effects on female mood and behaviour. It is an absurdity to say that female brains, exposed to a chemical cocktail of mind-altering chemicals, changing daily, are identical to the relative stability of a male brain, and its comparatively steady state of testosterone, a mind-altering chemical which ensures a different type of programming.

In the first half of the female menstrual cycle, oestrogen alone is present (at variable concentration), to promote egg growth. The concentration peaks when ovulation occurs, and, as it declines, progesterone is produced, promoting the conditions for a successful pregnancy. **At this stage of her cycle, even the smell of a female is attractive to a male (19), and will make the oestrogen-induced neoteny of her facial features and feminine curves irresistible.** Both oestrogen and progesterone levels then rise again in tandem, until they both peak, simultaneously. Progesterone can be converted into either oestrogen or testosterone, increasing female libido just when she is at her most fertile.... after which both oestrogen and progesterone levels come tumbling back down again, at the onset of menstruation. However, if she has been successfully fertilised, then both oestrogen and progesterone levels remain high.

The complexity of this cycle leads, inevitably, to female mood swings. Oestrogen is absolutely *essential* for the health of the dopamine dependent left-hemisphere of the brain (28-31). During the first phase of the cycle, the female subject typically experiences heightened sensation of touch, taste and smell, associated with a sense of well-being and high self-esteem. Progesterone, by contrast, has an inhibitory effect, producing profound reduction in cerebral blood flow, oxygen and glucose consumption. Libido drops, tiredness, anxiety and

depression take over. Yet, concurrently, there is an emotionally calming effect, almost akin to an acceptance of the inevitable.

Then, as the levels of both oestrogen and progesterone plummet in the pre-menstrual phase, there are inevitable withdrawal symptoms. Without progesterone to calm the mood and oestrogen to promote well-being, behaviour can swing from hostility and aggression towards depression, sometimes severe, and occasionally veering into psychotic territory.

This is where **Ms Patterning** comes in. Ms Patterning, the prototypical feminist, has been male brain patterned while still embryonic, possibly caused by her mother suffering congenital adrenal hyperplasia. Now an adult woman who is competitive, and dedicated to her career, Ms Patterning is revolted by the thought of heterosexual intercourse, and equally disgusted by the passive acquiescence of her fellow females to their roles as wives and mothers. She has made it her mission in life to have other women follow her example. In doing so, she has caught the eye of some very powerful men, who have assisted her for their own purposes and benefit. And, to succeed, Ms Patterning must tell lies. She must misdirect women, denying them their very essence, and, in so doing, she must deny the obvious, telling a different story, the one where male and female brains are identical, and that gender is a construct of 'The Patriarchy', fabricated for women's oppression. She must make women afraid of men, painting them as predators, filling women with guilt and shame should they succumb to their own heterosexual urges, and making the world a dangerous place for young men in the process.

As someone who probably has a great deal of experience in such matters, the acting head of the Metropolitan Police is on record for opining that most accusations of rape are made by women who simply regret having sex (20). While this must remain an opinion, it is actually borne out by hard facts (21), an overview of twenty-five studies... where seventeen of these studies reveal false accusation rates which are in the range of **10%** to **47%**. Even these figures do not tell the full, astounding story. It is not the focus of the police to compile evidence that a complaint is untruthful. Their job is the compilation of evidence which makes a prosecution case for rape. In many cases, it will be difficult to find evidence that the accusation is false, and, in most cases, the attempt to do so is not made. There have been instances where the phone records of the complainant, clearly indicating that she bombarded the plaintiff with text messages requesting sex, have been suppressed, never making it to the courtroom (22). Recent interpretations on admissible evidence have favoured keeping

complainant's phone records confidential, *to protect their anonymity* (23). Meanwhile, the name of the plaintiff is plastered everywhere. He will, undoubtedly, already have lost his job, and been thoroughly tried in the court of public opinion known as X, formerly known as Twitter. This is symptomatic of a society which is adopting ways of administering a 'justice' advantaging females, their ingrained thought processes (8) and default *modus operandi* (18).

One of the places where the myth of 'rape culture' is at its most hysterical is tertiary education. When you succeed in making university a hostile environment for young men, then male attendance rates will fall. Presently, the ratio of graduates is around 70% Female / 30% Male, which isn't seen as a social problem (although it garnered a great deal of attention from feminists when the M/F ratio was inverted in the 1970s, with 70% Male graduates). Inevitably, such numbers translate into the ratio we can expect in the politicians and judiciary of the future, but with an unintended consequence, to which many men are almost wilfully blind. Women tend to stick together, and prefer outcomes which favour women (4). This doesn't mix well with jurisprudence or politics, and further results are coming in, thick and fast. In Scotland, where the Chief Prosecutor and much of the top judiciary are female, there are advanced moves afoot to dispense with juries in rape trials (24), henceforth to be tried by 'trauma-informed' judges only. Again in Scotland, the need for corroborative evidence has been recently deemed to be no longer necessary. There is a mandatory requirement to consider female 'distress' as evidence enough (25). In other words, if she said it happened, it happened. Believe all women.

Unfortunately, the extensive studies above (21) would suggest otherwise, and, as we've seen, even the astonishing figure of 47% for false accusation may not tell the full story, as the definition of false accusation recommended by the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) emphasises the need to determine falsity through evidence of absence, rather than absence of evidence. *'The determination that a report of sexual assault is false can be made only if the evidence establishes that no crime was committed or attempted. This determination can be made only after a thorough investigation. This should not be confused with an investigation that fails to prove that a sexual assault occurred. In that case, the investigation would be labelled unsubstantiated. The determination that a report is false must be supported by evidence that the assault did not happen.'*

The lies of Ms Patterning and her warnings of a campus 'rape culture' are repeated endlessly in 'Gender Studies' courses, filling the heads of impressionable young women with

little real world experience, and whose critical reasoning abilities are not yet fully developed. It's a facile task for lecturers, these fully fledged feminists, to influence the sexuality of their students. Lacking the male sex drive, female sexuality is much more easily influenced by social and situational factors (26). Even as far back as 1994, it was recognised that tertiary education was associated with a 900% increase in women identifying as lesbian or bisexual (27). The lies associated with 'Patriarchy' fill the columns of the mainstream media, flicker on our TV screens, tower above us on cinema screens where Barbie ensures that a young female audience can begin the transition from 'girl' to 'feminist' prior to attending feminist finishing school, formerly known as university. She, and the other feminist fodder, will emerge from three years in the echo chamber into an already damaged society, filled with the zeal to 'put right' the historical wrongs of the past, and make the male oppressor pay for his crimes against womanhood. And, they'll be successful in this endeavour. They will, undoubtedly, be able to tear down all the constructs of civilisation which made western woman the most comfortable and entitled species on the entire planet. What they will replace it with is less certain, because they haven't really given much consideration beyond the tearing down stage.

Never mind, other people (powerful men) have done their thinking for them. And those powerful men will facilitate their mission. Meanwhile, the ordinary Joes like you and I find ourselves discriminated against, rendered unable to get a job, other than of the dirty and dangerous variety... the risk takers and cannon fodder. Intersectional politics will have man fighting against man, with certain demographics at the bottom of the pile, currently white males. **The left brain loves to control, and to make lists, as we'll see in the next chapter.** If we can't get a job, we'll be unable to attract a woman, we'll never have a family of our own. And, we're allowing this to happen, right under our noses, courtesy of five dynamics (A) – (E), well-researched and understood in their own right, but maintained in relative obscurity, and not always subjected to integrated comprehension and overview.

(A) Men only compete with each other for status, and they use this status to impress women, thereby improving their mating prospects. They will not compete with a woman, they will defer to her.

(B) Women have a 4x 'in group' preference for the views of other women.

(C) Having the greater reproductive burden, female ethics are naturalistic and utilitarian. These are not the male deontic ethics which arose from status hierarchies. In fact, females gain greatest advantage on their reproductive

mission by subverting such structures, and adopting the utilitarian outlook: *'If it's good for women & children it is therefore good for the human race.'* Although such outcomes can often be very adverse for men, women pay scant regard to male collateral damage, see below.

(D) Women will not show undue concern for poor male outcomes. Male gametes are a plentiful resource, female gametes are scarce, and sought after. A high self-regard is essential in the female sex, in order sift and reject suitors, thereby maintaining the quality of the human race. This is achieved by a female dominance of oestrogen-dependent, dopamine-driven, left-hemisphere processing. The idiosyncrasies of isolated left-hemisphere processing are understood in victims of right brain stroke and injury. There is high self-regard, and an almost psychopathic disregard for the consequences of actions on others. This would appear to be at the root of the cognitive dissonance exhibited by the female towards male concerns.

(E) Women are particularly adept in the techniques of GSRRM – gossiping, shaming, rallying, ridiculing and moralising (with *naturalistic* morality at centre stage, naturally). If you don't agree with their aims and assessments, no matter how ludicrous and easily disproven, you'll be apt to find yourself cancelled. A cancelled man won't find it easy to find another job in the current climate.

Male disadvantage in the modern world is occurring with incredible speed, the rot set in only a generation previously. Third wave feminism, led by Ms Patterning, has come from nowhere to world domination within a human lifetime. The deference of males to females (A), a feature of human pair-bonding, was once confined to domestic situations. Feminism has allowed it to escape into the wider world of the workplace, where influences (B) – (E), arising from women's left brain processing, consolidates female advantage. The male of the species, ordinary men, have been the frogs in a saucepan of water, heated only slowly to boiling. But, the gas is being turned up, and it may be too late to escape the fate being planned for us.

Chapter 2

The Master & His Emissary

This book, by Professor Iain McGilchrist, is widely regarded as a classic, and rightly so. In 'The Master & His Emissary' (7), McGilchrist posits that the right brain hemisphere (The Master) has an innate desire to seek and understand the universe beyond itself, with the left hemisphere (His Emissary) attempting to fragment, categorise, and make sense of the picture provided by the Master. The left hemisphere is ultimately dependent upon the right to an almost parasitic degree, but seems to have no awareness of this, being filled with an alarming self-confidence in its own *modus operandi*. In defence of his thesis, McGilchrist progresses to examining the behaviours of isolated right and left human brain hemispheres, a task which has been facilitated by studying the unfortunate victims of stroke and brain injury. He goes on to demonstrate how the particular 'ways of thinking' associated with left or right brain dominance in intact brains have come to shape our culture, coming to the alarming conclusion that the left brain hemisphere is very much in the ascendancy.

When you come right down to it, the respective 'ways of thinking' seem anodyne and innocuous, resolving to *holistic* and *linear* processing of information.

The right side of the brain processes from whole to parts, first grasping the entirety. It gains an overview, a *gestalt*, before being concerned with detail.

The left side of the brain deals with information in a linear manner, processing from part to whole. It takes pieces, lines them up, and presents them in logical order.

Who could take offence at this? Presumably because he wished to retain an academic career, the author has been very obtuse about the origins of left and right brain processing, and the resulting preferences in real world situations. Only once (page 33), does he make a couple of throwaway statements, both in parenthesis, the first being: '*Neurochemically, the hemispheres differ in their sensitivity to hormones (the right hemisphere is more sensitive to testosterone)*'. This is followed by: '*They depend on preponderantly different neurotransmitters (the left hemisphere is more reliant on dopamine, and the right hemisphere on noradrenaline).*'

In actual fact, oestrogen is essential to the functioning of dopamine neurotransmission. Oestrogen enhances dopamine receptors, from presynaptic release to post-synaptic receptor sensitivity (28). It affects dopamine availability, dopamine receptor density, and the affinity of the dopamine transport system (29). Oestrogen deprivation leads to the death of dopamine cells in the brain (30). Oestrogen increases dopamine synthesis, and decreases its degradation, re-uptake and recapture (31).

Really, the left-brain is an oestrogen-dependent dopamine powerhouse, a fact glossed over by McGilchrist, and probably with good reason. This origin of some unsavoury real-world behaviour (See Chapter 3, below) is unlikely to gain many feminist fans. Unlike the reasoned, holistic thinking of the right brain, the left hemisphere is primarily concerned with the getting and retaining of resources. Given the opportunity, it will focus on resource issues to the exclusion of all else, seeking safety and security, so that these may be retained. The left hemisphere requires *certainty*, and needs to feel that it is always correct... always. It therefore feels *threatened* by any outlook other than its own. With a murky morality, based entirely on self-interest, it will refuse to take responsibility for its own actions, and will confabulate grievances. If all else fails, it will revert to outright denial. All of these conducts, and much, much more, are slowly revealed as ‘The Master & His Emissary’ unfolds in glorious, obfuscating detail.

“Pervasively argues that our society is suffering from the consequences of an over-dominant left hemisphere, losing touch with its natural, regulatory ‘master’ – the right.” states Sally Vickers in her review of ‘The Master & His Emissary’, commending it as a ‘Best Book of the Year’ for *‘The Guardian’*, a feminist newspaper. It seems that they didn’t read page 33, or appreciate the implications.

In recapping information as he progresses, McGilchrist reminds us (page 226) that the two hemispheres are vast, coherent neurological systems, each capable of sustaining consciousness on its own, with different concerns, goals and values, likely to be expressed in different wills. And, although he *doesn’t* state the consequences of separate wills, these are likely to be manifest in dichotomy of morals for male and female human beings. There can be no uniform human morality. The evolutionary, reproductive aims of male and female couldn’t be further apart. It is obviously in male interest to mate with as many females as possible. Meanwhile the female, with the higher reproductive burden, must seek *the best possible provider* in a male partner, willing to commit to *long-term*,

*high investment parenting, and offering the best possible genes... a very, very high bar, which can be circumvented by sometimes arranging that her manifold requirements are not necessarily being met by a single man. In the western world, approximately 10% of men are unwittingly raising children whom they have not sired (32). We'll come to see how left brain qualities facilitate a situation which was spotted around 150 years ago by the philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer (33). 'Because women, in truth, exist for the propagation of the race, they live more for the species than for the individual, and, in their hearts, take the affairs of the species more seriously than those of the individual. Nature has made it the calling of the young, strong and handsome men to look after the propagation of the human race, so that the species may not degenerate. This is the firm will of Nature, and it finds its expression in the passions of women. For the secret, unformulated, nay unconscious but innate moral of woman is: **We are justified in deceiving those who, because they care a little for us – that is, to say, for the individual – imagine that they have obtained rights over the species. The constitution, and consequently the welfare of the species, have been placed in our hands and entrusted to our care through the medium of the next generation which proceeds from us. Let us fulfil our duties conscientiously.***

But women are by no means aware of this leading principle in abstracto, they are conscious of it only in concreto, with no means of expression other than the manner in which they act when the opportunity provides. So that their conscience does not trouble them so much as we imagine. For, in the darkest depth of their hearts, they know that, in violating their duty towards the individual, they have all the better fulfilled it towards the species, whose claim upon them is infinitely greater.'

We'll find, as all subsequent Chapters of this book unfold, that the female, being physically weaker, has much to gain through deception and manipulation – by subverting established orders whose foundations have been painfully built on male struggle and sacrifice. In this, she is assisted by her propensity for left hemisphere processing. The resulting outcomes, in real world terms, are incredibly painful for the male and his psyche. But, she's not going to concern herself with male casualties. Psychopaths, who have no sense of guilt, shame, or personal responsibility, are well known to have deficits in the right frontal hemisphere ('Master & His Emissary, page 85). It could be said that femininity is a mild form of psychopathy (34). All that matters are outcomes in which she

has gained both evolutionary and personal advantage. As Schopenhauer opined, she's unlikely to be aware of the leading principle *in abstracto*.

Perhaps the most important page in 'The Master & His Emissary' occurs at page 160, with the discussion on Max Scheler, and '*Scheler's Pyramid of Values*', subtly different from Maslow's Pyramid of Human Needs, with which many people are acquainted. Without knowing anything about hemisphere differences, Scheler believed that values form a hierarchy, which has been interpreted brilliantly by McGilchrist. The holistic, testosterone-sensitive right hemisphere sees the lower values as *deriving their power from the higher ones which they serve*. Meanwhile, the reductionist, oestrogen-dependent, dopamine-driven, left hemisphere believes that these *higher values exist only to serve governing principles of utility and pleasure*, Figure 1.

Figure 1. Scheler's Pyramid of Values

The Holy

(der Heilige)

Values of the Intellect

(geistige Werte)

INTELLIGENCE

VIRTUE, BEAUTY, TRUTH

Values of Vitality

(Lebenswerte)

NOBLE, ADMIRABLE, BRAVE, LOYAL

STRONG, SELF-SACRIFICING, HUMILITY

Values of Utility

(sinnliche Werte)

ALL VALUES RELATING TO MERE USE,

MATERIALISTIC, PLEASURE OR SENSUAL VALUES

As stated in ‘The Master & His Emissary’, page 161: “*The values of the useful and pleasurable, those of the lowest rank, are the only ones to which left-hemisphere modes of operation are applicable – and even those are often self-defeating to pursue (as the paradox of hedonism demonstrates). As things are always re-presented in the left hemisphere, it is their usefulness that is salient. In the world which the left hemisphere brings into being, everything is either reduced to utility, or rejected with considerable vehemence, a vehemence that appears to be born of frustration, and the affront to its ‘will to power’. The higher values in Scheler’s hierarchy, all of which require affective or moral engagement with the world, depend on the right hemisphere.*”

It appears to be the case that women preferentially apply sequential analytic logic, that left-hemisphere speciality, in service of *themselves*, recognising mainly UTILITY, the lowest rank of value. Any higher values are usurped to their own cause... that of *using men to get what women cannot attain by themselves* (35). Female natural beauty is utilised to attract the best possible male reproductive partners... who are, thenceforth, treated as mere tools – sperm donors and resource providers. Male intelligence enables manipulation of the environment for resources, building homes, settlements, towns, cities, communication and transport systems, weapons to defend the civilisations man has created. Taken across *all* recent studies, men are more intelligent than women by an average of five IQ points (36). Furthermore, because of the male-typical distribution of IQ scores (more exemplars at both extremes, while females are over-represented by average scores), the male intelligence advantage is greatly amplified towards the top end. There are 2x men than women with IQ score of 125. **There are 6x more men than women with IQ score of 165.** Intelligence across the spectrum of cognitive functions has been shown to be related principally to right hemisphere function (37), (38). Testosterone enhances both spatial and mathematical ability (39). But, in the end, it all boils down to young women being enabled to spin down the highway in a lemon-coloured MG (35), or Barbie driving her pink Chevrolet V8. It’s only the very occasional, self-aware feminist, like Camille Paglia, who is astute enough to recognise male virtues of high intelligence, and the indefatigable adrenergic right brain circuitry which is driven to see ideas taken through to real world benefit: *‘If civilisation had been left in female hands, we’d still be living in grass huts.’*

Similar sequestering of male-specific higher values to the cause of female utility can be seen with bravery. Females are very risk averse and prone to harm-avoidance, in order to protect their fertility. Bravery, in the male, is of high utility to the female, protecting women

& children and defending territory, in the interests of the gene pool - a sought after male behaviour from the sex whose priority lies towards the species, rather than the individual (33). Self-awareness, empathy, identification with others... these are all **right hemisphere** resources (*Master & His Emissary*, page 57). More pronounced in the male of the species, such Values of Vitality (*Lebenswerte*) are useful in forming large, co-operative teams for hunting, and armies for defence, ultimately to female benefit.

Meanwhile, the higher values of Scheler's Pyramid appeal to the testosterone-sensitive right hemisphere. At the pinnacle are values which are higher than the self, lying beyond it, in the realm of the unknown and unknowable, concepts to which males have given vast attention over the eons, particularly towards that of a higher entity, such as God... or goddesses.

It is the *unknowable* about women which makes them so attractive to heterosexual men, forming the basis of the fable told by Aristophanes on the origins of love – of the divided creature, looking for its other half – the soul looking for its peculiar other, longing for its complement. This concept has recently been taken further by Henry Blair (40) and expressed as '*The Heterosexuality Screen*'. Blair proposes that there is a cognitive and emotional divide pulled down between the sexes, causing them to view each other through ideals of what the opposite sex should represent – ideals which are completely different to how they see themselves, and members of their own sex. If there is an innate difficulty to fully understand how it feels to be a member of the opposite sex, then this may be something that touches on the depths of human sexuality. Complete comprehension of the other is likely to be accompanied by the breaking of illusions. There is, after all, a phrase in common currency – *You can love women... or, you can understand them.*

The sublime is never more truly present than when only partially visible, and beauty is only skin deep. Sadly, it would appear that the male attraction to beauty can be used against him, as a form of entrapment – the transcendent being used as a lure for peonage, in service to the utilitarian. I'd suggest that any '*Heterosexuality Screen*' is very asymmetric, just as the human pair bond itself (Chapter 5, below), primed for resources to flow from the male to the female. Here, the asymmetry arises because men can't understand women (thus encouraging them to take the sexual bait), and women don't *want* to understand men. Filled with all the certainty of oestrogen-driven, dopaminergic left-brain processing, the female

believes she *already* knows everything there is to know about the male. She knows how to USE him for her utilitarian benefit (35). That's all she *needs* to know.

As Blair suggests, a peek behind any '*Heterosexuality Screen*' is unlikely to aid the mating process. If enabled to glimpse the true motivations and *modus operandi* of the female, this might be a (literally) chastening experience for any man. Behind that screen, women tread the boards of play-acting, wearing their exaggerated costume, practicing the lines handed to them by Nature, polishing them, bringing them to perfection, becoming ever more adept at the re-presentation which is a left hemisphere speciality, its need to influence and manipulate. It can be seen that only half the world's a stage, and only all the women players. Yet, even more tragic is the fate of a heterosexual man who receives no acknowledgement from the female sex, and fears that he will never find sex and love. Any man who comes to believe that he will never fill the void in his existence – that *something beyond himself*, that significant other – begins to feel superfluous in the world, a man without purpose, doomed by his right brain to melancholy.

The dynamics of heterosexual relationships are bad enough. But, poor Ms Patterning finds herself left behind and confused by the subtleties of the Scheler Pyramid, disadvantaged from both sides, from the apex to the base. Basically, she doesn't understand what's happening. **Due to her 'lived experience', she already believes that she's been socialised to be female by 'The Patriarchy'**, forced to wear dresses, asked why she isn't interested in babies... meanwhile, her male-patterned brain makes her wish to compete with men in the workplace, and find a female as a sexual partner. She's in no-man's land. Despite having a female body, she isn't exactly oozing femininity, and will find it extremely difficult to attract a man and get him to do her bidding. Besides, with her male-patterned brain, even the *thought* of sex with a man will be akin to that of a heterosexual man contemplating homosexuality. Despite this male-patterned brain, it's unlikely to be a top flight example by male standards. Therefore, in forging a career of her own, all meanings of the word 'forge' become acceptable to her. And, in seeking a sexual partner, there will be no complementary 'mysterious other' beckoning from a transcendental domain. The available candidates share the same sex, with all too familiar idiosyncrasies, foibles and weaknesses. She'll be forced to choose another Ms Patterning, outsiders melding as misfits in a mould of mutual misery.

Within such poisonous relationships, the Ms Patterning of the world can plot their revenge on the males who have treated them so badly, with such contempt and disdain. Little do they realise that this is the predominant male 'lived experience' with the opposite sex.

Unwanted women will never stop hating men, and they aren't too keen on the perceived capitulation of fellow females to the abhorred sex. Jealous of the ease with which femininity can get what it wants so easily, with minimal effort, Ms Patterning encourages the sisterhood to throw off the yoke of male oppression – a concept which must seem laughably alien to any moderately attractive woman, yet all too real in the everyday life of Ms Patterning. Possibly, somewhere, deep within her psyche, she knows that she has singularly failed in her evolutionary prerogative to bear children. Spite becomes her only refuge, and she wants the attractive women to share her misery. In this endeavour, she has scored one of her few successes. Western women, childless, forced to artificially compete with men, are heading to the anomie experienced by western man for centuries, since the Industrial Revolution cut us from our natural roots.

The ardent hostility of feminism towards beauty and the transcendent suggests a jealousy, an envy of something which is beyond their grasp, qualities which they cannot appropriate for themselves and utilise for their own base purposes. In their literal, humourless world, where everything must have defined meaning, they also hate metaphor, and all that it stands for. The right hemisphere has a huge facility for metaphor, giving it a broad, complex field of association (*Master & His Emissary*, page 373). There are many consequences of the left hemisphere's incapacity for metaphor, and the right hemisphere's affinity for it. The importance of metaphor is that it *underpins all forms of understanding of science and philosophy*, no less than literature and art (*Master & His Emissary*, page 70). Albert Einstein once remarked: "*The intuitive mind is a sacred gift, and the rational mind is a faithful servant. We have created a society that honours the servant, and has forgotten the gift.*"

There is a vehemence associated with the current attack by feminism on men and masculinity. It suggests not just a misunderstanding of, but a fear of, their status as metaphors for the non-utilitarian values which men represent by proxy, male access to a transcendental world which the feminist will never experience. In this world which we half-create, half-perceive, it seems pointless to lower the bar for STEM and other human endeavours, favouring females in tertiary education and employment opportunities, then expect astounding results - astounding in any positive sense, that is. "*The masculine of a woman is*

inferior to that of a man. It is apt to be less original and less flexible. She tends to be impressed by organisation and theories which she frequently carries to excess. She then becomes hidebound by regulations and obsessed by detail.” (41). This typical failing of the left brain is picked up by McGilchrist throughout his book, one such example on page 50. *‘Left hemisphere thinking is de-contextualised, and tends towards a slavish following of the internal logic of a situation. This permits too rapid a capitulation to theory.’*

The less savoury aspects of left-hemisphere thinking, a need to be correct... ALWAYS, and a lack of familiarity with objective truth, these will rapidly cause problems in any scientific endeavour. But, feminism is using the entire western world as a social science experiment, with feminist theory now dominant in politics, justice, jurisprudence, education. As stated by Kelly Oliver, a prominent feminist: *‘The goal of feminist thinking should be to develop strategic theories. Not true theories, not false theories, but strategic theories.’* It’s all about power, gaining access to the power which Ms Patterning has been denied. And, to gain what she wants, she must destroy the core nucleus of the power base which has excluded her so cruelly, the heterosexual family unit. She’s perfectly willing to spread fabrications, half-truths, and outright lies to achieve her aims.

Doesn’t she ever *worry* about the fallout, the effects on others...?

Good question.

Chapter 3

Mundane Monsters

Themes recurring throughout *'The Master & His Emissary'* are the near psychopathic tendencies exhibited by those whose right-brain hemisphere has been disabled. In the absence of the right hemisphere, the left hemisphere is unconcerned about fellow human beings. Social intercourse is conducted with a blanket disregard for feelings, wishes, needs and expectations of others. Patients with right frontal deficits undergo personality change whereby they become incapable of empathy [M&E, p57].

In this context, it's interesting what Florence Nightingale, the social reformer, statistician, and founder of modern nursing, had to say about her fellow females. *'Women have no sympathy, and my experience of women is almost as large as Europe. Women aren't capable of love. Women crave for being loved, not for loving. They scream at you for sympathy all day long, yet they are incapable of giving any in return. They really don't have sympathy, or the ability to empathise, because they are always judging everyone and everything as a product on a social value scale that relates to their own egos. There is no capability for genuine feeling. Other people are just proxies, to bounce ideas off.'*

Yet, strangely, women are so good at *faux* empathy. Whereas, in all forms of emotional perception, the right hemisphere is dominant [M&E, p58], it is found that the left hemisphere specialises in more superficial, social emotions [M&E, p64]. This involves *conscious representation of emotion* – willed or forced emotional re-presentation, principally of the mouth area, and controlled by the **left** hemisphere. This is in keeping with the left hemisphere's need to *influence and manipulate* [M&E, p62]. And, it transpires that there's a very good reason for this. **Nature wants females to appear as though they're being nice (42)**. The perception of female altruism, rather than any true empathy on her behalf, will bring reciprocation of tangible benefit to her. Men are much more likely to actually *help* someone in need (26), and, unlike women, this need not be in the presence of observers, where it becomes a type of virtue signalling. Looking good is always easier than actually *being* good. Virtue signalling and 'social justice' provides an easy, formulaic approach to looking good, without any real effort (43). It also appeals to the 'grandiose', aspects of the

left brain, which is much less ‘self-aware’ than the right, in relation to the world at large [M&E, p83].

So – females love to perform, but only if there’s an audience around, in order that some tangible benefit can be gained. Males are constantly criticised by feminists for failing to display emotion. As they love to label our faults, it has been given the term *normative male alexithymia*, and described as ‘a severe deficit in emotional processing’. Thus, it can be categorised alongside other feminist tactics in smearing normal male behaviour, such as ‘toxic masculinity’, ADHD in young boys, and the egregious attempt to have autism diagnosed as resulting from extreme male brain patterning. But, these labelling experts really need to distinguish between **emotion** and **display of emotion**. Women do the latter. A lot.

The explanation is simple enough, and feminists can’t back out of it through socially-constructed Patriarchy theory, either. The *purpose* of emotion is to elicit *action*. But, feminists want us to accept that gender roles are socially constructed – promoting male hyper-agency, and female hypo-agency. Yet, females love hypo-agency.... often deliberately infantilising themselves, so that a male will do the grunt work. In the present slur on men, females fail to take into account that the hyper-agent has no *need* to express emotion. He simply cuts out the middle man and acts directly.

A female, on the other hand, must display her emotions for all to see, in the hope that a hyper-agent will come to her rescue. The purpose of female emotion is to invoke action in those with agency. Interestingly, it’s also how females carry out violence on others, a minimal-risk strategy when they tire of GSRM techniques (18).

Labelling a hyper-agent with a clinical pathology due to his lack of emotional display seems somewhat inappropriate. As ever, it comes from the inability of the feminist to peek behind the heterosexuality screen, and consider the realities of male life. A man will not be awarded assistance if he displays emotion. He can also kiss goodbye to any female companion in his life. Never again will she feel secure enough to dump her own insecurities on him, or utilise him to outsource responsibility for her life. She will mistrust, and, eventually, despise him. Her friends will despise him. His own friends will despise him. As stated by Warren Farrell: ‘*By displaying his need for help, a man forfeits the right to it.*’

Normative male alexithymia is revealed as yet another label for men, applied by feminists as they develop their strategic theories. As ever, with predominant left-hemisphere

thinking, it is decontextualized, and tends towards a slavish following of narrow internal logic, without any attempt to grasp the bigger picture, or the inconsistencies with other aspects of their own feminist ‘theory’. All this talk regarding the socially negative effects of **extreme male brain patterning**... it seems to sit rather badly with the risible output of feminist neuro ‘researchers’ such as Gina Ripon (16), Lise Eliot (15) and Cordelia Fine (14) – all of whom have argued, particularly the latter, in her *‘Delusions of Gender’* (14), **that there are no differences between male and female brains** (an easily discredited nonsense). These feminists claim that we are all ‘socialised’ into becoming male or female. They have to make such outrageous assertions, so that women can access male jobs – while wishing only the best ones, naturally.

Here, with *Normative Male Alexithymia*, it’s the **desired outcome** which is important to the feminist, and her **strategic strategy**. Feminists hope to turn young men into volubly emotional creatures. In doing so, what’s left of the male pedestal (a very short one, compared to the towering female pedestal in society) crumbles. The emotional male will become an object of contempt and derision for male and female alike. It’s imperative that men don’t fall into these feminist traps. Feminist theory is all about power, and eroding any aspect of residual masculinity retained in the male domain which will enable men to attract women and pair bond. Women don’t want the responsibility which comes with power, though. The modern feminist wants the power of a man, the privileges of a woman, and the accountability of a child.

Women have always needed men to assume responsibility for a cushioned female life. A key aspect of the marriage ceremony sees the father of the bride hand her over to the groom. The left hemisphere is not keen on taking responsibility, and the effects are spilling out into all aspects of society. In *The Master & His Emissary*, McGilchrist notes that: *‘Denial, a tendency to conformism, a willingness to disregard evidence, a habit of ducking responsibility – these are social aspects becoming ominously familiar to observers of contemporary western life.’* Of course, what he doesn’t say, overtly, is that these factors are all concomitant with women abandoning domesticity, making incursions into the realms of science, politics, and jurisprudence.... where female evolutionary in-group preference for other females (4), an evolutionary adaptation (26), combines with male evolutionary deference to the female (5) to orchestrate female-friendly outcomes, with female behaviours and preferences pervading society and becoming the zeitgeist.

Female outsourcing of responsibility to men is a recognised driver in women seeking marriage (44). And, as marriage rates decline, women's unwillingness to accept responsibility for life choices permeates wider society. If feminists make proclamations on the urgency of 're-defining' rape, it is tantamount to an admission that they intend to make false accusation much easier... despite the meta-studies which indicate false accusation rates *no lower than 10%, and as high as 47%* (21). The issue of consent, which can be extremely ephemeral, is reduced to female opinion after the fact. If she says it wasn't consensual, it wasn't consensual. A justice system based on the *post facto* opinion of a plaintiff, with actual *evidence* rendered inadmissible, and centuries of due process removed (24) – that isn't a justice system. It's a witch hunt. These campaigns are *not* motivated by any genuine concern for the well-being of women. They represent attempts to de-legitimise heterosexuality. Here, the main thrust is an attempt to create conditions which may convince young, impressionable women that all men are rapists. It represents but a single campaign on a broad front against male sexuality, particularly in the realm of Sexual Economics, as we'll see in Chapter 6, below.

Schopenhauer (33) had this to say, way back in 1851: *'Women are inferior to men in matters of justice, truth, and conscientiousness. It will be found that the fundamental fault in the character of women is that they have no "sense of justice". From that fundamental defect springs falseness, faithlessness, treachery, ungratefulness. In a court of justice, women are more often found guilty of perjury than men. It is, indeed, to be generally questioned whether they should be allowed to take an oath.'*

In such a context, it's probably of interest that our sense of justice is underwritten by the right hemisphere, particularly by the right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex [*M&E*, p86]. With inactivation or inhibition of this area, we act more selfishly. The right frontal lobe has a capacity to inhibit our natural urge towards selfishness, and is therefore an area relied upon for self-control and resisting temptation.

In the UK, women were first permitted to undertake jury service in 1921, just over a century ago. Back in 1991, when this civic duty had been their obligation for a mere seventy years, I was called as a juror. The experience was shocking, utterly shocking, and has been recalled, under pseudonym (45). I saw nothing to suggest that the mixed sex jury, a more accurate M/F representation of society, had provided better checks and balances, or advanced the causes of truth and justice one iota – quite the reverse. I observed a situation where

evidence was cherry-picked or ignored by the women, in order to ensure that wealthy, handsome young men eluded justice for a serious sexual assault on a (very) young girl. The evidence was compelling. But, the women weren't to be dissuaded on their mission. They stuck together, a known female trait (4), and influenced the men, another known trait (5). As a result, there was a travesty of justice. The freedom of those young, handsome men was more important to the female jurors than the agonies those same young men had inflicted on a helpless member of the female sex. Schopenhauer (33) would have understood, but I was a busy professional at that stage of my life, a young father with a family. I didn't have time to read Schopenhauer. All I knew was that I'd glimpsed the underpinnings of how society works, and the likely outcomes to expect. It wouldn't make full sense to me until stumbling across the case of Cameron Herrin, who, on May 23rd 2018, caused the death of Jessica Reisinger Raubenolt, and her 21-month old daughter, Lillia, by colliding with them while driving his Ford Mustang at 102 mph in a built-up area. There has been an outpouring of sympathy from young women for the handsome Mr Herrin, who was given the Mustang as an 18th birthday present. They started a petition #JusticeForCameron (46), saying '*he's too pretty for prison*'. As for John Barrineau, aged seventeen, who was driving the car which Herrin was street racing, but who *didn't* knock down and kill anyone...? Well, he's receiving identical jail time, but nobody seems to care, as he *isn't* pretty.

The dynamics seem distressingly similar to what I saw on jury service. The attack on a fourteen year old girl was carried out by two handsome brothers from a wealthy family, and their poorer, more facially challenged friend. ALL of the women on the jury wanted the two brothers to go free, and for the friend to take the entire rap. They got what they wanted, too. They influenced most of the men, wore them down. When I protested, the labels came out. The jury spokesperson, a coloured woman, accused me of racism and sexism. Any support I had simply melted away.

And, women, Schopenhauer's unreliable witnesses, aren't simply serving on juries, these days. For the past seventy years on the ascendancy, they've reached the top of the legal profession as judges. They're also the politicians *making* the laws, facilitating situations where women can act as judge *and* jury (22). What could possibly go wrong? Well, we'll see...

The polarised thinking of the female, where everything is black *or* white, with no middle ground, is a key characteristic of *moral infantilism* (43). It is a feature of

filtering/confirmation bias – giving sole attention to evidence which supports your pre-existing beliefs. Bad for justice, bad for science, bad for society, it is a feature of left brain processing, as this hemisphere can **only say ‘no’ or not say ‘no’** to information provided by the right hemisphere [M&E, p246, p345], and the right hemisphere has been compromised, post female adolescence (47). The left hemisphere would rather believe theory and authority – ‘*what it says on this piece of paper*’ – **rather than the evidence of its own senses** [M&E, p234]. The left hemisphere will insist on following its own theory (at the expense of getting things wrong), and will further insist that it is correct [M&E, p81], as it needs certainty, and it needs to be correct. It is, therefore, unsurprising that it has an affinity for **ideology**, beliefs which are fixed and inflexible. Ideological individuals are highly resistant to empirical refutation of their foundational ideas, irrespective of the strength of the counter-arguments.

Because of feminism’s iron grip on society, it is now held to be axiomatic that men and women are identical in all respects, and *the existence of all sex differences are denied*. Denial is a left hemisphere speciality [M&E, p84]. And, it only gets worse. Psychopaths, who have no sense of guilt, shame or responsibility, have deficits in the right frontal lobe [M&E, p85]. So – *why* on Earth would nature deliberately retard the female right hemisphere, post menarche? From that point onwards, females will exhibit a self-reverential solipsism, with often callous actions towards the male of the species. What can possibly be gained?

Chapter 4

The Selfish Left Brain Wants Only the Best

Sexual reproduction evolved as a ‘technology’ to improve the species (48), and requires a complementary sexuality between men and women. We’ve seen, in Chapter 1, that, before we’re even born, sexuality has already been templated into the brain by the presence or absence of testosterone. In its absence, the default human brain is female-patterned, as we might expect in a mammal.

Childhood allows the new human machines to be calibrated, with values and attitudes gained through experiencing ten years of innocence, without the distractions of sex. Even during these precious years, it’s obvious that girls and boys lack the differences of adulthood, but certainly aren’t identical. There is a tendency for *independence, motivation* and *action* to be associated with the right brain, and *passivity* with the left [M&E, p90], making girls easier to educate with a ‘*sit still and listen*’ style. Already, the girls are **watching** the more unruly boys, through female personal networks, where they can exchange information on the best male performers. And, the boys instinctively know that they need to perform – forming social pyramids where they assert themselves by rank. Even with the minimal amounts of sex hormones circulating during childhood, our brains are still responding to the templates set by the presence or absence of testosterone *in utero*, where it was present at much higher levels than childhood. Then, adolescence kicks in, a fresh wave of newly synthesised sex hormone awakens the *in utero* programming, and our sexual behaviours begin to manifest in earnest. In heterosexual interactions, we are, basically, signalling our brain patterning to the opposite sex.... asking: ‘*Is this what you’re looking for?*’

Males, looking for that something beyond themselves, find themselves inescapably attracted to beauty. It haunts us, fascinates us. We will seek it out in a female partner, her beauty acting as a subliminal signal of her fertility, and the probability of good, viable offspring. Men will also try to *create* beauty by their endeavours, whether in music, art; literature, mathematics, science – often falling short of the mark, but we’ll keep trying. The non-polarising adrenergic circuitry of the right brain is indefatigable. We seek that beauty to satisfy our own creative urges, impulses and endeavours, and we also know that some beautiful female creatures have just emerged from their chrysalis, and are keeping an eye on

us. Already, we're trying to impress them through our creative efforts (right brain), and they're evaluating us (left brain). We're stronger, taller, heavier than our female peers, with, on average, 15% more muscle mass and 10% bigger brains, which are 5% more intelligent, that M/F advantage only increasing in the higher echelons of the strength and intelligence scales. In the mixing pot of young adult life, those qualities of beauty, strength and intelligence are now on display. Every time we meet a member of the opposite sex, that same subliminal question is hanging in the air. '*Is this what you're looking for?*'

The signals sent out by the opposite sex are designed to be mutually reinforcing. '*One can think of sexual communication as self-amplifying, wireless neural communication between areas of complementary sexual impulse*' (48). Female sexual behaviour – beautifying her face, self-exposure which places her body on display, feminine flirting – this is *exactly* what the heterosexual male is looking for. The signals arouse male sexual behaviour – looking at her face and body, making an effort to impress, masculine flirting. The male brain is designed to be aroused by sight, it's very much a right brain sense. Battlefield wounds to the right brain destroy sight, even if the eyes and optic nerves remain intact. And, the effect of female pheromones amplifies the impression of this beauty on the brain (19). **Originating from the female**, a positive feedback cycle is initiated, rapidly erupting into an overwhelming of our senses, the experience which we call love.

Ms Patterning understands none of this. Already, she feels that she has been 'socialised' to be female, and she isn't attracted to men. Her distaste for men is further amplified by male behaviour towards her. They aren't seeking her qualities of an inferior male, packaged as an unattractive female. They've got plenty of male qualities of their own, thanks, and they're not going to trade those benefits for a life of peonage to some harpy. So, Ms Patterning enters the maelstrom of adolescence in a very disadvantaged position with males and females alike. Sexually, she's on the lookout for another lady, and not a man with the qualities sought by her female peers.

To escape her disadvantages, Ms Patterning must convince other women that they are wrong, and *she* is right. She must make her peers afraid of men. She must convince them that men, the brutes, have socialised women into an inferior social position, oppressed them into having babies for *male* benefit! Prevented them from having jobs, oppressed them, kept them in the domestic environment, and under male thumbs. She obviously hasn't heard of **Briffault's Law** (49), whereby it is the *female*, not the male, who sets all terms, conditions

and expectations in the human family, and very transactional they are, too. **Where the female can derive no benefit from association with the male, then no such association will take place.** More confusion for Ms Patterning..... seeking another woman, she will have to convince her pool of potential partners, most of them normal women who are seeking a man, that heterosexual sex is nothing more than male rape. She must tell them that the ‘male gaze’, a perfectly natural part of male sexuality (and one which has actually been *initiated* by female beautification and self-exposure) is an expression of ‘toxic masculinity’ whereby the rapists are choosing their next victim. She will convince the increasingly female political and jurisprudence class that ‘sexual harassment’ should be made illegal, introducing draconian legislation which allows only a one-way street for sexual signals to be broadcast... **from** females. If a male shows interest, he could find himself in jail. She will also exhort those female politicians and judiciary to disadvantage males in the employment market, handicapping them in the name of ‘equality’. Let’s see men try to impress women when the only jobs available to them are those which the ladies don’t want.

Politics and law are, in fact, very attractive female career paths, playing to their strengths. The left-hemisphere is the natural domain of language [*M&E, p70*], and the left-hemisphere likes to make arbitrary ‘rules’ for others to abide by. But, there are dangers extant where women become too powerful in matters of jurisprudence. Through competing with other males (generally for female attention), men form the deontic systems from which civilisations were built (6). Such systems attempt to be fair. But, when women gain dominion in these matters, they soon become subverted to base, utilitarian motives. Removal of due process for **crimes in which only men can be the guilty party, by legal definition** (24) is nothing short of outrageous. It leaves men open to losing liberty and a large part of their lives through false accusation. As such, it represents yet another attack on male sexuality and is a result of pressure from organisations such as ‘The Scottish Feminist Judgements Project’.

In the intensive slur campaign against males known as ‘Feminist Theory’, nature has, unwittingly, given Ms Patterning many such advantages. The tendency of her normal female peers is toward left brain processing, a state of affairs which has been continuously expressed in the female sex **as a quality control for the human race**, as we’ll see. But, we already know that the left brain will believe in theory and ‘authority’, rather than the evidence of its own senses [*M&E, p 234*]. Also, any theory whereby women are ‘special’ and superior will have a direct appeal to the grandiose aspects of the left brain [*M&E, p85*]. In this way, female brain patterning, designed as an aid to heterosexuality, can be used against heterosexuality,

especially in a modern age where we are bombarded with feminist misinformation. The results are aided and abetted by women's much lower sex drive, meaning that they are more easily influenced by social and situational factors. We have already seen that attendance at University is associated with a **900% increase in women identifying as lesbian or bisexual (27)**. What the figures are for young women attending 'Gender Studies' courses is anyone's guess. These seditious courses disseminate the outright lie that men and women are identical and interchangeable... flying in the face of the obvious, that men and women don't come together to compete against one another, or to be sexlessly interchangeable (**50**). They come together only to pair off, into the separate social world of male and female, with default normal patterning which Ms Patterning, the Gender Studies lecturer, will never understand.

And, what *were* the ladies looking for, those with normal patterning? Well, traditionally, they have sought a man, so that they can subject him to Briffault's Law for the rest of his life. And, in their choice of men, they have very simple tastes. They can be satisfied only by **the best**. As we've seen in Scheler's Pyramid, the Values of the Intellect (*geistige Werte*) and Values of Vitality (*Lebenswerte*) can, all too easily, become entranced by beauty and end up in service to the base Values of Utility (*sinnliche Werte*). Strength, intelligence, loyalty, self-sacrifice... these are four aces, an excellent hand to be dealt in life's poker game. If males properly understood the game, however, they might see that these are also good qualities in a work-horse.

And, what about that other prized quality, beauty, how does it rank on the scale of women's laundry list of desires? Male beauty is a scarce commodity, manifest only rarely in those who already hold the four aces. Many 'beautiful' males have feminine features, but are likely to concurrently exhibit less desirable, feminised, characteristics. Often, they are attracted to other men. Nonetheless, outrageously handsome, heterosexual men do exist. Likely to be narcissistic and self-regarding (typical left-brain characteristics), they can live very chaotic lives, due to the limitless sexual opportunities available to them, and make very poor prospects as a provider for high investment parenting. Most women recognise this. Not all. Some women hold such a high opinion of themselves (a left brain characteristic), and have such confidence in the supremacy of their own female qualities, they reckon such a man can be tamed. They're liable to be disappointed.

But, as Schopenhauer observed, way back in 1851, the female psyche can all too easily be tempted (**33**), especially if they have already snared a good provider. In modern

parlance, this is referred to as '*alpha f*cks, beta bucks*'. As for wealthy, handsome men – they are the dream sexual partners, and are (sometimes literally) offered a '*Get Out of Jail Free*' card by women (45), who like to keep them in circulation. Maybe they'll bump into one another someday, when she's at just at the high libido stage of her cycle, sparks will fly, and she'll gain evolutionary advantage by capturing the zygotes of a higher-value male, adding the resulting offspring to her pre-existing portfolio. She is much less likely to take contraceptive precautions during a fling, because she *wants* to get pregnant (51). Women see nothing wrong in behaving in this manner (52), and fully expect their cuckolded long term partner to pay for raising the child (53). Truly, as Schopenhauer opined, women feel that their first duty and obligation is to the species (33). In gaining evolutionary advantage for themselves (and, by proxy, the human race), through *deception*, we can begin to see more clearly why the apparently unsavoury characteristics of the left brain have been selected for, and form part of the human experience, often expressed in typical feminine behaviours. It's a first step towards answering the question which McGilchrist poses in the preface of '*The Master & His Emissary*'... but, never provides a solution to the puzzle: '*Why is the brain, an organ that exists only to make connections, divided?*'

The answer, of course, is so that male and female sexuality can exist. We'll find that, wherever female sexuality manifests, the characteristics of the left brain are never far away. And vice-versa, of course. But, this is not a suggestion that females are exclusively left-brained and males are exclusively right-brained. We are all a composite of both hemispheres, working together through the *corpus callosum*, the mid brain which bridges and also separates the worlds of the individual hemispheres (depending on excitatory, glutamate transmitters, or inhibitory, GABA transmission, respectively). The *corpus callosum* has a complementary, but also conflicting role. It needs to keep the 'worlds' of the left- and right-hemispheres apart, while sharing information between them. McGilchrist puts forward the proposal that sense of 'self' probably comes from further down the tree of consciousness, below hemispheric level [*M&E, p220*], and that the *corpus callosum* isn't necessary for any sense of integration. All the *corpus callosum* must do is maintain *independence* of the hemispheres from moment to moment, not integration of the self. This explains why 'split-brain' patients, who have undergone surgical commissurotomy as a treatment for severe epilepsy, don't describe a fragmentation of the self, but merely some difficulty in inhibiting *inappropriate conflicts of action*. 'The left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing.'

As we experience everyday life, we are unaware of ‘reality’ being formed by the synthesis of two incompatible world views, those of the left- and the right-brain hemispheres [M&E, p41].

McGilchrist posits that **the hemispheres have complementary, but conflicting tasks to fulfil, and need to maintain a high degree of mutual ignorance. Yet, at the same time, they need to co-operate** [M&E, p209]. Isn’t this beginning to sound like ‘*The Heterosexuality Screen*’ (40)? McGilchrist also states that each hemisphere may have radically different agendas [M&E, p91], and I’d like to return to that, later, in the context of morality (Chapter 7, below).

For most people in day-to-day situations, moving between environments, different contexts may alter processing preferences for the left and the right brain. Nonetheless, I’d submit that males will show a preference for right-brain processing, while females will utilise the left brain more frequently. **We’ll see good reasons why this left-hemisphere processing, a feature of the default mammalian female brain, patterned in utero, and reawakened by oestrogen at menarche, has been assigned to females - facilitating their unique role in maintaining the quality of the human race.** Post-adolescence, female ‘emotions’ are just evolution’s logic executors (54). Behind all these ‘feelings’ are the stratagems of the genes, utilising cold, calculating, left-brain logic. By adolescence, both sexes are getting feedback about their sexual market value (Chapter 6, below), shaping their self-esteem, and affecting how high they set their sights on a prospective partner (55). But, in the eyes of women, **male status** can compensate for mediocre looks, and a lack of brute strength. Women flock towards money. In fact, in the absence of bigamy laws, it has been demonstrated that women would (gleefully) sign up to be second or third wives, just so long as there was enough money to go round, known as the ‘polygyny threshold’ (56). No wonder those women on jury service were determined to bestow freedom on wealthy, handsome young men (45), no matter how badly these men had already behaved.

*

If the entire *point* of life is to pass on our genes, then brain functions which enable sex will be of overriding importance. Not just sex, but sex which will tend towards *improvements* in the gene pool, to the benefit of the human race. Nature is a eugenics programme, as old as time itself. No behaviour affects the transmission of genes more obviously than sex. Thousands of genes are involved in building the brain, with neurotransmitter signals governed by male and female sex hormones in the neuroendocrine system. The resulting left-

or right hemisphere processing preferences of the two sexes, these exist for a reason – the reason being that they goaded our ancestors into getting their genes into the next generation.

It's women who have done the sorting for the genetic qualities they desire, a situation which has existed for the last 100,000 years of evolution. **Women's role is to consign most male genes to the dustbin of history.** This brute fact of female function has been interpreted and explained in a much more elegant and scientific manner by Steve Moxon, and the importance of his extensive work (57), (58), (59) is difficult to overstate. Moxon painstakingly demonstrates that *'behind the veneer of our supposedly egalitarian modern societies, there is profound prejudice against the male sex, by men and women alike.'* He posits that, as females are the 'limiting factor' in reproduction, both in terms of restricted number of gametes, and being the principal direct investor in offspring, males are, therefore, deliberately disadvantaged by nature, so that only the 'best' males will be chosen as reproductive mates. Almost immediately, males must contest intra-sexually for dominance rank, trying to catch female attention against a yardstick of sexual attractiveness qualities which are important to a female (looks, status, resources, commitment). Women use these qualities as proxy indicators of 'good genes'. They may be willing to compromise (a little) on the first three, if there's evidence that the male is willing to commit to high investment parenting.

If males can demonstrate an ability and determination to *overcome* their disadvantages, with evidence that they can dominate other males on a social hierarchy, then the **status** they have gained will enable mating, thus providing superior genes to the female. Without 'evidence' of those superior genes, low-status males will be subjected to 'policing' by both males and females, who will attempt to restrict their sexual access.

As the male sex drive is so overwhelming, males *must* compete, with serious costs incurred to their health. Male mortality is particularly high during late teens and early twenties, when men are taking risk and exposing themselves to danger (not least from other men), while attempting to attract women (26). Nor does life's treadmill end for males after attracting a sexual partner. Trying to retain her for life, providing for her while offspring are reared, this will lay the foundations for stress-related lifestyle diseases, such as stroke or heart attack. Moxon concludes that males ultimately act as *'genetic filters'* on behalf of the local reproducing community, ultimately for the benefit of the species as a whole. It is a similar

conclusion to that reached by Roy Baumeister in his description of men as ‘*nature’s gambling chips*’ (26).

The function of evolution is to perpetuate and spread reproductively-valuable mutations (which are rare), while removing harmful ones, which are much more common. **Nature doesn’t squander reproductively-valuable females on this task.** Instead, from time immemorial until (almost) the present day, they have been kept safe, and consecrated to the mission of populating the planet. With males, however, nature can afford to experiment, losing a vast number in the process. The simplest way to achieve this might have been for mutations to occur directly on the Y-chromosome – but, it’s small, and lacks the space for further coding, beyond those which provide typical male sex characteristics. So, instead, mutations are exposed to the processes of natural selection much more so in males, while they take risk, and exhibit reckless behaviour to gain **status**, thus impressing females.

Women are naturally attuned to making comparisons in male genetic fitness. It’s what their left brain was built to do. And, the effects on the human race would have been particularly marked in earlier versions of human societies, the polygamous ones, where the fittest men hoarded all the women in harems.

The female role in the gene filtering mechanism can be seen to be inescapably related to the characteristics of their oestrogen-activated left hemisphere dominance, and all of its manifestations in real world situations. Clues can be found on the rare occasions that women choose to open up about themselves, as in the words of Esther Vilar (35): ‘*Women really are callous creatures – mainly because it is to their disadvantage to feel deeply. Feelings might seduce them into choosing a man who is of no use to them – that is, a man whom they could not manipulate at will. A woman with feelings would have to think and work, **take on responsibilities**, and learn to do without all the things which mean so much to her. Because she does not want this, she decides to remain callous. But, she knows, at the same time, that it is necessary to enact the role of a sensitive being, or man would become aware of her essentially cold, calculating nature. Still, as her emotions are always faked and never felt, she can keep a clear head. What an advantage man would have, if only he realised the cold, clear thoughts running through a woman’s head, while her eyes are brimming with tears.*’

As alluded to in Chapter 2, above, a peek behind the ‘Heterosexuality Screen’ is unlikely to be an edifying experience for the male of the species – mainly due to female play-acting while she figures out which relationship decisions are in her best interests. It is well

enough known that males see relationships with the opposite sex in terms of romance, while females view them in terms of transaction (49), (60). It's left-hemisphere processing which allows her to behave in this manner. It may be salutary to examine the same extract from 'The Manipulated Man' (35) in conjunction with what we already know about left brain behaviours from 'The Master & His Emissary.'

'Women really are callous creatures [*no sense of guilt, shame, or responsibility, M&E, p85*] – mainly because it is to their disadvantage to feel deeply [*incapable of empathy, M&E, p57*]. Feelings might seduce them into choosing a man who is of no use to them [*acts selfishly, M&E, p86 ; believes higher human values exist only to serve governing principles of utility and pleasure, M&E, p160*] – that is, a man whom they could not manipulate at will [*needs to influence and manipulate, M&E, p62*]. A woman with feelings would have to think and work, **take on responsibilities**, and learn to do without all the things which mean so much to her [*the purpose of the left hemisphere is UTILITY, and its evolutionary adaptation lies in the sense of grasping and amassing 'things' : M&E, p41*]. Because she does not want this, she decides to remain callous. But, she knows, at the same time, that it is necessary to enact the role of a sensitive being [*willed, or forced emotional re-presentation, M&E, p64*], or man would become aware of her essentially cold, calculating nature. Still, as her emotions are always faked and never felt, she can keep a clear head. What an advantage man would have, if only he realised the cold, clear thoughts running through a woman's head, while her eyes are brimming with tears.'*[specialises in superficial, social 'emotions', M&E, p64]*

It is, in fact, highly instructive to go through Esther Vilar's entire book, 'The Manipulated Man', with McGilchrist's 'The Master & His Emissary' acting as part guidebook, part translation of what is actually taking place. But, the point has probably been adequately made with the single paragraph above. The message is clear enough, and the reason why nature *wants* women to behave in this way is similarly straightforward. **All of these behaviours help set the bar high for potential male suitors. And, the left-brain mind-set allows females to rank, grade and choose males who are going to be useful in going out into the world, bringing back resources for females and their children. In return, she may see fit to dispense a sexual reward, keeping him in her orbit.** In fact, the more solipsistic, self-reverential and narcissistic the female mind-set, the higher that male mating bar is set, fulfilling nature's plan. Nature wants women to exhibit mildly psychopathic behaviour in their dealings with the opposite sex (34), ruthless in their discarding of inferior male genes. Women are programmed to be on a mission, one of supreme importance to the

continuation and improvement of the human race. They are manipulators who secretly see themselves as superior to men, having no concept of masculinity, *other than how they can benefit from it*. Out in the mating maelstrom, the ‘grandiose’ aspects of the left brain [M&E, p83] certainly assist them, and they ‘see’ only the top 10% of men. The others don’t exist. It is a left brain speciality **to deny the existence of anything which it doesn’t want to see** [M&E, p84]. The left brain is more likely to become angry or dismissive, jump to conclusions, become deluded, or get stuck in denial [M&E, p41]. The left brain underwrites a fragmented view of the world – literally more limited in what it can see, and less capable of understanding what it does see. To cap it all, it is less aware of its own limitations [M&E, p41].

Sound like anyone we know?

The left-brain **ducking of responsibility** is an important aspect of female behaviour, and deserves further attention. It has been stated, by a woman, no less, that: ‘**Women’s greatest ideal is a life without work or responsibility**’ (35). We’ve seen that a recognised driver of women seeking marriage is an underlying female desire to outsource responsibility for their lives to a male provider and protector (44). And, in Chapter 1, we’ve seen the underlying physiological mechanism, **the sexual dimorphism at the CRF-binding site, which is hugely affected by circulating oestrogen levels** (12). Females are rendered unable to deal with high levels of CRF. This situation evolved so that women would immediately withdraw from stressful situations, thereby protecting their fertility, preventing stress-induced miscarriage. By contrast, through exposure to testosterone, male CRF-receptors require much higher levels of stress to be triggered, and are subsequently desensitised by depolarisation. This allows males to deal effectively with protracted, stressful situations. The provider and protector role fits the adult male like a glove, allowing their female partners to bear and raise children in safety. It’s a two piece jigsaw which is astounding in its elegance. But, Ms Patterning denies it, and insists on sending women out into the workplace. Here, they bring with them a spectrum of unsavoury left-brain characteristics, designed for domestic dominance, but entirely inappropriate in an occupational setting. This makes life miserable for everyone – including themselves, as they are now, inevitably, exposed to higher levels of stress than they were ever designed to cope with.

Again, I have a certain amount of personal experience regarding the fallout (61). I’m aware of the results when women are pushed too far in STEM by infatuated managers. I’ve

seen female scientists divorce their husbands after they received unwarranted and unearned promotions, believing that their spouses were now no longer ‘good’ enough for them. This **hypergamy** trait of women, **always believing that she can ‘do better’ in her choice of men**, definitely arises from left-brain processing. I’ve witnessed the lost working time through miscarriages as women worked their way up, I’ve observed the nervous breakdowns on the way down, after reality finally intervenes (this particular scientist abandoned her husband and her children after a promotion). I’ve seen hard-won projects, the products of male blood, sweat and tears, sequestered from men, then handed to female scientists on a plate, in order to bolster failing female ‘careers’. I worked for Imperial Chemical Industries, which was, once, Britain’s largest Manufacturing Company, and the bellwether of the London Stock Exchange. Remember ICI? Its fate might be a warning to all of us. Much was going on behind the scenes, and none of it was good. The west, in thrall to fake, feminist ‘theory’, is shooting itself in the foot.

The tragedy is all the more pronounced in realising that the delicately balanced neurotransmission differences of male and female were all designed *to form and augment human bonding*. We can see this in how the left- and right-brain hemispheres interact with the world. Ultimately, the left brain is concerned with **getting** and **feeding**, while the right brain maintains **a broad and vigilant attention** (62). In harsher times than those which we currently enjoy, it was probably essential that the female was insulated from the concerns of the hypervigilant right brain, allocating the stresses and strains of the outside, non-domestic world, to the male. Due to desensitisation of CRF-binding sites, he can cope with stressful situations almost indefinitely.

But, does he *want* to do this, without a woman in his life? In the absence of sexual reward, the outside world and its endless competition with other males seems a little..... pointless. Enforced male chastity is associated with depression, even suicide. Whereas, when within a sexual relationship, males are usually able to ‘bounce back’ from any circumstance, and face another day. This is where the isolation of the female left brain from the concerns of the right gives rise to a situation which is probably indispensable to sexual reward and sexual healing in the male. The female will often remain blind to external challenges identified by the male, treating these in the most superficial manner [does not see what she doesn’t want to see]. But, in a good working relationship, she will offer sex (and platitudes), hoping to convince the male that his concerns have been blown out of proportion. **If females were similarly right-brained, they’d be just as concerned by the threats. They’d become**

stressed, eventually unreceptive to sex, and the relationship would suffer. Instead, female lack of concern, together with abundant sex, can, perversely, lead to a feeling of long-term stability for the male. Particularly if the expected threats do not materialise, he will become convinced that this woman, his sexual partner, is his rock of stability, preventing him from over-reacting (47).

But, if the threats **do** materialise, and his sexual partner sticks her head in the sand, as left-brain thinkers are inclined to do? I could see the writing on the wall for ICI. My wife couldn't.

I'm now an elderly manifestation of the cards dealt to me in life, entering adolescence as a scrawny, working-class kid with a (badly) broken nose. However, I'm also very driven and determined. I'm very right-brained, probably as a result of my mother being forty-two years of age at the time of my birth, and her raddled old oestrogen couldn't template me with many left brain characteristics. By the time I was twenty-four, I held a first class BSc and a PhD in Chemistry. These achievements had immensely improved my prospects with the ladies, and I'd capitalised on them, taking my time, and marrying an attractive woman with a great personality, definitely the least materialistic woman I'd ever encountered. We went on to have two children, both boys, and life was good. By the age of thirty-seven, I'd enjoyed a successful scientific career, and we owned two houses, outright. Although my wife worked for much of our marriage, it's probably fair to say that most of the material assets we owned were due to my efforts. But, I loved science, my career was, essentially, being paid to enjoy a hobby. Then came a huge, politically-driven influx of women into STEM, and it all fell apart – because, eventually, I *refused* to hand over projects to support hothouse flowers who were wilting in the real world.

The right brain is hypervigilant. In this case, it didn't need to be. Some very powerful people were now gunning for me. But, my wife refused to accept the situation, told me I was imagining things. I knew that we had options, *if I acted quickly enough, and took appropriate action.* **But, my wife had only one thought in her head, and that was to keep me on the straight and narrow until our boys reached maturity.** This placed me in an impossible position. Eventually, I, too, had a nervous breakdown, just like the hothouse flowers, but for vastly different reasons. They couldn't cope with a system which remained in the final stages of being predicated on competence, before the travesties of female-friendly employment environments which are foist on us today. I couldn't cope with my wife being wilfully blind

to my predicament, advising that I should simply hand over the products of my creativity. “*I don’t know what all the fuss is about – you’re still being paid, aren’t you?*” Consequently, I railed against the crude control mechanisms which she applied, trying to keep me in line – silence and withdrawal of sex. As a result, we both lost nearly everything (63). But, I feel that my losses were greater. The financial losses which we both suffered were, in my case, heavily outweighed by loss of identity and sense of purpose.

Here’s Esther Vilar again: *‘A man is like a child who is condemned to play the same game for the rest of his life. The reason is obvious: as soon as he is discovered to have a gift for something, he is made to specialise. Then, because he can earn more money in that field than another, he is forced to do it forever. The woman who is exploiting him will never permit him to look for something else. A man who changes his profession is considered unreliable. If he does it more than once, he will become a social outcast, and remain alone. A man whose earning capacity is lessened is considered a failure. He stands to lose everything – wife, family, home, his whole purpose in life – all the things, in fact, which give him security (35).*

I couldn’t really understand why I was being treated in such a cruel manner. Eventually, I lost the will to carry on. Unable to sleep, my last defences crumbled. And, it’s not as though women don’t know what they’re doing. *‘A woman can perfectly understand a man’s pain and struggle, his dreams, his aspirations, his feelings – all while simultaneously not acknowledging their intrinsic value, and quietly discarding them. Male emotions are not part of a female reality which is bounded by their own emotions, those of their children, and women & children in general. Thus, women can use men without any sense of guilt. Women actually understand men very well, particularly the parts that are useful to them. However, women have little or no interest in comprehending man as a whole. We could compare them to drivers of a car, without any knowledge or interest in learning about the design or internal structure of the vehicle. **Women will weaponise a sexual bond to coerce their partner. The withdrawal of sex, affection, approval and love is a super-stimulus used by women, in order to exert better control (64).***

So – who is the *real* master? Who is the *real* emissary?

Chapter 5

Who is the Master?

Men, and, to a lesser extent women, can survive perfectly well on a vegan diet. However, if it's a *pregnant* woman we're talking about, her pregnancy is doomed. She requires protein, fat, folic acid and Vitamin B12, with the most likely source of these nutrients being meat. Back in our cave-person origins, most females would be permanently pregnant or weaning, which rather restricted their hunting opportunities, no matter how much of a 'real go-getter' that cave-lady happened to be. Would a primitive woman really be able to see a string of pregnancies to term, look after the resulting children on her own, and find enough food for them? Of course not! Inevitably, she needs the services of the opposite sex, in order to secure the resources she needs. She'd therefore bestow a (temporary) sexual reward to the most successful hunter, in exchange for a share of his kill. Everybody's happy – apart from the vast number of males who don't get access to sex.... or meat. They can compete, to be good hunters, or they can die out, while female genetic futures are relatively assured. Doesn't sound like much of a Patriarchy.

Initially, the consequentiality between sex and offspring would have been poorly understood by our forebears. After the causal link was suspected, males became (rightly) concerned about having some degree of certainty over paternity. To offer greater assurance, the societal norm of monogamy, often enforced by religion, was introduced. The natural male tendency to mate with as many females as possible had previously been enjoyed by only the top 10% of men, the good hunters. With a widening range of human endeavours, such as agriculture and trade, monogamy became a means of spreading social stability by making sex available to many more men, the farmers and merchants. As ever, there is a trade-off. Men must now sacrifice a 'numbers game' strategy, based on their natural instincts, in order to comply with a preferred female mode of raising a small number of quality offspring (57). For the next few thousand years, men will commit to monogamy, in order to be exploited by females as the principal source of income, an income which will mainly be disposed of by their wives. This sort of information is probably lacking from Gender Studies courses.

As we progressed from our origins, through Dark Ages and Enlightenment, all the way to a present, Post-Enlightenment period of fake theory, ushered in by Ms Patterning,

only society has changed – not human nature, or the reasons men and women come together. Human children still need to be looked after for a period of fourteen years or more. The modern woman still requires resource providers. Unfortunately for the social status of men, many western governments have stepped into that role, offering almost unrestricted ‘welfare’ packages to women, leading them to believe that they are ‘strong’ and ‘independent’ and ‘don’t need no man’. This safety net only encourages the natural female trait of hypergamy, and (behaving exactly like many women who have already secured a *beta*-provider) they’ll now attempt to breed with the *alpha* males at the top of the tree, the feckless ones, with narcissistic personality traits of their own – the men who have no intention of settling down. These transitory arrangements often lead to children, but precious little commitment to fatherhood. Meanwhile, the welfare programmes are underwritten and paid for by taxing the army of *betas*, the ‘invisible’ 90% of males who wouldn’t even appear on the radar of the average, entitled female. Again, the individuals with least power in society are the majority of males. Is this looking like Patriarchy to you?

It’s an obvious fact that males are grossly oversupplied with a commodity (sperm) for which females have only a very limited demand – in fact, restricted to just a few days of the month when her libido may convince her natural hypergamy to favour a particular male, granting him access to a precious ovum. The simple law of supply and demand places the female firmly in control of negotiations, the **master** as it were. **Women wield sexual power over men. Men impose dominance hierarchy only on other men, simply to gain status, which will give them access to females.**

There’s a huge knock-on effect from this dynamic. Again, it’s the work of Steve Moxon (**57, 58, 59**) which has encapsulated it most elegantly. Men and women interact, not in terms of dominance/submission, but by **male deference towards females**. This is in recognition of the female being the ‘limiting factor’ in reproduction, through relative zygote scarcity, and being the principal direct investor in offspring.

This work explains why the competitiveness of natural sexuality is entirely intra-sexual and not inter-sexual, and why, due to the male sex drive, competition between males is so brutal. It also explains why the sexes have a starkly contrasting, though complementary sociality. I’d add that this complementary behaviour is entirely consistent with female left-brain processing of human values – **beauty, strength & intelligence**, attempting to capture male strength & intelligence in the service of beauty (with which she has been naturally

endowed), for her own utilitarian motives (babies, resources, comfort, security). Meanwhile, males process these values with their right-brain, willingly sacrificing their strength and intelligence towards beauty, which they see as being a sublime and sacred entity, offering something beyond themselves. Little wonder, therefore, that males view relationships in terms of romance, while females see them in transactional terms (60), (51).

All other things being equal, females will rank males in terms of **status**. As stated by Moxon (57: page 128) : *“The ‘opportunity’ for men to compete with each other for status is universally provided by work, for which men receive money (a proxy for status) as a reward. Status acquisition is the only option for men to gain ‘mate value’ and obtain sexual partners. Women do not require this status (ie rank in male terms), because they already possess mate value in their youth and beauty.’*

So, what happens in these feminist times, when women have been ‘encouraged’ out into the workplace, where hiring practices (Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity) now actively discriminate against men? Men have been disadvantaged, and will find it much more difficult to attract a partner and have a family. Meanwhile, women have brought their sexuality with them to the workplace, and some of them seem intent on using this to their advantage (65). This equates to utilising the human pair bond outside of its domestic setting, for female monetary and status gain, thus making forcible entry into male dominance hierarchies. Females can, thereby, short-circuit processes which have prevailed since time immemorial – that of improving their own status by proxy of their partner, whom they have chosen through innate female hypergamy. They will be allowed to succeed in this workplace endeavour, due to the natural male tendency to **defer** to females. In fact, male deference to females is not only based on evolutionary principles (57), (58), (59), but also on the subtle sexuality of initial pair-bonding, at the flirting stages (40), (48). Deference is a means whereby a male can de-escalate sexual signals received from the female, signalling back that he isn’t interested. In a business situation, this is the only appropriate response, otherwise the male will probably find himself on a ‘harassment’ rap, with profound consequences to his employment, and subsequent status.

This female deployment of her sexuality, *outside its natural setting*, has been deeply examined by William Collins (66). He posits that human behaviours offer evolutionary advantage only in the context of the environment where they developed. One such benefit is

the human pair bond, resulting in provision and protection for women, *particularly in their role as mothers*. It ceases to be useful when it is deployed outside that context.

As indicated by Moxon (59), the human pair bond is deeply asymmetric. The male burden is to prove his genetic quality through achieving **status** in a male dominance hierarchy. Male effort to secure mating opportunities **is not to his benefit as an individual**, perhaps shortening his life through struggle. In terms of resource provision, **the male is therefore behaving altruistically**. His bond to the female is emotionally based. But the female bond to the male is utilitarian. In the mating deal, the female is selling sex, the male is buying. He commits to providing resource, and the female expects to receive it.

The female altruistic contribution is when she becomes a mother, in the production of a child. Therefore, the mother to child bond is the one which is emotionally based. These bonds are asymmetric and unidirectional, as the underlying **service provision** is one-way. The **male to female bond** is the **primary emotional requirement** for the altruistic arrangement of resource provision. The payoff for men comes with the production of children, in relation to which the female behaves altruistically, and is emotionally bonded.

The outcome of pair bonding is that **women feel entitled to control men**. William Collins (66) offers an interesting premise – since the nature of the pair bond allows women to exercise control over male effort [a manifestation of Briffault's Law (49) when in a domestic setting], **it follows that women tend to become the arbiters of that which is 'good'**. Because the needs of women attain primacy in the motivation of men, this **leads to a ceding of moral authority to women. THIS IS THE ENABLER OF FEMINISM (66)**.

The feminist position is that the pair bond, in the institution of marriage, was created by men, entirely for their own benefit, using superior physical and financial power in order to control women. This leaves Collins bemused, and he emphasises that feminists never explain why men should want to do this. But, in actual fact, feminism may have a point on this one. Monogamous marriage was created by men, and by male-led religion, a counterbalance to female sexual power. The creation of this institution allowed lower ranking men an opportunity to pair bond, **otherwise females would gravitate to the harems of the powerful (56)**.

Female 'moral authority', in social circumstances where females exercise power in a domestic setting, is seen as a positive phenomenon for child welfare. It results in welfare

concerns from a male partner being focussed primarily on the female, as a proxy for the child. However, since the post WW2 creation of a ‘Welfare State’ the male role in the human pair bond has, inevitably, been greatly weakened. And now, with the rise of gynocentric feminism, **female moral power is being deployed outside of its intended sphere of influence, that of the family. Instead, it is being used to destroy the fundamentals of human bonding, by sweeping away any residual status which might allow the average male to pair bond, and thus form a family unit.**

When women utilise their ‘moral authority’ to obtain preferential conditions in the employment market, and subsequently use sexual attraction within a business setting for personal gain (65), the consequences for society can only be catastrophic. Meritocracy is the least corrupt form of any hierarchy, and it’s disappearing, before our very eyes. Females are, all too often, propped up in the workplace. I saw it with my own eyes in a STEM environment (61). One can hardly look at a female co-worker without harassment allegations. Men are not to be allowed to talk about sport around the water-cooler, lest the conversation progresses to their weekend exploits, making ladies feel uncomfortable (67). In an office environment, dress codes and speech codes abound, left brain specialities. Meanwhile, in the background, the atmosphere is poisoned by the subtle GRSM techniques (18) used by women to deal with rivals, and all too easily amplified, electronically, by e-mail and social media. This means of passive aggression has now been taken out of the context of normal female intra-sexual competition described by Moxon (59), and deployed in the unnatural inter-sexual competitive environment of the modern workplace.

In a business environment, it’s all too easy for females to bemoan and decry their relative lack of success in the competitive, traditionally male ‘provider’ role, blaming it on ‘glass ceilings’ and ‘gender pay gaps’. Actually, the latter was recently explained (by a woman) who received the Nobel Prize in Economics for showing that women prefer easier jobs, and take time off to have babies (68)... ground-breaking stuff. But, all that’s *really* happening is that women simply cannot get their heads around a prevailing workplace situation which doesn’t fit their evolutionary expectation and paradigm that **males provide and females receive**. As Collins states: *‘This female psychological orientation – that males provide, and females receive – doesn’t fit naturally into a male space where status (and hence seniority & pay) must be fought for in competition. The feminist mind-set interprets the competitive male environment as misogynistic, as it is totally devoid of preferencing – the hallmark of the domestic environment of the human pair bond. Note the irony of the situation*

– it is the *feminist* who is more desirous to focus on the world of work, rather than domesticity – yet it is the *feminist* who is psychologically least suited to it. One of the many inversions of reality within feminism is the claim that men are slow to adapt to change. In truth, it is the feminist, clinging inflexibly to a gynocentric mind-set, and refusing to change, which causes male spaces to be eliminated, in order to accommodate women’s distinct social style. Men are *obliged* to change, to their own disadvantage’ (69).

As you might expect in any mammalian species, females are the masters. Men evolved to be stronger, more durable in stressful situations, more intelligent – but, ultimately subservient to the beautiful creatures who deign to offer us sex. Long before birth, our male brains are templated by *our own testosterone* to serve the female, and provide the next generation of women with what they require – pregnancy, and the haven of a safe, comfortable life, where that pregnancy can be provided for, by the male, with nutrition, allowing it to come to term. Around male necks, there is a placard which reads ‘*Will Work For Sex*’, invisible to all but the 52% of the population who are female.

Invisible to *all*, men and women alike, are societal biases where harms to males are perceived as less significant than corresponding harms to females. William Collins calls this ‘*The Empathy Gap*’ and has written an extensive book on the subject (70). Steve Moxon had reached similar conclusions (59): ‘*The root of the distinction between the sexes is not ‘sexual conflict’. Sex-dichotomy arises from fierce male intra-sexual competition for females, and (to a lesser degree) female intra-sexual competition for males. Culture is part of this biology, thereby obscuring the perception of male disadvantage which arises.*’

This male disadvantage has always pervaded society. There is little relative ‘value’ in male gametes, which are ubiquitous, superabundant, and continually seeking release. Male sex drive has been an ideal mechanism for keeping us in halter, maintaining us in production mode, handing over the fruits of our labour to our ‘masters’, and maintaining the human race in the process. Man may be born free, yet is everywhere in chains – courtesy of his sex drive.

Nonetheless, he has some significant barriers to overcome before he can submit, willingly, to his serfdom. For starters, he must have a job....and, not just a job, a *good* job. He must convince the master that he is a good financial prospect. Also, he needs to be able to *signal his heterosexual intentions*, in a civilised manner, through ways which are acceptable to polite society. This used to be called flirting.

So – what’s going to happen to the indigenous male of a country when he is disadvantaged in the employment market, in favour of women and other ‘minorities’? What will become of his prospects when he could *lose* that hard-earned job (and maybe even his liberty) simply by *looking* at a female colleague, and thereby falling foul of draconian ‘sexual harassment’ legislation?

Over the past half-century, feminism has become embedded within our most powerful organisations (71), and feminist ambitions are scarcely disguised, these days (72). Aided and abetted by a global elite, women are being ‘encouraged’ into male jobs, *by lowering the standards which women have to meet, while imposing artificial barriers on men*. Male disadvantage has been making the jump to a whole new quantum level. Where does *this* leave us on the pair-bonding spectrum?

Chapter 6

Sexual Economics

The continuation of the species doesn't result from women's vague desire to have children. We're all here because of the heterosexual male sex drive, which is also where the heterosexual female gains her power. By adolescence, boys are getting sufficient feedback about their attractiveness to the opposite sex, they know which girls aren't remotely interested, and the ones who might be swayed. We've seen that **male status**, gained through competition among male peers, will be a critical factor in her decisions.... it can compensate for mediocre looks and scrawny muscles. Believe me, I know. In hunter-gatherer societies, lower status men didn't attend University, pass their exams, land a good job, and wow the ladies with their newly-acquired status. Back in the 1970s, though, that was a perfectly feasible plan. As we'll see, feminism has been working very hard to close that particular route to male fulfilment.

On reaching adolescence, the great game begins. At this stage of our lives, childhood barely over, what do we know about masculinity and femininity? We might begin to understand that masculinity, in the relationship with our male peers, is defined by considering which males we can dominate, relative to those who will dominate us. We'll tend to see femininity mainly in terms of youth and beauty, God-given fertility signs bestowed on girls by nature. In fact, the youth aspect is lost on us, as we, too, are young. A vague comprehension will be dawning that girls – these creatures whose beauty haunts us – act as the sexual selectors. What we are less likely to appreciate is that the *concept* of masculinity is useful to the female, enabling a ranking in her quest to accumulate resources, including semen, from the fittest man she can find. Would we have even an inkling about the cold-blooded, left brain processes being applied in order to categorise the likely candidates? As an adolescent..? Never! Does it *ever* dawn on us that we are the stock in a meat market? Many men will go to their graves in complete ignorance.

I'm sure we can all remember our early forays into the dating scene, scarcely aware of what we were doing, yet strangely compelled to take part. I recollect it as akin to being within a garish, noisy, over-illuminated pinball machine, where mere chance determined the direction of play, rolling to the buffers, awaiting the ricochet, hoping to score again, hurtful

rebounds, fearful that a wrong move would end in ‘game over’, but knowing that I wasn’t really controlling any of the dynamics... it was simply *happening*. And, no-one had explained the rules of this pin-table to me. As time went by, I guess I became better at understanding how it worked. I knew I was the seeker. I’d *chosen* to play the table and soak up the bruises from the bumpers. No-one was going to come *looking for me*, and offer a high score.

This is the quest to find a partner, the craziest few years of our lives. It can end pretty badly, and is more likely to do so if you don’t believe you can better your first scores. Each time you stumble across a girl who seems to be in your league, and genetically suitable for investment, you need to ask her out – spend time with her. Inevitably, red warning flags *will* show up, and the game becomes a question of how much time and money you’re willing to invest before calling it a day, or deciding to take things further. For success, you need plenty of these options, and to play the numbers game. If there have been no significant red flags, the aspiring suitor must now ask himself whether the girl he’s with is a *Madonna* or a *Whore*.

If the girl is sending out all the right signals of interest, but remains sexually aloof, *she is a suitable candidate*. If she seems over-eager for sex, there are few young men who will fail to oblige.... but, it is likely that the suitor’s outlook will shift from *investment* mode to *exploitation* mode. Subliminally, the male can probably sense that there exists a correlation between the rapidity whereby females succumb to sexual advances, and the likelihood of later cheating, making her a poor prospect. Males can, in fact, ruthlessly gain decision-making information by *encouraging* early sexual relations, a course of action whereby the female will eventually be discarded. Man is simply fulfilling his own pleasure, *while simultaneously checking on her powers of self-restraint*, this being an overwhelmingly valuable commodity in a woman who may become the mother of your children.

Most of us will play the game for a couple of years, attempting to maximise the outcome. Eventually, a result is reached, and we go on to live happily ever after. I’m a very, very, very fortunate man. I played the tables in the late 1970s, which were probably the best few years in the entire history of the world for a young man to be alive. There were several reasons for this – social mobility for those of working class stock, free tertiary education, and a libertine zeitgeist following the availability of the birth control pill and the ensuing ‘sexual revolution’ The rulebook which had existed from the dawn of time until the 1950s (1960s in Scotland) had been torn up, and new rules hadn’t been written. In this new dawn, girls were

unsure *how* to behave, but were newly in control of their fertility. Anxious not to disappoint male expectations, they mostly erred on the side of whore rather than Madonna, thus facilitating the filtering process.

In fact, on occasion, the offer of sex would be on the table almost immediately. Under such circumstances there's little you can do but take adequate precautions, then cut and run. Any reasonable male will presume that she makes similar offers to the boys she meets *every* Saturday night, and that situation doesn't bode well for Saturday nights of the future. Similarly disconcerting would be circumstances where you'd been getting on perfectly well with a girl, taking your time, but in a 'relationship' only a few weeks old, she'd suddenly start pressurising *you* for sex. When this happens, you may presume, perfectly reasonably, that you're about to be taken for a ride. It was instructive to observe how such girls behaved in the presence of their girlfriends (who were often single mothers). They were fascinated by those babies. You are about to be utilised as a tool to give her one. You don't want the inconvenience of an infant to intrude on a relationship in its infancy. Run.

I had close encounters of the first kind with maybe a baker's dozen of women before finding someone special and utterly unique, offering that something beyond myself which could complete me. Such a range of experience and *choice* for a working-class bloke with a broken nose is entirely peculiar to the 1970s. Education and social mobility played its part, as did the collapse of religion. Previously, the church had exerted an iron grip on society, encouraging female chastity until marriage, an arrangement which is, essentially, to both male and female benefit, offering a moral exoskeleton to hide behind while the filtering process can take its course (more on morals in Chapter 7, below). But, Christianity, in particular, had caved in, yielding to the forces of consumerism, the onslaught of mass media, and the sexual revolution – really, a Wild West, with no rules – which had been initiated by the birth control pill. However, in the background, an even more powerful force had stirred society, causing the strictures imposed by the church to become irrelevant – the mass acceptance of women in the workplace, ushered in by World War 2. **Women were now earning their own money.**

It didn't take long for this to have an effect. Male **status** had always been essential to any man wishing for success in the mating market. On marriage, **his** status would be automatically transferred to his spouse, who would judge her own socio-economic standard as being that of the man she had married. And, always, she aimed to **raise her intrinsic, pre-**

marital standard, through hypergamous choice. To a very real extent, **female demands created the ‘Patriarchy’** which they’d subsequently come to rail against, through feminism.

Now that women had the opportunity to earn their own money, **the status demands made on men became an ever-higher hurdle.** The female sex instinct is triggered by **male status within the male social hierarchy RELATIVE to how the female perceives her own status on a female social hierarchy.... always aiming higher than her own position.** On entering the workforce, the unfounded self-belief of many women, a left-brain characteristic, was on the ascendency. This comes complete with the many left-hemisphere characteristics we’ve encountered in Chapter 2, taken out of the domestic situation, and into the business world, **where men will defer to women, due to instinctive, evolutionary bias and sexual signalling of disinterest, the only appropriate response in a professional environment,** as seen in Chapter 5.

This isn’t necessarily good for business. The tendency of the left brain towards denial leads to denial of one’s own shortcomings. Subjects with right-brain deactivation tend to evaluate themselves over-optimistically, are convinced that their views are correct, and are more apt to stick to their existing point of view. It has been seen with right-hemisphere deactivation by stroke that patients are *‘crippled by naively optimistic forecasting about outcomes’*, and wildly unrealistic about flaws in reasoning. Suggestion has been made that similar right-hemisphere deactivation, by oestrogen, occurs in nearly all females, post-adolescence (47), preparing them for the qualities they must exhibit towards males during the mating process (Chapter 4). Where right-brain deficit disorder is manifest, sufferers ignore task obstacles, accept impossible challenges, make grossly inadequate efforts, and are then stunned by the poor outcomes. Yet, men are programmed to **defer** to the decisions made by females (5). In our comfortable world of consumer capitalism, the seeds of destruction of all that we hold dear were already being sown.

Now that women were earning their own money, the wording of the marriage ceremony began to change, first subtly... then, overtly. The word ‘obey’ was removed from marriage vows. Suddenly, the provision of sex by a wife within marriage was deemed to be **optional**, and marital rape became a legally-enforceable crime, with vague boundaries and definitions, but strong punitive measures applied. The social stigma and high barriers to divorce were eroded, having an effect through every strata of society. In 1936, King Edward VIII had precipitated a constitutional crisis when he wished to marry Wallis Simpson, a

divorcee. Edward was nominal head of the Church of England, which, at the time, did not allow divorced people to remarry in church, if their ex-spouses remained alive. Edward VIII was therefore forced to abdicate the throne. A similar stushie erupted when Princess Margaret wished to marry Peter Townsend, who remained married to another woman when their romance began in 1951. Townsend divorced his wife in 1952, and proposed to Margaret in 1953. But, as Margaret was under the age of 25, she required marriage approval from her sister, the Queen, who refused to give it, because of Townsend's marital history.

On October 31st 1955, Margaret made this official announcement on BBC radio: *'I have been aware that, subject to my renouncing rights of succession, it might have been possible for me to contract a civil marriage. But, mindful of the Church's teachings that Christian marriage is indissoluble, and conscious of my duty to the Commonwealth, I have resolved to put these considerations before any others.'*

Such self-sacrifice! Townsend had a rather different take on the situation, in his 1978 autobiography: *'She could have married me only had she been prepared to give up everything – her position, her prestige, her privy purse. I simply hadn't the weight, I knew it, to counterbalance all she would have lost.'*

It is in female interest to *appear* self-sacrificing, as it places them on a moral pedestal, and brings all kinds of reciprocal benefit. Nature wants females to appear as though they're being 'nice' (42), while, behind those captivating eyes, inescapable left-hemisphere processing principles, associated with the priorities of *grasping, getting and feeding* are operating inexorably, and with infinite capacity for deception, including self-deception.

It didn't take too long for the moral system enforced by Church and State to collapse spectacularly. Today, we are ruled over by King Charles III and Queen Camilla. The Archbishop of Canterbury was pleased to officiate at their marriage, despite the divorced status of both bride and groom. Needless to say, such blasé behaviour towards niceties which had previously been thought so important as to cause abdications, had already pervaded those impudent lower classes.

When 'no-fault' divorce became normalised, the entire state of marriage became a sham, and an institution best avoided by young men. They could only lose by following a model which had previously worked, at least adequately, as a 'glue' for society. Now, a wife could make significant personal gains.... a house, children, cash and assets, simply by

claiming that a marriage had ‘irretrievably broken down’. No fault divorce is rarely contested by the courts, and the standards for ‘irretrievable breakdown’ are low, with no burden of proof. We’ve already seen that men tend to view relationships in terms of romance, while women see them in terms of acquiring assets (60). The stage is, therefore, all set for men to be fleeced. Society turns a blind eye, through its myopia to male disadvantage (59), (70).

Not only that, it was already possible for women to short-circuit the process of acquiring status by proxy. All they had to do was take those male jobs for themselves. Each time they did so, they created *another* man who would never gain sufficient male status to attract a woman and form a family. And every female promotion **would remove an entire strata of males** from the radar of the promoted female. These men were now ‘no longer good enough’ for her. Particularly tragic were the effects of promotion on women who were already married, as she’d **reassess her husband in negative terms**, and, all too soon, he’d find himself in the divorce courts. I saw this female mind-set pervade the STEM environment of the mid-1990s to mid-2000s, where women were artificially encouraged and rewarded (61). Soon, management began sequestering my projects to prop up the ‘careers’ of these risible creatures. I endured years of this travesty, before finally quitting, almost bringing my own marriage to an end in the process.

Yes, the times, they were a-changing. Third wave feminism, utilising principles which it had ‘borrowed’ from Marxism, was just beginning to exert its grip on female thinking, encouraging women to believe themselves oppressed, and that the route to freedom was out into the workplace. The slogan ‘*Work Sets You Free*’, or ‘*Arbeit Macht Frei*’ has, however, a rather unfortunate history, being the sign above the gates of Auschwitz-Birkenau, a forced labour prison camp run by the Nazis, where many an unfortunate would be worked to death under inhumane conditions, or simply exterminated, if they were of no utility. I will avoid any obvious comparison with the Feminazis, and how they view men, now that we are of little further use to them.

While society was being rearranged to feminist principles, a social constructionist approach to the mating process was making itself felt, emphasising male subjugation of women, and women’s (supposedly) oppressed position in society. They were making themselves a few powerful allies in the process, as we’ll see (Chapter 8, below). It would be some time later before Roy Baumeister would take a different viewpoint, applying simple economic theory to sexual interactions, publishing his ground-breaking paper on ‘Sexual

Economics' in 2004 (73). It would be amiss to attempt any alternative summary of this work other than the original precis, below.

A heterosexual community can be analysed as a marketplace in which men seek to acquire sex from women, by offering other resources in exchange. Societies will therefore define gender roles as if women are sellers and men buyers of sex. Societies will endow female sexuality, but not male sexuality, with value (as in virginity, fidelity, chastity).

The sexual activities of different couples are loosely interrelated by a marketplace. Instead of being fully separate or private, each couple's decisions may be influenced by market conditions. Economic principles suggest that the price of sex will depend on supply and demand, competition among sellers, variations in product, collusion among sellers, and other factors.

Research findings show gender asymmetry (reflecting the complementary economic roles) in prostitution, courtship, infidelity and divorce, female competition, the sexual revolution and changing norms, unequal status between partners, cultural suppression of female sexuality, abusive relationships, rape, and sexual attitudes.

There are many fundamentally valid principles laid bare in the study. Women will receive valued goods in return for their sexuality. By contrast, male sexuality cannot be exchanged in a heterosexual community for other goods. Female virginity, chastity, fidelity, and virtuous reputation will have greater weight in the formation and continuation of a relationship. The reason why sex is a female resource is explained by reproductive strategies, shaped by evolution. Male investment in parenthood resulting from sex can be almost zero, whereas the potential cost to a woman (pregnancy, with attendant pain, and risk of death during childbirth) is substantial, even if the sex itself is pleasurable. There are also motivational differences. **'The person who is less in love has more power to shape and influence the relationship, because the one who is more in love will be more willing to make compromises, and offer other inducements to keep the relationship going.'** (74). This is interesting in the context of men being the more romantic sex in a relationship, while women are more transactional (60).

In modern western societies, women have been given all the rights and privileges enjoyed by men (often without attendant responsibility, such as military draft), and therefore do not need to trade sex as their only way of securing resources. Women can work together to

restrict male access to sex, and there is much evidence to suggest that this was extant in the conservative ‘protection’ of female sexuality as ‘virtue’, seen in western societies all the way to the sexual revolution, with marriage being the only socially-acceptable means of access. As third wave feminism gained greater control of western thinking from the 1970s onwards, and women became an increasing part of the workforce, female restriction and control of sexual access soon manifest through their political influence (71), (72), resulting in draconian ‘sexual harassment’ legislation (75), applicable to the workplace (76) and to wider society at large (77), so-called ‘street harassment’. Obviously, this can create difficult and dangerous conditions for young men to negotiate, with the risk of life-destroying false accusation being all too real (21).

The 1970s, the decade of notable ‘market correction’ where the price of sex was temporarily reduced for men, was a unique blip in history. It had already been recognised by women, generally, that the sexual revolution had been disadvantageous to their position, devaluing their main trading resource. This would never be allowed to happen again. The AIDS epidemic of the 1980s swept away much of the prevailing attitudes towards casual sex. By the time that threat appeared to be on the retreat, feminist political influence (71) had ensured that women would, never again, lose pricing control on their prime trading asset, while simultaneously lobbying to introduce legislation which would rob men of their overarching trading token, that of having a job. Deny a man a job, and he is no longer attractive to a heterosexual woman. The complementarity of the sexual economics market has been broken. Men strive for status, so that they can acquire sex. Women offer sex, so they can acquire status. Where he has nothing to offer he is *invisible* to her left brain and its calculations. And, at the end of the day, she calls the shots.

By now, feminism was intent on destroying male employment opportunity, the source of male status, his sexual trading asset. The 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women, in Beijing (71), resulted in the Beijing Declaration and the Platform for Action, **strategic objectives and actions for the advancement of women**, which were adopted unanimously by 189 countries. The conference is seen as consolidating several decades of drafting legislation which is specifically designed to advantage women. So much for ‘equality’! Equality is a nice word, with connotations of fairness and justice, but feminists and their puppet masters know how **men are disadvantaged by equality**. There isn’t a woman on this earth who’d be sexually interested in a man she sees as her equal.

This is third-wave feminist power in action. Within a lifetime it has gone from a standing start to practically running the United Nations, all without a single elected representative, without a single vote having been cast for its policies... a truly frightening misuse of power in an age of supposedly settled democracy, and men are *already* suffering as a consequence. The figures associated with this conference are staggering – more than 17,000 participants, including 6,000 Government delegates at the negotiations, together with over 4,000 ‘accredited’ NGOs. A parallel forum, exclusively for NGOs, had 30,000 participants. The media was in attendance, with 4,000 representatives. The number of international civil servants present is unrecorded. But, you can bet it was a lot.

We can see the results in the types of UN-backed legislation which have pervaded the globe. Affirmative Action (78), Equal Employment Opportunity (79), Environmental, Social & Governance legislation (80), Diversity, Equality & Inclusion legislation (81), innocuous-sounding bureaucracy which employers must meet, but which are **designed to disadvantage the employment prospects of the indigenous male population in the countries where the legislation is applied**. Although it all sounds ‘nice’ and ‘fair’ and above board, concerned only with an outcome of ‘equality’, it is social engineering against meritocracy, and against men in particular. ‘Equality’ disadvantages every male that it affects, **because women don’t want equality in male sexual partners**. They need men to be earning more than them. And a man who isn’t earning is invisible. The social engineers would do well to heed the words of the economist Milton Friedman, from 1980: *‘A society which puts equality – in terms of equality of outcome – ahead of freedom, will end up with neither equality nor freedom.’*

How did feminism manage to gain this amount of sway and influence, achieving coup after coup against men, with no-one raising a single voice of dissent? The church had been a male-led institution offering a counterbalance to female power in society, helping to keep female sexuality in check through imposition of artificial ‘moral principles’. But, by the 1970s, its power had waned to the extent that it was all but negligible. This, of course, left a power vacuum, and nature abhors a vacuum, particularly in its power structures. Third wave feminism, and its fabricated tales of female oppression, was ideally placed to take over the moral reins, thus becoming the new ‘religion’ of our times, the set of guiding principles by which we must live our lives. Never mind that it’s all lies. Oh well, I suppose that model worked well enough with religion. Then, as we shall see, feminism became inextricably embroiled with the cause of ‘global warming’, where environmentalism has become just another ‘mentalism’ to keep us in our place, and buying product.

The United Nations, and the associated trickle-down legislation which Governments have already imposed, these will ensure that we have little individual choice in the matter. Women and minorities will have priority in employment. Men can have the dirty, dangerous jobs which women don't want, because these would compromise female health and dignity. And, we'd better keep our eyes steeply averted while we sweep the streets and unblock the sewers, lest we are suspected of 'the male gaze' (82), and find ourselves in court, having committed some UN-sponsored 'harassment' offence. The new religion of feminism, like all religions, works hand in glove with the powerful, to keep ordinary men under control through imposition of artificial moral values. As such, it perfectly fills the power vacuum left by the Church, but with one important difference. Where the Church served to facilitate the formation of families, also assisting in keeping them together, the new religion of feminism seeks destruction of the nuclear family (83). In doing so, it hopes to usurp absolute power. Its financial sponsors may think differently (Chapter 8, below).

I strongly believe that the sponsors are doing the actual thinking and strategic planning for the feminist cause. The high priestesses of feminism, the Ms Patternings of the world, poor deluded souls, are no more in charge than the Spice Girls of the 1990s, a synthetic song and dance combo, tunelessly shrieking '*Girl Power!*' while strutting their stuff on stage, apparently oblivious to the fact that the group has been assembled by men, that they're singing songs written by men, and they're performing dance steps choreographed by men. Never mind. As long as the audience believe the message, pay for their tickets, and leave the powerful men enriched, the Spice Girls, and the feminists, will have served their purpose.

The feminist attack on men is really an attack on heteronormative behaviour, and the **family**, but under the deception of a false flag, a typical left-brain behaviour. It has been arranged for men to bear the brunt of feminist vitriol for reasons of public relations. **No-one will ever admit to, or sign off on, a campaign against women & children.** But, a campaign against men has every chance of success. We can see this all around us, these days, even in the advertising world, such as the Gillette campaign (47). Women tend to look out for what they believe are their own interests (4), and aren't concerned by how men will be affected. Meanwhile, many men, perhaps even the majority, can be persuaded to condemn other men. And, out in the milieu of society, nobody cares anyway (59), (70).

Courtesy of feminism, the sexual revolution, for men, was a flash in the pan. 'Anything goes...' has been replaced by 'That is not acceptable...' Through their powerful political and legal allies, women have regained control of the sexual marketplace. As a result, today's young men find themselves in an impossible position. The employment market has been seriously skewed against them, leaving them fundamentally weakened in the **status** aspect of the sexual economics market. Meanwhile, normal male sexuality has been almost criminalised. If men do manage to find a job with sufficient status to enter this market, and go out seeking a mate, they are *predators*. If they find a suitable candidate, they are potential *date rapists*. If they wish to avoid the trials and tribulations of the sexual economics market, they are *incels*, MGTOW commitment-phobes, immature, irresponsible, and very, very dangerous... according to Laura Bates, anyway (84) in her handy, feminist guide to everything that's wrong with the modern man.

Aside from the **status** that the young man can bring to the sexual economics market, **only if he has a job**, he may (in rare instances) be blessed with good **looks**, a sign of genetic fitness. But, it's important to realise that looks are not all-important to a female seeking a relationship. Really, her #1 priority is the security which comes from her newly-acquired higher status. Only after she has achieved this will she relax sufficiently to begin a breeding programme. You could say that, in marginal order of priority, her three life goals are: **STATUS > SECURITY > DESIGNER BABIES**. But, as Schopenhauer (33) and others (49) have pointed out, the provider of the ultimate life goal need not necessarily be the provider of the status and security.

This is a quintessential female dichotomy, and they seem programmed to be callously insouciant to the effect of infidelity on the men they betray, prioritising their own advantage, and the advantages conferred on their offspring. Surely, this evolutionary benefit of heartlessness towards males is one of the many reasons that nature retards the right brain with oestrogen post female adolescence (47). In Ester Perel's 'Mating in Captivity', she at least attempts to rationalise her selfishness (unsuccessfully). 'Females have a big problem. Their quest for security conflicts with their pursuit of passion. Domesticity and sexual desire are antithetical. **Equality doesn't raise erotic desire**, which thrives on power plays, unfair advantages, and the space between self and others. Marriage, for women, acts as a pragmatic institution, based on the financial dependency of women on men. **But, this dependency has been eroded to the point that it is no longer relevant. Therefore, female moral preferences will be on the ascendancy.**'

So - you struggle and strive, often for many years, to raise your male status so that you may enter the market of sexual economics. Then you spend another few frustrating, and often expensive years, sifting through the likely candidates. Finally, you are able to make a decision, offering marriage to a woman, and a lifetime commitment to high investment parenting, just to get the deal over the line....

... then, with her status and security provided for, she sees fit to cheat on you with a handsome man whom she sees as higher value. Not only that, she sees it as her 'right' (49), and the law, backed up by female 'medical ethicists' will insist that it is your duty to raise another man's child for the next eighteen years (50), and that you should be grateful for the opportunity to do so. Pointless to complain, in any case, as this will precipitate a no fault divorce where you'll lose your home, be taken to the cleaners for 50% of your assets, and will end up paying maintenance to nourish another man's genes in any case.

And, there's no shortage of handsome men out there. Only a century ago, no woman had seen Cary Grant or Rock Hudson (who was actually too pretty to be interested in ladies). But, cinema, TV, magazines, advertising billboards, they brought such men into female consciousness, created high-status 'stars' and 'celebrities', and raised the standards on both status and male attractiveness. Now, the internet and phone apps bring a constant stream of attractive chaps into the hand held devices of millions of 'oppressed' females, and hook-ups can be arranged in a matter of seconds, consummated in no time at all.

For the past forty years, we have been afforded the opportunity to observe how women behave when relatively unconstrained. The current practice of informal, rolling serial monogamy, so prevalent in the west, is a product of *female* choice. It is, in many respects, similar to polygyny, and has a pernicious effect on males at the bottom of the social scale. The ascendancy of female morality doesn't look like a great deal for men. Nor do children benefit, as, unlike biological fathers, social fathers care less profoundly about the children in their care. Women don't seem to realise that male capitulation to their incessant demand for resources *and* deference to their moral pedestal arises solely through them acting as proxies for the interests of *children*, who are nature's prime resource.

Chapter 7

Morals

When there is moral imposition from ‘above’, from those who see themselves as your social superior, the first question to be asked is: ‘*What are they gaining from my compliance?*’ The moral principles of Christian marriage, so important that kings must abdicate in the 1930s, and high-ranking heirs to the throne must toe the line in the 1950s, are revealed to be a sham, a charade, in the 2005 wedding of Charles and Camilla, with the Archbishop of Canterbury officiating. But the solemn pomp and circumstance of Christian marriage had been a very important tool of the Establishment. *It allowed control of the population within moral guidelines and grounding principles which assisted the formation and maintenance of families.* Monogamy is natural to neither men nor women. Men, with their naturally high sex drive, have an innate desire to mate with as many women as possible, the best reproductive strategy for a male. But, gaining access to females is never easy unless you have a very high sexual economics score, either very handsome, or very rich. Rich, handsome blokes have got it made, especially in their youth.

Women’s lower sex drive, and very high self-esteem (a left-brain speciality) makes them extremely picky. They rate male looks very highly. They might even see a handsome male in terms of romance, just as most men tend to see *all* women in romantic terms. But, the outrageously handsome man tends to be a rare entity. Good looks are not often associated with a male who wishes to commit, as he knows that he can have his pick of women. So, women make the best of the situation, and view most men as someone from whom they can extract resources. They grade male **status** as a proxy for genetic fitness, and seek it out in a partner, to give them **security**. A male must earn much more than his prospective female partner, or he will not be considered. It is a harsh fact of male life that blue collar workers and short men (both proxy for low status) are *invisible* to most women.

After gaining their security, many women have little compunction about playing away from home. The figures for ‘mis-paternity’ in the western world are truly staggering (32). Women justify this to themselves in terms of ‘following their true desires’, and finding the ‘romance’ which they missed out on (through their own choices). So – means must be found of persuading men and women into monogamy, and keeping them there, so that families can

thrive. That's where religious principles were so useful for 2,000 years. Monogamy satisfied male sexuality for the greatest number of men, allowed lower ranking men a crack at the marriage market, giving them a reason to get up in the morning – they must work to support a wife and kids... thereby making a profit for the masters, first feudal lords and landowners, and, eventually, industrial capitalists. Lower and middle-class males, when married, would be tired at the end of the day, much more likely to have their evening meal and seek their sexual reward, rather than getting together with other frustrated, sexually disenfranchised men, and using their untapped masculinity to plot rebellion against the elite. Unmarried males, having no stable 'social bonds' (wife & kids) have a propensity to cause violent disorder, riot and revolution (85). Meanwhile, monogamy helped keep natural female sexuality in check. What's not to like?

A man might feel that he'd like more than one sexual partner. Yet, a monogamous society is his best chance of, at least, getting one, which is better than none. A woman might feel that the romance which she 'deserved' has passed her by, but at least her needs for security and kids are likely to be fulfilled. Thus, the vast majority of men and women rubbed along for 2,000 years or so. The people at the top didn't bother with their own rules, of course. Morality is for those of mediocre means. The wealthy can always afford promiscuity.

The elites encouraged and supported the spread of religious orders, to act as a moral police force on the general population. Kings allowed dominion of a religious hierarchy over the merchant classes and the workers, who were obliged to follow the rules, at pain of becoming social outcasts. But, religion played a canny game, to ensure that its elevated position in society could be maintained indefinitely – pretending that the power of kings **flowed directly from God, but only through the medium of the Church.** In this way, the 'Divine Right of Kings' required that the Church be kept close at hand, holding a powerful position in the society which it kept a watchful eye on, always on the lookout for dissenters.

In this relationship of mutual synergy, the approval of the Church was essential before new Kings could start ruling. Their coronation required that they be 'anointed' by the Head of the Church, using a smelly oil that signified God's power being transferred to them, with a liberal helping of mumbo-jumbo. This was still being done in September 2023, at the coronation of King Charles III, Queen Camilla by his side, two divorcees being blessed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, a former oil industry executive, the secret 'anointment' carried out behind screens, so that the TV cameras couldn't bear witness to the 'divine' act,

consummated with a smelly oil whose components had been synthesised by industrial chemists, as the original contains non-biodegradable components, and is accessed from musk deer and civet cat, rather too cruel for modern tastes.

It is almost impossible to consider a more ridiculous, empty, pointless ceremony, and scarcely more edifying to realise that this puppet show kept us under control for 2,000 years. The synergy of self-interest between Church and State acted to keep the population in line, and the tithe barns full. Men and women would fill churches on the Sabbath Day, handing over even *more* of their hard-earned money, in order to hear a lecture about what was likely to happen to them if they strayed from the straight and narrow.... it would be hell-fire and eternal damnation. The grasses and the sneaks would tell tales to the Church Elders (and betters) regarding those who hadn't been following the rules. Public humiliation through the stocks and the ducking stool would be the inevitable consequence. In fact, during episodes like witchcraft trials and the Inquisition, it could all get a little bit out of hand.

Morality, when imposed upon us by those more powerful than ourselves, is little more than a Ponzi scheme of self-interest. By the time the benefits reach the bottom of the pyramid (the ordinary men and women who must '*go forth and multiply*' in order to swell the ranks of the congregations), there's little to be gained, apart from a Sabbath Day, which has been provided so that men didn't work themselves to death. Church and State are selling us a ticket to a promised land, which can be accessed only if we follow *their* rules, buying us with our own money, in the process. Conveniently, it's easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man access the Kingdom of Heaven. Don't forget to leave all your money to the Church in your will, if you're a wealthy merchant or farmer. At this point, the Aristocracy and the Church hierarchy can exchange a knowing wink.

The Abrahamic religions, Christianity, Judaism and Islam, once insisted on circumcising all male members (no pun intended). The foreskin is a natural roller-bearing, allowing a man to pleasure himself easily. Its removal renders such an act much more difficult, inconvenient, even painful, without some lubricant. Consequentially, he is much more likely to stick it in crazy and become a father, thereby making it much less likely that he will commit acts of sedition, and generating more followers of the '*Pay Now, Live Later*' scam. For Church and State, what's not to like..?

But, as we all know, Christianity has collapsed in the western world, and has become almost entirely irrelevant in imposing its 'guidance' on our lives. Almost without us knowing

it, third wave feminism has sneaked in and taken its place, thereby allowing the powerful to breathe a sigh of relief. The power dynamic between the elites, their enforcers and the general public follows the same general principles as previously exerted through religion.

Nonetheless, things have changed. The new boss is not the same as the old boss. King Charles III may be incredibly wealthy, thanks to the riches which religion, in no small way, allowed his family to accrue over the generations. But, he is a gross irrelevance in the modern world, created by tech entrepreneurs like Bill Gates, Jeff Bezos, Mark Zuckerberg and Elon Musk, their wealth managed by people like Larry Fink, of Blackrock Ethical Investments. Access of the wealthy to the political and legislative power embedded in the United Nations, is pretty much run by Klaus Schwab of the World Economic Forum, as power broker and facilitator for strategic alliances. These people have chosen third wave feminism as their moral police force. The question we must ask ourselves is WHY? Unlike religion, which smoothed the path for families to form and flourish, **the stated aim of third wave feminism is destruction of the heterosexual family unit (83)**. And, there are other, rather unsavoury aims tucked away in their manifestos, such as the mission statement **that male population must be reduced to, and maintained at, no more than 10% overall (86)**.

This call was taken up, enthusiastically, by Mary Daly (87), in her book '*Gyn/Ecology*', a blueprint for **ecofeminism**, in which all current 'Green' organisations have their roots. Population reduction is buried within the manifestos of Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth, countless others. For example, Green Party Policy, pp118: '*To achieve consumption and population levels that are globally sustainable and respect carrying capacity.*' It's not difficult to guess which sex has been earmarked for the adjustment bureau. Nor is it difficult to observe that the current Scottish Green Party elite are over-represented by homosexuals, of both sexes.

Meanwhile, the same tired old tricks are used by the elites to keep us in line, and give them what *they* want.... more money, social stability, removal of threats to their own power. Previously, we were threatened with the fires of hell if we didn't follow the moral arbitration of the Church, which was fleecing us to our faces, selling us expensive tickets to a non-existent afterlife, with invisible threats of God and devil. Now, we must follow the moral arbitration of third wave feminism and its social justice warriors, who are being used, by the elites, make us afraid of invisible threats like carbon dioxide (0.04% of the earth's atmosphere) in order to sell us big ticket items, electric vehicles, domestic heat pumps, otherwise we will burn right here on Earth. "*The era of Global Warming is over,*" we are assured by Klaus Schwab, "*The era of Global Boiling has begun.*" He is backed to the hilt by

Mark Carney, former Governor of the Bank of England, speaking at the height of the Covid-19 pandemic: “*Climate Crisis Deaths Will Be Worse Than Covid*” (88). This can be roughly translated as: ‘Please buy an EV and a domestic heat pump. My friends and myself have invested quite heavily in these technologies, and we’re becoming impatient about payback, it’s taking much longer than we thought.’

Remember the ‘solution’, proposed way back in the late 1960s, about how the wheels of late-stage capitalism could be kept turning when the post-service economy began to fail? *‘In a nation where all essential needs can be filled by no more than three fourths, or even half of the production capacity, a basic adjustment is required to keep the economy healthy. A technologically advanced society can defer an economic crash by shifting resources to environmental quality control.’* (2)

Essential needs met by no more than $\frac{3}{4}$ or $\frac{1}{2}$ of the production capacity? Here in GB, once a proud industrial nation, manufacturing now accounts for only 10% of the economy. In 2024, a decision was taken to close the final GB steel plant which was capable of making virgin steel, the decisions taken on the basis that we must meet ‘green’ targets. All we can do, now, is melt down steel produced by others, making us a *Steptoe & Son* scrapyards, and not exactly enhancing our strategic capabilities. To keep what’s left of the economy going, we must purchase EVs, and domestic heat pumps, made in China using coal-powered energy, shipped across half the world using diesel-powered freighters, then we must pretend that we have gone ‘green’. In order to overcome consumer resistance, their choice will be restricted, then removed, by legislation. We won’t have a choice. Resistance is futile. It’s handy for the elites to have the political and legislative classes on their side at the UN and the WEF.

What the elites get out of their feminist foot-soldiers is population control, political coercion, and an uncritical army of zealots who can spread the word on solutions to ‘climate change’. “*Why the ladies will take a shine to a chap who has gone ‘Green’*” was a newspaper headline of March 27th, 2021 (89). Women will always influence men in the way that they do so well, they have a natural tendency to be the middle management of the elites. As George Orwell remarked in ‘1984’, a seminal work which the elites seem to have chosen as their new bible: *‘It was always the women, and, above all, the young ones, who were the most bigoted adherents of the Party, the swallows of slogans, the amateur spies, and the nosers-out of unorthodoxy.’* Note that these are all left-brain characteristics.

What the power-hungry feminists get in return is **power**, through disenfranchising of men... leading to their avowed aim of destroying the nuclear family (83). Will they also get what Sally Miller Gearhart and Mary Daly advocated? We'll see... As oil begins to run out, and the battle for alternative energy resources intensifies, geopolitical alliances are recast at an astounding rate, and only one country, China, appears to have a coherent plan, in its 'Belt & Road' initiative. That's scary. Even *more* scary, for men at least, is that China may have plans for its surplus, non-sexually-bonded male population (85), and that the west may be using feminism to create its own vast strata of frustrated masculinity, an ideal resource if huge numbers of soldiers are required.

Presently, the elites are disadvantaging and displacing men from high **status** employment. They thereby gain a much more malleable and fearful workforce, predicated on **avoidance of harm**, prioritising safety over freedom, and more likely to look to Government for guidance. You could say that there was a trial run for this scenario during the Covid-19 lockdown, allowing Governments across the world to assess the scale of likely resistance. Reducing male status does not facilitate his pair bonding with a female. As 70% of graduates are now female, this status imbalance is likely to continue. Women are attracted to careers in politics and law, making rules for others to follow, and the likely result is an absolute runaway of left-brain thinking, the gloomy prediction of McGilchrist's *The Master & His Emissary* (page 431): *'Such a society would find it difficult to understand value, except in sense of utility. **Morality would come to be judged on the basis of utilitarian calculation. There would be a focus on material things, at the expense of the living, within a technologically driven and bureaucratically administered society. Social cohesion, the context in which each person belongs, would be actively disrupted, as incomprehensible to the left hemisphere. As a result, individualities would be ironed out, and identification would be by categories – socioeconomic groups, races, sexes – who will feel themselves in competition with, and resentful of, one another. Paranoia and lack of trust would be the relationship between the Government and its people. Such a Government will therefore seek total control – constant CCTV monitoring, DNA databases, satellite tracking through mobile devices. Any roles which depend on a degree of right-brain altruism, would become the object of suspicion. The left hemisphere can only comprehend altruism as a version of self-interest, the value which it understands best, and therefore sees it as a threat to its own power. Strenuous efforts will therefore be made to bring families under bureaucratic control*** [perhaps explaining the Scottish Government's attempts to interfere in family life through a

‘Named Person Scheme’ (90)]. *Accidents and illnesses* (such as Covid-19), *since they are beyond our control, will appear particularly threatening, and would, where possible, be blamed on others, since they would appear as a threat to one’s capacity to control one’s life. The left hemisphere, as will be remembered, is not quick to take responsibility, and sees itself as the passive victim of whatever it is not conscious of having willed* [perhaps explaining the high rates of false accusation by females in male-specific offences (21)].

It’s not a pretty picture. And, it’s already happening. From McGilchrist’s passage above: *‘Individualities would be ironed out, and identification would be by categories – socioeconomic groups, races, sexes.’* Third wave feminists, the moral Stormtroopers of the elites, have already been successful in **imposing a moral hierarchy based on identity, making damn sure that white, heterosexual males are placed on the bottom rung**, where they are to be least deserving of jobs, or even having their opinion noted. In so doing, feminists are sweeping away a system of meritocracy, hard-earned by male struggle and competition against the forces of feudalism. Predicated on competence, meritocracy is the least corrupt of any hierarchal system, and is based on male deontic values being an inevitable outcome of male dominance hierarchies in the male quest for **status** as a sexual trading resource (6). It is being replaced, even as the clock ticks, by a ‘diversity’ agenda, an ‘identity class system’ based on accident of birth, thereby dragging us back to feudal times, but with the top echelon of this new aristocracy occupied by the disabled black lesbian female, who deserves to be ‘enabled’ into every top position.

It would appear that the fate planned for men is inexorable. We are to be the incel class of blue collar workers, doing the dirty, dangerous, physically demanding jobs, and the soldiers called upon to protect this terminally diseased system, having no choice in the matter due to male-specific military draft, which cannot be avoided.

Third wave feminism, whose social justice warriors are today’s moral enforcers of the wishes of the elite, **is utterly devoid of any moral legitimacy**. In this regard, it is no different to any of feminism’s previous manifestations. First wave feminism was a particularly upper-class female phenomenon, demanding *‘Votes for Women’* at the time when most young men being packed off to the carnage of World War 1 had no vote, and therefore no say in the fate which awaited them. But, of course, the privileged suffragettes were blind to the fact that these men even *existed*. Nor would they have cared much, should it have been brought to their attention. Women soon achieved their equal voting rights, but without

commensurate responsibility to society. They were never going to be marched off to the trenches, to be gassed or eviscerated. Women, who, overnight, became the majority of the electorate, could vote for wars where only men must fight. Women spend over 80% of the money earned by men, make all the big decisions on ‘big ticket’ capital disposal, and tend not to rail against restrictive Government measures, so long as these make them feel ‘safe’. This makes them the consumerist darlings of the political establishment.

In second wave feminism, the concept of ‘equality’ between the sexes was extended from ‘rights’ to ‘abilities’, and we were invited to believe that men and women are utterly interchangeable entities, a premise which falls down quite badly in any maternity hospital. Of course, this ‘equal ability’ pretence must be maintained if women are to access all the good jobs which they covet so dearly in their pursuit of power. All differences between men and women must be vehemently denied, particularly the biological determinism inherent in how our respective brains operate (14), (15), (16). These feminist authors are prime examples of a situation described by Robert Wright (91): *“Fear of feminist backlash has been the main obstacle to an honest discussion of differences between the sexes. Feminists have written books denouncing ‘biological determinism’ without bothering to understand either biology or determinism.”*

Then, along came the third wave, inspired by the unimaginative usurping of Marxist identity politics, and claiming that women are an ‘oppressed’ class. As we shall see, on examining the fundamental basis of morality (6), this is very far from the truth. No surprises there. Feminism seeks ‘strategic’ theories, rather than the truth. They can’t even appreciate anything inherently *wrong* in this approach. In their left brain world, **their** truth, the female truth, is **the** truth, the SI Unit by which the workings of the world must be measured. Yet, the simple, valid and *provable* truth is one which we have already come across – **females have enjoyed all the benefits of a status-stratified society, while leaving all the actual competition for status to males (6)**. Not only that, but they gain **further** advantage by subverting the principles of moral frameworks achieved by male struggle.

How much longer this situation can prevail is anyone’s guess. The *status quo* of male tolerance is being pushed to the limits by feminism, and men are beginning to push back. Female privilege in society is certainly under threat, thanks in no small measure to Ms Patterning and her fellow feminists. Their crude social engineering to disadvantage heterosexual males means that *someone* will have to do the actual work of society, and men

are beginning to withdraw in vast numbers from a handicap race which they cannot win, meaning that MGTOW is coming to mainstream attention (84). Female privilege is protected by some powerful players, including the UN and the WEF, but the power of the disenfranchised man should not be underestimated. He can see that the game of give and take, in which men have *always* been expected to give more, in exchange for sexual reward, has been grossly skewed in favour of female political advantage, in return for which she offers *no* sexual reward. Give and take has always been a game where women offer minimal reciprocity, it's the basis of Briffault's Law (49), but women rarely know when and where to draw the line, particularly when they are being enabled by the top echelon of men. This is where we're at now.

*

In the book *'Morality as a Biological Phenomenon'*, Gunther Stent summarises the rival views which have coexisted ever since the Greeks first formulated the moral nature of man as a central problem of Western philosophy. The *idealistic* ethics advocated by Plato considers moral behaviour as being in accord with an ideal moral law. By contrast, the *naturalistic* ethics of Aristotle consider moral behaviour as a strategy for optimising human welfare. Their coexistence for two millennia suggests that, despite their *prima facie* contradictory stance, **both views must contain elements of deep truth.**

Here's where it gets interesting. Doesn't it make sense that the *naturalistic* view be held by the sex which bears the burden of reproductive responsibility? Their behaviour is teleological, anything which is good for women and children is *therefore* good for the human race, regardless of the 'rightness' or 'wrongness' of female actions on men, to whom blind disregard and insouciance are exhibited. **This will require some degree of disabling the female right brain hemisphere, post adolescence.** Meanwhile, the idealistic stance is held by the sex endowed with more efficient right brain processing, allowing *gestalt*, the perception of the bigger picture, and a desire for fairness and justice. Males are the providers and protectors of society. As concepts of law came into being through their efforts, men would have been the enforcers. **Ideal moral law becomes the benchmark for male-derived systems of law and justice.** Reasoning about what one may, must, or must not do in a given set of circumstances is called deontic reasoning (Hilpinen, 1981). Male behaviour is deontic, men will attempt to fulfil their duty or obligation to keep everything fair. The superior performance exhibited by this social strategy is called the *'deontic advantage'*. A large

degree of selflessness is required in men post parenthood, where the fair needs of wife and family must come first. A natural advantage is therefore conferred by ensuring that right-hemisphere processing channels of man, the family provider, are maintained as fully functional.

The work of Denise D Cummins (Department of Psychology & Philosophy, University of Illinois) has indicated the importance of dominance theory in human evolution (6), and we've already seen that dominance hierarchy (DH) is an exclusively male phenomenon (59). Dominance theory can explain the '*deontic advantage*' in human reasoning (6). The core tenet of this theory is that social cognition was shaped by the continual need to survive within dominance (status) hierarchies. High status individuals are, essentially, authorities, monitoring and controlling the behaviour of subordinates, in order to maintain priority of access to competitive resources.

Dominance theory posits five main cognitive functions shaped by the exigencies of living within status hierarchies:

- rank discrimination
- acquiring social norms
- monitoring compliance with social norms
- monitoring reciprocity
- flouting social norms through deception***

It's the last one which is really interesting, and there seems to be an unwillingness to state the obvious. That final cognitive function is a ***female*** speciality, it's how she gets her own way in a male dominance hierarchy, and her predominately left-brain processing endows her with a *huge* advantage in seeing through her actions to a successful conclusion. She simply doesn't concern herself with it, doesn't worry about the consequences on the male of the species. Deception can be used to gain access to wider reproductive opportunities, and woman is no different to females across the animal kingdom (92).

Moral code is a compromise between divergent interests. There is no *human* morality. Male and female moralities are, in a way, mutually exclusive. Right from the start, there's a mutual struggle to exploit a relationship, with the male seeking closure, while the female wishes to keep her options open for as long as possible. It's probably pointless debating who holds the moral high ground between male idealism, versus a naturalistic, utilitarian morality

where women selfishly desire female-friendly outcomes. This mutual exclusivity of male and female morality is probably why we have right- and left- brain hemispheres, with their associated processing preferences.

Interestingly, idealism gives rise to the phenomenon that men are much better at **teamwork**, as well as competition (47). Reciprocal altruism in teamwork allows men to form alliances which will be mutually beneficial in the male quest for **status**, and, ultimately, sex with females. All part of the hand to hand combat involved in getting our genes into the next generation (93).

Both sexes deceive, in order to get their way. The impulse of a man to profess undying love for a woman (right brain) co-exists with his natural desire to selfishly wander from the path of righteousness (left brain). But, this male tendency is policed by women, and he'll have to be an exceptionally handsome and/or wealthy specimen for his desires to be indulged. The appropriate male behaviour under different circumstances is probably weighed and balanced by the mid-brain, the *corpus callosum*. He'll behave more selfishly *if the opportunities are available to him*, and these opportunities are female controlled. A philanderer results from female selection processes. A man cannot simply decide to be a libertine and expect a successful career in his chosen occupation.

Once a man *has* pair bonded with a woman, however, and, especially after she has borne him children, his right brain imbues him with the nobility and self-sacrifice of making his own selfish interests subservient to the interests of his family. These are the male, idealistic, deontic values which keep families together.

Meanwhile, women, who are much more left-brained, will often treat men as mere targets for resource extraction. Even when apparently settled with such a partner, they will often cheat on these providers if they can gain temporary access to a more handsome and/or wealthy male. The opposite sex is merely a resource for producing the maximum number of genetically-fit offspring, after ensuring that support systems are in place.

When considering morals, these are revealed to be mere expression of a basic underlying dynamic between men and women – that of mutual exploitation. These principles were once limited to domestic situations. But, as women have made incursion into the wider world, the principles now pervade the corridors of power.

Chapter 8

Feminists & Their Friends

In 2022, the head of the United Nations, Antonio Guterres, expressed his (fairly powerful) opinion that: *'Investing in new oil and gas is economic and moral madness.'* Let's see if we can unpick what's going on at the United Nations, shall we?

*

Since the 1950s, the wealthy and powerful have sought to make acquaintance of Ms Patterning, with the ulterior motive of using her in fulfilling their goals. She finds herself overjoyed that her own mission in life, to end the domestic drudgery of her fellow females, has finally caught the attention of the world's movers and shakers, filling her with the self-important righteousness on which a left brain thrives. It should really be called lefteousness. Enjoying the time, attention, and, of course the sponsorship of her new friends, she plots her next move – how best to *use* this relationship? She believes that she's in control.

But, she doesn't realise that she's not dealing with the *usual* strata of men, the right brain romantics. Men who become wealthy and powerful become wealthy and powerful for a reason. This increased their **status**, and allowed them greater range of mating opportunities, that's for sure. But, they were also *driven* to amass material wealth... well... because they like material wealth. These guys are much more left brained than the usual crew. These guys are ruthless.

Feminists have never been afraid to mingle with the hated 'Patriarchy', so long as they could extract resources and believe themselves in control. Gloria Steinem worked for a company which was a front for the CIA, and accepted CIA money to found **Ms Magazine**, to get the message of feminism across. Did she realise that the message of 'independence through employment' was linked to the frustration of Government that the tax take was confined to males? Did she understand that making women into tax-paying citizens would suppress wages and raise the price of assets, like houses and cars? If she did, she certainly didn't seem to care, so long as she was mingling with the rich and powerful, including Henry Kissinger, who is known to have gloated that: *'Power is the ultimate aphrodisiac.'*

Ms Steinem wasn't exactly a shrinking violet. One of her quotes betrays the high esteem in which she held herself, the product of a perfectly-functioning left brain: *Self-esteem isn't everything; it's just that, without it, there's nothing.*'

Anyway, the elitist/feminist relationship is no different from any other human relationship, with its underlying principles of mutual exploitation. But, whereas men and women get together to form families, elitists and feminists get together to destroy them. Making a woman into a high-earning taxpayer means that the bar has been set very high for her male partner, who must now earn much more than her, or face destructive marital discontent. But, capitalism wins, because a divorced husband now requires a separate roof over his head, a car, a cooker, furniture, etc. Destruction of the nuclear family was always the avowed aim of radical feminism (83). Interestingly, it was also the top priority for BLM (94), and probably still is, although this aspiration has now been removed from its website. Same old story – those who covet power must destroy the **source** of power maintaining the society from which they feel excluded. Ms Magazine, as ever, helped spread the word.

"I feel that 'man-hating' is an honourable and viable political act, that the oppressed have a right to class-hatred against the class that is oppressing them." –Robin Morgan.

"The nuclear family must be destroyed. Whatever its ultimate meaning, the break-up of families is now an objectively revolutionary process." – Linda Gordon.

"Since marriage constitutes slavery for women, the women's movement must concentrate on attacking this institution. Freedom for women cannot be won without the abolition of marriage." – Sheila Cronin.

They're not the only ones to have spotted the underpinnings of society, of course. Destruction of power sources isn't just attractive to those who feel themselves 'oppressed'. It's also attractive to those who simply want even more power. Let's say that you wanted to **impose** your will on the population... not simply the population of your country, but the population of the world. You can see that the industrial revolution ran out of steam long ago, and that the service economy isn't serving your purposes. It's time to roll out that big plan, conceived in the 1960s, that of **throwing money at environmental concerns (2)**, but there's a bit of resistance to the big-ticket items which you're trying to peddle. What you require are some allies who are always attracted to what they see as the moral high ground – people who prefer **theory** to inconvenient facts. These are the people who will actually make the

decisions on the big-ticket items, and aren't noted for seeing the bigger picture. They're also notorious for their self-interest. So, you offer to assist them in dismantling 'The Patriarchy'. You're going to do this for them.... and *pay* them big bucks in sinecure committees where they can endlessly debate the ills which men have foisted on them over the years. You're going to ensure that these injustices can never happen again, through the new legislation you're going to introduce. At the risk of stretching a point.... what's not to like?

Lacking the right brain capacity for broad, vigilant attention, and with typical left-brain narcissism and self-importance, most feminists snapped up what was on offer. Only a very few would come to realise that they were being played. This paper (95), entitled '**Feminism and Corporate Globalisation – a Dangerous Liaison?**' was published in 2005. Despite the feminist slant of the publisher, it concluded that feminism was being used as a 'cultural solvent', to erode 'Patriarchy', while aiding Globalisation in the process.

The overtures of the wealthy and powerful towards feminism had a long history. David Rockefeller, former CEO of Chase Manhattan bank, was a long-time supporter of 'women's liberation'. His daughter, Abby, went on to become a member of Cell 16, a radical feminist organisation. Their end goal of radical feminism is: '*not just the elimination of male privilege, but of the sex distinction itself*'. Oh, the ability of the left hemisphere to deny that which is obvious, and right in front of the eyes, in favour of theory, particularly if that theory can bring about utilitarian, self-interested outcomes. The Rockefeller Foundation makes money available to these types, right to the present day, as can be seen from a cursory glance at the helpful advice given in its home page: '**Find funding for women & girls in our database of over 500 funders, supporting gender equality, intersectionality, and systems change.**'

This sort of thing can soon get out of control, with the positive feedback loop which arises through newly-empowered feminists, their big-money sponsors, their go-betweens at the WEF, their enforcers at the UN, the WHO, and the EU, and the politicians held in the pockets of the enforcers. Media won't be present at the clandestine decision-making processes, particularly on strategy. All too soon, however, we'll find that politicians have passed further laws which subtly undermine male ability to form bonds with women, and hence form families. Of course, the attack must *not* be overtly targeted towards families, or it will fail. The attack must be on masculinity and the rights of men. The media will be called to attend press conferences where slick publicity campaigns will attempt to convince the general

public that these measures are long overdue. In Scotland, I could mention the attempted disruption of families by the **Named Person Scheme** as a particularly specious example of all not being quite as it seems. **This legislation would have usurped the vital role of parents in caring for their own children, by giving the State an unprecedented role in the upbringing of every child.** It took the Supreme Court to declare the proposals unlawful before they were abandoned by the Scottish Government. But, the State campaign against the family continues. Now, LGBTQ+ values are to be taught in Scottish schools, enshrined as a matter of law. Legislation allowing self-identification of gender was passed in Scotland in 2023. To youngsters (who can vote at the age of 16 in Scotland), the traditional family, headed by a male, suddenly seems so 19th Century.

Even more egregious is the 2021 attempt, in Scotland, to **remove trial by jury for sex-specific crimes where only men can commit the offence (24)**. It may, or may not, be of interest that accusations of sexual harassment, even attempted rape, were made in 2018 against former First Minister of Scotland, Alec Salmond (96). In 2019, he was charged with fourteen offences, including two counts of attempted rape, nine of sexual assault, two of indecent assault, and one of breach of the peace. It may, or may not be coincidental that, in planning a political comeback through a nascent Alba Party, a rival to the SNP, Mr Salmond had become a political inconvenience to the First Minister of the time, Nicola Sturgeon. Fortunately, Mr Salmond was tried by jury, and all charges were dismissed. Ms Sturgeon, a child-free woman whose marriage may, or may not, be one of convenience, had been widely tipped for a major job at the United Nations after her political career ended. Unfortunately, this career ended rather abruptly, and her marriage indeed became inconvenient when her husband, then Ms Surgeon herself, were investigated in 2023 by the police, regarding possible misappropriation and misuse of Scottish National Party funds. This investigation is ongoing. Ms Sturgeon was forced to resign, opening the floodgates to revelations of secrecy and lack of transparency during her term in office. The UN are now running scared on the job offer front. Secrecy and lack of transparency isn't the image they wish to project.

At the UN, as a feminist, Ms Surgeon would have been among her own kind. The bias against male issues in the UN and the WHO has been spotted (97), but these interventions are low key, and the media aren't interested. Instead, these organisations prioritise the promotion of **diversity, inclusion, and radical environmentalism**. These are now imposed on wider society through DEI and ESG scores, which Companies must meet, instead of the primacy of

focusing on their own goals. As a result, capitalism is undergoing a stealth metamorphosis into what has been described as the **Woke Industrial Complex (98)**.

It was a sad day for men and masculinity when feminism stumbled across Marxist theory, and, despite the ridiculous contortions and confabulations required to make it 'fit', proceeded to apply already discredited theory to their own dubious goals. As stated by Moxon (57): *'Marx and Engels had both decried the pivotal role of the family in bourgeois society. The family can be seen as intrinsic to capitalist society, and, since Marxist analysis is that capitalism is pathological, then the family must be, too.'*

With the impending collapse of the USSR in the 1980s, the political left in the west sought to distance themselves from the cause of bettering the lives of the working class. They initiated a re-branding, where the largest constituency of the supposedly 'oppressed' were women, the majority shareholders of the electorate, and known to be predicated on 'harm-aversion' where safety is more important than freedom. Female left-brain tendency to believe authority and follow utilitarian motivation wasn't going to do the political left any harm, either. But, signing up to a war on the family is political suicide. Families contain women and children. **Therefore, the war must be waged on men, the Patriarchy. When they have been disempowered, the family will fold, of its own accord.** In the new 'Social' Marxism, the bourgeois is now identified with heterosexual white males, while the proletariat becomes identified with women, ethnic minorities, and minorities of sexuality. The working class has disappeared from the picture entirely, which is why the GB Labour Party no longer represents the working class (99), and Gordon Brown could dismiss the concerns of a traditional Labour voter as being those of an 'old bigot'.

The motives were spotted by Richard Bernstein (100) in 1994: *'The Marxist revolutionary process in America now centres on race and sex warfare, rather than the class warfare of earlier times. In its intent to restructure American society, it is a scheme more total than economic considerations only. The purpose is to destroy the hegemony of white males.'*

Writing in 1996 about the cynicism of 'Critical Theory', Raymond Raehn (101) had this to say: *'Critical Theory has led to the deconstruction of gender in American culture. The distinction between masculinity and femininity will disappear. The traditional roles of mother and father are to be dissolved, so that Patriarchy will be ended. Children are not to be raised according to their biological gender or assigned gender roles according to their biological*

differences. This reflects the Frankfurt School rationale for disintegration of the entire family.'

And, in 2004, the 'Cultural Marxist' perspective was, somewhat unknowingly, placed in perfect precis (102): *'Rather than the classless society of classical Marxism, Cultural Marxism promotes a radical egalitarian vision of an emptied-out, soulless multicultural, replacing the proletariat of old with a 'new proletariat' made up of immigrants, black nationalists, secular humanists, feminists, homosexuals, sex educators and environmentalists. The purpose of the project is to destroy and replace the traditional institutions of western civilisation, such as Christianity, national identity, and the nuclear family, through the use of politically correct ideology, and the portrayal of white men as evil.'* Methinks the apologist for Cultural Marxism doth protest too much.

It didn't take long for feminism's meteoric rise from fringe to mainstream, bringing with it Cultural Marxism, Intersectionality, Gender Studies, 'Green' politics, Affirmative Action, Equal Employment Opportunity, Environmental, Social & Governance scores, Diversity, Equality & Inclusion scores. How could it possibly fail, with the colossal amounts of Government and Corporate power and money which sustain it, behind the scenes?

This money isn't being used for the benefit of the human race. Whereas Gloria Steinem may represent an old-school feminist, a heterosexual who was well aware of her female ability to manipulate men, the message of empowerment carried by Ms Magazine soon attracted Ms Patterning and her chums, partially masculinized women who'd (unsurprisingly) been rejected by men. Disenfranchised from manipulating men in a heterosexual relationship, these women had a lifetime of bitterness to address, and their hatred of males would soon become mainstream.

Sally Miller Gearhart (86) the founder of Gender Studies, was a **eugenicist**, and the first openly-lesbian woman to achieve University tenure. Here, at San Francisco State University, she could preach her particular brand of ecofeminism and lesbian separatism. Her essay, *'The Future – If There Is One – Is Female'*, had three main points: **(i) every culture must begin to affirm a female future. (ii) species responsibility must be returned to women in every culture. (iii) the proportion of men must be reduced to, and maintained at, approximately 10% of the human race.**

Can you even *imagine* the furore if an agenda of this type were promulgated at western universities with the sexes reversed? Yet, for over half a century, such misandry has not only been tolerated, it has been actively sponsored and encouraged. And men have turned a blind eye to it. What were we thinking? Take a group of young women whose oestrogen-induced self-esteem is already through the roof, and whose critical reasoning faculties have been suppressed by the same steroid.... lecture them for three years about how *special* they are, and how those *awful* men are going to destroy the world unless they're brought back under female control. Then, set the new batch of feminists loose on the world, where.... in a meritocracy, they're going to learn some harsh lessons. They're not quite so special as they've been led to believe.

But, the system is set up to ensure that this never happens. Brainwashed to abandon heterosexuality and children, the new feminists emerge from their tertiary education chrysalis into an environment which has been tailored to their needs, wants and wishes, where artificial 'equality' is enforced through EEO, AA, DEI, ESG, and men are straitjacketed by harassment laws, making it an offence to look at a woman in the street (77). It would appear that item (i) on Sally Miller Gearhart's agenda is already well underway.

These teachings gained disciples pretty quickly. Daphne Patai was one of the first to helpfully summarise Gearhart's proposals for us, just in case they were too complex for mere mortals to understand. In her book *'Heterophobic : Sexual Harassment and the Future of Feminism'*, she makes the statement: **'The future must be in female hands, women alone must control the reproduction of the species, and only 10% of the population should be allowed to be male.'**

She's pushing, in the main, against an open door. We've seen that the female mammal is the master, her wishes have primacy. And, the female controls reproduction, she is the gatekeeper of sex. She, and she alone, can decide whether to reproduce with us, or consign our genes to oblivion. So – in the perverted dreams of Gearhart and Patai, there's only the advanced stage of the eugenics programme to be achieved, the vast reduction in male population. Mary Daly (87), another follower of Sally Miller Gearhart, took Gearhart's essay and reframed it from lesbian supremacy into a new entity called **Ecofeminism**. In her book *'Gyn/Ecology'* it appears that Daly has faith in a male attrition which will just happen naturally. She believes that God will, somehow, carry out the plan (which, in Gearhart's vision, was based on a male abortion/infanticide spree), because men = death, women = life,

and God and Nature and Earth all simply hate men. It's a bit like *Barbieland* in Greta Gerwig's ridiculous 2023 film '*Barbie*'. It all just happens. Barbie's pink V8 Chevy simply exists, without regard to mining metal ore, smelting, casting, pressing, engine design, or an understanding of electrical circuitry and the thermodynamics of the internal combustion engine. Or pink automotive paint.

Gearhart, Patai, Daly... feminists so blinded by hatred that the female advantages conferred by Nature are invisible to them. Instead of male genocide, what if there existed a drug which rendered men completely compliant and subservient to women? Then, men could do all the dirty work which required strength and endurance. The trick would be not to dull the intellect, in fact to enhance it, so that men would design and invent, trading all their creativity for a sexual reward. Ladies, that drug has existed for all eternity. It's called testosterone. Of course, if you're not a very attractive lady, the boys are going to keep their creativity to themselves, and look for another lady to hand it over to.

The underlying message of hatred, even genocide, towards men had already attracted some (literally) undesirables. One of the more notable was Valerie Solanas, educated at the University of Maryland, the University of Minnesota, and the University of California, Berkeley. She made use of all this education to write the SCUM Manifesto in 1967, urging women to '*institute complete automation and destroy the male sex*'. She must have had supreme faith in female skills in coding, programming and robotics well beyond the realities which existed in the mid-1960s. After shooting Andy Warhol in 1968, she was jailed for three years, and diagnosed with paranoid schizophrenia.

There is an interesting aspect of schizophrenia which, perhaps, deserves mention at this juncture. The current fixation of certain political elements with transsexual individuals as a means of weakening 'Patriarchy' (=families) has been briefly mentioned in the context of the Scottish Gender Recognition act of 2023. Interventions are available to 'assist' in male to 'female' conversion therapies, typically by 'treatment' with female hormones, which will allow development of female secondary sexual characteristics, such as increased body fat in the breast and buttock area. But, neurologically, it has been observed that providing oestrogen to anyone who has undergone male puberty **causes extremely high build-up of glutamate, an excitatory neurotransmitter (103)**. Also, the brain volume decreases dramatically, especially the hippocampus. Excessive glutamate is associated with schizophrenia (104), and

the excessive activation associated with such levels may excite nerve cells to their death, in a process known as ‘excitotoxicity’. It seems reasonable to assume that Ms Patterning, with a male patterned brain (possibly arising from maternal congenital adrenal hyperplasia, Chapter 1) faces elevated risk of schizophrenia after the oestrogen of menarche kicks in. It is particularly interesting that in *‘The Master & His Emissary’*, McGilchrist talks about the symptoms of schizophrenia as a veering between omnipotence and impotence [*M&E, p394*]. [This sounds so much like the joke about ‘Schroedinger’s Feminism’, where a woman is simultaneously empowered and a victim until something happens. Then, she decides which state benefits her most.] McGilchrist goes on to state that, in schizophrenia, there is a *subjectivisation* of experience, a turning away from the external world, while attention is drawn to a realm of fantasy. Meanwhile, that external world, and the people within it, become *objectivised*, without context or coherence, and lacking in meaning. These symptoms are explicable by an over-excited left brain, dominating the functions of the right-hemisphere. **It is an interesting proposition that nature keeps such matters under control by maintaining women as physically weaker.** This is a sensible precaution, a means of neutralising the potential damage that could be done by a relatively unrestrained left brain.

The feminist discourse often resembles schizophrenia. They really *don’t* see any problem with their self-contradictory arguments, and stubbornly refuse to see what is happening in reality, if outcomes contradict their theory. In different cultures, and different countries, there is always a statistically-significant percentage of women who behave in this way, indicating that the causal roots of feminist behaviour may be biological.

The Gender Studies courses initiated by Sally Miller Gearhart now became the training camps for armies of zealots, and university was rapidly becoming a hostile environment for young men. In the 1980s, the term ‘date rape’ was introduced into the lexicon by Professor Mary Koss (presently of the University of Arizona), and the myth of ‘campus rape culture’ began. Little wonder that, even in the early 1990s, attending university was associated with a **900%** increase in women identifying as lesbian or bisexual (27). Young women were being indoctrinated to believe that all heterosexual sex is rape....taught to despise their own heterosexual drives. Meanwhile, female ‘academics’ were pushing, successfully, to have the offences of rape and sexual assault redefined. A sexual assault was now deemed to have occurred if a young man attempted an awkward kiss after a first date. And, if a young woman engaged in consensual sex, but regretted the act subsequently, this was now ‘rape’. Under these new and convenient definitions, it was claimed that 28% of

female college students had suffered a ‘rape’ or ‘sexual assault’ – whereas, the true figure is around 0.8% (105). [It may be noted that the left brain does not like to take *responsibility* for its actions.]

In the feminist world where men are oppressors and females are helpless, innocent victims, the truth always had to be bent to fit the message, as befits a female left-brain dominance where the *theory* is all important. The Duluth Model of Domestic Violence was introduced by Ellen Pence, and posits that all domestic violence is a manifestation of male need for power and control. Absolving women of all responsibility, this model was rapturously received in the world of women’s refuges, whose generous state funding soon became conditional upon their following the teachings of the Duluth Model.

Here, the story of Erin Pizzey is instructive. She started the world’s first domestic violence shelter, Chiswick Women’s Aid, in 1971. There, she soon realised that most domestic violence is reciprocal, and that most of the women had *initiated* the violence. This fits the work of Moxon, who found that male domestic violence is aberrational behaviour, while perfectly normal in the female, being a form of partner-guarding (58). But, Pizzey’s message was not well-received by her fellow activists. What she did receive were death threats. She fled abroad to the USA, where her dog was killed by feminists. The refuge was taken over by the very people who had made earlier threats, and re-branded as the charity **Refuge**. Pizzey was never acknowledged as having founded the shelter, and her name did not appear on the Refuge website until 2020, when Sandra Horley (chief executive of Refuge since 1983) retired. Pizzey did not return to GB until 1997, and promptly found herself the subject of defamation campaigns, in particular by the charity **Scottish Women’s Aid** (106), who hounded her, while handing out anti-Pizzey leaflets. Oh, the gentle sex! The claims which they make, regarding how much more co-operative and fair the world would be, if only they were in control...

Well, it looks as though they’re going to get their opportunity, and show us all how it *should* be done. How so...? Let’s go back Antonio Guterres, head of the United Nations, and what’s going on behind his bold 2022 statement on the morality of new oil and gas exploration.

*

Growth, in an economy, is ideally achieved by increases in efficiency or productivity, and by increased demand for goods and services as consumers become more affluent. Greater GDP allows increased taxation, which provides for welfare, education, defence, and funds a generally better standard of living for all. When productivity or demand begins to falter, or people refuse to do the low-paid jobs, the machine can be kept running simply by keeping the numbers up, resulting in policies which are relaxed towards immigration. Every new member of TeamGB requires a roof over their head, clothing, food, and some basic furniture and cooking equipment, before they can even begin to contribute to society. But, that brings its own social and cultural problems. If the incomers fail to integrate, sticking rigidly to their own customs and culture, they have failed to assimilate in the dominance hierarchy so essential to deontic values (6). **They have failed to acquire social norms, and they have failed to comply with social norms.** It's even worse if a perception arises that their relationship with the natives is a one way street – all take and no give. **They have failed to demonstrate reciprocity.** Before long, a saturation point is reached, where the drawbacks outweigh any perceived benefits, and the drain on resources becomes too much to handle. **Creating more consumers is a pyramid scheme of late stage capitalism which can't go on indefinitely.** And, there is an elephant in the room. The pyramid scheme is *already* close to collapse with the existing, indigenous population. But, which Government will ever take the suicidal step of imposing strict birth control? Only one that we know of, so far – China. And it was working out pretty well for them, too. They had industrialised, hugely raising GDP and living standards, they'd created an international market for their products, and were well on the way to creating a huge domestic market, a property-owning middle class, before they became over-ambitious in trying to surpass the west, borrowing money to keep the boom going. This created a huge, unsustainable Chinese property market, now beginning to implode with the collapse of Evergrande. Hundreds of thousands of people have paid deposits on houses which are very unlikely to be completed, a recipe for social unrest. And, the bursting of a property speculation bubble in late 1980s Japan led to decades of economic stagnation, which has yet to be resolved.

The massive increase in world population has been funded by relatively cheap energy sources, mainly the irreplaceable resource of fossil fuels. And, situated near the fault lines and flash points of the world, this resource isn't going to remain an easily accessible global commodity forever. We've already witnessed the shock to energy prices caused by Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022. The powder-keg of the Middle East was reignited in 2023, and,

just like the Ukraine situation, the geopolitical fallout is yet to be understood. Currently, there are attacks on western oil tankers by militias in the Red Sea. And, anyway, we all know that oil isn't going to last forever. As supply stutters, the demand, in a world of 8.1 Billion people, is at its highest ever level. In a very sensible statement, the boss of energy giant Equinor has advised that countries should secure supplies of oil and gas by sourcing locally (107). Of course, in Scotland, since the SNP Government are reliant on support from the Green Party, the response has been to phase down North Sea Oil production, and deny licences for new exploration.

The over-population of the world is a matter of huge concern to the United Nations (108), and this organisation is well aware that exponential population growth has been facilitated by the availability of relatively cheap energy. As David Pimintel of Greenpeace states ominously: *'In a world without fossil fuels, nations can support only about four people for every acre of arable land.'* **That is, in the absence of fossil fuels, world population is sustainable at only one fifth of its current level.** (109)

This is very bad news for women, whose fertility is now one of the 'inconvenient facts' regarding a future where there aren't enough resources to go around, and men will be forced to fight for them. The simplistic Mary Daly interpretation that men=death and women=life takes no account of the fact that men often have no wish to fight for resources, so that women can fill the planet with a superabundance of life. In many ways, the conflict in Ukraine (a country rich in oil and gas resources) is no more than a Russian response to sustained entreaties from Europe that Ukraine should become a member of the EU and NATO – this despite long standing assurances from the west that NATO would *'expand not an inch eastwards'* (45). The conscripted man has no choice in whether he wishes to take part in conflict or not. It is particularly painful to watch video footage of men who do not wish to enlist being dragged from buses while disinterested women simply scroll on their phones, possibly making their own details available on some dating website, and posting it to a potential suitor in a different, safer country.

The UN doesn't want us worrying about oil running out. Nor do our Governments. They know that we'd attempt to hoard fuel, like we did with toilet paper and pasta during the Covid-19 lockdowns. But that would only be a minor inconvenience, relative to the mass **panic** which would ensue were we to realise the enormity of the consequences inherent in the age of oil coming to an end. So – the efforts of the UN and Government are taken up in

attempting a managed transition to ‘Green’ energy sources. This represents a bit of a conundrum however – if we don’t realise how urgent the situation is, we’re never going to sign up to the expensive electric vehicle and the expensive domestic heat pumps which are intended to get us out of this mess.... not while we have a perfectly good internal combustion engine car and a gas or kerosene boiler. Yet, if we do appreciate the full picture, with imminent resource wars looming, together with precipitous decline in living standards, we’re liable to panic, or simply opt out, and refuse to take part in the travesty which society is rapidly becoming.

Step right up, the invisible bogeyman of carbon dioxide. Now, instead of telling us the full story, making us aware that China’s insatiable demand for oil (over 14.1 million barrels per day) has tripled since the year 2000, and that Iran and Russia are more than happy to supply (45), we are invited to do our bit for the environment, giving up our ICE car and fossil fuel boiler so as to prevent ‘climate change’, aka ‘global warming’. The guys at the UN, when they have convinced you to purchase these big ticket items, hope to make a bit of money for the WEF, the financial arm of the powerbrokers. But, we’ve all been rather hesitant, reluctant to take the plunge on this expensive hardware. Not to worry, the legislative arm of the powerbrokers, the politicians, will simply skew the market, making it impossible, nay **illegal**, for you to purchase goods **other than those which they wish you to buy**. There are sales targets to be met, and our resistance to them is obvious. Resistance is futile.

It’s pretty clear that the illuminati expected this all to be done and dusted by 2030. It seems to have been a very important year for their plans. There’s a reason for this. The masterplan, of which the 1995 Beijing Platform (71) forms only part, began life in 1992 as **AGENDA 21** (also known as **Sustainable Development**) which was a blueprint for the elites regarding how the 21st Century should be run (for their benefit, of course). But, things have been heating up (not least the climate, apparently), mainly because China got its industrial act together much more quickly than anticipated, and began making unprecedented demand on what remains of the world’s oil. So, in response, **AGENDA 30**, which was formulated in 2015, is the greatly accelerated timescale for everything being achieved by 2030.

The statutory climate change advisors to the UK government initially imposed a target that 7 million domestic heat pumps should be installed by 2030. But, in the whole of 2022, there were 59,862 units installed. Similarly, it was announced, in 2020, that no new internal combustion engine cars or vans could be sold in the UK after 2030. But, in 2023, the ban was

kicked down the road until 2035. Government policy, revealed on 3rd January 2024, now reads: ‘80% of new cars and 70% of new vans sold in Great Britain will now be zero emission by 2030, increasing to 100% by 2035. The UK now has the most ambitious regulatory framework for the switch to electric vehicles of any country in the world, thanks to new laws which commenced today.’ (110)

Growth in demand for new electric cars has sagged. Most were initially bought as Company cars, in response to Government incentives. But these are now on the second-hand market, where there is little demand, due to expensive insurance, depleted batteries which represent a large proportion of the car’s value, suspicion of fire risk, and justifiable concerns that the charging network is inadequate. And private buyers are wary of the high depreciation rates. So, behind the scenes, the pressure has been shifted to the manufacturers. **More than 20% of each manufacturer’s new cars sold in 2024 must be ‘zero emission’, or they will face fines of £15,000 per vehicle.** This is an incredibly totalitarian move. Non-compliance with Government policy would see car makers forced to pay a fine of £15,000 for every ‘polluting’ vehicle they sell, above the imposed limit. **So – if a brand missed its target by 100 units, they would be required to pay a penalty of £1,500,000.**

The terms ‘polluting’ and ‘zero emission’ are so many weasel words. Electric vehicles are not environmentally friendly. A typical 1,000 pound EV battery requires the mining and processing of 500,000 pounds of earth. EV Corporations make little or no mention of the environmental consequences of mining for lithium, nickel and cobalt, or the human rights abuses and child labour associated with the extraction. Also, the manufacturing of an EV requires significantly more energy, and produces **60% more CO2** than an internal combustion powered vehicle (111). And, if the electricity powering the EV is being produced by Drax power stations, burning wood chips we’ve imported from Canada, rather than burning domestic coal...? Well, we’re *pretending*, really, aren’t we? Pretence, for the sake of occupying the moral high ground.... it’s a left hemisphere speciality.

This is where the other enforcement arm of societal compliance comes in, and **why feminism is such an important ally of the UN, the WEF, and governments all around the world.** Feminists, attracted to **theory**, which, conveniently, need not be true (112), have swallowed the CO2 Global Warming scam, hook, line and sinker, as it fits in so nicely with the ‘theories’ of Mary Daly’s ‘*Gyn/Ecology*’ and the principles of Ecofeminism.

There are over 8 Billion human beings on the planet. The exponential population growth of the past 100 years or so (despite two World Wars in the 20th Century) has been made possible by relatively inexpensive fossil fuels. Without oil, only around 1/5th of the current population will survive, and it's already approaching the stage where men will be forced to *fight* for resources (as usual). The United Nations and the World Health Organisation are, basically, shitting themselves. They're attempting to soften the blow by **making us all go 'Green', and by empowering women**. If women are allocated all the good jobs, this means that men don't get a look-in on the Sexual Economics market, and are thereby denied a leg over. By this means, fertility rates (measured as the number of children produced by a female) will tumble precipitously. In Europe, the fertility rate is already well below replacement level (2.1 children per female).

The effect of employment discrimination against males is then amplified by 'harassment' legislation, making it well-nigh impossible to approach a woman if you are a 'creep' (earn less than she does). **No western politician would ever attempt to impose birth control policies, it would be political suicide**, particularly as women represent 52% of the electorate. Instead, by introducing bias *for* women in employment, and bias *against* male sexuality, they allow women's natural hypergamy to take care of the birth rates, by making it appear that very few men are 'good enough' for them.... by law. **Feminism is embedded in the UN and WHO for this very purpose (71), (72)**.

Forty thousand Government delegates (71)... how does any average male combat *that* amount of power? Men have, basically, been so successful in building societies which generate large numbers of healthy, viable offspring, that we must now be *excluded* from that society in our droves. Of course, it never occurs to our lords and masters that *female fertility* is the inconvenient fact. Or, if this point is ever raised in their brainstorming sessions, they know it's a vote loser, so the problem of world population will never, ever be addressed from the angle of curtailing female freedoms and choices, quite the reverse. **It's always easier to use males as a disposable resource**. After all, that's the mind-set which has allowed civilisations to flourish, and brought us to this advanced, comfortable juncture, where we males are now threatened by the consequences of our own success. Men have plenty of gametes, more than enough to go round. You don't need all that many men to rebuild a civilisation, so long as there's plenty of women, and the men are of 'good' stock. Personally, I'd be a bit suspicious of the Freudian slip inherent in the nomenclature of the **Build Back Better Act (113)**, passed on November 19, 2021, an offshoot of the Infrastructure Investment

and Jobs Act, which was going to cost the taxpayer **\$3.5 trillion**, with its provisions for **climate change** and **social policy** (favouring females, naturally).

Oh, and the wealthy and powerful class also gain from the strategy, of course. Females naturally flock to wealth and power. Why else would Gloria Steinem date Henry Kissinger? There are many good reasons why it suits the WEF to act as power brokers in enabling the Build Back Better Act, and similar legislation. Behind the façade of altruistic justification lurk many motives. They can make a buck through the ‘ethical investments’, brokered by Blackrock Investments and their ilk. And, they may gain advantage for themselves and their genes.

Not so very long ago, chastity for the average male was a fact of life. Genetic research shows that reproduction was limited to 40% of men who ever existed, compared to 80% of women (26). The majority of males did not mate, as the supremely wealthy were known to hoard females in the same way as they hoarded money. Abrahamic religion, and its associated monogamy, was a means of allowing the emerging merchant and farmer classes an opportunity of forming a family, while attempting to control natural female preferences for the best genes her looks could possibly attract. The birth control pill, and the associated sexual revolution, has placed **female** sexual choice front and centre once more. Presently, the choice appears to be rotating monogamy (cock carousel), a series of temporary arrangements, no more than a type of polygamy.

In the not too distant future, under conditions of **Build Back Better**, it isn't a huge effort of the imagination to envisage how this might play out. The simplest forecast is a three tier strata, comprising: (a) The supremely wealthy and powerful at the top, as ever. This strata would be filled with the super-successful males, such as Bill Gates, Elon Musk, Jeff Bezos, Richard Branson, but would also include the powerful Government and judiciary class. Also, top media representatives, to keep the misinformation flowing. And educators, to make sure that we're all fluent in Newspeak. The good-looking women would seek out the males of this stratum. Lord Alan Sugar may find himself fired. (b) There would be a predominately female middle class, encouraged by feminism into employment where they are advantaged by legislation. These women eschew babies and families in favour of ‘careers’, **and are unwilling to mate with males whom they see as ‘beneath’ them.** (c) At the bottom, a blue collar ‘service’ class of males would have to do the grunt work, the dirty and dangerous stuff, and will be invisible to nearly all females.

Thereby, the top females get to mate with what they see as the most genetically-fit males, and enjoy a life of luxury within the polygyny threshold (114). Alpha-males get to spread their seed widely. Meanwhile, the female middle classes (comprised of the rather less attractive females) won't be breeding much, as they'll be unable to find many suitable, higher ranking men. These women have swallowed the premise of feminism, and believe that the sisters are doing it for themselves. **In reality, they have been grossly enabled into a position where, fearful for their jobs, they can be bullied and manipulated by the powerful.** They'll pretty much have to do as they're told. And, unwittingly, they will accept this situation, in return for continuing Governmental protection and provisioning. That protection and provisioning prerogative of the female psyche runs deep, feminist or not.

Lower-ranking males will, once again, be mostly celibate, and must keep their eyes steeply averted in the presence of m'lady, lest his 'male gaze' should upset her, leading her to report him to the authorities. Birth rates plummet, of course, and the replication rates are now grossly biased in favour of the rich and powerful. There will be wars for resources in the interim, men will be forced to fight for the residual oil. And, long before the final oil well runs dry, there will be conflict for the resources so important to the 'Green' manifesto of **Build Back Better**... the lithium, nickel, copper and cobalt required for the batteries of electric vehicles. China owns most of the mining rights to these minerals, across the world, courtesy of the foresight it has shown in its '**Belt & Road**' initiative, now more than two decades old. One might be forgiven for believing that China has always had a plan, and that the west is struggling to keep up.

Having a plan, and sticking to it, is easier under a totalitarian regime, of course, and it's not to say that China hasn't made mistakes. The one child policy which the Chinese state enforced between 1980 and 2016 played an enormous part in bringing its population under control and allowing most elements of a planned economy to succeed. With an enormous pool of inexpensive labour, China created a huge market for its relatively cheap goods, right across the globe. It wasn't afraid to burn fossil fuel in the process, mainly domestic coal, so as to remain independent of western interference. But, by the late 1990s, it was obvious that huge oil imports would also be required. This led to a flirtation with Iraq, just at a time when Saddam Hussein was insisting on being paid for oil in euros, infuriating the US. Despite the invasion of Iraq by 'allied forces' in 2003, on the spurious pretext that Iraq held 'weapons of mass destruction', it is a fact that Chinese and Russian oil companies benefitted from the invasion much more than western companies. China, in particular, was willing to accept 20

year, fee-based deals (45), with profit margins lower than were acceptable to western companies, but ensuring a flow of oil. Recently, China renewed its energy security through high value deals with Iran. On 27th March, 2021, China promised to invest \$400billion in Iran, over 25 years, in exchange for a steady supply of oil.

So, China would appear to be sitting pretty. Although its labour costs have inevitably increased in recent years, while it raises the living standards of its workers to middle class status, it isn't saddling itself with the 'green' policies which are crippling the west. Meanwhile, we keep their economy booming by importing Chinese goods produced by factories whose power was generated by fossil fuel...oil from Iraq, Iran and Russia... and China's almost unlimited domestic coal resource, burned in 310 active coal-fired power stations (with 40 more under commission). China uses this advantage to manufacture solar panels, domestic heat pumps and electric vehicles for the west! **We have a situation where China, which produces 35% of global CO2 emissions, is exporting 'green' goods to Great Britain, which contributes less than 1% to atmospheric carbon dioxide.** Even the USA contributes only 14% of the world's CO2, an industrialising India is responsible for 7%, and Russia manages only 5%. This might lead one to suspect that the 'green' image of the goods which we have imported from the other side of the world (adding to their already vast 'carbon footprint' while the transport container ships belch CO2), is much more important than any reality. Tell me that late-stage capitalism isn't in the shit, and that the Stanford plan (2) to keep it staggering on for a few more years hasn't already been implemented.

In the personal transport market, China appears unstoppable. In 2023, China sold a total of 25 million new cars, and overtook Japan as the world's largest auto exporter. Chinese brands dominated their domestic market (which is the world's largest), mainly through the demand for EVs (115). Growth is forecast to reach 31 million units by 2030. The emergence of affordable Chinese EVs on the global stage is going to be disruptive to established manufacturers, on a much larger scale than Tesla. Much of the apparent competitiveness of these brands is built on Chinese state subsidy. Between 2016 and 2022, electric vehicles (including plug-in hybrids and pure electrics) received Chinese state subsidies equivalent to \$57 billion. In the USA, government subsidy for the same period was at a level of \$12 billion. It's not exactly the sort of 'free market' capitalism on which the 20th Century operated in the west (or so we were led to believe). **Basically, taxpayer money is being used to fund the production of 'environmentally-friendly' products, which those taxpayers will be forced to buy. By law.** And, the 'kindness' of these products to the environment is a sham. The

basic premise of ‘global warming’, ‘climate change’, call it what you will, is fatally flawed. Carbon dioxide isn’t even a greenhouse gas (45). Capitalism has learned a great deal from feminism. As stated by the feminist Kelly Oliver (112): “*The goal of feminist theory should be to develop strategic theories – not true theories, not false theories, but strategic theories.*”

By empowering feminists, who are already deeply embroiled in a Mary Daly ecofeminism of the ‘*Gyn/Ecology*’ blueprint, the elite have a vast army of zealots at their disposal, a right-brain impaired goon squad who are obsessed by theory, yet aren’t in the least concerned as to whether it’s accurate or not... just so long as it suits their purposes. The role of these feminist enforcers may be compared to the first actions of Margaret Thatcher after she won the 1979 General Election – she stockpiled vast quantities of imported coal, while pretty much *doubling* police pay in the next four years. Only then was she confident enough to pick a fight with the miners, leading to the miners’ strike of 1984. Today, the elites know that they have an empowered, politically-correct police force monitoring dissent, which will be dealt with ruthlessly, using the GSRM techniques at which women are so adept (18), amplified by modern social media, and the fact that the mainstream media are ‘on-song’, singing from the same song-sheet. Dissent doesn’t stand a chance.

The western elites walked into Iraq in 2003, believing that they could prevent a destabilisation of the dollar, caused by Saddam Hussein insisting on Iraq oil exports being priced in euros (45). They didn’t want that sort of behaviour encouraged – so, they waged an illegal war, based on a ‘strategic theory’ that Saddam Hussein held ‘weapons of mass destruction’. It seems so self-evidently self-serving now, yet they were allowed to get away with it, right to our faces. No ‘weapons of mass destruction’ were ever found, but Saddam Hussein was tried by an international court, found guilty as a war criminal, and hanged. These are truly strange times that we live in.

But, although George W Bush’s US and Tony Blair’s UK may have prevented dollar destabilisation, they didn’t get as much access to Iraq’s oil as they may have hoped for. Subsequently, it flowed from Iraq, Iran and Russia to China, a state which had a bottomless demand for oil resources in its race to industrialise. And, the Law of Unintended Consequences kicked in. Removing the Shia power bloc in Iraq allowed festering religious resentment from Sunnis to come to the surface, destabilising the entire Middle East in the ISIS phenomenon which defined much of the early 21st Century, and the ‘Arab Spring’ where Middle Eastern regimes tumbled like skittles. The ensuing western panic is probably

responsible for AGENDA 21 becoming AGENDA 30 in 2015. The west doesn't want to fight China for oil. That's why it would like us all to purchase an electric car, and a domestic heat pump.

Instead, the west, in the form of the EU, made overtures to oil-rich Georgia and Ukraine that they might like to join the European Union, thereby infuriating Vladimir Putin. This caused civil war in Georgia, and has, ultimately, led to Russia invading Ukraine, in an attempt to head off western expansionism and corralling of precious resources. That's just about where we are now. And, the frustration of Donald Trump, that dangerous moves by the EU are underwritten by America's spending on NATO... well it's understandable. Germany is the country with most to gain from retaining oil as the prime energy source for a bit longer. Germany's car industry is the jewel in the crown of its mighty economy, but the German car industry is thought to be over-reliant on internal combustion technology, and furthest behind in terms of its ability to transition to electric vehicles. It needs a bit of breathing space, a *lebensraum*, if you like, so that it can adjust. But, Trump is warning them, obliquely, that if he becomes US President again, they're going to have to 'pay their bills' for NATO protection. And, the war in Ukraine has merely underlined the fact that Russia's hydrocarbon economy doesn't depend on the west as consumers. The oil is flowing to China and India, and is being paid for in Chinese yuan, thereby decoupling the dollar from hydrocarbon transactions. Just what the USA wanted to avert with Saddam Hussein, and his impudence on insisting on payment for Iraq's oil in euros. While the emerging situation strengthens the Chinese yuan, it's not particularly good news for the dollar, the fiat currency of the USA, the world's biggest debtor nation, owing some \$27 trillion in 2020. Every November, the USA avoids becoming technically bankrupt merely by changing the rules, while the western world looks the other way, and indulges in the usual Christmas spending spree (45). In 2021, it was predicted that it would cost \$1 trillion annually, just to *service* this debt. That was before interest rates spiralled in 2023. Not only are times strange, but they are interesting and dangerous.

The west and the east face one another uneasily in the battle for residual fossil fuel, and associated currency dominance. The proxy wars are already being fought, not least in Ukraine. Hoping to avert the inevitability of catastrophic oil wars, the elites have been conning the general populace into the environmental concerns which may lessen the dominance of oil as a resource, thereby mitigating the impact of such large-scale conflict. It's a sham, of course, and it solves nothing, merely moving the focus onto the resources required

for the ‘Sustainable Development’ strategy, and strengthening China’s hand in the process. The minerals required for EV batteries are controlled by global mining rights acquired by China in its ‘Belt and Road’ strategy. As a result, China will always be the major player in the EV battery market. It’s too late for the west to catch up. They’ve been outplayed.

But, there remains a predictable and inevitable flash point, one which the west may be pinning all of its strategy upon. China adopts a ‘One-China’ principle – *There is but one China in the world, the Government of the People’s Republic of China is the sole legal government regulating the whole of China, and Taiwan is part of China*. This position is accepted by Russia, as stated in Article 5 of the 2001 Sino-Russian Treaty of Friendship.

Taiwan accounts for 65% of the world semiconductor market. By contrast, China produces a little over 5%, and the USA makes nearly 10%. Semiconductors are essential components of all modern cars, but are particularly indispensable in electric vehicles, which require semiconductors of the rather advanced type. **Taiwan makes almost 90% of these advanced semiconductor chips.**

Taiwan is an inevitable flash point. As indicated by BBC news (116), the USA has been quietly arming Taiwan to the teeth, under a programme of Foreign Military Finance (FMF). Meanwhile, diplomatically, the USA supports the ‘One China’ policy that Taiwan is a mere Chinese province. This ambivalence can’t continue indefinitely. Undoubtedly, the USA would take a dim view of China sending an equivalent level of money and arms to Honolulu, encouraging Hawaiian independence, while officially declaring a ‘One USA’ foreign policy. This is where the lockstep of feminism and the western elites may have taken a particularly nasty turn. Earlier in this Chapter, we’ve alluded to it in the realms of Sally Miller Gearhart’s odious ideology, committed to ‘Ecofeminist’ doctrine by Mary Daly in her book ‘*Gyn/Ecology*’. It’s now time to spell out the link. And, to place it in context, we must revisit the work of another feminist, Valerie Hudson (85), and her 2004 book ‘*Bare Branches*’.

It turns out that China’s ‘one child’ policy, implemented between 1980 and 2016 as a necessary means of bringing its population under control, thereby facilitating China’s present economic dominance, was also subject to that pesky Law of Unintended Consequences. Hudson found herself outraged by the high abortion rates of female foetuses in ‘one child’ China. As such, this is the polar opposite of the male abortion/infanticide strategy for lesbian feminist domination proposed by Sally Miller Gearhart. Surely, then, a suspicion of selective female abortion must have ‘Patriarchy’ written all over it...?

It turns out that, in the predominately rural, agrarian China of the 1980s, having a male child was, perhaps unsurprisingly, seen as a better economic investment than a female. If China were going to impose a ‘one child’ policy, then a male was a better bet for a farmer’s economic survival. After mobile ultrasound units began to make inroads into rural areas, the results were inevitable. By the 1990s, **there were 120 live male births for every 100 female live births**. Hudson correctly envisaged that, through numbers alone, when this demographic reached maturity, a large proportion of the male population would be unable to attract a female and form a stable family unit. The male population has been disadvantaged, even before their quest for **status**, and their battle in the sexual economics market. She called this group the ‘Bare Branches’, which, basically, is the Chinese term for incel.

Hudson predicted that acquiring a disproportionate number of low-status, young adult males would give China a major military advantage. These young, surplus males could be enlisted into nationalistic, military ventures, particularly where China’s resources may be threatened by western interests. **In her book, she argues that ‘surplus male population’ in China, and, increasingly in India, pose a ‘threat to domestic stability and international security’**, with global implications for the 21st Century.

It’s the old Gearhart/Daly doctrine under a different guise. *‘There are too many men in the world – it’s a threat to world peace!’* It doesn’t really help that Hudson is a professor of political science in the Department of International Affairs at the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University, where she holds the George W Bush Chair. In her later book, *‘Sex and World Peace’* (2012), Hudson attempts to argue that *‘the safety and security of women is a vital fact in the security of the state, and its incidence of conflict and war.’* Different day, same old message. Truly, that female prerogative for safety and security runs deep, together with pleading for state-sponsored protection and provision. That’s taxpayer-sponsored, by you and me. The bleating beneficiaries of our largesse want us to look after them from cradle to grave, believe their global warming stories, buy an electric car, impose legislation on ourselves to force this to happen, fight for the required resources, and in return...? In return, we are to receive next to nothing. We must accept the female sexual preference for a cock carousel of rotating temporary monogamy, and keep our eyes steeply averted if we aren’t chosen for the ride. This does not seem like a particularly good deal for men.

In fact, it's a particularly bad deal for those who must do the fighting. These, inevitably, will be the cohorts of disenchanted millennials and Generation Z, who appear to have been deliberately excluded from the Sexual Economics market so that the west may have its own supply of 'bare branches' for the showdown to come. In the inevitable mass slaughter, the perverted wet dreams of feminists like Miller Gearhart, Patai and Daly are likely to become reality, at least to a certain extent. It would appear that the elites may be intending to follow the feminist playbook to the letter. The conflict necessary for an 'adjustment' in male population is likely to come sooner rather than later, especially while China experiences domestic unrest as a result of self-inflicted damage caused by an unsustainable property boom fuelled by credit, and the subsequent collapse of Evergrande, amongst others. There's nothing like a good, nationalistic war over an island, seen as part of the nation state, to divert attention from domestic problems. Let's face it, this worked really well for Thatcher in 1982. For present day hard-line feminists and many of their powerful enablers, the optimum result is for the conflagration to be as big as possible. With less pressure on resources, living standards will increase for the survivors, just as happened after the Black Death of 1347. Greenpeace won't have to worry any longer, as there'll be more than enough resources to go round. It's all part of the 'Great Reset' referred to by Klaus Schwab and his buddies at the WEF, where he and his chums Hoover up what remains, and are very parsimonious regarding what may trickle down to the hoi-polloi. **'You will own nothing and be happy'** is a phrase originating in a 2016 video by the WEF. It was based on an economic essay, originally entitled: **'Welcome to 2030. I own nothing, have no privacy, and life has never been better.'** That's the sort of future the WEF want for us. And, post-conflict, women will be a *very* abundant resource, but we won't be afforded a sniff of them.

It's the end for infinite economic growth, with remorseless increase of GDP seen as the bellwether of a nation's prosperity. Instead, from the ashes of post-Taiwan conflict, intangible concepts of 'happiness' will be offered to the rump of humanity as our reward, within the type of left-brain dominated society described so well by McGilchrist [*M&E*, p431]. This 'happiness' will be governed by the female, left-brain predilection for safety and security, as presaged by Hudson in *'Sex and World Peace'*, a 'happiness' which can be gained only at the expense of FREEDOM, such an important, male, right-hemisphere value, and McGilchrist has afforded us a glimpse of what the Brave New World will look like. We came across it in Chapter 7, but it's worth repeating the extract here. *'Such a society would find it difficult to understand value, except in terms of utility. **Morality would come to be***

judged on the basis of utilitarian calculation. There would be a focus on material things, at the expense of living, within a technologically driven and bureaucratically administered society. Social cohesion, the context in which each person belongs, being incomprehensible to the left hemisphere, would be actively disrupted. As a result, individualities would be ironed out, and identification would be by categories – socioeconomic groups, races, sexes – who will feel themselves in competition with, and resentful of, one another. Paranoia and lack of trust would be the relationship between the Government and its people. Such a Government will therefore seek total control – constant CCTV monitoring, DNA databases, satellite tracking through mobile devices. Any roles which depend upon a degree of right brain altruism would become the object of suspicion. Strenuous efforts will therefore be made to bring families under bureaucratic control.'

Sounds great. How on earth did this book become a 'Guardian' book of the year? Don't the feminazis realise who McGilchrist is referring to? Oh yes, of course – the left-hemisphere is noted for its lack of self-awareness.

*

To return to the start of this Chapter – in 2022, the head of the United Nations, Antonio Guterres, expressed his (fairly powerful) opinion that: '*Investing in new oil and gas is economic and moral madness.*'

It seems as though Barclays Bank are listening. In February 2024, they announced that they'd be making no new investment in oil or gas. That Brave New World is, inexorably, coming our way.

Chapter 9

Females Can't Fail (But They Do)

It's touchingly amusing, in the most senseless and tragic way, to see just how much stock the WEF and the UN seem to place on WAW, the 'Women Are Wonderful' effect. Vague notions about the collaborative, empathetic nature of the female brain, taken from popular culture rather than science, are freely bandied around as hard evidence, and used to promote a hard sell, where powerful agendas are being pursued. A couple of years ago, I realised that McGilchrist's book *'The Master & His Emissary'* helped to make sense of the counter-intuitive aspects of the WAW narrative which has assailed us from the late 20th Century onwards (47). That's not to say that women *aren't* wonderful, BTW, but very much in their own, feminine way which was once so useful in forming and maintaining pair bonds. I am *not* a misogynist. Let's try to see it all in context, shall we? If those left-hemisphere templated behaviours *aren't* being used in pair bonding, and, instead, are pervading the workplace and society, they may be rather less useful to that society. Perhaps we shouldn't continue to *pretend* that women can do anything they set their minds to, giving those awful men such a showing-up in the process. This message pervades education, the workplace, the media, and it's relentless. The effect on boys, in particular, must be catastrophic. Surely, in the quest to keep a lid on western birth rates, the elites could have conceived a more *humane* scheme? But, I guess that males have always been disposable.

Nonetheless, a take-home message which greatly assists in making sense of the world is that it's **no use asking a woman to take responsibility and accountability for her actions, which will always reduce to those of self-serving utility**. I knew the absolute veracity of this statement. I'd seen it in the workplace, after women were 'encouraged' to make inroads into STEM. I'd encountered it during my long marriage to a woman whom I have loved for 44 years, and I know that love is reciprocated. When she let me down, she couldn't help herself, she was doing what she was programmed to do. This had always puzzled me. The dynamic between the left- and the right-brain hemispheres offered a means of understanding what was going on.

I've taken it a bit further in my own work. Being a trained research chemist, I remain fascinated by the possibilities offered by Hydrogen Bonding as a means of differentiating the

sexes. In sex hormones, the dominant H-Bond DONOR is oestrogen, which templates the default female brain. Only in the presence of testosterone, the same steroid framework, but having an H-Bond ACCEPTOR, is the brain patterned towards typically male behaviours. Oestrogen is much more thermodynamically stable than the more reactive testosterone, which can be converted to oestrogen by the enzymes *demethylase* and *aromatase*. Mother Nature likes to get her own way. My first, faltering steps towards comprehension, published prior to reading *'The Master & His Emissary'* were encapsulated in the concept of *oestrogen automatons* (63), very similar to the blindness of the left brain to anything other than its own aims, and justificatory morality.

I've now taken it a bit further, envisaging the left brain as a digital computer, its calculations and their consequences isolated from the real world, *other than in the realm for which it has been programmed, and the output intended*. Meanwhile, the right brain functions in a much more analogue sense, constantly checking the results against the world *as perceived at the present moment*. It can be taken further still, in terms of the particle/wave duality of the universe (117), with the left brain more attuned to the *materialistic* principles whereby everything can be reduced to fundamental particles, forming the basis of *knowledge*. Meanwhile the right brain, more *idealistic*, allows experience to flow in waves, with constructive and destructive interference patterns from which we learn, forming the basis of *experience*. This work, while interesting (*I think*), is nowhere near ready to be published.

So – back to the matter in hand. When, after reading *'The Master & His Emissary'*, I was doing some preliminary research (47), I came across one of these WEF fellows, Michael Hempt. In 2016, he made the following statements on behalf of an enterprise calling itself *Project 2030*.

The Left Brain Hemisphere is Hard-Nosed, Logical and Male.

The Right Brain Hemisphere is Dreamy, Sensitive and Female.

These statements are presented as apparent *facts*. Meanwhile, we can gain insight into the bold mission statement of *Project 2030*, as presented to the WEF: *'Project 2030 is an audaciously bold, sweeping vision, to migrate the human species from competitive societies to collaborative societies.'*

It's certainly an audacious plan. Some might say impudent, and most definitely imprudent, because it is based on assumptions which are completely WRONG. The left brain

is known to be dominated by dopaminergic, pleasure-seeking circuitry, and extremely sensitive to oestrogen (28). In the absence of oestrogen, dopamine receptors will atrophy and die (31). Meanwhile, the right brain hemisphere is sensitive to testosterone, and has a predominance of adrenergic circuitry, very resistant to burnout [*M&E*, p33]. As for the (supposedly negligible) emotional qualities of the right-brain, McGilchrist shows that the right-brain is an essential resource for all true expression of human emotion [*M&E*, p437-8].

There are several, utterly terrifying aspects of the smug, self-congratulatory ‘vision’ of organisations such as *Project 2030*. It’s not only that they seem to know what’s best for everyone (collaboration, obviously), and appear to hold few qualms about the paradox of *imposing* collaboration – but that their views are based on utterly erroneous assumptions about the male brain, and the neurological basis of competition – conflating these with the left brain hemisphere, which is then labelled as male. This just couldn’t be more wrong if they tried.

As far as cooperation is concerned, *Project 2030* would do well to examine the work of Joseph M Baker (118). He found, consistently, that all-male groups were the most cooperative, followed by mixed-sex groups, with all-female groups bringing up the rear, by a considerable margin. **All of the cooperation resulted from male effort. The only situations where there appeared to be attempts, by either party, to understand the intentions and motivations of the other, were within all-male groups.**

Even more interestingly, **there was inter-brain coherence for same-sex groups.** Men thought in a particular way. Women thought in a particular way – but differently to the men. **For BOTH sexes, the RIGHT brain was involved in cooperation.** Males showed coherence in the right inferior prefrontal cortex. Females exhibited coherence in the right temporal cortex. For mixed sex groups, there was no coherence.

So – in cooperative situations, the right brain is utilised, but with marked sex differences in the **area** of the right brain being used. **And, teams containing at least one male showed significantly higher behavioural performance than all female groups.**

It would appear that the feminist narrative is attempting to overwrite all the beneficial results of evolution. In some circumstances, we need to compete. In other circumstances, we need to cooperate. **Men have evolved to be better at both**, but this simple fact will rarely be acknowledged during the strange times we find ourselves living through, particularly in

academia and the media. And, once women dominate the workforce, the lowered level of men will reduce both cooperation and competitiveness. There's a tendency for women to view competition as something silly, more suited to little boys than the tolerant feminist societies which they'd like to impose.

Yet, for our civilisation to survive, we must create Gross Domestic Product. This process is likely to require cooperation, both within and between teams, while competing with rivals in the outside world. These competitors are unlikely to abstain from advantage simply because *Project 2030* tells them it should. It's *feminists* who are being silly, artificially attempting to re-write evolution, the process which got us here, using rules which they've dragged out of their left-brain, and have imposed on men quite successfully, thanks to the co-operative nature of the latter. Steve Moxon (58) makes the point that many males have accepted that it is their civic duty to be replaced by women!

But, the preliminary results are not good. Only a seriously 'mind-blind' individual (8) could look around western society and pretend that everything is going swimmingly. It boils down to that left-hemisphere tendency to ignore what it cannot control, focusing on its own concerns to the exclusion of all others. The left brain is winning the culture wars. That's all that matters. It doesn't see the bigger picture, cannot perceive that everything is falling apart in the process.

All the 'empathy' which women have been credited with – leading to expectations of stellar performances in team situations – real world experience suggests something entirely different. Only if interactions are taking place in small, almost intimate, groups will women exhibit *any* degree of social empathy, much of it through false and forced representation, a **left**-hemisphere speciality [*M&E, p64*].... and, crucially, they will empathise only with other women.

Females prefer to interact with other females, and have a particular preference for *small* group situations. Ancestrally, men would have been absent for long periods, with a high probability that they may never return. Women needed to form a small number of close bonds with other women who could provide support at critical times, like childbirth, and whom she could subsequently trust with her children while she foraged. As a result, in a group dynamic, women form small cliques, from which outsiders are excluded. Researchers have observed that, within such cliques, there is a constant need for validation from the wider group, *including those whom the clique has actually excluded*. This drives an inflated sense

of their own importance, referred to as ‘collective narcissism’ (119). The work of Joyce F Benenson has shown that social exclusion is a strategy well-tailored to the social structure of human females (120). **Within female-dominated environments, none of this bodes well for diversity and inclusion being followed in any ‘real’ sense of the word, other than box-ticking tokenism.** Interestingly, situations where ‘diversity’ and ‘inclusion’ are imposed have indicated the tensions associated with a human need for **validation and similarity to others (LEFT-brain)** conflicting with a need for **uniqueness and individuality (RIGHT-brain)** (121).

Yet, the plethora of influential, cash-rich organisations beloved of the UN and WEF continue to believe that, if we simply place females in positions of power, astounding results will be achieved. [It’s quite probable that they *will* be astounding, but for all the wrong reasons.] Here’s an example, published by the Rockefeller Foundation on 16th Jan 2020 (122). It’s written by Lyric Thompson, Director of Policy & Advocacy, International Centre for Research on Women, and Sundaa Bridgett-Jones, Former Chief Partnership and Advocacy Officer [*I do hope they haven’t had a falling-out*], and its premise is: “*Now is the time for **Feminist Foreign Policy** – aimed at prioritising peace, and **controlling** the most egregious challenges of our day – climate change, gender based violence, and misogyny.*” [I’ll bet those two wouldn’t have bombed Cambodia, a neutral country, like Henry Kissinger did, probably giving Gloria Steinem the hot in the process. However, I’m not sure that climate change, gender based violence and misogyny are driving the present (2024) conflict in the Middle East.]

Another factor which mitigates against expectations of female success in competitive environments is their much lower sex drive. Creativity and career discipline don’t simply appear from nowhere, and are well-known to be associated with the male sex drive (26). The hard work associated with creativity (10% inspiration, 90% perspiration) simply isn’t attractive to the dopaminergic left brain, which gives up easily. The female doesn’t need the **status** which comes from hard work, she knows that the boys will come calling anyway. Instead, she expects to be provided for, even in a competitive environment like the workplace, with calls for Affirmative Action, and complaints about ‘glass ceilings’.

The situation is bound to deteriorate even further. For decades, the prevailing culture has been affording females an illusion of infinite choice in whatever they attempt, whether in their careers or their personal lives. Much of this illusion undoubtedly arises from the type of

societies bandied around in Gender Studies courses, the feminist ‘utopias’ (86), (87) which will, apparently, spring from the ashes when the ‘Patriarchy’ (aka the family) has been destroyed. In the vision of a feminist future embraced by Silly Maller Gearhart (*oops*), Daphne Patai and Mary Daly, there’s a common theme going – these utopias enjoy all the benefits of tightly-knit communities, while, apparently, paying none of the costs that such left-leaning societies inevitably entail, especially the curtailment of individual freedom [M&E, p431]. Feminist theory demands that the drudgery of marriage must be replaced by unlimited ‘relationships’, but leaving out the part that such behaviours are likely to lead to unfulfilled middle age and lonely old age. And, although choice of career has been artificially engineered to favour females during these strange days, this is another temporary illusion, which, really, ends with schooldays. Even in attending tertiary education, you are beginning to specialise. Society won’t allow *anyone* to chop and change too many times. Females, especially during early, fertile years, will be afforded some forbearance in altering career trajectory, but the patience and tolerance of society, like female choice, is not infinite. [And to think that, once, before Ms Magazine put ants in her pants, she could have been married with kids, and living in a house with the mortgage serviced by a single wage earner. That’s ‘progress’.]

The damage has already been done during school years, and tertiary education is the finishing school for infinite female expectation. Educational establishments seem committed to force-feeding the feminist dream, and repeating the lie that there were very few female engineers, mathematicians, scientists (especially in the discipline of physics) or creative musical composers, because of.... well.... Patriarchy. But, soon, there will be such an outpouring of creativity and cooperation and constructive empathy as the world has never seen. In the world of feminist theory, everyone is equally capable of excellence, and you, girls, have been deliberately held back, because men expect you to bear their children. This is deliberate mendacity disguised as education, and its normalisation should be a cause for concern. Are organisations such as *Project 2030* simply wallowing in blind ignorance, or is there an end game?

How do they get away with the *lies*? It is a *fact* that only 1/5th of girls in primary school can reach AVERAGE levels of male performance in tests of spatial ability (10). It is a *fact* that this deteriorates further after menarche. It is a *fact* that STEM vocations require spatial ability scores in the top 10% of the population.

Here is another, more disturbing fact. The Air Traffic Controller Skills Assessment Procedure is designed to mentally exhaust candidates, then ask complex questions while the interviewee is in a state of mental exhaustion. Cognitive abilities, memory, attention to detail, spatial orientation, logical reasoning, are all under the scrutiny of the interviewer. Usually, only 0.5% of applicants are successful. But, facing pressure to diversify the workforce, the Federal Aviation Authority began using a ‘biographical test’ as a first screen of candidates. Preferred candidates were fed ‘buzz words’ which would bump up their resumes to top priority (123). Correct answers to the take-home biographical questionnaire were given to these candidates in their entirety. We’ll all feel much safer in skies which are controlled by a diversity agenda, I guess.

Young women emerge from the indoctrination into a world already bending to their every whim, thanks, in no small measure, to the powerful women who are already in place, and playing their part. Women are, currently, 4x more likely than men to be offered an interview, an uncanny coincidence with the factor by which women prefer other women to men (4). They go into female businesses which have been preferred through UN ‘**Gender Lens Investments**’ which have been conveniently tied to ‘**Climate Smart Investments**’ (124), where they can proceed to be the preferred useful idiots of those who are pulling their strings.

But, all is not well. Too many women, in a task-oriented environment, fail to understand that the *outcome* is all-important. Not the effect on their social network. Not the fact that they employed other women, and gave ‘Patriarchy’ a bloody nose. It takes a great deal of cognitive dissonance for someone like Carolyn Tastad (Group President of Proctor & Gamble’s \$30 billion North America business) to hire feminist Kim Gehrig for Gillette’s advertising campaign, based around ‘toxic masculinity’, lose them \$5 billion in sales, a further \$8 billion in non-cash write-downs, then turn this dismal failure into astounding success by having Gary Coombe, CEO of P&G (who own Gillette), state that this was “*a price worth paying*”, as he now better understands that “*for the majority of people to fall more deeply in love with today’s brands, you have to risk upsetting a small minority, and that’s what we’ve done*” (47).

In March 2020, it was reported that the number of women in Fortune 500 Companies fell from 32 in 2017 to 24 in 2018, and the main reason given was the poor performance of the incumbents (125). The author of this piece, shocked by the outcome, implies that the

stress caused by juggling business and family pressures has contributed to the situation, and suggests that Companies should be more tolerant of women's priorities towards their families. It's a very odd statement to make – almost as though men didn't have families, too. Here, it's of great interest to rediscover an old study by Corinne Hutt, which examined 25 women in top management positions, revealing that they had all shown 'tomboy' characteristics as children (126), suggesting that they may have a 'virilised' brain, a key concept which we came across in Chapter 1. While a 'virilised' brain may be an essential component of female success within a competitive environment, it is probably skewed to the margins in the Gaussian distribution of normal female brain development, and **Ms Patterning** isn't the optimum role model for those young women whose foetal brains **weren't** affected by abnormally high levels of maternal testosterone.

In even earlier work, Corinne Hutt had explained how the impact of sex hormones on a developing foetus didn't simply create a male or female body, but was essential in creating a male or female brain (127). **As this was seen as 'deterministic', publication of her work was delayed, then buried and ignored by academia after her death, at the age of 46. Determinism had become anathema to modern western thinking. It challenges the validity of those deontic moral values and beliefs which had founded contemporary laws – free will, justice, the notion that we're in charge of our lives and decisions, the idea that each and every one of us is responsible for our fates, the concept of objective right and wrong.**

And, now...? Every one of those deontic values has been subverted, by stealth, to the service of the utilitarian. Only a generation ago, women still had to use men, and the deontic values created by men, as their proxy tools to obtain the utilitarian outcomes they sought. Now, men have been weakened by men more politically powerful than themselves, and women enabled to achieve their aims directly, **if they do a deal with those same politically powerful men and renounce the babies and families which were the ultimate aim of the oestrogen programming for utilitarian outcomes in the first place.** Who is the Master? Oestrogen is more thermodynamically stable. The house always wins.

*

I don't particularly wish to pick upon the failures of female CEOs. Male CEOs fail too. But, **females tend to fail in a very specific way.** Here, I'm going to draw on my own experiences with female colleagues in STEM (61) and show parallels with some high profile,

sometimes disturbing failures of female CEOs which have caught public attention recently. If I were to summarise what I came across as women were (hugely) enabled to make inroads into STEM environments of the late 1990s/early 2000s, it would be these three characteristics. **(a) A breezy over-confidence in their abilities. (b) A lack of competence in the systems they are managing. (c) A lack of familiarity with TRUTH.**

Characteristic (a) is an almost inevitable consequence of a dominant left brain [*M&E*, p83]. To quote McGilchrist: *'The left hemisphere is ever optimistic, but unrealistic about its shortcomings. Right brain deficit disorder leads to task obstacles being ignored. Impossible challenges are accepted, grossly inadequate efforts made, then the subjects are stunned by the poor outcomes.'* When we look at how right brain deficit disorder manifests, we can immediately see the behaviours of children... and many women, unfortunately. It would appear that there are elements of truth in Schopenhauer's assertion that: *'Women remain children all their lives – for they always see only what is near at hand, cling to the present, take the appearance of a thing for reality, and prefer trifling matters to the most important'* (33). He could have been describing left-brain dominant behaviour.

Characteristic (b) can be exhibited by both men and women, there are no shortages of incompetent men in positions of power and authority. However I'd like to say a little bit about what I observed on changing job in the mid-1990s. At my new place of employment, I came across Karen, who was undertaking a Company-sponsored PhD. I'd vaguely known her previously, she'd been a technical assistant for my old employer, but had quit, as they wouldn't sponsor her through college as an undergraduate. Now, all this time later, she seemed to have the world at her feet, having consistently attained top examination marks as she spent six years studying for a GRSC on day release. It was obvious that she had some besotted fans amongst the male management of my new employer, and it was equally apparent that she was aware of this fact.

This, unfortunately, was where her awareness seemed to end. The dichotomy between her image and reality was sharply apparent in the laboratory. Here, the woman was a liability, her risible practical skills outweighed only by a lack of comprehension in basic principles. She couldn't remember anything of what she'd been taught, **because she didn't understand any of it, couldn't grasp the context of how the facts fitted together in a big picture. It was all just a big jumble of unrelated information which she'd been able to commit to (fairly short-term) memory, parrot-fashion. She could regurgitate her lines quite**

effectively in examinations, where specific areas of coursework are under the spotlight, somewhat like an actress on stage, performing in a play. But in any real-world situation, the information was irretrievable. It had never been there in the first place.

Unhappily, her skills as an actress weren't limited to the examination room. There were four men who had joined the Company at that particular time. Three held PhDs, myself included. One of us had a BSc. Karen saw all four incomers as potential threats to the stellar career she had planned for herself. With several infatuated, male upper and middle managers eating out of her hand, she'd foreseen a spectacular rise as inevitable, but this new recruitment policy had taken her by surprise. So, she used every technique of GSRM at her disposal (**18**), and very effective it was, too. Two of my colleagues were soon being monitored, and found themselves under remedial measures. One was sacked within two years, for having the audacity to criticise her work, precipitating the inevitable female tears, and outraged management response. It was only a matter of time for the other, as her underhand campaign against him was relentless. The third realised what was happening, and adopted a survival strategy where he used one of Karen's female rivals as a shield, and a tool which could further his own career. More of this later...

As for myself..? Karen and I had crossed paths at my previous employer, but we worked in different departments and weren't rivals. Previously, she'd worked in the Biological Evaluation Department, testing the molecules which I'd synthesised, and she knew my reputation as a productive stamina merchant, I always had plenty of good materials under evaluation. Perhaps for that reason, she backed off a bit on the GRSM, even though she'd now chosen Chemistry as a career (*that illusion of unlimited choice, which society indulges in fertile females much more so than in males*), which did make us rivals. But, I had more than enough projects to go round, and our infatuated line manager was always kind enough to redistribute them in Karen's direction when her work (inevitably) failed.

Things changed after the first sacking from the batch of new male recruits. Having witnessed her role in the sordid proceedings, I sent a warning shot across her bows that she needn't contemplate similar action against me. And, I began to dig my heels in against my work being sequestered to prop up this odious woman. Needless to say, this was spun that I wasn't a 'team player', and the GSRM swung into action. And the tears...

At this juncture, it is worth pointing out that GSRM was an accepted abbreviation for the female (herd) competitive strategy towards circumventing argument by undermining

rivals, poisoning the well, and reputation destruction by use of (G)ossiping, (S)haming, (R)allying, (R)idicule, (M)oralising, instead of male (pack) strategy of using factual argument, solving for TRUTH, regardless of losing face.

Feminists have realised that the fewer who are aware of this strategy, the better. For that reason, searching for the term will find most search engines inundating you with spurious GSRM information centred on Gender, Sexual and Romantic Minorities.

She got my projects. She got her promotion, on the back of my projects. She now drove a Rover company car. Meanwhile, raising my young family, with little cash to spare, I struggled to run an old MG Maestro. She divorced her husband, who was no longer ‘good enough’ for her. She proceeded to have a nervous breakdown, while ensuring that I copped some of the blame for making things ‘difficult’ for her. And, all the while, I could no longer prevent the outflow of my ideas into her lab, where she’d proceed to f*ck them up. The infatuated upper and middle managers had succeeded in getting my ideas into an ‘Ideas Database’, and had no further use for the *originator* of those ideas. They were gunning for me, and I was almost sacked, too. This wasn’t sustainable. And, you know what...? None of the *Sustainable Development* of the WEF brigade will be sustainable either.

Of all the flaws which are over-represented in female managers, it’s (c) which is most fatal to any enterprise – **a lack of familiarity with TRUTH**, and we can now see that the female herd strategy of GSRM is but one stratum of a seismic fault line which runs wide, and runs very, very deep. **The tendency of a female to lie - without apparent concern, guilt or remorse as to the consequence of her actions, as long as she perceives that she has gained utilitarian advantage – this makes her a very poor fit with systems based on male deontic principles.**

Even after I’d avoided disciplinary proceedings and an attempted sacking, Karen’s underhand campaign against me continued, with lies which I couldn’t disprove, because I hadn’t been made aware of them. She knew which ears would be receptive, and she knew that they and I didn’t mix in the same circles. She concealed the fact that her own molecules weren’t biodegradable, while weaponising her own incompetence by putting my molecules into the wrong tests, where they were *bound* to fail. I had Development Materials held up for *years* in the pipeline through this strategy. When I eventually discovered what she’d been up to, I asked for clarification in an e-mail, and proposed a timescale and budget for submitting my molecule to the *correct* tests. She countered this by turning on the waterworks, and I

found myself in trouble once more. It amazed me, at the time, that she saw nothing morally wrong in her behaviour. She believed herself to be a ‘high-flyer’, therefore anything which supported that illusion was justified, deception or not. The molecule of mine that she killed through unjustified biodegradation concerns was worth *at least* £20 million annually to my employer, in 1998 money, something which may have helped them service the interest on the loans they took out when they overpaid by £2 billion on a business acquisition. And, this is far from being the full picture – Karen was intimately involved in the assassination of a score of molecules on which I’d expended blood, sweat and tears, but which threatened her laziness, her incompetence and her entitled mendacity (61). She used her favoured position with middle and upper management to wage war on me by proxy, in acts of industrial sabotage.

The other strand to this tale is just as bad, perhaps even worse. The IT skills of the other male PhD were well ahead of his Chemistry expertise. So, in a Chemistry environment, he ensured his survival by making promises to Kim, a woman who collated results of biological evaluation. These promises were of the variety that he would leave his wife for her. Soon, all the raw data in the Screening Database had gone, replaced by helpful bar graphs and pie charts which gave inexplicable and unwarranted advantage to the molecules of Kim’s new lover. Needless to say, it all ended in tears. This sort of stuff will be going on throughout the ‘*Sustainable Development*’ world, anywhere that men and women work together, and women have been encouraged to make inroads into male deontic structures. How do I know..? Because, in the 1990s, it was going on *everywhere* on that site where I worked, not simply in the Research Department. The stories are too numerous to tell, all of them bad, all of them counter-productive, all of them part of a slow death of a thousand cuts to the Organisation which once employed us, before it collapsed.

I was shocked. From 1980 to 1994, I’d practiced Research Chemistry in laboratories which were exclusively male. Everyone knew where they stood, and the TRUTH was all important, it was what we sought when we came to work. Everything had now changed. Spending 95% of your time covering your arse, while trying to FIND the TRUTH, all the while attempting to predict where the next spat of GSRM was likely to arise.... this was all new to me. Productive it isn’t.

Remember the neurological work of Joseph Baker, which showed that men are the more cooperative sex in team situations (118). Men experience a mutually-reinforcing sense

of belonging to a group, and competitiveness **on behalf of the group**. They will also make individual effort within it, to try to rise to the top. As stated by Moxon (57): *'Men are much more task-oriented, and can cooperate with colleagues they don't like. **But women may perceive the achievements of others as a threat to their personal success, and a form of relational aggression. They'll then marshal their network against a victim, resulting in social ostracism for him/her.** The current notion is that women make better employees than men. Men are thought to be 'bolshy', and women compliant. Yet, it is men who have the clear attributes of being both task-centred and of forming teams within the workplace, rather than personal networks (which can be used disruptively). Currently, there is a misperception that interpersonal facility necessarily makes for constructive cooperation, and that relational aggression makes for fruitful competition.'*

Whatever happened to ICI...? That's a good question. The answer to it is has been sketched out above. The same games will already be ubiquitous in the fatally flawed model of filling organisations with females, anticipating that, *ergo*, success will follow, and a prosperous, peaceful society will bask in a warm glow of goodness, sweetness and light by 2030.

Recently, the big story of 2024 saw the actions of some female top dogs (top bitches?) dragged into the spotlight, exposing incompetence, lies and callous insouciance on a grand scale. In fact, the UK Post Office Scandal is probably **the biggest miscarriage of justice in UK history**. Over 900 sub-postmasters and postmistresses were prosecuted for stealing money, due to inaccurate information provided by a computer system called Horizon, which the Post Office had purchased in 1999 from Fujitsu. But, immediately the Horizon system was implemented, sub-postmasters had quickly complained that it suffered non-trivial bugs – often reporting shortfalls which amounted to thousands of pounds. Some were forced to use their own money to cover non-existent shortfalls, because their contract with the Post Office stated that they were responsible for any unexplained loss.

Then, the prosecutions began. The Post Office itself brought most of the cases to court, prosecuting 700 people between 1999 and 2015 – an average of one person every week. A further 283 cases were brought by other bodies, including the Crown Prosecution Service. **The court cases, criminal convictions, imprisonments, loss of livelihood and homes, debts and bankruptcies took a heavy toll on the victims and their families, leading to stress, illness, divorce, and at least four suicides.**

236 People went to prison. Once the Post Office had a criminal conviction, it could attempt to secure a Proceeds of Crime Act order against the convicted postmasters, allowing their assets to be seized.

Throughout this process, the Post Office insisted that Horizon was robust, and failed to disclose its knowledge of faults in the system while securing convictions. But, it was becoming impossible to keep a lid on it. *Computer Weekly* broke the story about Horizon faults in May 2009. In 2012, MPs and pressure groups forced the Post Office to **allow forensic accountants from the firm Second Sight to investigate the Horizon system.** Second Sight were not appointed or paid for by the Post Office, but by a small group of MPs, and by JFSA – the ‘Justice For Postmasters Alliance’. Second Sight, accepted the responsibility, only if the Post Office were going to be open, and allow access to all papers and information. An initial report **concluded that Horizon was, in some instances, ‘not fit for purpose’.** It had not been tracking money from lottery terminals, vehicle excise duty, or cash machine terminals. It could also generate phantom discrepancies which didn’t even exist. **The report stated that Post Office investigators had not looked for the cause of the errors, preferring to accuse sub-postmasters of theft.**

The result..? The Post Office attempted to sack the author of the report, sought to discredit Second Sight, and terminated their contract. The Post Office continued to insist that there were no systemic problems with Horizon. They were pulled up sharply in 2013 by their own barrister, Simon Clarke, who reminded them of their obligations as a prosecutor, regarding disclosure, **and that the duties of an expert witness did NOT extend to lying.** Fujitsu employees had given expert testimony on behalf of the Post Office, attesting to the accuracy of Horizon, despite being well aware of the bugs in the system. **Clarke expressed the view that several trials had been misled as to the reliability of the Horizon system, raising the possibility that there had been many miscarriages of justice.**

It’s the role of these empathetic, compassionate women which I take greatest issue with here, and Paula Vennells deserves particular mention. As Group Chairman from 2007 onwards, she’d seen all the Horizon problems shaping up while another woman, Dame Moya Greene, had led the Company. Moya Greene was the highest paid UK civil servant in 2010, taking home £498,000, although that’s a drop in the bucket when you include her ‘performance’ bonuses, giving her a total package of around £3.7 million. **How many families had to suffer for that bonus?** Vennells, meanwhile, became Chief Executive of

Post Office Ltd in 2012, when it separated from Royal Mail. In 2013, while at the helm, she has full cognisance of the report from Second Sight, the forensic accountants. She is in complete awareness of advice from the Post Office's own lawyer that there may have been miscarriages of justice, and that it's time to come clean about the Horizon system.

So – what does someone like that do? Tell the TRUTH, attempt to resolve the obvious problems inherent in a system for which she, as CEO, now holds full accountability?

Tell the TRUTH about what she knows, to alleviate the mounting human misery for which she, as CEO, is now fully responsible?

Of course not. Post Office lawyer Clarke has now become aware that Vennells issued instructions to shred minutes of a conference call about Horizon bugs, and has reminded her of Post Office duty of disclosure. In response, Vennells claims that there was nothing to hide, that there had been no findings of system-wide problems with Horizon software.

Running a regime which was described as **cruel and incompetent** by Conservative peer Lord Arbuthnot, Vennells makes use of her network of highly paid henchwomen, to obfuscate and mislead. Even Fujitsu claim to be shocked by the scale of misrepresentation of evidence by Post Office executives, saying that **they'd expected evidence generated by Fujitsu to be treated with HONESTY and COMPETENCE** (two words which don't appear in the Feminist Book of Newspeak). Angela van der Bogerd, who became Business Improvement Director, refused to hand over key files to Second Sight, while claiming to MPs that she was cooperating fully. Alice Perkins was Chairman of the Post Office, and chaired the sub-committee which decided to sack Second Sight. They all played a role in a stubborn, selfish preference to abandon truth and due process to the easier option of personal convenience and advantage. Keeping people in jail, and perfectly ready to place other innocents behind bars, so that they can pick up their 'performance' bonuses, and maybe a CBE. Perhaps, like Vennells, they should all train as ordained ministers, and lecture us on morals, while using their social networking to pocket further vast sums, 'serving' as directors on the Boards of various Companies.

2030 is going to be great.

Chapter 10

End Game of 'Equality'

Recently, it was claimed, in a survey carried out by Australian feminists, that the vast majority of the Australian population are feminists. While there *does* appear to be a determined effort by the authorities to feminise Oz, the result remains surprising. Scratching the surface reveals that the majority of those questioned were in agreement with 'feminist aims'. This is where it becomes instructive to delve deeper, attempting to ascertain the methodologies used in the questionnaire. Was it, for example, held within a 'Gender Studies' Department? The answer to that is affirmative. Even more egregious is the questionnaire itself – basically a single question: *'Do you believe that there should be equality between men and women?'*

Ah.... *now* it begins to make sense. Who's going to answer negatively to that one? So – let's carry out a survey with an outcome which we can anticipate will be predetermined in our favour, then use the result to clamber aboard our moral high horse, riding it to a variety of crusades, almost unrelated in every way.... except one. We can expect to gain utilitarian benefit from each crusade. Gentlemen – welcome to the world of feminist 'methodology', the suspect means by which even more dubious feminist 'theory' is 'justified' and 'validated'. I didn't introduce that sentence by saying 'Ladies & Gentlemen...', as I strongly suspect that the ladies already *know* how it's done.

Let's have a look at what we're signing up for, when we vicariously agree to validate feminist 'theory'. **Did we know, for example, that 'equality' renders objective truth impossible?** According to feminist theory, truth is the preserve of power, and society is composed of systems of power and privilege which must be 'deconstructed'. Even more disturbingly, **truth must not become an obstacle to seizing power, retaining power, and using it.** Well, it would appear that Paula Vennells and her female cohorts have definitely been singing from that song-sheet.

So – the doctrine of 'equality' has led to the concept that absolute truth is now discredited. In fact, it doesn't exist. The opinion of others as to what is true is EQUAL to yours. Therefore, there is no absolute truth. If Vennells says there isn't a problem, there isn't a problem. **Absolute truth becomes incompatible with the adoption of 'equality' as an**

overarching moral precept. Having ‘equality’ as an overarching POLICY OBJECTIVE is therefore likely to lead to destructive effects on any society based on male, deontic values. And, when the woke foot-soldiers are interpreting ‘equality’ in a naïve manner (as may be likely with students in a Gender Studies environment), the damage they may cause is likely to be considerable.

In fact, equality of the sexes is never in male interest. When a woman seeks a sexual partner, she isn’t searching for a man who is her equal, such a man would never be considered. This is due to the asymmetry of the human pair bond. **Men must do all of the prior work which will enable pair bonding. He must demonstrate his genetic fitness through status, which he has acquired through competition with other males.** The female contribution comes after she has been exposed to courtship rituals, and has acquiesced to making a choice of partner.... **she then produces and rears a baby**, an energy-intensive business, during which she expects to be provided for.

This accounts for the fact that males are usually at least two years older than females in long-term relationships. It’s got nothing to do with males being predators, it’s a simple result of *female choice*, like most sexual matters. As Schopenhauer opined: ‘*Women only have one kind of business*’ (33). Even with a two year age gap, women normally pair up with a man at an early stage of his career. Therefore they must calibrate his potential, **another of the reasons why left-hemisphere brain processing is a female speciality.**

For the past seventy years, a single human lifetime, there has been an unprecedented change in society, with women encouraged to have their own jobs, and be independent of men. This possibly suits **Ms Patterning** and her virilised, male-patterned brain. However, nature tends not to follow the dictates of social constructs. Plenty of women who call themselves feminists will still succumb to an innate desire to reproduce. And, when they do, no matter how much money they earn, no matter how wealthy they are, how secure they are, **they will still follow the evolved pattern of seeking a man who is of higher status than themselves.** In fact, women become even more discerning, not less, as their wealth, power and social status rises. Financially successful brides-to-be placed even greater emphasis on the earning potential of their husbands (128). Where’s the ‘equality’ in that? Women seek ‘equality’ only when they believe it will be to their advantage, and **‘equality’ is never to male benefit.**

No male higher status => No pair bond => No child ever produced

One thing is for sure – if a man doesn't have a job, he's out of the running (129). For him, the race to reproduce is over, his genes consigned to history. Nor are women attracted to the castrated, gelding men who have taken over the modern woke-place. Feminist men aren't going to get their leg over, either, as women can see that these specimens have debased themselves to the very lowest level.

But, men are finding it difficult to get higher status jobs, for a variety of reasons. The old industrial economy allowed plenty of scope for male traits to thrive – competitiveness, risk-taking, enterprise, initiative, leadership. But, the west has been a predominately service economy since the mid-1950s (1). An air-conditioned workplace, optimised for risk-free, repetitious, sedentary work **has been used by feminists, empowered by an elite capitalist class of apex entrepreneurs and politicians, to eliminate women's economic dependence on men, and to discourage the formation of families**. In so doing, the ways of life which were familiar to our parents, grandparents, and almost every other previous generation cannot be sustained any longer. We can already see the results all around us, those results achieved in a single human lifetime. And, the situation is far from stable. No one raised too many eyebrows when robotics invaded the factories, and male jobs were lost due to 'efficiency and productivity' measures, but the effects of AI on present female employment are likely to be even more devastating.

In the tedious and stultifying post-industrial bureaucracy, women appear to be ideally suited to the fastidious compliance with directives and minutiae. They're untroubled by political correctness, as it's something which women themselves brought with them to the workplace. But, anything they can do, AI can do better, and more cheaply. No more 'Lazy Girl Jobs', the non-technical, remote jobs offering good remuneration and flexibility, as described by Gabrielle Judge (130). These jobs enabled 'quiet quitting' by women, who repaid their salaries by doing as little as possible. It's a bit like the pre-1950s female strategy of relying on male support in the old, traditional marriage model with an exclusively male breadwinner, and making minimum monthly repayments in the bedroom, a principle of **minimum reciprocity** (34).

Young women like Gabrielle Judge are blithely unaware of the threats, of course. It's the job of the **right**-brain hemisphere to be aware of its environment and maintain a broad, alert vigilance on what's happening, ready to counter potential threats... as befits the

traditional male role. Gabrielle is probably too busy watching ‘Cash in the Attic’ when she should be working, and obviously feeling pretty pleased with herself.

In the service economy, and the post-service economy (aka the ‘green’ economy), powerful manipulators appease women by offering them the external appearance of achievement – paying them too much for dumb jobs, and imposing diversity quotas to keep men out. Corporate hiring and promotional preferences are presently predicated on lowering the bar... for risk, for overcoming obstacles, and for objective achievement. **We can begin to see how pernicious ‘equality’ really is to the health and competitiveness of society.** Females don’t cope very well with competitive environments (12) and have a particular aversion to the dominance hierarchies which men have imposed on other men (58). Unfortunately these hierarchies form the basis of the business, commercial or scientific endeavours in which she may be trying to earn a living. Not only do women not understand this, but they have a socially-conferred expectation of being deferred to (58). This can easily lead to unwarranted allegation of ‘bullying’ when a male co-worker expects her to exhibit competence in achieving objectives.

Following their post-1950s incursions into the workplace, encouraged by a feminism which was bankrolled by CIA and Rockefeller money, women are now consolidating on the advances they’ve made, again aided by powerful forces, presently the UN and the WEF. These actors see the morality of ‘equality’ as the false flag by which to sell us their ‘green economy’ agenda, reducing birth rates to ‘sustainable’ levels in the process. The ‘Diversity, Equity & Inclusion’ agendas are designed to appeal to women – females are favoured in the hiring process, while males are given the ‘divide and rule’ treatment of intersectionality, brought to you by one Kimberle Crenshaw (131). That’ll mean fewer ‘bullies’ for women to deal with. Meanwhile, the concurrent ‘Environmental, Social & Governance’ policies ensure that ‘Green’ legislation, which will deny consumer choice, is introduced through the back door. In the battle against ‘discrimination’, there’s no way that the Government will allow you to make a discriminatory purchase of a new petrol vehicle, for example. This was supposed to come into force in 2030.

The application of DEI agendas, probably more accurately described as **Divide, Exclude, Indoctrinate**, have a dreadful effect on men. In employment discrimination, men have most to lose. In the UK, even now, the unemployment rate for men is double that of women. There is a strong causal link between male unemployment and suicide, as work is

related to male self-esteem. Men who are thrown out of work are 4x more likely to develop depression, while women exhibit no marked difference in their mental health – an effect believed to be linked to traditional expectations that men should be ‘breadwinners’. For married, working couples, there’s a greatly increased probability of the wife filing for divorce, should the husband become unemployed. **It would appear that female drive for ‘equality’ does not extend to supporting a non-working partner.**

On being deprived of employment, a man loses most of his identity in society. He may also lose his wife, his home, his children. Hence, the depression, and greatly increased suicide rates. The probability of taking one’s own life is 4x greater for males (47), another tragic figure which can be correlated to the ‘breadwinner’ expectation. It’s probable that these, already shocking, ratios of male depression and suicide relative to female will **increase**, courtesy of the feminist indoctrination which passes as the modern educational system. It is a fundamental necessity of human existence that we feel *value* in our lives, giving us a purpose for living. Yet, the ‘not required’ message is being inculcated in males from an early age.

Even in the absence of employment, a mother can always feel that her life has been worthwhile. She knows that she has brought forth new life, and that her genetic legacy resides in her child. But females gain most evolutionary advantage by *deception*, by *subverting deontic systems*. Even within a stable and secure relationship, in fact one might say *especially* within a stable and secure relationship, she may easily succumb to a one-night stand if exposed to the attentions of a high-value male, and she’ll be unlikely to take precautions under such circumstances (51). As well as the pressures of breadwinner expectations, males can never be certain of their genetic legacy. DNA testing for paternity is illegal in many western countries, including France (132). We’ve already seen that there’s societal pressure to be ‘chivalrous’ about such matters (52), and to accept the deception of ‘social fatherhood’ as a privilege (53), which men should be happy to bankroll for eighteen years or more. In the sexual behaviours of women, then, the call to **‘Believe All Women’** (133) can be seen to be fraught with peril for the male of the species, backed up by some pretty damning false accusation statistics (21).

After just one human lifetime under the yoke of state-sponsored feminism, and maybe two generations of female sexual liberation, the western world is in a mess, a mire of its own making. There’s only so much that can be excused by the left-brain tendency to deny

obvious, real world evidence, especially if this evidence doesn't fit its own, internally-generated 'theory'. The quest for power and control is all that matters. Men are *bewildered* when they finally realise the intensity of the feminist rage directed against them, rage born of synthetic virtue, and enabled through the political paymasters of feminism. As well as the deliberate disadvantaging of males in employment legislation, an entire legal industry has ballooned, based upon newly-instigated crimes and torts for which only females can be victims, and only males can be guilty (75). **It is a highly-suspicious circumstance when the most empowered women in the history of the world have suddenly been rendered sexually helpless (44).** And don't expect due process to be followed when male-specific crimes come to court (24), (25).

In the new 'equality', not everyone is equal under the law. The deontic values which built civilisation are being eroded, right before our eyes. Back in 1865, Arthur Schopenhauer was very prescient when he opined that women should be kept well away from any court of law (33). Allowing women to **write** the laws we should adhere to is an obvious mistake, as these laws will always be subverted to utilitarian female advantage. Now, employers are *breaking the law* if they do not make *special provision* for menopause!

'Feminist jurisprudence' of the type exemplified by *'The Scottish Feminist Judgements Project'* (134) is bad news for men. What could possibly go wrong..? Perhaps we should again contemplate the narrow squeak experienced by Mr Alec Salmond, former First Minister of Scotland, when he had the audacity to challenge the authority of his female protégé (and First Minister at the time of his trial). He soon found himself accused of sexual 'offences' (96). Fortunately, he was tried by jury, and cleared on all counts. This may not have happened had *'The Scottish Feminists Judgements Project'* been successful in sweeping away human rights for men, and denying him the right to trial by jury (24). That could be you in the dock, one day. Soon.

*

Make no mistake, **'The Great Reset'** envisaged by Klaus Schwab and his chums at the WEF, is coming our way (135). The availability of relatively inexpensive fossil fuel energy has allowed the west to become bloated and lazy. The energy which underpins lazy girl jobs (131) and generous welfare parents to 'one parent families', aka 'single mothers' (who were previously denigrated in pre-1960s western society as unmarried mothers – we should, perhaps, draw a discreet veil over the nomenclature of their offspring), will

increasingly flow east, rather than west, exposing the fragility of western lifestyles. From 1980 to 2015, China has managed to catch up with our standard of living **through controlling its population with a one-child policy**, and is now powering ahead of us economically. But, with economic progress, comes the inevitable sexual oppression which females will exert in a relatively prosperous and secure environment, especially one with too many males (85). The comments of a young Chinese woman in a recent BBC article (136) are instructive: *'I don't need to provide anything, but the man needs to have a house, a car, an engagement ceremony, as well as pay a bride price. I feel like I'm at the top of this marriage market.'* The demands made by women before they will commit to pair bonding have a tendency to become bloated in a successful economy.

India, too, is industrialising, with few qualms about using fossil fuels to power the factories, and appears to be keeping the birth rate under control by following the current western model of disadvantaging males in employment and social interaction with females. In many ways, the latter legislation is, already, even more draconian than its western equivalent. You can be jailed for 'rape' if a plaintiff claims that she succumbed to advances only because she was promised a marriage. She doesn't have to prove any of this.

In Japan, birth rates are well below replacement levels. The same situation exists for most countries in the EU, where the assault on the traditional family continues. In February 2024, Greece passed legislation which legalised gay marriage, and became the first country to do so where a Christian Orthodox Church remains powerful. **Again, this is all sold to everyone in the name of 'equality'**. How could anyone possibly be against it? Most people remain unaware that same-sex marriage hasn't been promoted due to sympathy for homosexuals. The objective has always been to render 'marriage' meaningless. And, everywhere, the power of religion to maintain men and women in partnership, keep us in our place and making babies is ebbing away, like oil itself. It might be time to try to grasp an overview of all this, and ask it.... *'Quo vadis?'*

The state-assisted attrition of normal male/female human relations isn't going to be enough to prepare us for the coming shock. The ebbing of a wave function is insufficient to deal with the circumstances faced by the human race.... too late for that. What's required is a massive jump to a quantum level several states lower. For David Pimintel of Greenpeace is absolutely correct, **a world without fossil fuels can support only around 1/5th of the current population (109)**.

The oil wars have already begun. The present situation in Ukraine is no more than a response by Putin against an attempt by the EU to corral resources which were aligned with Russia. Any 'victory' in Ukraine always depended heavily on western intervention, and the appetite for this may be tailing off. Because.... *'Quo vadis?'* Where does it go, if Russian forces are driven out of Ukraine? Is China likely to simply watch, as a disinterested spectator on the side-lines? And, why should the USA bankroll a campaign which will hand oil resources to the EU, particularly if EU members of NATO haven't been paying their fair share of bills for the collective defence of the NATO umbrella? As of 16th February 2024, the city of Avdiivka on the eastern Ukrainian front has fallen, and Ukrainian forces have withdrawn, to avoid encirclement. With a USA election in the offing, it's impossible to say how this will play out, but Republicans are more coy than Democrats about supporting Ukraine in this conflict. And, lest the west have failed to understand that Putin takes no prisoners, his political adversary, Alexei Navalny 'died in jail', 16th February 2024.

It seems much more likely that Russian forces will now advance until Ukraine sues for peace. Under those peace terms, Ukraine will have lost the Donbas region to Russia, and there will be Russian stipulations that EU membership for Ukraine will never happen. By agreeing to the latter a decade previously, Zelensky could have held on to Ukraine in its entirety, but he fell for the overtures of the EU, which have now abandoned him, despite their own nervousness regarding Russia. Meanwhile, Putin is sending out ample signals that he is not a man to be trifled with. Alexei Navalny can, in a way, join the 14,000 deaths arising from the 2014 Donbas conflict (largely ignored in the west), and the estimated 500,000 casualties already resulting from the 2022 Russian offensive. As ever, the western authorities are outraged only at civilian casualties, with their concern limited to women and children. Spare a thought for the conscripted men of both sides. They didn't want to be near the battleground either, but they weren't afforded any choice in the matter.

How long can men continue to accept the feminisation of a society which is likely to follow the Sally Miller Gearhart model (86), and march that masculinity off to its doom? Our tolerance appears almost unlimited. *'We are suffocated by a culture which reflects women's risk-averse nature. Outrageous tax burdens finance the lifestyle of single mothers, whose benefits are provided by men whom the women would never consider as partners. Poorly paid, low status men are being mugged on these women's behalf (137).'* And, female sexual morality tends to go hand in hand with financial prudence. The poorest people in society rarely bother to calculate the consequences of their actions. In fact, the worst possible

scenario for the genetic fitness of the human race arises when the poor become artificially 'wealthy' by their own standards, through welfare payments.

Just as marriage has been rendered meaningless, the stigma which society once accorded unmarried mothers has evaporated. Today, there are no illegitimate children. The legitimacy of a child was based on being able to legally identify its biological father, and the purpose was to allay male concerns over paternity. The legislation and social stigma did not support female sexual preferences (51), (52), (53), and we can see the result – it's gone. Religion was always a male-led counteroffensive against female sexual preference and the utilitarian, matriarchal basis of any family-founded society, best encapsulated as Briffault's Law (49). But, religion has collapsed around our ears, only to be replaced by feminism, a matriarchal order which wishes to destroy the family, and reduce men to 10% of the population (86), (87). Onward, male, feminist soldiers, marching as to war.... on women's behalf. You're not going to find many female feminists anywhere near the front lines.

Are we going to do women's fighting for them, in the conflicts to come? Good question. We always have done, up until now. But, we were blind, and now some of us can see. Capitalism has always placed women front and centre. Males spent money on courtship, and women spent male money on household budgets after courtship. But, capitalism has now seen fit to finance and support women to become open misandrists. It is a role they have embraced with considerable zeal, encouraged to view **Ms Patterning** as their role model. Why should men play along any longer? Rare indeed is the man who would be misogynistic to the extent that many modern women are misandrists. Men are programmed to love women, we won't hate them, no matter *how* much we may come to partially understand them. And, any sort of comprehension is a comparatively recent phenomenon. For it to occur, a man must have the opportunity to be released from the treadmill, now and again. He must be fortunate enough to enjoy a long and healthy life, where he is afforded time to think and contemplate. As Rich Zubaty (138) once said: *'Of course, I don't hate women! I don't hate tigers, either. But, I am exposing myself to great danger if I don't understand their nature.'*

Perhaps women should understand this about male nature – no man's tolerance should extend to being mugged, to his face, before being marched off to war.

Feminism is an empire of hurt feelings, where the weaker sex have effectively utilised the language of pain and the culture of grievance to force their worldview, not only onto men, but the entire human race. Society has made a rod for its own back in institutionalising the

idea that most men are misogynists. Nothing could be further from the truth. But, the social contract we have with women depends upon us being treated with a little respect. If women want to come down from the pedestal we have placed them on, they may find life at ground level to be a little bit harder than they anticipated.

Emboldened by their advances (which powerful men have enabled) do women really believe that they will, one day, simply take over? It may be interesting to examine the fate of other empires. The intersectional politics advocated by Kimberle Crenshaw (131) have been facilitated by unrestricted immigration policies, and may well play their own part in bringing what's left of male deontic civilisation crashing to the ground. However, it's unlikely that Ms Crenshaw or her advocates will pick up the pieces in any effective manner, despite exhortations by a follower called Nadina Ali (139), and her London poster campaign addressed to a specific audience: *'Hey, straight, white men – pass the power! We got this!'* [Her other 'works' include *'Never forget George Floyd'* and *'No-one is free until Palestine is free'*, and her posters were put up by The Artichoke Trust, a taxpayer-funded charity – funded to the tune of £3 million.]

In *'The Master & His Emissary'*, Professor Iain McGilchrist warns of how the effect of unrestrained left-hemisphere thinking was instrumental in bringing down the civilisation of the Roman Empire [M&E, p291]: *'An infinite variety of vigorous natural growth was levelled, and regulated into an unchangeable, firmly crystallised order, where individuals became an immovable part in the cadre of the state.'* This is beginning to resemble intersectional politics, and its immutable hierarchies of oppression.

In fact, **feminism, immigration, multiculturalism, and 'Big Government'** all appear to have played their part in the fall of Rome. In the 3rd Century BCE, a group of women barricaded the Forum, intending to repeal laws which limited women's use of expensive goods. In the year 376, the Empire faced an unusually large influx of Goths, and other non-Roman peoples, fleeing the Huns. Roman forces were unable to exterminate, expel, or subjugate them, as had been normal procedure previously. This led to destructive civil wars, where Goths and non-Romans became a force which could threaten and challenge an Empire which was becoming hamstrung with inefficient bureaucracy. **Rome fell when its men didn't feel it was worth fighting for any longer.** Many men in the west currently experience these feelings, and it probably doesn't work to female benefit. There are no

reports that the Goths and non-Romans decided to abrogate their battle-won power to non-combatant Roman women, allowing them to indulge their love of expensive goods.

'War is an ugly thing,' said John Stuart Mill, 'But, it is not the ugliest of things. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which believes that nothing is worth a war is far worse. A man who has nothing that he is willing to fight for is a miserable creature who has no chance of being free.'

Well, society is at its strongest when men are employed, and have a constructive purpose in living. Ever since human beings evolved, that purpose in life has been in pair bonding with a woman, having a family, and providing for that family. But, female employment is being prioritised at the expense of men. For a male, this breaks even the possibility of heterosexual pair bonding.

Society is also strengthened when female preference for hypergamous temporary monogamy is just as controlled as male hyper-sexuality. Religion was a construct of men, to provide artificial 'moral' guidelines for both sexes. There is no universal human morality. Post 'sexual revolution', female mating strategy has become the societal norm, with devastating effects on the role of fathers in raising their own children.

Such a society is doomed to failure. We can only hope that its survival is not predicated on the utilisation of 'surplus' men (85) in a destructive manner, in a futile attempt to salvage a system which has become terminally diseased.

Chapter 11

The Last Great War

The ten years or so after World War 2 are a unique time in many ways. But they are of particular interest because men used their most advanced, creative technology of the era – cinema – to give an insight into female nature in the raw. Undoubtedly, the output was inspired by male experience during the extended conflict. Many returned, battle-scarred, from situations where they'd faced death daily, only to confront a reality that their wife or significant other hadn't bothered to remain faithful. In such circumstance, one might well be forced to question the wisdom of making the sacrifices for society in the first place.

Barrack room conversations ensured that the word soon spread – this was no isolated occurrence. This is simply what happens when females are left to their own devices and vices. Due to the prevailing wartime conditions, men had been afforded a glimpse into the future – one where all the 'good men' have been taken away to fight a war, leaving women in safe, comfortable conditions, far from any conflict. For this reason, the phenomenon of *film noir* originated in the USA. In Europe, the conflict was closer to hand, the threat more immediate, and females calculated, correctly, that they'd still require male protection. They didn't mind which side, of course. The instances of female collaboration with the enemy are legendary.

When conflict finally ended, a tsunami of male cynicism was inevitable. The output of *film noir* exposes women as devious and manipulative *femme fatales*, using their sexuality to get men to do their bidding, in some fairly noxious enterprises.... often selecting a suitable mark to get rid of a husband who has become inconvenient. Once he's gone, she'll become wealthy and free. She and the patsy will live happily ever after. Of course, she doesn't love the new bloke any more than she loved the old one. She simply uses him to her advantage, gets him to do the wet work, disposes of him by putting him in the frame for the crime, and proceeds in her quest to dominate the world while her superficial beauty prevails. By the time she's hit the wall, she'll have enough money and assets not to worry too much.

In these films, it's always the men who must act as the conscience.... always men who appreciate the enormity of the undertaking. Always Fred McMurray, Alan Ladd or Robert Mitchum who must ask if she's *sure* she wants to follow this course of action. Of

course, she's sure! She's got you safely set up for any consequences, ready to take the rap. This is how females carry out their violence on society, through men, when the techniques of GSRM (18) are insufficient to achieve desired outcomes.

Two observations: First of all, the making of such films would be **impossible** in today's society. Anyone associated with the enterprise would be run out of town by the woke elite, and they'd never work again. The Twitterati mob would be baying for blood on X, screaming '*my soggy kneeeeee!!*' and labelling those involved with every '*phobia*' they can think of. **For, this is the mob mentality. If you don't believe in every aspect of their world view, you must be mentally ill.** Projection at its finest, and doesn't even require a cine projector.

Secondly, I strongly believe that such films offer some support to a theory that **men are the collective conscience of society**. I've already reached a conclusion (Chapter 8) **that women are the weaker sex as part of Nature's plan**. When oestrogen comes on-stream at menarche, driving left-brain hemisphere behaviour, **it actively stops growth of the long bones, and consequently prevents any substantial addition to stature (127)**. Women need to be left-brained, calculating and callous towards males, in order for them to function properly in their role as genetic assassins, mating only with the very best. **But, it wouldn't be of benefit to the human race for that level of left-hemisphere processing to be encased within a stronger, taller, more muscular female frame**. Lacking any effective conscience, such Amazons would have been more than troublesome, to themselves and others. The word 'Amazon', applied to a fabulous race of strong, athletic female warriors in Scythia (modern day Crimea) is derived from the Greek language: '*a*' = not, and '*mazos*' = breast, from the practice of these women to remove the right breast, to facilitate the use of a bow as a weapon.

Same old story, though. The male Scyths were once rulers of the entire region of upper Asia. Off they went, in pursuit of the Cimmerians, overthrowing the Empire of the Medes. But, when they came back to their homes, after a twenty-eight year absence, they found an army waiting for them. For the Scythian women, as time went by and their husbands hadn't returned, had now intermarried with their slaves (141): '*When, therefore, the children sprung from these slaves and the Scythian women grew to manhood, and understood the circumstances of their birth, they resolved to oppose the army which was returning from Media, taking them by surprise in a tract of country previously fortified by the slaves, with a broad dyke all the way from the Tauric mountains to the vast Lake Maeotis.*'

So – the Scythian men couldn't force an entry without huge losses. At last, one of them addressed the remainder: *'What are we doing, Scythians? We are fighting our slaves, diminishing our own number when we fall, and the number of those that belong to us when they fall by our hands. Take my advice – lay spear and bow aside. Let each man fetch his horsewhip, and go boldly up to them. So long as they see us with arms in our hands, they imagine themselves our equal in birth and bravery. But, let them behold us with no other weapon but the whip, and they will know that they are our slaves, and will flee before us.'* The Scythians followed this counsel. The slaves were so astounded that they forgot to fight, and ran away (141).

Maybe, there's a lesson for all men in that tale. In the present day, my own advice is this: *Small, bossy, domineering women became a trope for a reason.* The oestrogen kicked in early. That's why they're so small. They're very left brained, they're ruthless, and they're not very nice human beings. The empowering of the Paula Vennells type, by men, is a mistake. Brook no nonsense from them.

*

For the human race to have survived this far, it has been necessary for the stronger sex to be more right-brained than the weaker sex, and have some sort of conscience, otherwise atrocities and cruelty will abound. The weaker sex are more left-brained, driven to amass resources for themselves and their genetically-assured offspring, but can only do so by using the stronger sex as their tools, entrapping them by seduction. This could be the plot of any *film noir*. It's also a precis of life to the present day. It would remain accurate, all the way to the mid-1950s, a mere seventy years ago, only the span of a single human lifetime.

By 1955, World War 2 was a decade behind us. Hollywood could try to sweep away the *femme fatale* image, attempt to convince a new generation that women were all wholesome, Doris Day types.... before third wave feminism and the birth control pill blew *that* illusion apart. Since then, there has been an inexorable rise in the age at which women become mothers. In the 1960s, any woman in a maternity ward over the age of twenty-five was classed as *elderly*. The Amazons would have been giving birth at the age of thirteen, fourteen. Now, a first-time mother in her late thirties is considered perfectly normal.

It's foolish to imagine that there are no inherent consequences associated with the new trend for late motherhood. The powerful oestrogen of a teenage mother would give rise

to male offspring with a functional right-hemisphere conscience, but who were, nonetheless, very left-brained. As such, when those boys grew to maturity, they'd be more inclined to seek resources, thus increasing their **status**, and their own reproductive potential. It would be far easier for them to attract women. A right-brained male dreamer would have to exhibit advantages such as good looks or obvious intelligence, to keep him in the running. It was my strong suspicion that late mothers of male children are more inclined to give birth to boys who are right-hemisphere dreamers. The raddled old oestrogen of the mothers can't template us for the left-brain characteristics which used to prevail (tempered by some sort of male conscience, which maintained a level of social cohesion, and prevented anarchy). I made initial attempts to rationalise this, a couple of years ago, with only partial success. (47).

We've already seen what can happen when a female brain is accidentally exposed to testosterone *in utero* and becomes male-patterned. The resulting **Ms Patterning**, often with lesbian tendencies, decides to cut out the middle man and goes off seeking resources for herself, *without* using men as a tool. She don't need no man.

There's a corollary to this, of course. What happens when a foetal male brain is accidentally exposed to a surfeit of oestrogen? The male homosexual is notorious for an almost psychopathic, narcissistic self-regard – the same qualities required in females **to maintain and improve the quality of the human race**. But, in a male, these qualities can only be destructive. There has long been a stereotype associating homosexuality with **militarism** especially after the Eulenburg affair (142) in Imperial Germany of 1907 – 1909. Historians have linked the aftermath of this affair to changes in German foreign policy which raised its military aggressiveness, contributing to World War 1.

As the Nazis rose to power, post WW1, Hitler made great use of the militaristic, homosexual Ernst Rohm as leader of the Stormtroopers, a terror force against civilian political enemies. Prior to the outbreak of WW2, British diplomat Richard Smallbones wrote, in 1938: '*The explanation for the present outbreak of sadistic cruelty may be that sexual perversions, in particular homosexuality, are very prevalent in Germany.*' The sexuality of Nazi leaders, including Rudolph Hess, Baldur von Schirach, and Hitler himself, was often questioned. '*At the heart of Nazi militant nationalist politics lay sinister schemes of decadent homosexual criminals.*' (143)

Writing immediately after World War 2, in 1945, Samuel Igra published a book (144), in which he claimed: '*There is a causal connection between mass sexual perversion and*

German war crimes, during both world wars. I think it is reasonable to hold that the psychological forces which let loose the sadistic orgies of the concentration camps, the mass murders in Germany, and the subsequent atrocities in the occupied countries may be attributed mainly to one source – and that source is the moral perversion which was rampant amongst the Nazi leaders, and which had its typical embodiment in Hitler himself.'

There seems little doubt that the Nazis recruited boys and young men into a sports and physical culture which was rife with homoeroticism, and channelled into brutal, militaristic, ideological fixations with powerful leadership figures. In the Soviet Union, Maxim Gorky pronounced that: *'Eradicate homosexuals, and fascism will disappear.'* Later analyses hold the tenet that homosexuality was a central element of the fascist system (145), that the Nazi elite was rampant with homosexuality, that Hitler was a homosexual prior to his rise to power, and intentionally surrounded himself with homosexuals throughout his entire adult life. Homosexuals made more rapid advance in the party ranks, and, like Ernst Rohm, were allocated responsibility for the actual implementation of many Nazi atrocities. Hitler knew he could rely on them to get the job done, without attacks of conscience.

The problems arise when science believes itself sufficiently advanced that it can prevent societal problems by 'curing' deviance. The 1970s work of Gunter Darner (146) held to a belief that 'sexual deviations' could be 'widely prevented' by intervention – through the correction of abnormal hormone concentrations in prenatal, or early postnatal life. This soon extended to a doctrine that criminal, sexual, and even morally neutral behaviours, such as dyslexia and stuttering, were overwhelmingly a matter of defects in the male brain, and with a convenient explanation: *'This probably occurs because the natural variation of the brain is female. It requires the active intervention of androgens to rewire it into male circuitry, and such conversion and restructuring introduces scope for error'* (146).

In attempting initial survey of the area, a couple of years ago (47), it was impossible not to be sceptical about Simon Baron-Cohen's explanation of autism as a manifestation of an extreme male brain (147). In this approach, there is an inherent denial that females can suffer autism, which we now know to be profoundly untrue. And, if we're going to start 'curing' pathologies with sex hormones, we'd better be absolutely certain that the biological pathways are unambiguous, **and we know which hormones are involved.**

Chapter 12

Losing Faith in Science & Progress

Think-tanks of the *Project 2030* variety, so beloved of the WEF and their ilk, can all too easily get out of control in their zealous mission to make the world a better place. We've already seen (Chapter 9) that they can't even get the functions of the right- and left-brain hemispheres correct, and compound their mistakes by ascribing some erroneous sexual labelling to these hemispheres. So, in the hands of *Project 2030*, and other dogma-driven devotees, the following passage (148), first written in 1989, (but reprinted in 2015) would be a disaster: *'If we want to eliminate sex differences, we must use the means which created these differences in the first place – we must change the biological cocktail of creation. We have, as they say, the technology. We will introduce selected sperm to suitable ova in clinically sterile surroundings. **Having decided what the societal norm should be (men less aggressive, or women more so; women less responsive to the demands of parenthood, or men more so), we can sluice the developing foetal mind with the relevant synthetic chemical hormones.** We can also decide the appropriate model for society's sexuality, and we may choose whether or not to allow homosexuality to exist. We can potentially eliminate the most extreme sexual perversions, and we can chemically tweak the male and female hypothalamus to produce a greater correspondence of libido.'*

Oh, this sort of situation is so beloved of those who are driven by the prospect of **power** and **control** – that is, those who are already left-brained. They see nothing inherently **wrong** in their interference with nature – turning children, designed by nature to be the products of love, into nothing more than the output of an impersonal assembly line, units which can be 'tweaked' according to the requirements of those in charge of production. It's a situation presaged, a century ago, by Aldous Huxley in his book *'Brave New World'* where the techniques of the Ford assembly line were applied to the human race. A range of intelligence, from *alpha-* to *epsilon-* was assured by the levels of foetal dosing with alcohol. If society required more people to sweep the streets, no problem – just up the dose. And, of course, if the pre-existing *alphas* felt their position coming under threat from the rising generations, there was an easy way of minimising the menace. Huxley also predicted the impersonal characteristics **and female promiscuity** of a society where religion had folded – efficiency and imposed stratification are all-important, and everyone worships the mass-

production techniques which have made this possible. Henry Ford is revered as the creator of society, and the World State numbers years of its calendar in the 'AF' era – 'Anno Ford' – with AF1 being equivalent in Gregorian years to AD1908, the year in which the first Ford Model T rolled off the production line. The **World State**, split into ten zones, is run in western Europe by 'His Fordship' **Mustapha Mond**, who argues that *art, literature and scientific freedom must be sacrificed to secure the ultimate utilitarian goal of maximising social happiness*. I'm guessing that Klaus Schwab of the WEF has read this book.

Huxley had given a brief pre-figuring of *Brave New World* in a prior book, *Crome Yellow*, written in 1921, where he described a future 'impersonal generation' that will: *'Take the place of Nature's hideous system. In vast state incubators, rows upon rows of gravid bottles will supply the world with the population it requires. The family system will disappear; society, sapped at its very base, will have to find new foundations; and Eros, beautifully and irresponsibly free, will flit like a gay butterfly from flower to flower through a sunlit world.'* Yes, this is beginning to look like post sexual revolution feminist doctrine. It's interesting that Government policy in *'Brave New World'* **requires that 70% of the female population be comprised of Freemartins – women who have deliberately been made sterile by exposure to male hormones during foetal development**, but are still physically normal except for 'the slightest tendency to grow beards.' Too many children are never seen as a good thing by those perfect pianists who compose new tunes for society and see themselves as utopianists. They tend to follow a Malthusian score.

There's something that may be interesting, though, about the climactic ending of *'Brave New World'*. Here, masculinity, frustrated by the sexually promiscuous behaviour of femininity in the new, 'liberated' society, takes a whip to her, rather in the manner of the Scythians (141). Is it a metaphor that 'civilised' men need to assert themselves against the tendency of 'emancipated' women to try to walk all over them (52), (53)? Monogamy is a compromise which both sexes make for the sake of optimum childrearing within a civil society. It doesn't play to male nature any more than female nature. That nature was templated long before 'civilisation' became a concern.

The dystopian worlds of George Orwell's *'1984'* (written in 1948), and Huxley's *'Brave New World'* (written in 1931) have been contrasted (149) by Neil Postman in his book *'Amusing Ourselves to Death'*. In it, he writes: *'Orwell feared those who would deprive us of information. Huxley feared those who would give us so much that we'd be reduced to*

passivity and egoism. Orwell feared that the truth would be concealed from us. Huxley feared that the truth would be drowned in a sea of irrelevance. Orwell feared that we'd become a captive culture. Huxley feared that we'd become a trivial culture, preoccupied with some equivalent of the feelies.'

Why should we have to choose between dystopias, though? The power-hungry elites have learned from both texts, and have come up with a hybrid model. Orwell shows a regime which will **go to any lengths to own and possess history, rewriting and reconstructing it to its own ends** (Women are oppressed, and it's all because of Patriarchy. Climate change has stolen Greta's future. These are left-hemisphere traits. *'The left-brain hemisphere will insist on following its own theory. Even when obviously wrong, it will maintain, emphatically, that it is correct. [M&E, p81]*). Huxley, meanwhile, foresees a world where we can be happy with our lot if we simply turn a blind eye to how the elites are manipulating us, swallow the *soma*, go to the *feelies* and take part in the *orgy porgy*. There's an overburdening of entertainment and information, (including scientific information), and most of it is completely without value. These, too, are characteristics of left-hemisphere interests. *'The left hemisphere requires novelty, excitement and stimulation [M&E, p199]*. No matter what totalitarian state will control us, it'll be run along left-hemisphere lines.

That's about where we are. Maybe a hop, skip and jump away from where we can *'own nothing and be happy'*, once the avowed aim of Klaus Schwab for 2030. Yes, for us. Not for him, obviously.

In Chapter 9, we saw that Corrinne Hutt had demonstrated how androgen intervention by testosterone was essential in diverting the default female brain into a brain patterned for male behaviours (127). This work was known in 1972, and was not well-received in academia. It is anathema to the feminist fairy-tale idea that men and women are interchangeable entities, and that we can all be whoever and whatever we decide to be, the old female desire for unlimited choice with no responsibilities. All the responsibility for failure is passed to the oppressor class (men), who have been preventing women from fulfilling their potential. In the feminist dogma, there can be no such thing as 'biological determinism'.

The frustration of a few, more-enlightened academics of the day was obvious: *'Fear of feminist backlash has been the main obstacle to an honest discussion of differences*

between the sexes. Feminists have written books denouncing “biological determinism”, without bothering to understand either biology or determinism.’ (91).

Yet, strangely, all the feminist qualms over biological determinism suddenly evaporate when it can be used to ‘explain’ criminal behaviours, sexual perversions, mental illnesses such as schizophrenia, mental conditions such as autism which prevent a proper response to the environment, or even stuttering and dyslexia... all of which have been proposed to be caused by androgen interventions on the, otherwise perfect, default female brain. How convenient! Governments in the US and Europe have provided funding for research which, implicitly or explicitly, examines male and female brain differences in order to assess pathologies in behaviour (150), including socialisation, substance abuse, neurodegenerative disease (Alzheimer’s, Parkinson’s, ALS, Huntington’s), neurological disorders such as ADHD, stuttering, dyslexia, and mental health conditions such as autism, autism spectrum disorder, and schizophrenia. One of the authors of this paper has recently published a further paper, entitled *‘Sex Differences in the Developing Brain as a Source of Inherent Risk’* (151), stating that: *‘For reasons that remain mysterious, the control of both synaptic inhibition and potentiation, via gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA) and glutamate respectively, is achieved through distinct cellular signalling pathways in the hippocampus of male and female rodents.’* Well, it’s reasonable to assume that excitatory and inhibitory transmitters are used to give the ‘gender mosaic’ we observe in the brains of men and women, when neurological activity is measured as they go about their business. I’ve long had a theory that the oestrogen released on female puberty causes mid-brain release of inhibitory GABA, rendering many right-brain resources inaccessible (34), (47). Female-typical behaviour occurs as a result. The female right brain may be lighting up like a Christmas tree, but, if the neurotransmitters which are released are inhibitory, left brain behaviours will prevail.

Beware of the treatments for ‘pathologies in behaviour’, if the causes have not been properly established. In Chapter 9, we saw that **oestrogen is much more thermodynamically stable than testosterone**, which can be easily converted to oestrogen by the enzymes *demethylase* and *aromatase*....

Back in 1995, some supremely important work on the **action of gonadal steroids on the asymmetry of the developing foetal cerebral cortex** was reported by David Warren Lewis and Marian Cleeves Diamond (9). They found that several behaviours observed in rats,

including **male-typical sexual behaviours**, some forms of **aggression**, and **spatial awareness**, including maze-learning skills, appeared to be dependent on the presence of **OESTROGEN** in the male brain, during critical periods of late gestation and early postnatal life. **They asked if testosterone acted on the developing cerebral cortex primarily by conversion to oestrogen, and subsequent reaction with oestrogen receptors?** Such a model would predict high *aromatase* activity in the cerebral cortex, during the appropriate development period.

It has taken thirty years for confirmatory evidence to be accumulated, mainly due to the current interest in *trans*-conversion ‘therapies’. A recent paper (152), entitled ‘**Role of Hormones in the Transgender Brain**’ states this: *‘Research has the potential to inform our understanding of the developmental origins of gender identity, and sex differences, in response to gonadal steroid manipulations. **The presence of the androgen testosterone, and its AROMATISATION to OESTRADIOL in utero causes the foetal brain of the male to organise in such a manner as results in a more masculine phenotype, across the lifespan. By contrast, the absence of androgen production by the female foetus, and the oestrogen-binding of alpha-fetoprotein in the female foetus leads to a more feminine brain phenotype.***

So- testosterone is converted to oestrogen, which is the actual AGENT of masculinity induction in the male foetus. The female foetus, lacking testes, cannot produce testosterone, therefore its own oestrogen cannot arise as an end-product. Any extraneous oestrogen is mopped up by *alpha*-fetoprotein, allowing the female foetal brain to develop unmolested by any sex steroid, unless swamped by the corticosteroids of congenital adrenal hyperplasia (Chapter 1), oxidised to oestrogen, leading to **Ms Patterning**. Oh boy! How far off the mark are the interventions and ‘treatments’ of the past half-century likely to be...? The smug statements we saw at the beginning of Chapter 12 don’t look quite so clever now, do they?

*

As well as the ‘biological determinists’ getting it all wrong as to the actual chemical agents of biological determinism, there’s also the assault on scientific truth executed by those at the far end of the attempted reality spectrum, those who are keen to ‘prove’ that there are no brain differences between men and women (14), (15), (16) and, if they’re forced to accept any dimorphism, then society (aka Patriarchy) is to blame. In recent years, as part of their drive towards ‘empowering’ women (71), (72), the United Nations has been quite keen

to support ‘research’ which would enable such ‘conclusions’. Recently, the strategy seems to be a use of AI to crunch the data, as in this recent paper (153), entitled ‘How Machine Learning Serves and Transforms Biological Explanations of Human Difference’, with the following precis.

*‘In neuroscience, the adoption of machine learning changed how scientists think about measurement and modelling of group difference. This reinvigorated the “sex difference” movement by offering a “truly categorical” quantitative methodology which aligned more closely with an understanding of male and female brains and bodies as categorically distinct. But, J W Lockhart calls for increased sociological attention to the inner workings of these technologies which are typically “black boxed”, in light of the potential consequences for the social world – **conception of human groups beyond sex, including race, sexuality, criminality and political position.**’*

From the quotation marks used in “sex difference” and “truly categorical”, I’m guessing that J W Lockhart doesn’t really believe in either. However, I’d have to agree that we all need to know the inner workings of these “black boxes”, otherwise they can, all too easily, become a tool to demonstrate that (for example) all white males aged 33 go through a phase of criminality, political extremism and sexual perversion, and should therefore be locked up for their own good, and the greater good. Obviously, equally ludicrous (yet inherently dangerous) scenarios are available. And we all know how much the left-brain hemisphere is a devotee of theory, and quite content to obey orders (aka what it says on a piece of paper given to it by Authority). **But, realistically, how many of us will be familiar with the workings of the “black boxes”, even after they’ve been explained?** Personally, I have no idea how even a personal computer works, the one which I’m presently typing on.

There could even be a battle royal brewing between the AI devotees. Exactly one year after the publication of Lockhart’s paper, there has been a publication from Vinod Menon of Stanford University (154), where **AI has indicated that male and female brains work differently**. Here, the model was shown MRI scans of working brains, and told whether the brains belonged to a man or a woman. Over time, the AI began to discern subtle differences between the sexes, previously missed by human analysis. After viewing around 1,500 brain scans, the model was over 90% correct in identifying if the subject was male or female. The paper gained an article on the front page of the *Daily Telegraph* (155). In striving for a balanced article, the *Telegraph* Science Editor, Sarah Knapton, saw it necessary to solicit a

counterpoint view from Gina Ripon (16), wheeled out to take her usual stance in denying any differences in male and female brains. Ms Knapton also proceeded to mistakenly assign Vinod Menon as female, telling us all about ‘her’ research, and all the work ‘she’d’ done. Otherwise, I guess, it wouldn’t fit the narrative that today’s science is done by females, don’t you know?

*

This is a major problem in the modern world. It’s beginning to resemble Huxley’s *‘Brave New World’* where we are assailed by information in quantities so vast that it’s impossible to sort the wheat from the chaff, there simply aren’t enough hours in a human lifetime. And, there’s a lot of chaff around. The corruption of academia by feminists interested only in ‘The Theory’, and unfamiliar with the concept of **truth** has become a recognised problem (156). As a result, science is being destroyed. And, J W Lockhart (153) makes a perfectly valid point. How are we to check the validity of conclusions reached by the ‘black box’ of AI? Even as I write, there’s a relevant article on today’s BBC news: **‘Google is racing to fix its new AI-powered tool for creating pictures, after claims it was over-correcting against the risk of being racist’** (157). Apparently, prompts to seek images of America’s founding fathers turned up women and people of colour. The Gemini bot has been supplying images indicating a variety of genders and ethnicities, even when doing so was historically inaccurate. Results on ‘Vikings’ were similarly wide of the mark, drawing criticism that **the AI has been ‘trained’ to be laughably woke**. *‘It’s embarrassingly hard to get Google Gemini to acknowledge that white people exist,’* wrote computer scientist Debarghya Das (157).

That’s all you have to do now – train an AI model for the sort of ‘reality’ you want. Print out the results, and wave that sheaf of paper. This is now ‘the truth’. And, who will be able to check those results, testing them against objective reality, seeking reconciliation?

Back in 2020, I found myself irritated by the ill-considered opinion of Ann Francke, **Chief Executive of the Chartered Management Institute**, that men should be prevented from talking about sport in the workplace, lest this should lead to women feeling uncomfortable, as they can’t join in (67) [*very much an assumption on the part of Ms Francke, especially in these days of women’s soccer*]. In the same article, she went on to make an even more ridiculous assertion – that a clampdown on men talking about sport

would prevent them progressing to talking about their weekend conquests. In fact, just shutting them up completely would thus avoid the possibility of further female discomfiture.

Although already convinced that Ms Francke is an idiot, and someone who should not be in a position of power where she can influence male employment and promotion prospects, I determined to discover a little more about her before reaching a final decision. To this end, I had a look at her book, '*Create a Gender-Balanced Workplace*'. What a revelation! What a roadmap to an ideal world! The first paragraph of the blurb (158) tells you all you need to know. '*Gender balance is first and foremost a business issue. McKinsey estimates that we could add 28 trillion to global GDP if we achieved gender equality everywhere – that's more than the GDP of the USA and China combined. But, it's so much more than that. Gender balance is one of the levers we can pull to build better managers and leaders at every level, improve team performance, and create better cultures where everyone can thrive...*'

Sounds great!! Twenty-eight trillion, conjured up from nowhere, just by achieving 'gender balance'. There are a couple of points which require clarification, though. The currency of the 28 trillion is never stipulated. And, it's impossible to pin down where and when McKinsey made this assertion. This is *modus operandi*#1 of feminist propaganda, for propaganda it is. Make a statement of which suits your aims, no matter how outrageous. The more obscure the origin, the better. Repeat it a few times. Have your feminist friends reference it in their own work. Before too long, it becomes 'fact', and has self-perpetuated throughout the literature like some selfish gene. Whereas, science, even social science, from an era where science was not infected by feminism, would demand that such assertions be proven by checkable, **objective** facts. And, regarding the outcomes which Ms Francke regards as inevitable, the '*better managers and leaders*' are likely to suffer from an inability to deal with elevated stress levels (12), and '*improve team performance*' flies in the face of the objective facts which we do know (118), (119), (120). I do hope that '*creating better cultures where everyone can thrive*' doesn't end in 'cruel and incompetent regimes' of female managers (128), where 236 innocent people are jailed, so that the cruel incompetents can deny systemic failures and retain their multi-million bonuses, where the currency can be confirmed as £, the GB pound sterling.

In Chapter 9, we touched on the subject of '**Gender Lens Investments**', and the convenient linking of these to '**Climate Smart Investments**' (124). Let's see if we can

scratch the surface of what's going on in these investment vehicles, filled with shiny, happy people making the world a better place. Here's a precis about Gender Lens Investments from the **GIIN – the Global Impact Investing Network (159)**: *The Gender Lens Investment Initiative is part of the Global Impact Investing Network. It is a strategy or approach to investing that takes into consideration gender-based factors across the investment process, to advance gender equality, and better inform investment decisions. The GIIN continues to do extensive work geared towards supporting investors to implement a gender lens investing.'*

Any the wiser..? Maybe they'll come clean in a later section, entitled **Why Is Gender Lens Investing Important?** *'At its core, gender lens investing seeks to close what is commonly referred to as the "gender gap". As defined by the **World Economic Forum**, "the gender gap is the difference between men and women as reflected in social, political, intellectual, cultural or economic attainments and attitudes." The lack of gender equity has been a systemic issue in the business and investment community throughout its existence, but, for some time now, there is growing evidence that pursuing gender equity as an investor will have positive benefits for the investment, business and society. **Empowering women globally creates a VIRTUOUS CIRCLE.** Globally, the purchasing power of women is growing, and companies and investors are taking note of the opportunity in accessing this capital. **Entrepreneurs who can effectively demonstrate their ability to empower women will have greater success accessing these capital sources than those who cannot.'***

After going round and round in circles for quite a bit longer, the take-home message seems to be that the GIIN want you to invest in women-owned or women-led enterprises, and thereby hoping that women, with their increasing purchasing power, will choose products made by enterprises where women appear to be at the helm. This is mere extrapolation of a female personality trait which has been known for two decades (4).

Now – let's say you were a big investor, who can see that the days of oil are limited. You'd like to put your money into a 'green' investment where results should be virtually guaranteed, since Governments have been influenced into legislating against the opposition, so as to save the world from 'climate change'. What better way to ensure success than to make your product particularly attractive to women, the consumers of the future (just as they were in the past), by having women on the Board of Directors, women on the Development Teams, women doing the Marketing, appealing to the safety of the planet, home to children of the future? Yes – that should work. And, just to make sure that it does, the WEF will

facilitate investment in enterprises which tick the right boxes, and will penalise those who continue to employ these pesky men at the top, **by ensuring that they are marked out by having ‘awful’ ESG and DEI scores.**

An organisation known as 2xGlobal (**160**) certainly got the message about the purchasing and investment power of women. *‘Women now control nearly 60% of the wealth in the United States, and continue to control more assets globally: **from \$34 trillion in 2010 to \$72 trillion in 2020.** This will rise at a **compound annual growth rate of 5.7%** to \$97 trillion by 2024, outpacing the growth of men’s wealth.’*

So – what happened to the feminist goal of ‘equality’? Are we nearly there yet..? It seems that all these messages of women powering ahead are being hushed up, so as not to upset the advantages gained by claiming ‘victimhood’ status. And, yes, it isn’t really difficult to predict that women will continue to control more assets. They are the beneficiaries of divorce law, allowed to pillage assets which men spent a lifetime of creativity in building. Meanwhile EEO and AA legislation works in female favour, while ESG and DEI scores consign men to the Company side-lines. This is all short-term, though. Eventually, after artificial ‘encouragement’ to become the dominant sex in the workplace, women must rely on their own drive, initiative and creativity. There are many factors which mitigate against *that* ever becoming a reality (**26**), (**57**), (**58**). Are the elites aware of these contra-indications, or do many of them blindly and blithely swallow and follow the song-sheet of the *Project 2030* brigade, unaware of just how far off the mark it is?

The literature of the ‘Gender Lens Investors’ seems to indicate that there’s at least some knowledge of a semi-coherent wet dream of the elitists, and that it has at least some overlap with the feminist wet dreams of the Mary Daly variety, largely based on the **ecofeminism** of her book *‘Gyn/Ecology’*, where we must respect the planet, and reduce the population – **particularly the male population, which must be reduced to no more than 10% overall.** With every tick of the clock, we head closer to the inevitable confrontations over what remains of fossil fuel, and the flash points over control of the raw materials required for the ‘green’ technologies. It’s **men** who will have to do the fighting. Meanwhile, at the very top of the 2xGlobal website, there’s an application form: **Call for Proposals – imagining outcomes for women-led clean energy enterprises through applied research – APPLY HERE.**

Here is the answer to 2xGlobal's own rhetorical question '**What is Gender Lens Investing?**' *'Gender Lens Investing has been around for over a decade. We coined the term "gender-smart" to reflect the larger ethos of those who understand that gender is material to financial, business, and social outcomes. Gender-smart investors recognise that financial systems engage with and benefit men and women differently, **and particularly women of colour**, and are actively **committed to using finance as a tool to promote gender equality**. This integration of an **intersectional diversity lens** is a more recent evolution of the field, promoted by the **JEDI community of practice**. JEDI investing is in large part about who is investing, what results occur, how investment terms are structured, and how those decisions are made. It covers gender, racial and ethnic diversity at the ownership level, governance, leadership, decision-making, employment, value chains, and products, services and customers. It is also about power dynamics and engagement. JEDI can also mean different things depending on the country or region. In Australia, for example, it refers to indigenous Aboriginals; in Africa, it could be a marginalised ethnic group; in Europe, it could be refugees. In the Global North, high impact strategies may include enhancing racial diversity at the investment team or fund manager level, while the Global South perspective often focuses on expat versus local founders.'*

Now, the message seems to be that Gender Lens Investing should be particularly tailored to **women of colour**. In fact, somehow, GLI already seems a little 'old hat' and the Intersectional Diversity Lens is much more cool and exciting, particularly when seen from the JEDI perspective. Someone has watched too much Star Wars. Make no mistake, this stuff is coming your way with the next Labour Government (**94**), (**161**). In the Global North region of Little Britain, once known as GB, it's doubtful if the indigenous white male working class is an intended beneficiary of taxpayer-funded Government largesse to women and 'minorities' in tendering for big Government projects, particularly if these can be greenwashed in some way.

Intersectionality, that gift of Kimberle Crenshaw (**131**) is being used to divide and conquer men, while relentlessly pushing a 'green' agenda, which increasingly bears little resemblance to reality (**45**). The debasement of scientific literature by 'researchers' who are in the pocket of their paymasters – this is not a new phenomenon. Half a century ago, the puppet scientists were well known, and their output, in marginal, notorious journals, could be safely ignored. When I attended University, the GB University system was predicated on Oxford, Cambridge, and four ancient Scottish Universities, all of which were used as a sort of

finishing school for the elites (162). MI5 and MI6 openly recruited in the department where I studied. As a working class male, I was indeed fortunate to be afforded the opportunity to break through *those* barriers, riding the early 1970s wave of egalitarianism spawned by the 1960s, and was one of only 217,000 tertiary education students, distributed across only eighteen further Universities in the entire UK, filled to the brim with predominately middle-class and upper middle-class types.

That's all changed, of course. Whereas only 8% of the potential student population attended University in 1973, **that figure exceeded 50% in the 2017-18 academic year, with females, at 57%, vastly outnumbering males (163)**. The number of Universities has exploded to 166. There has been a mushrooming of 'academic' output, and, like most mushrooms, it grows on bullshit. Spotting the fraudulent output in a tsunami of dubious 'research' becomes increasingly difficult by the day (164): *'There's a veritable truckload of bullshit in science. When I say bullshit, I mean arguments, data, publications, or even the official policies of scientific organisations that give every impression of being perfectly reasonable – of being well-supported by the highest quality of evidence and so forth – but which doesn't hold up when you scrutinise the details. Bullshit has the veneer of truth-like plausibility. It looks good. It sounds right. But, when you get right down to it, it stinks.'*

Scientific papers have become, overwhelmingly, little more than advocacy for 'The Narrative'. The proponents of this type of 'science' see nothing inherently wrong in using biased sampling techniques, or cherry-picking evidence. I'm sorry to say that the fair sex seem to have particular preference for bias and cherry-picking, rather than endure a more painful search for objective truth – I was aghast at witnessing some behaviour on jury service (45). I was, later, aghast on witnessing a female willingness to demonstrate bias and cherry-picking in the scientific environment of the late 1990s and early 2000s (61). The origin of such behaviour has troubled me for decades, and a female preference for left-brain processing certainly offers a viable explanation. With tertiary education comprising a 57% female population, where does it leave the prospects for objective truth? And fair jurisprudence, come to that.

In July 2023, Italian MP Angelo Bonelli tabled a bill which would **criminalise dissent against climate orthodoxy**. The groundwork, calling for 'climate criminals' to be punished, has been around for more than a decade (165). Meanwhile, the IPCC rewrites climate history by erasing the existence of the **Holocene Thermal Maximum**, a warm period

which occurred between 10,000 and 6,000 years ago, by embracing a new, modified ‘hockey stick graph’. The Medieval Warm Period (circa 950 – 1250) and the Little Ice Age (circa 1300 – 1850) are also glossed over. The latter was caused by volcanic activity, changes to ocean currents, variations in the Earth’s orbit, and axial tilting. But, now, all ‘climate change’ is blamed on poor old carbon dioxide, because that’s the best way to sell you an electric car and a domestic heat pump, preventing you from pining for the oil which has propped up our population explosion of the past 120 years. That growth has occurred *despite* our best attempts to keep the numbers down in two World Wars. Therefore, for the next one to be *effective*, it’ll have to be pretty drastic.

*

It’s worth looking again at that statement from 2xglobal (**160**): *‘Women now control nearly 60% of the wealth in the United States, and continue to control more assets globally: from \$34 trillion in 2010 to \$72 trillion in 2020. This will rise at a compound annual growth rate of 5.7% to \$97 trillion by 2024, outpacing the growth of men’s wealth.’*

The elites know where this is heading. Of course they do, they’ve despoiled men’s position in society, and brought about the disenfranchisement, disempowerment and asset-stripping of men, through tentacles exerted in international politics, legislation, finance and media. They couldn’t do it by themselves, of course. Feminism has been front and centre in their policies, and a front to their real aims. And men, those frogs in the vat of still comfortably warm water, haven’t noticed the raising of the temperature by increments.

Feminism, presently, is smugly replete with its own self-satisfaction. The sisterhood believe that they are achieving great progress, all by themselves. **Ms Patterning** has successfully made other sisters afraid of ‘The Patriarchy’, a Wonderful Wizard of Oz manipulated by **Ms Patterning** as the wicked witch behind the curtain. But this stage and its curtain is only a front for a second, larger stage, behind which the elites manipulate and operate **Ms Patterning** as a poor, deluded puppet, who serves their present aims. Hitler used the dubious storm-troopers of the homosexual Ernst Rohm until he, and they, became politically inconvenient. After the step change event which will fatally weaken masculinity, those elites will have little time for the lesbian freemartins, other than as a particularly left-brained police force, a role which will suit them very well. By then, the elites, looking forward to a good old ‘orgy-porgy’ of the ‘*Brave New World*’ model will have made off with our money, and the most attractive of our heterosexual women, who will come flocking to the

rewards of the polygyny threshold (166). This model shows how females can gain a higher level of biological fitness in their offspring by mating with a male who already has a mate. The female makes this choice because of the status and wealth of the chosen male. His vastly better territory and food supply are seen as evidence of his superior genetics over other males, and she has no problem in mating with him, even though he is supporting other females on his territory. Of course, the junk science is already telling us not to worry (167).

*

A civilisation can survive only if its members believe in the basic values which underpin it. The assisted ascendancy of **Ms Patterning** and her feminist cohorts into academia, politics, jurisprudence and media has been severely detrimental to male interests over the past sixty years. In fact, the situation has become incompatible with the welfare of men, who remain necessary for society to function. Our present society has gone beyond mere mocking of masculinity's values and terminal weakening of male roles. Attacks on free speech and scientific enquiry are driving out the Enlightenment principles which placed western civilisation on the ascendant. We are now in steep decline, and the new Dark Ages wait in the wings. Can we, as men, do anything much to avoid whatever fate has been planned for us by feminism and the elites? Well, there may be a few opportunities to hoist feminism on its own petard of blinkered intolerance. The laws it has seen fit to pass may also be brought to bear on its own head.

Within a pedantic, 'groupthink' monoculture, there is no room for deviation from the narrative. Even slightly different viewpoints will be mistrusted, and will require 'punishment'. Any sects which arise must be quickly destroyed, or their views might 'infect' the rest of the tribe. This can be seen by the torrents of GSRM abuse (18) known to erupt on social media when feminists stray one iota from the proscribed path of self-righteousness. There can be no infringements of the groupthink, at penalty of displays of hatred. But, the current feminist predilection for the politics of intersectionality lays the seeds of its own downfall. There are, simply, too many viewpoints for a monoculture to tolerate. The sects become increasingly intolerant of one another, until the *most intolerant* prevails. Then, they will turn upon *themselves*, as the boundaries of conformity become increasingly rigid and dissent is eliminated. Mathematical modelling demonstrates that identity politics always ends in catastrophic self-destruction (168).

Under intersectionality (169), religious, racial and sexual orientation minorities are seen as valuable allies to feminism in its endless battles against Patriarchy. But, what happens when schisms appear between these allies? This occurred when Muslim parents voiced their disapproval of western RSE, the Religious & Sex Education programme where Primary school kids are lectured by drag queens, telling them that there are 73 genders. Beginning in Birmingham, Muslim parents began to demand that schools should cease their LGBTQ-inclusive RSE. This received response (170) from the *Guardian*, despairingly headlined: **Muslim and LGBTQ Groups Should Stand Together, Not Fight One Another**. However, similar protests against age-inappropriate sex education on behaviours seen as deviant by specific religions continue to the present day (171).

It's tragically amusing to watch the puzzlement of feminists under such circumstances, unsure of who to support, and knowing that they risk the wrath of the mob should they choose the wrong side. So – usually, their silence is deafening. This has *not* been the case with legislation which makes it easier to change the sex recorded on a UK birth certificate. **Gender-critical feminism, also known as trans-exclusionary radical feminism, or TERF-ism has been around since at least 1973. The ideology opposes the concept of gender identity and transgender rights, particularly in regard to gender self-identification** (172). Proponents, who tend to be quite vocal, believe that biological sex is immutable, and that the acceptance of trans-women into spaces reserved for biological women is a clear and present danger to the latter. And, into this minefield has wandered the current Scottish Government, not especially noted for its competence.

Under a guise that: *'To comply with international human rights law, Scotland must have a system for obtaining legal gender recognition'* (173), Scotland has ill-advisedly pressed ahead with legislation making it easier for citizens to self-identify as the gender of their choice. The tiny minority of people for whom this is an issue (less than 1% of the population) believe that the Scottish Government are fighting for the rights of the oppressed. In reality, this group is merely being used as a tool to provoke a fight with the Westminster Government. The SNP knew that this legislation would be a step too far, and would be blocked by London – thereby provoking a 'constitutional crisis' on the role of the devolved Scottish Parliament. This is, indeed, what happened, but Nicola Sturgeon, First Minister of Scotland at the time, couldn't capitalise on the anticipated fallout, as there was too much flak of an unanticipated nature.

In January 2023, just days after the Scottish legislation was passed, **Isla Bryson**, a 31 year old transgender ‘woman’ was convicted of the rapes of two women (174). These offences had occurred in 2016 and 2019, and the accused, previously known as Adam Graham, had decided to transition to a woman before his case came to trial. Sentenced to eight years, ‘Isla Bryson’ was initially housed in a women’s prison, prompting an urgent review of guidelines. Concurrently, the Sturgeon administration was rapidly disintegrating under the weight of secrecy, maladministration, and accusations of corruption of funds by Ms Sturgeon’s husband, CEO of the SNP. There has been speculation as to whether or not this marriage is one of convenience (175) Ms Sturgeon announced her intention to resign on 15th February 2023, and formally tendered her resignation as First Minister on 28th March 2023 (176). Sturgeon would later say that internet speculation about her love life, her sexuality, and her property portfolio were factors which contributed to her standing down (175).

Meanwhile, the row about trans-gender recognition rumbled on, especially after the case of Andrew Miller, a butcher from Melrose. While dressed as a woman, and calling himself Amy George (177), this person abducted a primary schoolgirl, subjecting her to prolonged and serious sexual assault. The new First Minister of Scotland, Humza Yousaf, refused to confirm whether Miller would serve sentence in a male prison. Mr Yousaf has a history of attempting to distance himself from ‘progressive’ legislation, if this is likely to conflict with Muslim support. Previously, he had succeeded in absenting himself from key votes on gay marriage, the Marriage and Civil Partnership (Scotland) Act, 2014, claiming ‘urgent business’ elsewhere (178).

The so-called ‘trans-debate’ is very divisive to the united front of feminism. The party line to be followed is that trans-women **are** women. The **United Nations supports trans-rights** as part of its *‘free and equal’* initiative, where ‘protected identities’ now extend to LGBTQQIP2SA.... that is, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Questioning, Intersex, Pansexual, Two-Spirited and Asexual. The National Women’s Law Centre calls on women not to be TERFs (179), but the message seems to be getting lost. There were many angry demonstrations by women outside Holyrood as the Gender Reform Act (Scotland) passed through Parliament, proclaiming that *‘Women Won’t Wheesht’*.

Where does it all end? In legitimising identity subgroups and their policy agendas, feminism has played a huge role in the development of **special interest groups** from the latter part of the 20th Century onwards. But, it has all got a little bit out of hand, and the

resultant hyperplurality has only served to *weaken* and *divide* the ability of feminism to unite women in a common cause.

The UN definition of ‘equality’ is an interesting one. **Member states recognise that all persons are equal before and under the law, and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal benefit and equal protection of the law.**

This doesn’t appear to apply to men. Egregious legal discrimination against men remains near universal, and has been amply documented in an outstanding book (70). There doesn’t seem to be any concerted effort on the part of the UN to address these inequalities. Perhaps it’s time to call them to account.

*

Where does it leave us? The ambitions and behaviours of **Ms Patterning** have been used by the elites as the template for modern women’s aspirations. As such, she has served as the unwitting tool of some powerful agents, who understand the role of male employment in forming the heterosexual pair bond. Preferential employment of a woman has the strange effect of rendering men below her pay grade with the property of invisibility. Couple this with an explosion of one-way ‘sexual harassment’ legislation, and the inevitable result is that women become unapproachable.

The goal of feminism has always been destruction of the family unit. This seems to be well underway. Modern women have become so unpalatable that men don’t wish to marry. Birth rates in the developed countries of the world are running below replacement levels.

The elites know that the population of the world is too high, at a level which will be unsustainable when oil resources dwindle. They have made investments in ‘green’ technologies, and know that these technologies are guaranteed feminist support through the doctrine of **ecofeminism**. Hidden in the doctrine is a call for a greatly reduced **male** population. There has been a massive transfer of resources from male to female since 2010, and **women now control 60% of global wealth**. Gender Lens Investments in ‘green’ technologies are intended to radically increase that disparity.

China intends to control the future market in personal transport. It planned for this outcome, decades previously. The majority of global mining rights for the metals required in electric vehicle batteries are owned by China through its ‘Belt and Road’ initiative. The

operation of these vehicles requires advanced semiconductors. Taiwan makes 90% of the advanced semiconductors required for electric vehicles, and China sees Taiwan as a rogue province of China.

The west cannot catch up with China on the Lithium, Nickel and Cobalt required for EV batteries, or the Copper required in wiring. China will always control the price and supply of these resources. The west needs to be in a position where it can influence the semiconductor market as a trade-off. There are coming wars over resources. Men will be expected to fight these wars. Conscription, as we've recently seen in Russia and Ukraine, tends to be confined to men. When **men cannot leave the country, and are drafted into the army against their will**, what does this say about **equality**, as defined by the UN? **Member states recognise that all persons are equal before and under the law, and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal benefit and equal protection of the law.**

Yeah... right.

These are, indeed, strange times that we live in. And, they're going to get stranger. Every day, the world seems to be a little more *weird*, bombarding us with behaviours which we can see to be associated with left-brain hemisphere thinking processes. With the hostile incursions which feminism has been encouraged to make into the previously deontic world of male civilisation I do *wonder* why that should be the case?

I'd like to approach the end with a few words from men much more enlightened than myself. In *'The Moral Animal'*, Robert Wright writes this: *'Natural selection has a malicious sense of humour. Sensual pleasures are the whips which natural selection uses to control us. Men got their thrills from a hard day's work – taking risks, undermining rivals, then going home to eat and copulate. Women got their biochemical reward from bearing and raising children. If we refuse to play the game, this is an incitement to mutiny, a rebellion against the forces which created us. **Yet, indifference is a plausible route to liberation.**'*

F. Roger Devlin takes it even further. In his book *'Sexual Utopia in Power'*, he offers advice which is overtly that of MGTOW: *'The present feminist-bureaucratic regime is propped up only by the continued willingness of the hated heterosexual white males to live according to the old rules – working, saving, paying taxes, obeying the law, fathering and raising children. Once we stop doing such things, the entire system of patronage and parasitism collapses. MGTOW can tell women they will be "liberated" from men, whether*

they wish it or not. Women can hold down their own jobs, pay their own bills, live, grow old, and finally die by themselves.'

We've seen that men are facing powerful forces. With an enlightened overview, a right-brain speciality, our best course of action is to embrace the situation which has been engineered against us. Feminism hasn't freed women from an oppression which they largely imagined. Feminism is freeing men from the oppression which they didn't know they were under. Once you've seen something, you can't unsee it. There's no going back. We're already avoiding University and its armies of harpy Gender Studies enforcers. In a blue collar, trades environment, young men are free of student debt, and enjoy a more linear relationship between effort and monetary reward, compared to the unpaid overtime of an office environment. A building site or a workshop is a much less toxic, woke-free workplace. The biggest problem is the toll taken by manual labour on the body. For optimum results, it's probably best to start young and retire early, around mid-40s. If self-employed, don't forget to charge plenty of money for your services. Remind the clients that they can always build their own houses, assemble their own kitchens, or do their own plumbing.

If war breaks out, use their stupid laws against them. Identify as a woman, and insist on your rights under the *'free and equal'* guidelines of the United Nations.

The truth is man's ally. The truth is supreme, and it always prevails, sooner or later. These are simply strange times, where we may have to bend the truth, to the perverse rules of the rulers, in order to remain free.

The right brain is man's ally. Those who are left-brained will always underestimate the right-hemisphere's powers of perception, its sense of humour, and the indefatigability of its adrenergic circuitry.

Above all, don't fight in a war you can't win. Stay safe.

References

- 1) Alvin Tofler, '*Future Shock*' p23 Pan Books (1970)
- 2) Alvin Tofler, '*Future Shock*' p216
- 3) Rick Bradford, 'Database of Mispaternity Rates', *The Illustrated Empathy Gap*
- 4) S A Goodwin, L A Rudman, *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, **87** (4), p494 – 509 (2004)
- 5) Steve Moxon, *New Male Studies*, **12** (1) 1 – 28 (2023)
- 6) Denise D Cummins, 'Dominance hierarchies and the evolution of human reasoning', *Mind & Machines*, **6**, 463 – 480 (1996)
- 7) Professor Iain McGilchrist, '*The Master & His Emissary*' preface
- 8) Freya India Ager, 'The Neuroscience of Intellectual Openness', *Areo magazine*, 12th June 2021
- 9) David Warren Lewis, Marian Cleeves Diamond, 'The influence of gonadal steroids on the asymmetry of the cerebral cortex', in '*Brain Asymmetry*' [R.J Davidson, K Hugdahl (editors)], MIT Press, pages 31 -50 (1995)
- 10) Dr Anne Moir PhD, David Jessel, '*Brain Sex*' (1989)
- 11) Camilla Benbow, Julian Stanley, John Hopkins University, Maryland
- 12) Debra A Bangasser, Kimberly R Wierselis, *Hormones*, Vol 17, p5-13, 16th April 2018
- 13) Dr Anne Moir PhD, David Jessel, '*Brain Sex*', p33 (1989)
- 14) Cordelia Fine, '*Delusions of Gender*': see Cordelia Fine Wikipedia page for 'neurosexism'
- 15) Lise Eliot, '*Pink Brain, Blue Brain*'
- 16) Gina Ripon, Wikipedia page, with particular reference to review of her work by Lise Eliot
- 17) Rhonda Voskuhl, Sabra Klein, *Nature*, **568**, 171 (2019)
- 18) The Natural Law Institute, *Definition of GSRM*
- 19) D Eugene Redmond, Csaba Leranth, *Journal of Neuroscience*, **20**(23), 8604-8609; also Megan N Williams, Amy Jacobsen, *Evolutionary Psychology*, April 22 2016 ; also see references (28) – (31) below
- 20) Sir Stephen House, Channel 4 News, 1st March 2023
- 21) Philip N S Rumney, *The Cambridge Law Journal*, **65**(1), 128-158 (12th March 2006)
- 22) BBC News, June 5th 2018
- 23) victimscommissioner.org.uk/news/psc-amendments

- 24) Dorothy Bain QC, BBC News, 3rd November 2021
- 25) BBC News 18th October 2023 ; BBC News 20th October 2023
- 26) Roy F Baumeister, *'Is There Anything Good About Men?'* (2010)
- 27) Laumann, Gagon, Michael & Michaels, *'The Social Organisation of Sexuality'* (1994)
- 28) C M Kuhn et al, *J Neuroendocrinology*, April 22(4), p226-237 (2010)
- 29) *Hormones & Behaviour*, Vol 74, p125-138 (2015)
- 30) Erik Vance, *Scientific American, Mind*, **21**, p6, (May 2010)
- 31) Juan Pablo Del Rio, Maria I Attende, Natalia Melina, *Frontiers in Public Health*, 23rd May 2018
- 32) William Collins, *'The Empathy Gap'*, Chapter 15, Section 2 (2021)
- 33) Arthur Schopenhauer, *'On Women'*, 1851 essay
- 34) Dan Murdoch, *'The Making of Mundane Monsters'* (2023)
- 35) Esther Vilar, *'The Manipulated Man'* (1971)
- 36) Irwing & Lym (2005)
- 37) O'Doyle, Benbozer (1990)
- 38) Gorynia & Muller (2006)
- 39) Catherine Gouchie, Doreen Kimura, *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, **16**(4), 323-334
- 40) Henry Blair, *'Lovism'*, p154 (2020)
- 41) Irene Claremont de Castillejo, *'Knowing Women – a Feminine Psychology'*
- 42) Robert Wright, *'The Moral Animal'*, p388 (1994)
- 43) William Collins, *'The Destructivists'*, Chapter 15 (2022)
- 44) F Roger Devlin, *'Sexual Utopia in Power'* (2020)
- 45) Dan Murdoch, *'The Jury'* (2021)
- 46) Cameron Herrin, #JusticeForCameron
- 47) Ken Jataimu, *'We Won't Need Gillette When the Taliban Arrive'* (2022)
- 48) Henry Blair, *'Lovism'*, p38 (2020)
- 49) Dale Harvey MBA PhD, *'Briffault's Law'*, *Psychology Today* (2016)
- 50) Steve Moxon, *'The Woman Racket'*, p60 (2008)
- 51) Robert Wright, *'The Moral Animal'*, p104 (1994) ; see Buss & Schmitt (1993), pages 214, 219
- 52) Melanie McDonagh, *The Spectator*, 23rd October 2010
- 53) Heather Draper, *Journal of Medical Ethics*, **33**(8), 475-480 (2007)
- 54) Robert Wright, *'The Moral Animal'*, p109 (1994)
- 55) Robert Wright, *'The Moral Animal'*, p149 (1994)

- 56) Robert Wright, *'The Moral Animal'*, p121 (1994)
- 57) Steve Moxon, *'The Woman Racket'* (2008)
- 58) Steve Moxon, *'Sex Differences Explained'* (2016)
- 59) Steve Moxon, *New Male Studies*, **1**(3), 96-124 (2012)
- 60) Gwendolyn Selna PhD, *Psychology Today* (2014)
- 61) Dan Murdoch, *'Creating a Stink'* (2020)
- 62) RSA Animate *'The Divided Brain'*, YouTube, 21st October 2011
- 63) Dan Murdoch, *'The Anglerfish'* (2020)
- 64) Manhood Shitty Shit, *'The Rise of Men'* (2018)
- 65) Nina DiSesa, *'Seducing the Boys' Club'* (2008)
- 66) William Collins, *'The Destructivists'* Chapter 16 (2022)
- 67) Anne Francke, Chief Executive of Chartered Management Institute, January 2020
- 68) Claudia Goldin, Nobel Prize lecture, 8th December 2023
- 69) William Collins, *'The Destructivists'* Chapter 23 (2022)
- 70) William Collins, *'The Empathy Gap'* (2021)
- 71) UN Conferences on Women, Beijing
- 72) UN Conferences on Women, Istanbul Ratification of Beijing Declaration
- 73) Roy F Baumeister, Kathleen D Vohs, *Personality & Social Science Review*, **8**(4), p339-363 (2004)
- 74) W Waller, R Hill, *'The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation'*
- 75) Louise Jackson, *Gender Equality at Work*, 24th Jun 2021
- 76) Catherine MacKinnon, *'Sexual Harassment of Working Women'* (1979)
- 77) Street Harassment Wikipedia page: new guidance issued by Home Office, 24th March 2023
- 78) Positive Action in the Workplace – Government Guidance issued 17th April 2023
- 79) The Equality Act (2010)
- 80) Companies Act (2006): large Companies (>500 employees, or > £500 million in annual turnover, must produce a non-financial report which covers ESG matters
- 81) FCA Policy Statement 20th April 2023: UK Companies must report information and disclosure against targets on the representation of women and ethnic minorities on the boards and executive management teams
- 82) Liz Fe Lifestyle, *'The Problem With the Male Gaze'*
- 83) Janice Fiamengo, *The Fiamengo Tube 2.0*, YouTube, 10th Feb 2022
- 84) Laura Bates, *'Men Who Hate Women'* (2021)

- 85) Valerie Hudson, *'Bare Branches'* (2004)
- 86) Sally Miller Gearhart, Wikipedia page
- 87) Mary Daly, Wikipedia page
- 88) Mark Carney, BBC News, 5th Feb 2021
- 89) Daily Mail, March 27th 2021
- 90) Scottish Government *'Named Person Scheme'*
- 91) Robert Wright, *'The Moral Animal'*, p 173 (1994)
- 92) P Gagneux et al, *'Furtive Mating in Female Chimpanzees'*, Nature, **387**, p358-369 (1997)
- 93) Robert Wright, *'The Moral Animal'*, p412 (1994)
- 94) Patrick O'Flynn, *'Labour's Foolish Embrace of BLM Ideology'*, spiked-online.com/2023/10/04
- 95) Hester Eisenstein, *Science & Society*, **69**(3) p487-518 (July 2005)
- 96) Alex Salmond Scandal: Wikipedia page
- 97) Dr James Nuzzo, *Psychreg Journal of Psychology* (2020)
- 98) Vivek Ramaswamy, *'Woke Inc. – Inside the Social Justice Scam'* (2021)
- 99) William Collins, *'The Destructivists'* Chapter 12 (2022)
- 100) Richard Bernstein, *'The Dictatorship of Virtue'* (1994)
- 101) Raymond Raehn, *'Critical Theory – a Special Research Report'* (1996)
- 102) William S Lind, *'Political Correctness – a Short History of an Ideology'* (2004)
- 103) Angel Gomez, Sebastian Cerdan, Esperanza Ortega, *Hormones & Behaviour*, September 2020
- 104) Krajuljac et al, *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 11th March 2021 ; see also Julian R Bustillo, Elizabeth C Mayer, *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 2021, **12**, 660850
- 105) Philip Karl Salzman, *'Minding the Campus'*, 11th Feb 2019
- 106) Erin Pizzey, *'Who's Failing the Family?'*, *The Scotsman*, 30th March 1999
- 107) Simon Jack, Lucy Hooker, BBC News/business 8th Feb 2024
- 108) United Nations, un/org/en/global-issues/population#
- 109) Rex Wehler, *'Does Human Scale Matter?'*, Greenpeace.org 16th March 2018
- 110) Anthony Brown MP, Department of Transport, 3rd January 2024
- 111) Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois: cited by US Environmental Protection Agency
- 112) Kelly Oliver: Feminist 'Theory': toxicfeminism.blog/2021/10/16

- 113) Build Back Better Act, Wikipedia page
- 114) Polygyny Threshold, Wikipedia page
- 115) Reuters: Autos & Transportation, July 5th 2023
- 116) BBC News, 6th November 2023
- 117) The deBroglie theory of matter waves
- 118) Joseph M Baker, Ning Liu et al, *Scientific American*, Article no 26492, 8th June 2016
- 119) A G DeZavala, A Cichota, M Bilewicz, *Journal of Personality*, **81**(1), p16-28 (2013)
- 120) Joyce F Benenson, Henry Markovits, Grace Bullock, *PlosONE*, Feb 6, 2013
- 121) Lynn M Shore, *Journal of Management*, **37**(4), 1212-1289 (2011)
- 122) Lyric Thompson, Sundaa Bridgett-Jones, Rockefeller Foundation, 16th June 2020
- 123) Gary Leff, 'View From the Wing' article: '*Diversity in the Skies*' January 29th, 2024
- 124) Joint Statement on the Australia – UK Strategic Dialogue on Gender Equality
- 125) Professor M S Rao, '*Are Women Failures as CEOs?*', *SalesPop*, March 30th 2020
- 126) Corrinne Hutt, '*Play, Exploration & Learning*', Routledge (1989)
- 127) Corrinne Hutt, '*Males & Females*', Penguin (1972)
- 128) Simon Andreae, '*Secrets of Love & Lust*' (1988)
- 129) Gwen Guthrie, '*Ain't Nothin Goin On but the Rent*' (1986)
- 130) Lazy Girl Job, Wikipedia page
- 131) Kimberle Crenshaw, Wikipedia page
- 132) DNA Paternity Testing, Wikipedia page. In France, arranging such a test is punishable by up to a year in prison and a fine of 15,000 euros. The French Council of State declare that the purpose of the law is: '*Preserving the peace of families*'
- 133) Believe Women, Wikipedia page
- 134) The Scottish Feminist Judgements Project, homepage.
- 135) Klaus Schwab, '*The Great Reset*'
- 136) China's Matchmaking Mums, BBC News, [bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-china-64873186](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-china-64873186)
- 137) Mike Buchanan, '*Feminism – the Ugly Truth*' (2017)
- 138) Rich Zubaty, '*What Men Know That Women Don't*' (2001)

- 139) Douglas Murray, *The Spectator*, 30th July 2022
- 140) ‘Feminism blamed for fall of Rome’, *Pharos*, Feb 2, 2018
- 141) ‘*The History of Herodotus*’ (Rawlinson), Book 4
- 142) Eulenburg Affair, Wikipedia page
- 143) Andrew Wakerfuss, ‘*Stormtrooper Families*’ Harrington, NY (2015)
- 144) Samuel Ingra, ‘*Germany’s National Vice*’ (1945)
- 145) Scott Lively, Kevin Abrams, ‘*The Pink Swastika*’
- 146) Dr Anne Moir PhD, David Jessel, ‘*Brain Sex*’ p200 (1989)
- 147) Simon Baron-Cohen, ‘*The Essential Difference*’ (2004)
- 148) Dr Anne Moir PhD, David Jessel, ‘*Brain Sex*’ p185 (1989)
- 149) Neil Postman, ‘*Amusing Ourselves to Death*’ (1985)
- 150) M M McCarthy, A P Arnold, G F Bale, J D Blaustein, G J DeVries, ‘Sex Difference in the Brain – the not so inconvenient truth’, *J.Neurosci*, **32**(7), 2241 – 2247 (2012)
- 151) Margaret M McCarthy, ‘Sex Differences in the Developing Brain as a Source of Inherent Risk, *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*, **18**(4), p361-372 (2022)
- 152) Hillary B Nguyen, C Neill Epperson, James Loughhead, Emily Lipner, Lisa Hantsso, Sara L Kornfield, ‘Role of Hormones in the Transgender Brain’, *Neuropsychopharmacology*, **44**(1), 22-37 (2019)
- 153) Jeffrey W Lockhart, *Big Data Soc 2023*, Jan-Jun **10**(1) ; E-pub 20th February 2023
- 154) Vinod Menon, Srikanth Ryali, Yuan Zheng, PNAS, Feb 20th 2024, 121(9) e2310012121
- 155) Sarah Kempton (Science Editor), *Daily Telegraph*, page 1, Tuesday 20th February 2024
- 156) William Collins, ‘*The Destructivists*’, Chapter 31 (2022)
- 157) BBC News, [bbc.co.uk/news/business-68364690](https://www.bbc.com/news/business-68364690) 22nd Feb 2024
- 158) Ann Francke, ‘*Create a Gender-Balanced Workplace*’ (2019)
- 159) GIIN (The Global Impact Investing Network): ‘*The Gender Lens Investing Initiative*’
- 160) 2xGlobal : ‘*What is Gender Lens Investing?*’
- 161) Tom Slater, ‘*Labour’s Plan to Foist DEI on Britain*’, spiked-online.com/2024/02/11

- 162) David Jobbins, 'UK Higher Education Since Robbins', *University World News*, 1st November 2013
- 163) Sean Coughlan, 'Symbolic Target of 50% at University Reached', bbc.co.uk/news/education-49841620
- 164) Brian D Earp, 'The Unbearable Asymmetry of Bullshit', *Quillette*, 15th February 2016
- 165) William C Tucker, *Ecology Law Quarterly*, **39**(3), p831-894 (2012)
- 166) Polygyny Threshold, Wikipedia page
- 167) Cody T Rors et al, 'Greater wealth inequality, less polygyny: rethinking the polygyny threshold model', *The Royal Society*, 18th July 2018
- 168) William Collins, 'The Mathematical Basis of the Catastrophic Nature of Identity Politics', *The Illustrated Empathy Gap* (2019)
- 169) Scottish Government, '*Using Intersectionality to Understand Structural Inequality in Scotland*', 9th March 2022
- 170) Owen Jones, 'Muslims and LGBTQ People Should Stand Together, Not Fight One Another', *The Guardian*, 11th April 2019
- 171) Birchfield Primary School, July 4th 2023
- 172) Gender-Critical Feminism, Wikipedia page
- 173) Gender Reform Act (Scotland), 22nd December 2022
- 174) Isla Bryson case, Wikipedia page
- 175) Media P A (2nd April 2019): 'Online rumours played a part in Nicola Sturgeon resignation', *The Guardian*, 2nd April 2023
- 176) Resignation of Nicola Sturgeon, Wikipedia page
- 177) news.stv.tv/scotland/andrew-miller-horror 18th May 2023
- 178) Humza Yousaf, Wikipedia page