

**WOMEN: A TEXTBOOK FOR MEN.**

BECOME THE KIND OF MAN  
**WOMEN DESIRE.**

The Last Book You Ever Need to Read.



O. NOVOSELOV

**Women: A Textbook for Men.  
Become the Kind of Man Women Desire.  
The Last Book You Ever Need to Read.**

**By Oleg Novoselov**

Copyright © 2013

## Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1. First Thing's First</b>	
<b>The Matrix, or a System of Illusions</b>	1
<b>A Map of the Real World</b>	6
<b>The Firmware</b>	11
<b>Male and Female. The Birds and the Bees – Take Two</b>	13
<b>Basic Instinct</b>	17
<b>The Life Cycle and the Male Hierarchy</b>	18
<b>The Life Cycle and the Female Hierarchy</b>	21
<b>Chapter 2. The Formula for Love</b>	
<b>An Algorithm</b>	32
<b>The Sexual Hunt</b>	32
<b>Preliminary Testing Mode</b>	34
<b>The Lure</b>	42
<b>Courting</b>	43
<b>Love</b>	47
<b>Domination, Reverse Domination, and the Love Cycle</b>	52
<b>Why Women Cheat</b>	56
<b>Chapter 3. The Free Sexual Marketplace</b>	
<b>Hierarchy, Sex, and Money</b>	59
<b>Sex as a Commodity</b>	60
<b>The Friend Zone</b>	68
<b>Exes</b>	70
<b>The Sexual Showroom</b>	70
<b>The Culture of Sexual Provocation</b>	71
<b>Marketing</b>	72
<b>The Free Sexual Marketplace and Society</b>	76
<b>Chapter 4. How Women Control Men</b>	
<b>The Human Female's Interactions with Various Males</b>	79
<b>Myths</b>	81
<b>The Double Standard</b>	85
<b>Collective Female Solidarity</b>	86
<b>Women's Logic</b>	88
<b>Creating a Guilt Complex</b>	91
<b>Creating an Inferiority Complex</b>	97
<b>Provocations</b>	100
<b>Cons</b>	101

<b>Women’s Psychological Combat Tactics</b>	102
<b>Sexual Blackmail</b>	110
<b>Emotional Terror</b>	112
<b>Blackmailing with Break-up or Divorce</b>	114
<b>Employers and Women Joining Forces to Exploit Men</b>	115
<b>Relationship Planning</b>	116
<b>Craving and Displaying Power</b>	117
<b>Forming Public Opinion and Demonstrating the Relationship as a Means of Power</b>	118
<b>Surrogate Men</b>	120
<b>The Trick of “I’ve Got a Headache (or My Leg Hurts, or My Back, or My Butt, or Whatever),” “I’m Tired.”</b>	121
<b>Seizing and Marking Territory and Resources</b>	121
<b>Power-Seizing Techniques of the “Puppet Master” Type</b>	122
<b>Smart Women</b>	124
<b>Defending Yourself against Manipulation</b>	126
<b>Chapter 5. Men</b>	
<b>It’s a Man’s World?</b>	131
<b>Men through Women’s Eyes</b>	136
<b>Lines of Destiny</b>	141
<b>Man and his Offspring</b>	146
<b>Chapter 6. How the Sexes Can Work Together</b>	
<b>Men and Women as Partners.</b>	150
<b>The Family</b>	155
<b>Marriage</b>	156
<b>Traditional Marriage</b>	161
<b>Partnership Marriage</b>	163
<b>Parasitic Marriage (Amateur Prostitution)</b>	164
<b>Chapter 7. The War of the Sexes</b>	
<b>Failed Females</b>	168
<b>The Strategy of the War of the Sexes</b>	172
<b>The Tactics of the War of the Sexes</b>	173
<b>Increasing the Size of Sexual Minority Groups</b>	176
<b>Breaking up Existing Couples and Families</b>	177
<b>Destroying Mankind’s Reproductive Function</b>	179
<b>Feminism and Normal Women</b>	184
<b>Feminism and Power</b>	185
<b>Chapter 8. Control over the Situation</b>	
<b>Happiness and the Meaning of Life</b>	189

<b>Happiness Formed by the Hierarchical and Reproductive Programs</b>	190
<b>Happiness Formed by the Territorial and Construction Programs</b>	193
<b>Strategic Planning for a Man's Life</b>	195
<b>Sex as a Commodity</b>	198
<b>How to Relate to Women</b>	200
<b>How to Interact with a Woman</b>	206
<b>How to Pick a Woman</b>	211
<b>Afterword</b>	216

## **Chapter 1. FIRST THING'S FIRST**

### **The Matrix, or a System of Illusions.**

Let's start with the most important thing of all. You know, the thing no one's talking about - the real reasons behind the universal problems with relationships between men and women.

First of all, let's divide the problems people have into two groups – the ones that can be solved, and the ones that can't. Here we observe something very striking. If we have a problem with, say, our electrical wiring, we call an electrician, and he solves our problem for us. If we have problems with our car, we take it to the shop, and the mechanics solve our car trouble. If we have a problem with our computer, well, there are specialists who can help us with that too. The same can be said about any issue we might have other than those having to do with people. In all of these examples our problems are entirely controllable. This is the case because modern sciences like physics, chemistry, mathematics, biology, and engineering have reached a very high level of development, so there are plenty of specialists out there with enough knowledge and experience to solve any technical problem we might have. Generally speaking, problems unrelated to people can thus be solved.

The problems in our lives that cannot be solved are those that have to do with relationships between people. It's only here that we have no ability whatsoever to control the situation. Situations involving women are especially difficult for us to control. In fact, they can be so difficult that many men who don't feel themselves up to the task become depressed, commit suicide, become asexual, rapists, chronic masturbators, doll fetishists, etc. It's every bit as bad with women, by the way. They have no control over their relationships with men, which is why vibrator sales continue to rise. Not even the government, with all the economic and legal means at its disposal, can hope to control the situation: the family is disintegrating, and the birth rate is in catastrophic decline. And yet we can see that there are some men who have complete control over their personal lives. Women are crazy about them and can't wait to bear them children.

So what's their secret?

We can try to ask these lucky men for advice and follow their example, but for some reason their methods just don't work for us. Comprehensible and effective books about how to establish a happy personal life are virtually nonexistent. The closest things we can find are guides to seduction. Every movie ends with a wedding, which leads to the unfortunate idea that life also ends with a wedding. The only realistic cartoon ever made, *Shrek 2*, shows us a married ogre with a perpetually gloomy expression who runs around solving other people's idiotic problems - a pretty sharp contrast to the happy Shrek we saw getting married at the end of the first movie. Just take a look around you: see all the men who're unhappily married or whose ex-wife took them to the cleaners? Now compare them to the wild, carefree guys they used to be before they got married, and suddenly our suspicions about life ending with marriage start to seem justified. But then again, we can also find men who are happily married. They live their lives with a faithful wife by their side and die of old age, surrounded by beloved grandchildren and great-grandchildren. And yet, we can see that most of these men live in the Middle East. In the Western world, happy marriages are becoming more and more of a rarity every year.

How can we make sense of all this?

We all have the feeling that something about this world just isn't right. We look for happiness, peace,

love, and the meaning of life, but we never find them. Sometimes it seems like we've found something, but then suddenly it's gone, and our happiness turns out to be a mirage.

They tell us that happiness can be found in money. But no matter how much money we make, all we end up with is a mountain of useless junk. Our only reward is a burden we're then forced to control, a burden that saps our attention, our time, and our energy. All this burden does is consume our life – it can't bring up happiness.

Why?

They tell us that happiness can be found in hard work, in a career. So we work hard and become successful, but this doesn't make us happy or give our lives meaning. All it does it turn us into tiny little cogs in the business machine, and instead of the happiness we were promised we get nothing but stress. We don't even understand what we're working for, what we're living for. We hear everywhere that this is just "the way it's supposed to be," and in the end start to believe it. But every now and then someone turns up who can't take it anymore, so he buys a little cottage in some "underdeveloped" country and settles down there for good. He voluntarily surrenders all the "benefits of civilization," and yet he seems happy.

So why do we need a career?

They tell us that happiness can be found in a family and children. So we get married. We marry a woman who then goes on to create an atmosphere in our home that we find psychologically unbearable. Eventually we can't take it anymore, so we get divorced, losing our family and everything we've put into it. What's more, we lose the last shreds of the illusions that kept us going. In the end, all we end up with are worries, expenses, a drinking problem, an inferiority complex, and massive financial woes, but no happiness. Marriage turns out to be nothing more than a fraud.

Is there any other way?

They tell us that happiness can be found in love, but all love really gives us is a little bit of pleasure followed by a metric ton of worry, loss, and the pain of separation. More often than not, what we thought was love turns out to be nothing more than amateur prostitution.

How can we turn love into something genuine, selfless, happy, and permanent?

They tell us that all we have to do is work hard and make ourselves into nice, successful, rich, caring guys, and we'll be appreciated, everyone will respect us, and women will love us. But once we actually become nice and successful, we see that, instead of society's respect, all we can hope for (if we're lucky) is a kind word from our boss. The only thing a nice guy has that interests women is money; whatever free, genuine love they have is for assholes and losers.

Why?

We can plead for advice from psychologists, scholars, priests, fortune tellers, and whoever else claims to have all the answers. And what do they do? They castrate our brains with antidepressants. They give us a bunch of clever-sounding words about how all our problems stem from our childhood relationships with our parents. They tell us that everything depends on the music of the spheres. They tell us that everything is the will of God. And, at first, this stuff even seems kind of helpful, but then it turns out that our problems are still unresolved, our questions are still unanswered. We can control whatever we want – our money, our car, our computer, our professional lives. We live in a wealthy, powerful country, we're educated, we have all the food and toys we could ever want, we rule the world, but we have absolutely no control over our own happiness. *We're* dissatisfied with life, *we're* unhappy, but half-naked savages running around in the jungle are perfectly content. And our grandparents were much happier than we are, even though their lives were harder. They got by without an army of psychoanalysts, psychologists, and psychotherapists. They didn't need antidepressants.

Why?

The longer we live, the more we start asking questions that don't seem to have any answers. The realm of people and human relationships remains a riddle for us; it's something illogical, irrational, crazy. We've gotten used to living in the theater of the absurd, we've convinced ourselves that everything's fine, that this the way it's supposed to be. And yet we can't shake the feeling that we've been cheated, that happiness is out there, somewhere, that it exists. Sometimes we even see it in other people. We feel like something or someone is making a huge fool out of us. Who? How? Why? – we have no idea, and we can't do a damn thing about it. We're like blind kittens, rubbing up against life's teat without knowing what we want. And so the years go by, and we

lose our health, our strength, and our self-confidence, vainly groping in the dark for the way to happiness.

But now all these senseless torments have come to an end. It's time to learn how to independently take control of our lives and our happiness. Let's finally come to grips with these and start living.

For starters, pretend you're getting ready take a vacation to some exotic Caribbean island. You've packed your scuba gear, swimming trunks, suntan lotion, beach sandals, and a map of the island with all the best diving spots marked on it. You're prepared to take control of your vacation. But when the plane lands and you get off, you realize to your horror that it's the middle of the night and you're somewhere in the mountains. You've got no cell phone signal. There's nothing but rocks and trees everywhere. It's cold, and it's raining. You hear wolves howling in the distance. There isn't a single human habitation for miles around you, much less palm trees, beaches, or comfy hotels. All your diving skills, your scuba gear, your detailed island map – it's all totally useless. You have no control over this situation. You've been duped, and you have to do something about it. So you set off in a random direction, dragging your useless scuba gear and island map with you because it's all you have, when suddenly your luck changes, and you run into a guy who has everything you need – a rifle, five boxes of ammo, a sleeping bag, a backpack, a map of the area, a GPS navigator, and a full skydiving suit – and he's ready to part with it all for a couple hundred bucks.

So what do you do? If you've got a brain, you toss that useless scuba gear and buy the ammunition you need to cope with reality. This is how you take control of the situation.

You can probably see where I'm going with all this. The fact of the matter is that your parents and teachers have crammed you full of what is, quite simply, false, illusory information about relationships with people in general and women in particular. I'm offering you an opportunity to free yourself from these illusions and replace them with the true knowledge about relationships you so desperately need.

If you can't fix a problem with your computer or your car, there can be only one reason: neither you nor the people around you have the experience and knowledge (information) necessary to solve the problem. The same rule applies to problems in your personal life. If those problems haven't been solved yet, it's because you don't have access to any real experts. This proves that the information your parents and teachers have given you about happiness, love, and relationships is totally useless. So forget everything you know about love, happiness, and relationships, because it's all bullshit. I'm going to tell you about the real mechanisms behind these relationships. If you can free your mind from false, illusory assumptions, I can fill it up again with the information you need. Remember: just like Mo'at said in the movie *Avatar*, "It is hard to fill a cup which is already full." So pretend you don't know anything about women or relationships. We'll start with a "clean slate."

Now that you've got a decent idea of what the matrix is, the next step is to find out how the real world works and what its rules are. Get rid of your scuba gear and island map – it's time to turn on the GPS!

Welcome to the real world!

## **A Map of the Real World**

Just like with any other sphere of knowledge, learning how to take control of the situation starts with mastering the theory. In order to understand electronics, you have to know Ohm's law. In order to drive a car, you have to know what the traffic laws are, where the steering wheel is, and what the pedals do. In order to fly a plane, you need to know something about the basics of aerodynamics. Don't worry, we're not going to delve too deeply into the scientific jungle, but we need to know the theoretical basics – it can't be helped. Otherwise you won't understand anything, and you won't learn how to take control of your own happiness. You see, in order to control your happiness, you need to know exactly what it is, what makes it tick, where it comes from. All I ask is that you have a little patience and read this chapter as carefully as possible. I should mention that this guide is meant to be as efficient a tool as possible, which means that a number of things have been skipped over or heavily simplified. That's why I would advise anyone looking for a deeper, more detailed study of all the aspects of relationships between men and women turn to professional treatises on ethology.

A word of warning: whatever you do, DO NOT discuss the contents of this book with women. This includes women you consider close. Most of what you'll find in this book is information that women either do their best to hide from men or are themselves oblivious to. If you try to talk to them about this stuff, you'll be rewarded with nothing but accusations of chauvinism, hurt feelings, and other kinds of aggressive female

behavior. If you want to discuss the book with other men, that's fine – but wait until you've read the whole thing.

How come most of the ideas we have about human nature are false, illusory, or totally distorted? The primary reason for this lies in the historical development of the humanitarian tradition that sees man as something fundamentally distinct from other animals. This subjective approach has led to more mistakes and illusions than you could imagine. The only objective way to study human beings is through objective scientific knowledge about living things, that is, biology. We need to examine ourselves in exactly the same way as every other living thing on the planet, namely, from a biological perspective, and figure out what our main characteristics are. That's right – we're animals. It's time to admit it. This isn't to say we're not different from other animals, of course. Every biological species has certain traits that distinguish it from others. These are called “species-specific traits.” For example, elephants have a trunk and are capable of infrasound communication; dolphins have a fish-like body and ultrasound localization. Every species can be classified and studied according to their species-specific traits. The things that set human beings apart from other animal species are our powerful intellect and our ability to create material culture, which includes an artificial living environment and artificial hierarchies. However, this last ability comes with certain complications. You can only understand the relationships between the members of any given group (a herd, a flock, etc.) within an animal species if you understand the hierarchical structure of that group. For example, in order to control honeybees and have a productive apiary, a beekeeper absolutely has to study the structure of the colony's hierarchy, as well as the instincts that govern their behavior. The species *Homo sapiens* also has a certain set of instincts that were established during the Lower Paleolithic age. Back then, people lived in small groups (basically human herds) in a state of nature, that is, they were surrounded by an aggressive environment. Today, however, we live in an artificial, abundant, and safe environment built around the powerful artificial hierarchies of business and government, which means that we have to repress any natural, instinctive behavioral tendencies that are incompatible with the artificial conditions of our existence. This is accomplished by way of culture, religion, and education. It also screws up our behavior and our social relations so badly that just figuring it all out can be an extremely tricky thing. And yet this is precisely what we're going to do. In this book, we're going to examine man as a biological object, factoring in his species-specific traits. Once we know what makes human beings tick, it'll be a lot easier to understand and control the finer points of relationships. It'll be just as simple as driving a car.

First, let's think about what a relationship is. Obviously, a relationship is the sum total of the behaviors two people toward one another. And a person's behavior is a series of commands given to the body by the brain, which is like a human being's onboard computer. This means that, in order to understand relationships with women, we need to figure out this computer's operating system.

Okay, so the human brain is a simple little biological computer operated by a basic operating system. In order to understand how this computer works, we don't need to know whether it was created by God, developed as part of an evolutionary process, or developed as part of evolutionary process directed by God. That's a whole different conversation. We're also not going to talk about the computer's hardware. We don't need to worry about that. We're the computer users, not the Geek Squad. All we need to know is how to use the computer, and for that we just need to know about the programs that are hardwired into it, or, in other words, its firmware. We'll a look at how it works, how it's related to the structure of the human world, and how an intelligent, resourceful guy can make use of it in his life.

The programs hardwired into our brains can also be called instincts. Psychologists call them “the unconscious.” These programs direct most of human behavior by creating motivations and aversions, desires and emotions. If you suddenly want something, this means that some instinct or other has started to fulfill its designated function. For example, let's say you want a woman. This is your reproductive instinct at play. Or let's say you get hungry - this is your instinct for sustenance. If you perform the action in question, your instinct will reward you with pleasure (positive emotions). For example, if you eat some food or get laid, your instinct will reward you with pleasure. However, if you don't obey instinct's commands, it'll punish you with displeasure (negative emotions). On the physiological level, the actions of our instincts can be understood as the functioning of various hormones.

How does this work in real life? It's pretty simple. Let's say you see a woman. Your onboard computer launches the program responsible for reproduction. The program conducts a preliminary test of the object according to certain external criteria. If the computer decides on the basis of the female's appearance, behavior,



or odor that she's old, sick, or dangerous, then the command to release certain hormones never happens. And you don't want her. However, if the program comes back with the verdict: healthy, genetically worthy female of reproductive age, then your brain gets to work producing the necessary hormones. And you get the urge to bang her. If you obey instinct's orders and sleep with this woman, it'll reward you. You'll get some pleasure and feel positive emotions. But this is just pleasure, not happiness. Pleasure is what the computer's subroutines reward us for obeying its minor demands. Happiness, on the other hand, is a big, strategic pleasure that our operating system gives us for strategic success in life. It's a reward for attaining a strategic goal. So what is this goal, what is success? I'll tell you in just a little bit.

By the same token, if you see a woman you want and don't bang her, this means you're disobeying instinct's orders, and instinct will punish you for it by creating negative emotions. If everything's been fully launched and you're ready to go, the negative emotions you experience will be all the worse. You'll feel unhappy and get depressed; in other words, you'll receive strategic displeasure. You can try to poison yourself with various chemical substances (antidepressants, alcohol, drugs), but this won't solve the real problem. It will, however, create a slew of new psychological problems. You can't solve the problem by running away from real life (into the world of illusions, games, and virtual spaces). The more you ignore instinct's commands, the more deep-seated and potent the negative emotions generated by your program will be in the end.

All of this happens subconsciously, automatically, without any participation by the intellect. In general, the intellect can never play anything more than a supporting role. All it can do is support a decision that instinct's already made. If instinct's decided that it wants you to bang a certain female, your intellect will find a way to get her into bed. However, there are cases where the intellect can adjust or neutralizes motivations created by instinct. In the example I just mentioned, if you know that the woman you want has a tough-looking boyfriend, then your intellect will counter your reproductive instinct with your self-preservation instinct. The more powerful and developed someone's intellect is, the more effectively he can neutralize instincts that create dangerous motivations. We call these people "rational," or sometimes "a pain in the ass," and say they're disciplined and can control their emotions. The weaker a person's intellect, the harder it is for him to fight his desires, and the closer he is to other animals. We call these people "emotional," "impulsive," "eccentric," or "stupid."

## The Firmware

Let's take a look at the most basic instincts:

- Self-preservation. This program is responsible for security. In the event of a threat, it motivates you to either defend yourself or hide and run away. In order to accomplish this, the program creates emotions and emotional states such as fear, panic, rage, and aggression.
- Sustenance. This program motivates you to find food. Let's conduct an experiment: throw some pigeons a piece of bread. The most typical behavior in this case is for each pigeon to grab its booty and run off to devour it in a safe place, that is, where no one else can take it away. A person with a disorganized mind will behave in exactly the same way - say, a pickpocket, or a high-ranking bureaucrat from a criminal country with a low level of cultural development. The bureaucrat steals a ton of money in his native country, and then runs off to a civilized country so he can spend his ill-gotten gains in a safe place. This is typical animal behavior. A person with an organized mind, on the other hand, neutralizes the desire to steal. He gets an education and works hard in order to earn his bread efficiently and legally. If you feel positive emotions from fishing, hunting, or gardening, this is also the sustenance instinct at work. This part of the sustenance program is called the "hunter-gatherer instinct."
- Territory. This program motivates you to secure and defend territory. You like to walk around your lawn. You want to plant a garden and put a fence around it. And if someone else wanders into your plot of land, you feel irritation and aggression. These desires and emotions are created by the territorial instinct. The program is motivating you to defend your territory. In the modern world, a man's hunting ground has been replaced by his business, which he protects from competitors.
- Construction. You feel a desire to create something that doesn't exist in nature. This can involve

building a house, assembling model airplanes, or tinkering with your car in the garage - it's all a function of the same program that drove our ancestors to precisely and methodically beat one rock against another for days on end until they'd formed the blade for a stone knife.

- Reproduction (also known simply as the sex drive). This program defines every aspect of our reproductive behavior. It's also so tightly connected to our hierarchical instinct that there's no way to separate one from the other.

- Hierarchy. This program defines the relationships between people within the hierarchical structure of society, including those between the sexes.

You've probably already guessed that our main focus is going to be the last two instincts. Once we've come to grips with how they work, we'll be able to learn how to control our happiness.

Different programs in different people will produce motivations of various levels of intensity. Your individual collection of accumulated, variously intense motivations is your personality, your concrete individuality as a person. This is what defines the difference between one person and another.

Moreover, we have to make sure we never forget the species-specific trait of *Homo sapiens*. Let's take another look at this now. Man's uniqueness lies first and foremost in the fact that, thanks to his powerful mind, he can create artificial conditions in which to live. What are these conditions? Well, first of all, there's his artificial environment. This includes cities, landscapes, abundant edible plants, etc. The second is his ability to create the artificial hierarchies of governments, business, etc. The third is that he can create technical innovations that allow him to exceed his native capabilities. For example, thanks to technology, human beings can move around quickly, live in low temperatures, fly, and kill each other with remarkable efficiency. The fourth is man's ability to provide himself with a level of abundance and safety unheard of in the rest of the animal kingdom. The fifth and last trait is that, in order to compensate for the incongruity between his natural instincts and the artificial conditions in which he lives, man creates religions and cultural traditions. To return to my computer metaphor, the brain is the human being's onboard computer, instincts are the "firmware" and operating system of that computer, and religion, tradition, education, and upbringing are software that allows human beings to function under certain concrete conditions.

However, since the concrete artificial conditions of our existence are constantly changing, this software has to be patched and updated all the time. Unfortunately, however, changes in religion and tradition generally don't keep up with changes in the rest of the world. Once they've ceased to be relevant, religions and traditions no longer work. As a result, the incongruity between our in-born firmware and the changing conditions of our existence become more and more severe over time. Our native programs start to conflict with one another and with our intellect. Human society becomes unbalanced and unstable and starts to fall apart.

This ongoing process of balancing, unbalancing, and falling apart is called "history." Our current historical period is one in which the religions and traditions of the "civilized world" are disintegrating, and this is accompanied by a natural process of social destabilization.

But let's get back to instincts. In order to understand how instincts work in the real world, let's try to figure out why we need them and what they do for us.

## **Male and Female. The Birds and the Bees - Take Two.**

Male.

The human male's primary internal functions include: accomplishing the maximal distribution of his gene pool by impregnating females, teaching and caring for young, and making shelter, tools, weapons, and everything else that makes up the material and intellectual environment in which people live. His external functions include: actively interacting with an aggressive surrounding environment by scouting it, hunting in it, defending it, extracting and accumulating resources from it, and transforming it. Males act as a buffer between the aggressive surrounding environment and the reproductive nucleus of society, namely females and offspring.

In order to fulfill these functions, the human male has the following characteristics: males have an active sexuality, including a readiness to mate with a variety of females. The male's potent and powerful brain is the brain of a scout, hunter, warrior, and creator. This is why he has the ability to construct multi-tiered logical chains: in order to learn and predict the behavior of prey and the enemy, as well as understand the logic of how

the world works and how to interact with it.

Men are typically endowed with physical strength, bravery, agility, curiosity about the outside world, the ability to coordinate group activity, an aptitude for decisive action in extreme circumstances, and altruism to the point of self-sacrifice. Men are motivated not just by their own benefit, but also by the interests of the society in which they live. This includes strategic interests, since they can predict the outcome of a situation many steps in advance.

Female.

The female's primary internal functions include: preserving the gene pool in her own person (by adapting and surviving at any cost), bearing children from a genetically promising male and caring for the early stages of their development, actively interacting with other females in order to take possession of the resources they've found or produced, re-working or redistributing these resources for the good of themselves and their offspring, and assisting in the acquisition and production of resources.

In order to fulfill these functions, the human female has the following characteristics: she prefers to bear offspring from a genetically promising (beloved) male. However, she's also typically ready to mate with various males for the sake of food (resources). This is the origin of both every day and professional prostitution. A woman's brain is smaller than a man's. It's the brain of an opportunist. A woman can't construct multi-tiered logical chains, but she does happen to be an expert at building the kind of pseudo-logical constructions we call "women's logic" or rhetoric. This allows her to successfully manipulate men and take what they've earned. A woman can't think in terms of the strategic interests of the society in which she lives. She thinks in terms of her own immediate interests and is motivated by desires and emotions. By the way, this is why the introduction of universal suffrage has inevitably led to the degradation of Western democratic societies. In extreme circumstances, a woman will usually try to avoid danger by placing a man between her and the source of the danger. A woman's attention is focused on her relationships within the reproductive nucleus of her society and with men. The external world holds little interest for her.

That's how it was in the ancient world. At the cost of intense labor and personal risk, men went out and bagged the mammoth, defended the home, made spearheads out of stones, invented bows, and sacrificed their lives to defend their women and children. Meanwhile, the women and children stayed in the safest and most comfortable place – at home, right next to the fire and the food stores – and engaged in easy work such as cooking food and cleaning hides. It's the same way today. Farmers, miners, oil-, metal-, and energy workers, engineers, scientists and soldiers are almost all men. Women only re-work, redistribute, and consume resources that men have already acquired or produced. Take a look around you. Everything you see – houses, factories, cars, your computer, the chair you're sitting on – all of it was invented and built by men from the materials they'd acquired. Women can only re-work and maintain. They sit in safe, warm offices, laboratories, and kitchens, doing things like counting money on computers built by men, conducting "experiments" according to methodologies developed by male scientists, or baking bread from wheat grown by male farmers. In general, women don't strive to bring coal from a mine or catch salmon in the waters of the North Sea. Even in the army, they don't charge into battle with machine guns at the ready. Their function is merely an auxiliary one.

We can see that men and women have very little in common. They're two very different organisms with different purposes. This is why they have so many differences in terms of anatomy, physiology, ways of thinking, and native programming. It couldn't be any other way. Don't let the fact that they have arms, legs, and a similar speech apparatus fool you. An excavator made for digging has a different purpose and function than a race car. Sure, there's a formal similarity – they both have wheels and an internal combustion engine – but that doesn't eliminate these differences. It would be stupid to assume they could ever be interchangeable or equal.

Let's talk a little more about the differences between how men and women think, since there's a fundamental deception at play here that's causing men a lot of problems in their relationships with women today. I mentioned earlier that men have significantly larger brains than women. By the way, this is why there are almost no women among Nobel Prize-winning physicists. This is why chess championships have separate competitions for men and women. This is why the overwhelming majority of engineers, computer programmers, and entrepreneurs are all men. Women can be scientists or engineers nowadays only because men have made it possible for them to do so. Men have developed tools that are so simple and algorithms that are so easy to understand that even women can figure out how to use them. The powerful brain of a creator and hunter needs

logic to understand the behavior of his prey and the structure of the world around him. This is why a man can think logically. He needs to be able to understand mechanisms, reasons, and consequences. He needs a profound understanding of connections in order to take control of the situation. He needs a chart for the structure of the world, and, as long as he has that chart, he's very effective. Therein lays his strength. If he doesn't have a real chart, he makes do with the one he's been given. Therein lays his weakness. This is why men so often conduct their affairs on the basis of genuine religious convictions, ideologies, ideas, morality, and other charts, including illusory ones.

A woman's brain is small, and it's the brain of an opportunist. This is why a woman has no need for charts and can always see the world the way it really is. Therein lays her strength. But she sees the world only superficially, without making connections. She can't construct logical chains or predict consequences, so she easily gets entangled in her own emotions and desires. Therein lays her weakness. This is why she sees ideas, morality, and religion either as obstacles to the realization of her own immediate desires or as instruments for that realization. And she only accepts the parts of these charts that are of use to her.

### **Basic Instinct**

Forget the Sharon Stone movie – we're going to use the term "basic instinct" to refer to the hierarchical instinct. The sex program is totally dependent on it, and together they form a unified system.

Now we're going to take a look at a chart of the hierarchical and reproductive programs of male and female humans. So much of our social life is bound up with this instinct that, after reading this section of the book, you'll probably have a feeling of "epiphany, like you've "found the last piece of the puzzle." That's normal.

However, we're not going to forget for an instant that these programs were developed for life in a state of nature, that is, a small human herd surrounded by an untamed natural environment. Nowadays man lives in a safe and developed social world. He's refined and educated. This is another way of saying that his surrounding environment and social hierarchy are unnatural. This is why, for example, his programs tend to "crash" and "hang," or why people develop neuroses and psychoses. Moreover, the programs' functioning has, to a certain extent, been adjusted by reason, upbringing, and tradition. All this stuff smears up the picture.

So, reader, you've found yourself on the threshold of understanding the logic and structure of the human world. This chart is the key to understanding not just relationships between men and women, but also the human world in general.

### **The Life Cycle and the Male Hierarchy**

The male's instinctual firmware has three basic programs that are set to switch on once he reaches certain positions in the hierarchy. In ancient times, a human male would climb the hierarchy as he grew up and acquired experience, carving his way from the bottom to the top of the herd by brute force alone. This would continue until he started to age, lost his agility, and got eaten by a saber-tooth tiger at the age of 35-37.

#### **The LR's**

The instinct of the low-ranking male (LR, omega-male). The low-ranking male is either an adolescent or a loser who can't stand up for himself. He has low self-esteem, is afraid of everyone, worships the leader, and can only dream about the females. Any time he tries to mate with a female, he gets driven away by the other females and the mid-ranking males. He's sexually repressed, and his life means little to him. He doesn't worry too much

about himself, but he's happy to try and please others in hopes of getting into their good graces. He can try to make his way into the MR level by displaying extreme aggression, and, unless he's under a lot of pressure, it might even work. If it does, his set of mid-ranking instincts switches on.

### The MR's

The instinct of the mid-ranking male (MR, gamma-male). Mid-ranking males have fewer responsibilities than the leader, but they do control the low-ranking males. They can win females over by feeding them. They value the occasional sexual favors the females give them and are afraid of the leader, who protects them. As soon as the leader becomes weak, the strongest MR takes his place, at which point his leadership instincts switch on. The MR's not at the top of the hierarchy, but he's on the way there. He lives in a state of constant competition with the other MR males. Only one of them can become the leader, after all; the rest of them either drop to the LR range as they get older, or die. This is why the MR has no choice but to try as hard as he can to rise up in the hierarchy – he can either sink or swim. It's also why the mid-ranking male tends toward aggression, bragging, and showing off - he needs to let everyone know he's the best, to set himself apart from the crowd. All of the MR's energy goes toward this end.

In a traditional society, this stage begins with the male's first attempts to earn a living, then ends with his wedding, that is, when he gets his own exclusive female and becomes the leader of a family hierarchy.

In our modern matriarchal society, this stage usually continues throughout a man's entire life. A matriarchal society is precisely a society of mid-ranking individuals.

### The HR's

The instinct of the high-ranking male (HR, leader, alpha-male) is a suite of instinctual programs that enable the leader to his herd, to take control of the situation. This is where you find traits such as firmness in conflict, maximal self-confidence, commanding intonations, and the ability to manipulate both individuals and groups. The leader's instinct also includes responsibility. He watches tirelessly over his surroundings, raises the alarm in the event of danger, leads the herd to food, and protects his herd at the head of a troop of males. The leader sees his herd as an extension of himself, as a part of himself. This is why he worries so much about its prosperity. The leader also tends to have a developed territorial instinct, which is the origin of what would eventually become the human instinct for property. The leader has unlimited access to the females, can mate with any of them, and is convinced that it could hardly be any other way. He drives other males away from the females whenever he can. The leader's function is, of course, to lead, to make decisions, which means that he alone has immunity from female manipulation. He has complete, total, and unconditional self-confidence, which is why he has no need to display excessive aggression or show off. He also has no need to advertise himself. He tends not to assert himself unnecessarily. On the contrary, he's careful, and he only displays direct aggression when he absolutely has to – that is, whenever anyone questions his status as leader. If a woman sexually rejects him, he assumes there's something wrong with her. It never even occurs to him that an adequate female could refuse him. A leader never doubts himself, never worries about other people's opinions, and never feels guilty for anything. He cares about his own comfort and health. He is decisive, focused, and persistent.

In traditional cultures, a man is raised first and foremost to be the active leader of a family. In his society, relationships, including the custom of marriage for life, have been set up in such a way that the man develops all the attributes of a leader. He has total control over his business, his home, his woman, and his children, over everything that makes up his herd, and that makes him a leader. He attains the strategic goal of his existence, which means that his basic instincts are satisfied, and they reward him with strategic happiness. In other words, the man is happy.

In our modern matriarchal society, a woman can, with the government's help, easily take away a man's bread, as well as his lair and his children. The matriarchal government acts as the leader, while the man is robbed of his ancient masculine rights. What's worse, he even becomes convinced that so much as thinking and talking about those rights is nothing more than chauvinism and barbarism. This is why a man can only be happy for a little while, that is, while he's still under the illusion that he's a leader, while his woman is still beside him, before she's declared war on him.

It's interesting that, once a male's leadership instincts have been switched on, he's no longer able to

reduce his rank in the hierarchy. There's no going back. He can be killed, he can be exiled, but he can never be demoted. Even if he ends up alone, he'll still have a truncated version of his leadership instincts – the instincts of the solitary male. He's a "leader without a herd." On the other hand, mid-level males can still be demoted to the rank of LR.

Let's turn our attention to the following important phenomenon. There are two different kinds of rank: there's rank as an active instinctual program in the onboard computer of the *Homo sapiens*, and there's rank as a person's actual position in the real social hierarchy. Don't confuse the two. If a male is situated within a hierarchy similar to a herd (for example, a gang), then his two ranks will coincide, since his programs were installed under conditions just like the ones he lives in. In this case, a female will always instinctively and understand just what kind of male she's dealing with. The impression he makes on her according to her Stone-age criteria will be reflected in his real status in the gang.

However, if a male is situated within a modern civilized hierarchy, the two ranks will frequently not coincide. In the modern world, an alpha-male can be a low-ranking employee, a criminal, or a junkie, while a weak omega can inherit a successful business and end up in the highest layers of society. He becomes a tyrannical boss who demeans his subordinates. This kind of behavior is typical of low-ranking individuals, who have a constant need to assert themselves. Moreover, modern artificial hierarchies are frequently formed according to criteria that are at odds with our instincts. The scientific hierarchy, for example, is formed according to the number of publications you have; the military hierarchy – according to the number of medals on your chest, etc. In such a vague situation, a female's instincts get totally confused. This is why, in the modern world, a human female will spend her whole life running from alphas to omegas and from omegas to alphas. She's consumed by the eternal feminine questions of "should I do what I want, or what he wants?" and "did I really put out for *him*?"

### **The Life Cycle and the Female Hierarchy**

The *Homo sapiens* hierarchy is three-tiered, so the females naturally have three-level firmware just like the males do, with their own LR's, MR's, and HR's. However, unlike males, who, once they've come of age, start working their way from the bottom of the hierarchy to the top, females start at the top, then work their way down. This is one of our species-specific traits, and it represents a major difference between us and other primates. It's connected with the fact that we have a much longer period of maturation and learning.

First off, let's not forget the biological reason for the female's existence – the propagation of the species in general and the genetic line of a survival-capable male in particular. In a herd, this would be the leader.

The HR's (14/sexual maturity to 21-25 years old)

From a biological perspective, this is the age range for reproduction. This is when a woman possesses her maximum level of sexual attractiveness. She can genuinely love a man, she can worship him; in other words, she can regard him as her leader. In a herd, a young female (who's still not totally independent; who's fragile and needs someone to take care of her) would immediately become the property of the leader when she reached maturity. She would love him. She would desire him and give him unlimited sex. She would be protected and fed by him. And she would, in turn, bear him her first and most healthy babies, that is, she would fulfill the female's primary function: continue the genetic line of the most survival-capable male. She would also be perfectly happy, since her sexual and hierarchical programs would be satisfied. It's always been considered prestigious to have a young girlfriend or wife because, according to our pre-installed programming, this is the sign of a leader. This is why all old women do their best to look young (which is, by the way, the basis of the entire "beauty industry").

In the modern world, a high-ranking female is a faithful and loving wife or girlfriend. The majority of traditional cultures supports precisely this (HR) mode and can extend it indefinitely. In other words, in a traditional culture, a woman's youth and happiness can continue throughout her entire life. This is why virgins have always been prized. This is why girls used to get married at 13-15 years old, and an 18-year-old unmarried girl was considered an "old maid." This is precisely why qualities such as kindness, thriftiness, and modesty used to be seen as those of a high-ranking female. This is why men used to get married only after they'd already established themselves. This is why wives and mothers used to be considered people worthy of respect in a

traditional society. These were exclusive females protected by their leaders. Girls used to be taught from an early age to respect men, that is, to acknowledge their high rank. A husband was a girl's destiny, he was forever. It was the woman's duty to revere and obey him. This is how the family hierarchy of the husband-leader and his wife, his exclusive female, would be intentionally formed.

In this context, the traditional concern for the first-born son also makes sense. The first-born son is the offspring of the leader, of the most survival-capable male, and he's the one with the best chance of becoming the leader himself. This is why, for our species, the quality of a child depends on its birth-order. This was something that was obvious even to humans at a very early stage of civilization, and it's why, in the majority of traditional cultures, the first-born son is prized, as well as why he's the one who inherits his father's material resources.

In our matriarchal (mid-ranking) society, the HR level is getting smaller and smaller all the time. This is why a matriarchal society encourages people to get married later in life. Girls are raised not to respect men because the dominant mid-ranking females don't want attractive, young, potentially high-ranking females to have access to the mature, established males. Meanwhile, they also forbid mature males from having sexual contact with young, sexually mature females by, for example, increasing the so-called "age of consent." This is nothing more than a battle between the older, dominant females and their competition.

The MR's (25 to 32 years old)

This is a potential female reproductive age. Once she got old and lost the "first blush of youth," a female would be driven away by the leader and demoted to MR. She would usually already have a child or children by the leader, who would continue to extend to her a certain amount of protection. However, in order to feed herself and her offspring, she would have to provide highly moderated doses of sex to sufficiently strong and productive mid-ranking males for food and protection. In order to survive at the MR level, she would need to develop traits that were completely different from the ones she'd had as an HR. Now, instead of loving, obeying, remaining faithful, and acting altruistically, she would have to learn to manipulate, maneuver, intrigue, exploit, and engage in vicious competition with other mid-ranking females for the available males. She had to do this in order to survive. This is why the mid-ranking female's active instincts are so different from those of the high-ranking ones. The mid-ranking female had to try to provide sex only to whichever male had something to offer, not just the one she happened to love. In other words, she was a prostitute.

All traditional cultures that actively promote the HR level of their society do everything in their power to prevent females from switching on their MR programming. Active mid-ranking females, that is, both professional and amateur prostitutes, are something that a traditional culture actively struggles against. They're considered "fallen," deprived of resources, and driven right to the bottom of society. This is exactly why they used to talk about "ruining" girls. The fact of the matter is, that a woman's MR firmware often gets activated when her first, beloved man dumps her. This is when her instinctive reaction to being driven from the harem by the leader comes into play. But once this instinctual program launches, it can never be shut down. This is why, from the perspective of a traditional culture, a woman like this, i.e. one who's no longer capable of love or fidelity, is considered defective. This is precisely why traditional cultures have such a strong prohibition against sex before marriage. A woman's active programming can also switch from HR to MR with age, which is why the psychology of many women changes drastically around 21-23 year old. They're surprised to realize that they've suddenly become "bad" – they're more cynical, more careful, and no longer able to love and respect their husband. They become dominating and manipulative. This is just the biological clock starting up.

In our modern matriarchal society, the MR level is as wide as possible and is actively encouraged. Women who can genuinely love a strong man have become extremely rare, as have, by the way, strong men. When a mid-ranking female sees a high-ranking female, she becomes jealous of her and does her best to drag her down to her own level. For example, there's the classic situation where single divorcees, whether they're co-workers or "girlfriends," purposely provoke a married woman to cheat on her husband or do other things that could destroy her family. High-ranking females have intentionally been given a negative image. It's stupid to love and obey your husband, and fidelity is old-fashioned. On the contrary, it's now considered prestigious and smart to sell yourself for as much as you can. Being a kept woman, that is, an amateur prostitute, selling sex wholesale, is respectable. It's the cherished dream of many modern women.

The expanding MR level we see today is being facilitated by sexual freedom, co-ed education, and the fact

that young people aren't being raised in a traditional culture. Girls usually pass through their HR level too quickly, while they're still in school, when they fall in love with some jackass their female instinct takes for a leader based purely on superficial signs. Then, when this jackass dumps the girl he's "ruined," her MR programming switches on. Once she's hit the MR level, she spends the time until her first attempt at marriage honing her female manipulation techniques. This happens all the time, although there are exceptions. Sometimes a young female will take her time searching for a leader. She wants to be exclusive and faithful, but with every new male, the likelihood of her MR programming switching on increases. Sexual freedom, which encourages young females to exchange sex partners frequently, also makes it much more difficult for her to accept a particular male as her exclusive, beloved mate. In other words, she loses her ability to become an HR. Women call this "throwing yourself away." The fact that girls are raised in a spirit of sex-selling and material consumption also encourages the MR programming to turn on as quickly as possible. In a matriarchal society, your average woman either flies right through the HR phase, or else skips it entirely, dropping right down to MR or even the dreaded LR. This means that her basic instinct can never be satisfied. In other words, she's damned to unhappiness, and the best she can hope for is to content herself with the minor pleasures she gets from consuming material goods.

Within the MR level there's an entire hierarchical structure with extremely intense competition for male resources. A female's status within the MR level of the herd is determined by how well the males feed her for sex. This is why mid-ranking females, just like mid-ranking males, usually have a hypertrophied drive to acquire and demonstrate the resources they have. In other words, they brag and show off. This is the biological basis of consumer culture. Once they end up on the MR level, unconfident men and women are much more powerfully driven to acquire the unnecessary products of material culture, especially if advertisements position their products as something prestigious. Mid-ranking females love shopping, i.e. trying to compensate their unhappiness with minor pleasures. The greatest scam in the modern world – consumer culture – is founded on the assumption that everyone's already sunk to the MR level. Then they sell them a mountain of junk that they objectively do not need, they give them a little bit of pleasures and tell them it's happiness, and people become the unhappy owners of things they have absolutely no use for but still buy hand over fist.

Older mid-ranking females are painfully jealous of their young rivals and hate them. I once conducted the following experiment: on an online women's where most of the participants were around 40, I created a thread about how young women are much more attractive and desirable than old women. Despite the fact that my thesis was obviously true, the forum participants tried over and over again to convince me of the opposite, then went on to clog my inbox with obscenity-filled hate-mail for the next three years!

MR females usually display overtly sexual behavior and wear make-up and sexy clothes. This is why smart men don't pay any attention to overtly sexual women. An experienced mid-ranking female who knows how to successfully manipulate males, i.e. how to dominate them, can, by the time she gets old, get used to the idea of always being in charge. She becomes excessively confident, "stubborn as a mule," aggressive, confrontational, and unable to compromise with, agree with, or give in to a man. She doesn't even sell sex for food anymore, but she still demands complete obedience. That's why this kind of woman gives up on trying to display her sexuality or maintain her appearance. She doesn't need it anymore. These females usually get fat.

The MR level of the herd hierarchy would be made up largely of young males and older females. A sign of this kind of herd tendency in our modern matriarchal society is the growing number of couples where an experienced, dominant older woman rules over her young husband or boyfriend with an iron fist.

#### The LR's (32 to death)

Eventually a female would get old, lose her liveliness and sexual attractiveness. She would become totally uninteresting as a recipient of food or protection, but would still be available to all. An LR female is one who mates with a variety of men, hoping that someone will give her a scrap of food. In the modern world, they're called "sluts." This kind of woman would remain in the LR level for a little while before eventually getting gobbled up by a predator. This is why most women ramp up their "sexuality" after 30. Biologically speaking, their chances of pairing off and reproducing at this age are pretty slim. This is why marriages with women "over 30" are usually unstable, and why gynecologists refer to pregnancies by these women as "late-life" pregnancies. This is also why so many married women start to actively cheat on their husbands and destroy their families once they hit 30.



In traditional societies, this level is practically nonexistent, or at least exists only as a thin layer at the very bottom. In our modern matriarchal society, on the other hand, it's quite broad, which further destabilizes society and facilitates the spread of venereal diseases.

## THE BONUS ROUND

In the modern world, human life has become unprecedentedly abundant and safe, so it's not uncommon for people to go on living for a few decades after their biologically reproductive age has passed. When this happens, a female's programming can continue to function by inertia, or even re-launch a new cycle. This explains the women who, after they've already destroyed their families and "had some fun," still try to find a new long-term mate despite the fact that they're already in what is, biologically speaking, post-reproductive old age – after 40. And sometimes they even have children. However, these couples tend to be unstable and to have unhealthy children, so the women become unhappy, lonely old ladies, never understanding what female happiness really is.

## HAPPINESS

Human happiness, as a collection of hierarchical and reproductive programs, can be satisfied only at the HR level. By the same token, only a high-ranking female can experience happiness. Her basic instinct can be fulfilled only when she's located at the top of the hierarchy, when she's the exclusive female of a leader, when she gets her food from him, is protected by him, and has his children. It's the same with males. Only a male with a lair, a hunting ground, and a female and children who acknowledge his leadership can be happy. This is why traditional cultures intentionally promote and support this way of life by creating a family hierarchy with the husband at the top. It's also why, despite their material comfort, modern matriarchal men and women are unhappy.

## INSTANT MATING

Along with the female brain's species-specific reproductive program described above, there's also another, simpler one. This program, which is found in many other animals that pair off, isn't connected to the basic one, but runs parallel to it. A female can sometimes surprise even herself by spontaneously mating with a random male whose status and resources are unknown to her. This can happen even when she has a beloved, wealthy, strong man, as well as a family and children. None of that matters. In the modern world, this is called "accidental sex." Afterward the woman says, "I don't know what happened, something came over me." All this means is that the female "instant mating" program was suddenly activated. Then, when it turns out that the kid isn't her husband's, the woman's just as surprised as he is. She totally forgot she cheated on him.

## CONCLUSIONS

Number one. Three types of relationships between male and female *Homo sapiens* are possible – HR, MR, and LR. Two of these types of relationships – HR and MR – can lead to reproduction. The third one – LR – has nothing to do with reproduction. The types of relationships that can lead to reproduction can be realized in various ways and with various results in terms of the formation of society at large. If the majority of couples in a given society are of the HR type, the result is a patriarchal society. If they're mostly MR relationships, then the result is a matriarchal society. We live in a matriarchal society. But our great-grandfathers lived in what was still a patriarchal society. The relationships that exist between the sexes today are fundamentally different from those that existed only a century ago. Things like the family and marriage now have completely different meanings. Everything changed over the course of two generations. And the fact that the family and marriage continue to be called by the same names only confuses modern men and prevents them from re-orienting themselves.

In our modern matriarchal society, the female wastes her reproductive period trying to resemble a male. Then, when she's already old, she tries to form a stable couple and bear children despite the fact that, from a biological perspective, this is unnatural. Moreover, she does this with a mid-ranking male whose ability to reproduce is supposed to be limited. This practically guarantees the woman a disastrous family and personal life

and prevents her from feeling the happiness and love she craves. Modern feminist propaganda is aimed at depriving women of their natural self-actualization. It promises them happiness only during their post-reproductive period, i.e. when true female self-actualization is practically impossible. At that age, a woman can only extract resources from men and manipulate them to her own ends. This is the elaborate fraud that lies at the heart of our entire society. Women have, quite simply, been cruelly deceived, psychologically mutilated, and had their lives destroyed *in utero*. To be blunt, women's "conscious life" is in its death throes. There will be consequences.

Number two. There's only one practical conclusion that a man can draw from all this: in our modern matriarchal society, you cannot expect that any relationship with a woman will be for life. You can be a rich superman with a 12-inch dick and marry a Muslim virgin, and it still won't protect you from her betrayal and its consequences. Just when and how will your woman switch over? You have no way of knowing. Maybe her love for you will fade with age. Maybe her instinct will react to your love and care for her as the behavior of a weak male. Maybe her girlfriends will push her into doing something vile. Maybe she'll be swayed by feminist propaganda. Only one thing matters – sooner or later, she will almost certainly begin destroying your family, and, unlike in the earlier traditional culture, our cultural traditions and our laws will be almost powerless to protect your interests and your investments. In other words, a man needs to keep his powerful brain constantly turned on and alert, tirelessly following the state of his female's active programming, doing his best to direct it, while making sure that, no matter how honest and loving the woman might have seemed at first, the lion's share of his resources stays out of her hands. But this should come naturally to a strong, intelligent man. After all, carefulness is one of the qualities of a leader.

And, last but not least, number three. If you want to have real success with women, it makes no sense whatsoever to attract them by buying them the expensive things that advertising makes prestigious. Sure, you'll get a woman to pay attention to you, but as soon as she talks to you she'll ferret out all your weakness and identify you as a weak mid- or low-ranking male. You'll be nothing more to her than a source of resources, and never a beloved man. She'll sell you her body, but she'll never love you. Therefore, in order to be a man who's loved by women and happy, you need to be a real leader, which means you have to switch on the high-ranking hierarchical programs in your onboard computer. Well, you're in luck – this book is the remote control that'll switch on your leadership instincts. It's easy. A leader can feel out his herd, observe its members' behavior, and direct it. By giving you the leader's understanding, this book will also give you the leader's ability to see and understand the human hierarchy and human behavior. And once you have this ability, your entire program will automatically switch on. So read the whole thing carefully, mull it over for a while, then read it all over again. This is important.

## 2. THE FORMULA FOR LOVE

### **An Algorithm.**

What is love, and how can you take control of it? First of all, we should keep in mind that there are a number of completely different emotional states that people all call “love.” They love oysters, they love their country. Furthermore, a man’s love for a woman and a woman’s love for man are two completely different things. Different men also love in different ways, and one man can have different kinds of love for different women. If we want to make sense of it all, we first have to come to grips with the nature of basic heterosexual love.

So pay attention, my dear reader! Feel the gravity of this moment! You are about to learn the elusive FORMULA FOR LOVE, the very thing that philosophers of every age and every nation have sought in vain! You’re about to peer into the female holy of holies and master the logical algorithm of her in-born “firmware.” From this moment forth, woman will cease to be a mystery for you, instead becoming a readily comprehensible and easily predictable creature - a biological robot with some simple programming.

Let’s take a detailed, point-by-point look at this algorithm now.

### **The Sexual Hunt**

As you can probably guess, this is the mode in which the woman’s inner female combs through men, searching for one with a quality gene pool. Obviously, the more choices she has, the wider her selection. Therefore, in order to broaden her search as much as possible, the woman conducts it everywhere, especially in crowded places where men typically hang out. In the modern world, this could be sectors of the sexual stock-market such as clubs, restaurants, beaches, and other places where women can determine the quality of potential partners while displaying their own assets. By the way, did you think women go to college because they want to become doctors and lawyers? Get real! All they want is to find a future doctor or lawyer so they can marry him and forget their pre-med or pre-law classes as quickly as possible. The only women who actually become doctors or lawyers are the ones nobody wants. Some particularly advanced women take up sports like diving, windsurfing, etc. as a way to meet rich, active, healthy men. It’s the same thing at work- another part of the sexual stock-market. A woman will hunt anywhere can find prey. Her standard tactic in the sexual hunt is to scan the men around her, comparing her impressions of them with her own idea of “the perfect man.” Meanwhile, she also displays her own goods (her body, the way she moves, her charm, her face, etc.). In order to do this, she emphasizes whatever advantages she might have while hiding any deficiencies with the help of make-up, clothing, jewelry, seductive poses, dance moves, etc. This is how she gets men to notice her and begin the courting process. Beyond this passive sexual provocation, the woman can also try to actively attract attention. She can make eyes at you, ask for advice, help, or a cigarette, “accidentally” bump into you, spill her drink on you, or just ask if you want to sleep with her. The possibilities are endless.

It’s interesting to note that men don’t react as actively to overt attention from women as they do to more subtle methods. This is because the women who show initiative are usually already in the post-reproductive mode of full dominance. These women provoke a sense of revulsion in healthy, worthy men.

So, a man and a woman pick each other out of a crowd of members of the opposite sex, and at least one of them, whether consciously or instinctively, identify the other as a potential partner. From this moment forward, both of them switch on the mating algorithm of their sex instinct.

The most basic technique in the woman’s hunting repertoire is “playing hard to get.” Once she’s demonstrated an interest in the man, she immediately retreats, which gives the man an opportunity to begin the process of pursuit and courting and lets her assume a more favorable position as the object of the hunt. It also

allows her to switch on the man's hunting instinct, which forces him to show what he's worth. Moreover, this position is more favorable from a psychological perspective. "You're the one who's after me, so that means I'm worth something, not you." The material advantages of this position should be obvious. All the expenses usually land right in the man's lap.

### **Preliminary Testing Mode**

This is a really interesting mode. Biologically speaking, it's also very responsible. The woman's offspring need to get their genes from the best possible male. In this mode, the woman evaluates the man's genetic caliber as a potential father and bread-winner for her future children. She does this both instinctively and on a conscious level. Her specific criteria will depend on how much common sense, life experience, and education she happens to have, but the basic factors that determine sexual attractiveness are purely biological. So, at long last, let's unveil the secret factors behind sexual attractiveness.

First of all, let's look at the instinctive criteria that will determine the woman's choice. The primary biological criteria are pretty obvious: 1) as the father of her children, the partner has to be genetically worthy. 2) as a breadwinner and protector, he also has to be survival-capable. By the way, this applies to the mother, too. In principle, it applies to both genders.

A significant portion of the information the man and woman receive about each other comes from the cloud of pheromones wafting from the potential partner. This includes their genetic compatibility, rank, emotional state, and health. All this information is revealed on a subconscious level through the sense of smell. However, nature, in her infinite wisdom, usually doubles her mechanisms, so the whole thing doesn't begin and end with smell.

Each potential partner conceptualized the other's genetic worthiness in terms of beauty. In other words, the evaluation occurs on the basis of external signals. It's interesting, by the way, that the only criterion that's evaluated immediately and mercilessly is body symmetry, whereas the only criteria that will produce immediate aversion are obvious signs of disease or deformity, since these are clear signs of bad genes or poor survival-capability. Other signs, such as body proportion, skin color, hair color (and presence), and eye shape get evaluated in various ways not just in various cultures, but even in various social levels or time periods within the same culture. For example, in a major city, thin women might be considered beautiful, while in rural parts of the same country, chubby women are preferred. Instinct's logic is really pretty simple: if there are a lot of people around who look a certain way, then that means they've multiplied successfully. Therefore, they're carrying genes that promote the local population's survival-capability under a given set of conditions. So, the more women there are in a given place or time period with a similar look, the more men will find that look attractive. However, a partner with a look that's atypical for a given population, yet still symmetrical, can bring in fresh genes. In this case, a different program can switch on – the instinctive preference for fresh blood. Then the partner can appear particularly attractive, and a well-formed woman with regular features can, thanks to an atypical eye shape, nose, skin color, or just unusual make-up, become "exotic," which gives her additional sexual attractiveness. This is why standards of beauty change so quickly. In the modern world, these standards are formed commercially with the aid of familiar advertising tricks. It's interesting in this context to mention tattoos. In cultures where tradition has made tattoos something standard (for example, in certain Native American tribes), they're seen as a decoration that intensifies sexual attractiveness. However, in a culture where the tattoos are non-standard, they can produce a sense of aversion or disgust in many people. They see a tattoo almost as though it were a skin disease testifying to a person's poor survival-capability or infectiousness.

A factor that's just as important to a partner as genetic worthiness is general survival-capability. This can be indicated by a vast number of different signs. In men, the primary signs are the same traits that characterize a high-ranking male, or, in modern parlance, "real men." This is why women are instinctively drawn to confident, assertive, optimistic, decisive, goal-oriented, ambitious, emotional men with a sense of humor. It's also why they like narcissistic egoists, pricks, scumbags, lowlifes, and loud, cocky morons. Female instinct is blind. It doesn't know the first thing about civilization, and it still reacts to formal signs of survival-capability according to Stone-age criteria. Instinct has no idea that, in the modern, world the loudmouthed jackass is going to turn into a junkie loser, or whether the narcissistic, overconfident prick is going to end up planning his whole life around the woman herself, or spend years in jail for fraud. Her instinct assumes that these guys are going to become leaders

and productive hunters. There are, however, adjustments that can be made when an educated woman from a civilized culture allows rational considerations to interfere with her selection process. Additional factors beyond “manliness” that the female can use to determine a male’s survival-capability can include intelligence, earning power, success, and social position.

The man’s male instinct also evaluates his potential mate’s survival-capability, albeit according to criteria that are hardly compatible with making a happy life with her. More exactly, he looks for things like shrewdness, a tendency to play games, lie, haggle, have her own way, and generally manipulate men into providing for her and her offspring. To men, these traits come off as charming. When they’re hypertrophied, they come off as bitchiness. By the way, we’ve accidentally uncovered the reason that so many men love bitches, as well as why so many women love to be called by that name. It’s also why most men will find an honest, decent woman sexually unattractive. And so the poor girl ends up with an experienced prick who knows he can take advantage of her. It’s interesting that, when it comes to the selection process, survival-capability is much more attractive than plain old beauty. A woman who’s beautiful, but fragile, shy, or awkward, will seem unattractive, since instinct will shrink from anything that seems like it might be a bad sign from a biological perspective. What if she ends up getting sick? Most men prefer a woman who’s less attractive, but more cheerful and active. By the same token, a great-looking guy with a haunted, fear-filled gaze will also be unattractive to women. They’d prefer a man who’s unattractive, but confident, assertive, good-natured, and easy-going. Women call this “male charisma,” and they see signs of weakness as indicative of bad genes.

We’ve seen why women like “bad boys.” So how come “nice guys finish last?” Well, the fact of the matter is that men who are “good guys” from the perspective of social morality, that is, useful, productive members of modern society, got that way mostly because of their upbringing. In other words, they’re useful and productive because they’re good at obeying their teachers and parents. However, women still evaluate men according to Stone-age criteria, and, according to those criteria, men who obey are LR’s, and thus unworthy to mate with them and pass along their genes. A modern man with a good head on his shoulders doesn’t attack another man with a two-by-four; he solves his problems with words. However, according to the woman’s female instinct, this is a sign of weakness, a sign of a low rank. A modern man with a good head on his shoulders is well-behaved and predictable. In other words, he obeys the rules. However, since the rules must be enforced by someone, anyone who obeys them must be an LR. And, by extension, anyone who doesn’t obey the rules and act unpredictably must be an HR. A modern man’s been raised to respect women and fulfill their desires. He asks, “Where do you want to go today, honey?” or gives his baby an expensive present. Or even worse – he asks her permission to kiss her or have sex with her. And that’s where he loses the woman’s love and respect, because her instinct is hard-wired to believe that only a weakling could act that way. A strong male decides everything by himself and expects others to abide by his decisions; a strong male takes a woman for free any time he wants to. This is Stone-age logic. In a traditional culture, it’s been neutralized by religion and tradition. In a traditional culture, girls are raised to think that “real men” are kind and hard-working. But being a “nice guy” in a modern matriarchal society is the same as being a low-ranking male in a Stone-age herd. In other words, modern man is socially adapted in such a way that he sacrifices the very qualities that could make him attractive to women. Civilization deforms men in the eyes of women.

We can see that the instinctive choice is obviously not the best one. This is why developed traditional cultures never allow these decisions to be made by the emotions (instincts) of young people. The bride and groom are usually selected by their parents, who have acquired wisdom through life experience, and by the clergy. Otherwise, chances are the woman would end up either alone with unwieldy children or with a useless oaf of a husband, a failed leader from the ancient tribes. And civilization would never get what it needs - sensible children from a “nice guy.” The free sexual market – that is, letting women choose their partners on their own – thus inevitably leads to the degradation of the intellectual potential and general well-being of society.

For understandable reasons, instinct reacts positively to good physical data. People have special a ritual for precisely this purpose: dancing. You’ve probably seen birds performing mating dances on the Discovery Chanel. Well, a dance club is exactly the same thing. When they dance, people of both genders show off how well they move, how graceful they are, their coordination, and other physical and psychological factors. There’s a ton of information encoded in a dance, and it’s usually decoded and analyzed on a subconscious level. However, if you know the “code,” you can watch someone dance and figure out what they’re like in bed, or, for

that matter, in life. This is why all human cultures ascribe so much significance to dancing.

A woman will also usually test a potential mate for his fighting ability. In order to accomplish this, she instinctively creates conflict by sending signals to multiple men at the same time, thus provoking them into competition so she can determine where they stand in relation to one another. This is a very ancient instinct. However, it would be naïve to assume that you can win a girl's heart forever by punching your rival in the face. Chances are, she'll enjoy the opportunity to assert herself and will be sure to repeat her little trick over and over again.

Fashion is a particularly interesting phenomenon. People have always liked to decorate themselves. When a hunter from an ancient tribe would make himself a necklace from his trophies - say, the claws from bear he'd killed - this would serve as proof of his strength and skill. Nowadays this tendency has survived as "style" or fashionable "bling." An expensive cell phone or car is a signal to a modern female of a male's productivity as a hunter in the urban jungle. It also shows her that the male can, in principle, be controlled. A single little tug on his "vanity" cord is all it'll take to manipulate him into doing whatever she wants.

Based on the data acquired in testing mode, the woman's female instinct will make a determination about the status of a given male. In other words, she'll decide who he'll be in relation to her - a friend, a lover, or a sponsor (husband) - and how (for what price) he'll be allowed to mate with her. There are three possible results.

1. The man is determined to be a clearly inferior male. He's weak, an LR with poor survival-capability. In this case, the woman usually doesn't see the man as a sexual partner. But, if he shows an interest in her and starts to court her (gives her presents, does things for her), then she'll do her best to make him her "friend." She'll "bench" him, giving him small doses of attention and encouraging vague hopes. Obviously, she'll also continue to use him as a source of presents, free services, and other useful things. If a woman offers you friendship instead of sex, this means that to her, you're nothing. You're not worthy of her intimacy. There's nothing more humiliating for a man than the "friend zone." A woman can "bench" a whole series of "friends." This increases her status in female society by demonstrating her demand by men, that is, her female success in life. This is why a woman will in principle never, ever cut off all relations with a man or refuse him completely unless she absolutely has to. She'd rather keep him on a tight leash of hope.

2. The man is determined to be an elite inseminator with an especially valuable gene pool (the arrow on the left side of the chart). It would be natural if, as soon as the partner's been determined to be genetically promising, the couple got right to the business of reproducing. No matter what. This is a biological imperative. This is why instinct switches off part of the intellect, as well as the person's ability to accurately comprehend reality and their partner. The partner seems ideal. Depending on the degree of sensory inaccuracy, this state can be called "being in love." Usually there's only one man who can hold this status for a given woman. There might be other men, "friends" and "sponsors," but only one "beloved." He gets as much sex as he wants, and he gets it for free. The woman wants him.

3. Instinct isn't totally sure, but, according to formal instinctual or rational criteria, the man might be acceptable either as the beloved, or possibly as bread-winner/provider. In this case the woman tries to hold his interest by setting up a "lure." This can be any overt sign of attention. She might ask for his help with her car or computer to flatter his male vanity. Or she might sleep with him once, just to show him how nice it is, then act like that was never what she wanted. It just happened, and now she's not sure whether it was the right thing to do or not. Obviously, the man then has to go ahead and prove to her that it was, in fact, the right thing to do. Or something like that. The main thing is to get the man to feel positive emotions connected with the woman. If, after all that, the man doesn't start to court her, then the relationship can end. If he does start to court her, then testing mode continues into the courting process. But we'll talk more about that in the next section.

By the way - instinct's verdict will depend not just on the characteristic of the man being evaluated, but also on how he stacks up against other potential rivals for the status of sexual partner. It goes without saying that it's in the man's best interest to be a "big fish in a small pond" - the less experience and the fewer choices the woman has, the better it is for the man. And usually for the woman, too.

Women who have already entered full dominance mode, especially older, post-reproductive women and women in a matriarchal culture, conduct their evaluation according to a simplified scheme - all they care about is the man's potential as a provider, and as soon as they're done with the test, they move right into dominance

mode. For older women, this is connected with the fact that they're basically no longer able to fulfill their reproductive function. This is why men hold no interest for them as sources of genes. A woman in a matriarchal culture is used to the idea that she's surrounded by weak men, so she automatically sees almost every man as *a priori* lesser being and a source for resources. The only exceptions are men whom they know to be successful and who display obvious signs of an HR male. But even this doesn't last for long. The woman's still used to being in charge and seeing other women dominating their men. There's no question of love here.

If a less intelligent woman who's already entered full dominance mode finds a man attractive as a source of resources, she'll immediately plan her attack under the assumption that he's an *a priori* low-ranking man who's been fortunate enough to get some female attention. She'll try to swallow him in one bite. Her goal is to take control of the man and his resources, her tactic: find the sensitive parts of his psyche, get her claws in there, and break him. Her primary method is to attract his attention, win him over with her intensity, stalk him, and inundate him with calls and texts - even if they're stupid or presumptuous ones, it doesn't matter. She might also try to break down his self-esteem with primitive attacks while simultaneously displaying her interest. "Sure, you're a piece of shit, but I love you just the way you are." If a woman tries this tactic on a man and he's flattered by it and takes the bait, then at that point he's been tested, snatched up, and broken. He's ready for use. It's a primitive, but very effective, technique.

Women who are in dominance mode but have a little more brains will hunt for men's resources a little differently. They've developed whole arrays of techniques for testing and snatching up their men. They carefully study the markets for cars, cell phones, and men's clothing and shoes. That way they can determine how well-off a man is instantly, at a glance. They study books on popular psychology. They take classes. They swap notes with their friends on how to test and attract men.

Let's take another look at a very important detail. Women in dominance mode pay especially close attention to whether a man decks himself out in designer brands. They look at the make and model of his car, his cell phone, the brands of clothes he wears, his fashion sense, and his style. All of this tells her how easily the man can be manipulated by advertising techniques. If he's a walking billboard, this means he has no mind of his own, and in the long run it'll be easy to take him over and get at his money - which he definitely has. I remember that one girl I went out with could tell on our first date that my stylish wallet was a gift - that's how sharply it contrasted with my independent way of thinking.

Smart women test men in the same way, but with the opposite goal. They're looking for a man who has his own mind, a leader. For example, a woman might ask a guy to buy her a drink. If he agrees, she'll decide he's a wimp. But if he refuses, he's a potential partner worthy of respect.

Strictly speaking, women test men constantly. The initial testing happens during the first encounter, and, usually after a minute of conversation, the woman will already have developed a preliminary verdict as to whether she'll sleep with him or not. However, she also has other testing methods (usually provocations) that she runs all the time, over the course of her entire relationship with any man. But, in order to be more precise, we've considered testing mode only in its most characteristic place in the "Formula for Love" algorithm.

## The Lure

If the woman decides that the man's worthy to be treated as a mate, but her instinct still isn't sure whether he qualifies as an elite inseminator, she can perform a ritual demonstration of some of her own assets. For example, she might spend the night with him, as if by accident, demonstrating her full sexuality by providing maximum pleasure. Or she might do the dishes. Or help him out with something. Or even clean his bathroom floor. The important thing is not to get too flattered by this. It's not going to happen again. All she's doing is showing the man how nice things would be for him if he can prove himself worthy of her. And so the lure ritual is followed by the ritual of playing hard to get. She retreats from the man, takes a step back. He's not going to be accepted as the beloved right away - he has to fulfill the courting ritual first. In market terms, she's going to haggle intensely with him, exchanging her sexual services for his material services, and she'll observe and evaluate his behavior the entire time. If the woman's instinct decides he's inferior, she'll turn off the lure and start dominating him.

However, if the woman's instinct decides that he's a good catch, then the lure will switch to the next

phase: “love.” This phase might go on for a long time. That is, until the woman pulls off reverse-domination.

## Courting

There are a number of animal species that require the males to somehow prove their right to inseminate a female by demonstrating their survival-capability. They might drive a rival male away from the female, or seize and defend territory, or build a nest, or show off their agility and endurance in a ritual mating dance, or maybe all of these things at once. All you have to do is take a look around you to become convinced that all of these factors have the most direct possible influence on the human female’s decision about mating with a male. We already know that, in a state of nature, a woman in her child-bearing or breeding period is incapable of surviving independently for very long. This is why, before getting pregnant, she has to be convinced that her chosen male is not only survival-capable, but also able and willing to take care of her.

Courting is the process by which the woman performs a detailed examination of the man’s ability to survive and provide for her. The man, for his part, attempts to demonstrate these qualities to her.

For example, in a ritual mating dance, the man will display not just his physical traits, but also his ability to interact with the woman, to “lead” her – that is, his responsibility and initiative. During the process of ritual entertaining and gift-giving, when he takes her to a restaurant or gives her flowers, he’s displaying his readiness to feed the woman and his ability to bring home the bacon.

The woman, meanwhile, intentionally creates situations designed to test the man. By making sure he bumps into a rival, she can evaluate the man’s skills as a fighter and protector. By showing up late to a date, or standing by the bar and saying “buy a lady a drink?,” or “Ooo, I like that car. I hope I don’t have to take the subway forever, I’m so sick of it,” etc., she’s testing his reaction to being demeaned and manipulated by a woman, as well as his ability to think independently. This is, by the way, a very interesting test. If he succumbs willingly to the leash and takes the bait, if he fulfills all of the woman’s demands, he displays his inclination to be controlled, to take orders, and therefore his promise as a bread-winner. The woman gives him an appropriate place in her life – namely, a stall to be milked in. She’ll milk him, but she’ll never love and respect him. She’ll either give him no sex at all, or give him strictly controlled doses based on how much he pays. If the man gets upset and starts trying to teach her a lesson about the immorality of amateur prostitution, the woman will be forced to respect him, but she’ll still end any “serious” relationship with him because he’s demonstrated too much immunity to manipulation. However, if the man displays psychological fortitude or confidence, but does it in a non-aggressive or humorous way, limiting himself to symbolic ritual gifts and thereby putting the woman in her place, the woman’s female instinct will identify him as a strong male, someone who has his own mind but is still ready to provide for a female and offspring. And her love switch will flip into the “on” position. Women’s caprices can also be kind of test. During the courting process, the man has to simultaneously demonstrate his readiness to obey the woman to a certain degree (satisfy her minor whims and caprices when he’s not busy), his reliability (by not making a big deal out of them), and his firmness (casually extricating himself from any whims that are absurd or excessive). Firmness is also a very useful sign for displaying survival-capability and psychological fortitude. This is the reason why a man who stubbornly and persistently pursues a woman usually gets her in the end.

While the man is ogling the woman’s legs and dreaming of a night of passion with her, the woman’s conducting a conversation test. By peppering him with leading questions, she discretely fishes for information about how successful he is, how much he earns, the structure of his income and expenses, his personality, his relationship to money, women, and children, the history of his personal life, and especially his psychological vulnerabilities – all the information that’ll come in handy when it comes time to make a decision about his suitability as a partner and how to control him. As they say, everything you say can and will be used against you.

All of this at once, the whole testing system, makes up the Courtship Ritual. The Ritual tells the woman, even more clearly than her instinct, whether a given man is suitable for the role of beloved or husband. If the result is “approved,” that’s when instinct flips her love switch to “on.” Failure to conduct the ritual will either scare the woman off (for example, when a man is either excessively aggressive or absolutely impossible to control) or push the man into the “friend zone.”



Practical guides to dating, seduction, and taking advantage of women's instinctive reactions can be found in a more or less systematized format in pick-up books and various websites. That's why I'm not going to worry about that stuff in this book.

In traditional cultures, the process of courtship and selecting a partner, as a very important process for society as a whole, is conducted under the supervision of religion and the cultural tradition. So, after the couple has been selected, first comes the betrothal, then an extended sequence of scripted events that serve to bring the bride and groom closer together. There's a system for giving gifts, including their contents and what they should cost, a protocol for encounters, etc. so that the woman's, as well the man's, instincts are set to establish mutually positive identifications of one another. This also serves to minimize the moral and material expenses that can arise in the event of a poor choice

In our modern, unbalanced, matriarchal culture, both the man and the woman are disoriented. Their instincts have no idea what's going on, so they're in no position to conduct the Courtship Ritual with any kind of biological precision. Women frequently display excessive initiative, scaring men away with behavior typical of a dominating or inadequate female. Or, intimidated by hysterical feminist rhetoric and the demonized image of men in the media, women are afraid of men and avoid them. Or, having consumed too much sexist literature, they treat men with *a priori* disdain as lower, primitive beings. Men, on the other hand, have had their behavioral norms distorted by their upbringing. For example, a man who, whether by his upbringing or in some other way, has succumbed to feminist hysteria, won't display the firmness and initiative that a woman instinctively looks for. All of this serves to significantly decrease the likelihood of a successful pairing. In some matriarchal countries, young men in dance clubs stand along the wall waiting to get "picked" by a girl. They're afraid of accusations of sexual harassment and the legal persecution that follows, so they become scared of girls and act passively. Their sex instinct is blocked by their instinct for self-preservation. No wonder these countries have demographical issues!

But let's assume that a man's somehow managed to successfully conduct the Courting Ritual. Female instinct has identified this man as a genetically promising potential provider and flipped the woman's love switch to "on."

The processes of searching for, courting, and testing a partner have been the subject of an enormous number of artistic, scientific, and popular-scientific books, as well as movies other artistic works in every genre. The problem is, however, that this point in the process, i.e. the most interesting one of all, is where everything ends. Artistic works, scientific studies, or movies depicting men and women sharing everyday life and love are practically nonexistent. There are too many sex guides and too much porn to keep track of, but the specialized literature dedicated to solving family crises is totally unconvincing, especially given that there are more and more of these crises all the time. It's as if life ends when two people who love each other get together or get married. This slippery topic might be unattractive to authors - but not to us. On the contrary, we think this is the most interesting thing of all. And so, dear reader, let's take a look at the wheels within wheels and see if we can't draw up a diagram of humanity's greatest mystery - love.

## Love

What is love, anyway? First of all, let's forget all the sighs, songs, and poems dedicated to love, and ask this question a little differently. Why do we need love? Which functions does it fulfill for a couple? We obviously need it for something other than just reproduction, since it's perfectly possible to create offspring without love.

We need it, first and foremost, in order to unite a man and a woman, to bind them together, to transform two separate and otherwise autonomous biological units into a new biological unit suited to procreation. The result has to be an association, called a couple or a family, in which the functions of the man and woman are clearly defined. The first and most important function is leadership, the function of authority. One of the two has to dominate, and the other has to assume a subordinate position. Therefore, the first thing love has to do is clear up the question of who's in charge by giving the more worthy partner the first move. If the man's survival-capable and strong, especially if his leadership program's switched on, the leadership function will go to him. If he's weak or loses his survival-capability, the woman will snatch the leadership function out of his hands. Since

a woman is, generally speaking, going to be physically weaker than the weakest man, it's up to love to make a stronger man controllable while easing the reins on a weak woman. If the man's strong, if he's a leader, this should never happen the other way around. Therefore, there aren't just two different kinds of love, one for men and one for women, but also different kinds of love as experienced by strong vs. weak men. These different kinds of love have different goals. Let's see how this all plays out in real life.

The MR and LR levels. Imagine, if you will, that you're God (Or the Earth Mother, or whatever). Before you are two independent beings that are supposed to be fruitful and multiply. Moreover, their newborn baby is going to be totally helpless for a long time, so it'd be best if the male could take care of both it and the female. In order for them to accomplish their common goal, they're going to have to be together for a long time. This means that you'll have to set up a new functional system, and this system needs a leadership center - the being that's weaker and stupider, but closer to the baby. You've already decided to make it so that they're drawn to one another. They're psychologically dependent on each other, but the man is drawn more powerfully by sex. If you stopped there, then the strong, intelligent being would never let himself be controlled by the weak, stupid one, but would just take whatever he wants by force. In other words, you have to set up an adaptive process by which the weak, stupid being can, by the end of the process, control the strong, intelligent one. How are you supposed to do this? Your solution is going to need to take the following things into account:

1. The being that's meant to be in control has to have a better understanding of the one it's controlling, while the one being controlled should have no understanding whatsoever of the nature, motives, and goals of the one controlling it. In fact, it shouldn't be able to understand it at all.

2. The being that's meant to be in control should treat the one it's controlling in functional terms as a means of attaining its goals, while the one being controlled should have complete trust in the one controlling it.

3. Both beings should take an active interest in each other, but the being that's meant to be in control should be tempted by the future results of its control, while the one being controlled shouldn't get scared or run away.

4. In the event that the being that's under the other's control is sufficiently strong and independent, then, if the one in control can't make peace with the one it's trying to control, the uncontrollable being's valuable genes should be multiplied even more efficiently than if it were controllable. In the event that one of the two beings isn't survival-capable, they shouldn't have any offspring.

The only way to accomplish all of these things at once is to make it so that the two beings are completely unable to accurately perceive each other, albeit in different ways. And that's just what happened.

Therefore, love is first and foremost a state in which two partners perceive each other inaccurately. When in this state, the man and woman idealize each other. They each exchange a real potential partner for a virtual, idealized image.

Let's look further. According to the functional division within the couple, the woman brings up the rear. This is why the man idealizes her in precisely the way he does. He sees her as a kind, soft, receptive, sexual, reliable partner, no matter how cold, calculating, and greedy a bitch she really is. Moreover, in relation to this woman, he himself becomes soft and attentive. He enjoys (i.e. he's gotten used to) fulfilling her desires, giving her presents, etc. A man's love for a woman is thus mixed equally with care, with service. It also has to be mixed with passion, since it's the woman's job to increase the man's bond to her with sex.

The HR level. The love of a strong, intelligent man or a man who's simply taking advantage a demand among women is something else. This is a completely different instinctual program. During the age of the animal herd, this program was switched on for the leader alone. The leader of the herd wasn't just supposed to provide and care for specific females; he was supposed to distribute his valuable gene pool as broadly as possible, controlling every member of the herd regardless of their gender. Therefore, this kind of man loves a woman shallowly, without sacrificing his accurate perception of her. He loves her like a favorite toy, or a cute pet. He understands that this pet has to be fed, that it bites and shits, but doesn't worry too much about it. And, needless to say, he never transfers the leadership function to it. On the contrary, this kind of man will control and manipulate a woman himself.

However, there's no strict correlation between types of love and the active level of a man's hierarchical program. Sometimes a man can love one woman according to the first type, but love a few other ones according

to the second. It can also happen that an indisputable leader idealizes a woman and puts his faith in her.

A woman's love is a totally different thing, despite the fact that we use the same word for it. A woman idealizes a man differently. She idealizes his abilities. She's convinced that he'll be a good father and husband (that he can provide and protect), no matter how lazy and philandering a con-artist he really is. But she sees his personality traits, his character, very clearly. There was a reason she tested him so thoroughly during the courtship process, after all. A loving woman instinctively attunes her psyche to that of the man she loves, she copies it. She starts using his expressions, his concepts, his way of thinking, his religion, his convictions, his hobby. Women themselves call this "losing yourself in a man." Psychologists call it "psychic reflection." It allows the woman to accomplish two goals at once: she gains the man's trust, weakens him, and gets him to put his guard down, while simultaneously feeling out his weaknesses, his vulnerabilities, his sore spots, his passions, his complexes, and other things she can then put to use when manipulating him. If a man's love is defined by passion, care, and service, then a woman's love is a process of aggressive reconnaissance and preparation for seizing control. In other words, it's an instrument that'll help her worm her way into the man's trust.

In the movie *The Runaway Bride*, Julia Roberts very accurately plays a woman with a hypertrophied ability to reflect a man. Her character attunes herself so strongly to a man (copies his interests, his favorite foods, etc.) that she loses her own personality. Then, when she realizes this during the wedding ceremony, she runs away.

When a woman's been pushed into full dominance mode by a modern matriarchal culture, she has no need to love a man. There's no need to soften him up - the entire system of his matriarchal upbringing has already made him soft and malleable for her. Therefore, all a woman needs is for men to love her. She sees love as an extremely undesirable disease that might make her do something for free that she could just as well do for pay.

In the event that a woman is unable to successfully attune her psyche to a man's, an alternate program switches on that we know as "feeling sorry for him." This is a very interesting phenomenon. The woman never feels sorry for someone who's actually worthy of her sympathy - say, a weak, non-survival-capable male - but she's more than ready to "feel sorry for" a drunken oaf whose behavior is no different than that of an aggressive Stone-age male.

When this happens, the woman instinctively sees the inadequacy of the man's behavior either as the results of his "checkered past" or as a psychological vulnerability. In ancient times, either circumstance would have given the female a chance to seize control from the male. "Feeling sorry for him" is really nothing more than the female's reaction to a certain vulnerability in a strong male, one she can get her claws into, then use to make him dependent on her. She treats his wounds, pets him, and shows him that he's now the one bringing up the rear. This is the most direct way to make sure that, once he's recovered, the hunter will come back and deliver his prey to precisely that female.

Professional con artists know how to take advantage of this phenomenon and have based an entire system of seduction on it. First, they create the image of a strong male, then they display a vulnerability. Female instinct reacts to this this by saying, "here's a strong male, and here's his vulnerability; all I have to do is exploit it in order to control him."

So, what have we learned? A mid- or low-ranking man's love amounts to his offering himself up as a sacrifice and a servant. A high-ranking man's love, on the other hand, is about care and protection. But a woman's love is a process of aggressively scouting a man and buttering him up so that she can try to reverse-dominate him.

### **Domination, Reverse Domination, and the Love Cycle**

Strictly speaking, reverse domination begins during the courting process, when the man starts feeding the woman, doing things for her, and demonstrating his readiness to be submit to her. However, as soon as they become established as a long-term couple, the woman sharply escalates her pressure on the man.

The mechanism that sets this off is usually a baby. This makes sense. The baby has to be provided for, and

this stimulates the woman's drive for reverse domination. However, nowadays reverse domination usually happens right after the wedding. This is connected with the fact that a married woman has a number of legal advantages over her husband and can't wait to take advantage of them. "Ever since the wedding, Melissa's been like a totally different person," a friend once told me who'd been shocked by a similar change in his woman's behavior.

The method by which women achieve both reverse domination and regular domination is psychological warfare - provocation and manipulation. The point of provocation is to pull the man out of a state of equilibrium, then quickly seize the psychological advantage. For example, the most basic female trick is to give a man an inferiority complex and a guilt complex (we'll take a more detailed look at women's methods for controlling men in a later chapter). In order to accomplish this, she first brings down the man's self-esteem by exploiting some flaw. For example, she might start a fight by turning an emotional screw: "you don't make much money, your friends are doing better than you." Then she'll apply another typical technique: "you suck, but I'm such a princess, I wasted my youth on you and it's your entire fault." And once it's all your fault, you obviously have to make up for it, to earn forgiveness and rehabilitate yourself in the woman's eyes. In other words, you need to provide the woman with even more services and material goods. In this way, the man falls into a psychological trap and ends up a doormat, a functional appendage of the woman. Then the woman switches over to dominance mode. But what about love, you ask? Think about it: what kind of love could anyone have for their own functional appendage, or for a dairy cow? In our matriarchal times, when women have legal advantages over men, these provocations can even take on hypertrophied, bizarre forms. For example, a woman, in the middle of a huge blow-out that she started, might threaten to divorce the man, taking half his property and his children. This might even be the last thing she really wants. She's been brought to this behavior by the combination of her female instinct and the conviction that she's invincible. However, the man who's getting traded in sees her behavior as an unambiguous betrayal. And the couple is doomed. Or the woman breaks the man psychologically and turns him into a doormat.

And yet we can hardly say that the male community consists of nothing but doormats. There are long-term couples enjoying love, and there are permanent bachelors who are surrounded by female attention, switch girlfriends every now and then, and love their lives.

If a woman fails to pull off reverse domination because the man is psychologically firmer than she thought, refusing to lose his self-esteem or develop a guilt complex, and is also successful and reliable, the love switch doesn't flip to "off." And everything starts all over again. Love, interspersed with provocations and attempts at reverse domination. This can go on forever.

In fig. 5, this situation is labeled "the love cycle." The woman never ceases to test the man's firmness, but, as long as he resists her, she keeps loving him. This is why long-term love is a balancing act. It's also the best possible situation for the couple - best for them, best for their children, best for the society they live in - best for everybody. This is why all traditional cultures do their best to carefully extend the woman's female instinct along the entire process of attraction, then lead it into love mode and keep it there for the rest of her life, all while ensuring that she never slips into dominance mode. This is accomplished by strengthening the man's position and by suppressing the woman's dominant tendencies.

In the chapter called "Love," we took a look at how instinct flips the love switch to "on." Now let's take a look at how it can get flipped to "off." In full accordance with the logic of its biological purpose, love switches off as soon as the goal it was switched on for has either been reached or is obviously unreachable. The goal that flips the love switch on is to seize control over the man. Therefore, it'll switch off again as soon as the man has demonstrated his submission to the woman. This could take the form of a present that's too expensive, a declaration of love, the man's humiliation in front of the woman, etc. Professional con artists even have their own special system for getting rid of a woman once they're sick of her: they get down on their knees and beg her for something in a humiliating way. The woman instantly loses interest in the man.

The other way love can switch off is when the man is so strong and psychologically firm that he's impossible to control, and all the woman's attempts to feel out his soft spots have been in vain. This situation has been depicted with biological precision in the movie *9 ½ Weeks*. The male lead in this movie is good-looking, rich, and intelligent. He does a beautiful job courting a woman, loves her, and is even ready to provide for her. The problem is that his way of thinking is too independent - he's totally uncontrollable. So the woman breaks up

with him. I'll mention in passing that, in a stone-age, contraception-free world, 9 ½ weeks is long enough for a female to get pregnant at least twice from such a genetically promising male. Therefore, in the ancient world she would have been forced to find a low-ranking male, or even several of them, in order to provide for herself and her child. This is why, as soon as the love switch flips to the "off" position, a woman will automatically shift into full dominance mode via search mode according to the "gold-digger cycle."

If love switches off after the man submits, this doesn't necessarily imply that the relationship is over. An easily controlled and well-off man can become a dominant woman's doormat of a husband, or her sponsor, or just her "friend." If she's a classic woman, she'll cycle on this kind of dominance. If she's not inclined to form a stable couple, she'll cycle through a series of partners while hunting for new men. However, one woman can easily be in various modes at the same time in relation to different men. She dominates her husband, but with her lover she's in lure mode.

If it turns out that the man is obviously weak, or if the woman is in full dominance mode, the love switch never gets flipped at all. The woman's instinct bypasses it entirely. The instinctive lure mode never switches on, although a short-term, intellectual facsimile of it can come into play before transitioning seamlessly into "turning the screws" – that is, constantly increasing psychological pressure.

We already know that, from a biological perspective, full dominance is a mode typical of mid-ranking females. The older she is, the more thorough her dominance becomes. This is why a dominant female, even a young and pretty one, loses her sexual attractiveness. An adequate man's male instinct can perceive her as old, post-reproductive, or inadequate, and therefore no good as a mate. If a woman's both dominant and ugly, she's got pretty much no chance at all. The only thing left for this kind of woman is to become a lesbian or a shrill, man-hating feminist. Or she can make do with a very poor male specimen with no other options. Or it could be the other way around. I personally know two older women who, despite their age, never entered dominance mode. Since they had a certain charm and were still in a persistently "young" mode of self-advertisement, men up to 15 years younger than them still found them sexually attractive. Dominance visibly ages a woman.

A civilized man on a lower stone-age level can also have a very hard time finding a partner among the consistently dominant, emancipated women of the modern world. Their minds take him for a threat, while their instinct sees him as old and sickly. In either case, he's no good as a potential mate. As time goes on, it becomes more and more likely that he'll end up perpetually single, look for a partner among much younger women, lead an asexual lifestyle, or go gay. A lot of these men try to find mail-order brides from countries where women are raised in traditional cultures or are just cheaper.

## Why Women Cheat

Once she's successfully pulled off reverse domination, the female becomes the male's *de facto* superior in the family hierarchy. Or at least that what she thinks. Her program starts up. A number of things can launch it: excessive worry, the man's susceptibility to manipulation, his patience, tact, gentleness, or tendency to avoid conflict, or even his expensive presents to her or the fact that he puts significant resources into her hands – in other words, everything that mothers (dominant females) teach their sons when preparing them for family life. Then the woman loses respect for the man, that is, she ceases to acknowledge his high status in the hierarchy, and her love automatically fades. Sex becomes stale and infrequent. And, whether consciously or subconsciously, the female starts looking for another man, a strong one. And sooner or later she'll find him.

This is obviously the man's fault, right? People tell him, "it's because you didn't pay enough attention to her," or "it's because you were smothering her." And they tell everyone else that he "drank, beat her, cheated on her, neglected her, and didn't make enough money, the bastard."

The first warning sign of immanent cheating is a disrespectful or careless attitude toward the man. It's possible to take preventative measures and put the woman in her place, but you'll also have to start thinking about how to protect your resources in case of a break-up or divorce.

If the woman's hanging around social networking sites, hiding her emails and texts, locking herself in the bathroom with her cell phone, buying sexy clothes that she doesn't wear at home, then this means she's already started cheating. Even if, for whatever reason, she still hasn't slept with the new guy, she's already cheated in her

heart, and there's no going back.

A woman can even cheat on a beloved man if her animal program of "instant mating" happens to fire up. This kind of cheating can happen spontaneously, surprising the woman as much as anyone else. Some slick douchebag just showed up out of nowhere and banged her.

Once she's started cheating, the couple's doomed. The final break-up is just a matter of time. The process is irreversible. Either that, or the couple can turn into two strangers who happen to live together. This means there's absolutely no point in begging the woman to change her mind or trying to figure out what's going on between her and her new boyfriend. Pissing contests won't do anything but beef up the woman's self-esteem, while the guy begging her to change her mind can only inspire her with indifferent disgust – a woman's normal reaction to a low-ranking male. This is why they say a woman never forgives a man for forgiving her affair. All his forgiveness means to her is that she has permission to do it again.

The difference between when a man cheats and when a woman cheats is that "a man cheats with his dick, a woman with her heart." In other words, cheating for a man means having sex with another woman, while cheating for a woman means betraying her leader. This is why affairs by men and women are treated differently in traditional cultures, with women being punished much more severely.

In the modern world, where traditional morality has been practically destroyed, we can see that, even when meeting someone for the first time, most women openly display their disrespect for men. Girls are raised from childhood to be mid-ranking, dominant females. This is why cheating is rampant. It's pretty much guaranteed. This is why nowadays you can never assume that a relationship with a woman is going to last forever. There are just too many factors that can provoke her to cheat on you and betray you. Plus, there's no guarantee whatsoever that she won't reset at any moment. Even if you know you can trust your woman today, everything could change tomorrow. This is why smart men keep their resources where their females can't get at them.

**So**, what have we learned? The human female's in-born sex instinct can be understood as a behavioral algorithm containing a few level-based modes and three basic algorithmic cycles that guide the female's interactions with males in the conditions native to stone-age tribal life. These are:

1. A cycle for interacting with high-ranking males;
2. A cycle for interacting with mid-ranking males;
3. A cycle for interacting with low-ranking males.

The culture of a traditional patriarchal society nullifies the incongruity between the stone-age criteria and the civilized criteria a female uses to evaluate a male. This encourages the female's instinct to operate in cycle 1 (love) when interacting with a high-ranking male.

In an unbalanced matriarchal society, this incongruity doesn't get nullified, but motivates the female's instinct to operate in cycles 2 (sex for food) and 3 (food without sex). This is the basis of the free sexual marketplace. And women are stuck in the old-lady mode of full dominance. This is the biological basis of a matriarchal society.

All of this will inevitably lead to various kinds of conflicts among reproductive programs, as well the destruction of families, demographic crises, and other social problems on a global scale.

## Chapter 3. THE FREE SEXUAL MARKETPLACE

### Hierarchy, Sex, and Money.

The themes of sex and money have become so tangled up in our lives that it's now time to examine them very carefully.

Traditional cultures with clearly delineated internal family, clan, and class structures usually have a carefully controlled process for selecting human material and protecting the property of each family in the event of a match. In these cultures, couples are formed with a great sense of responsibility, taking into account the genealogy and upbringing of the bride and groom. Sex is localized within the framework the institution of marriage, which is regulated by religious and cultural traditions. The man is positioned as the leader responsible for the good of the family hierarchy, and, as the leader, he gets as much free sex as he wants. Sex outside of the family, that is, as an element of the sexual marketplace, is condemned and stamped out.

Following the erosion of the family, the boundaries between various social layers, and traditional culture, modern society is slowly but surely turning into a homogeneous mid-ranking herd in which the government plays the role of surrogate leader. Men are being positioned as mid- or low-ranking males subject to the leader's authority. Given this state of affairs, it's no surprise that the free sexual marketplace, a phenomenon peculiar to the MR level of the stone-age herd, has developed into a social norm. This market doesn't stop at prostitution, mind you – it's also making its way into the level of the family and of loving couples. And, of course, it's also beginning to be legally mandated. For example, just 70 years ago there was still a legal concept called “marital obligation.” This was a legal reflection of the husband's right, as leader, to unlimited sex. Nowadays, instead of “marital obligation,” we have “marital rape,” which reflects the female's right to sell sex within the confines of the marriage. The sexual marketplace also doesn't promote the thoughtful, intentional selection of a partner - its selection process is based on a combination of instinctual and mental urges. In the absence of any established cultural or religious criteria for selecting a mate, each individual ends up forming their own criteria in an intuitive, accidental way. Moreover, since modern matriarchal society has dragged most men down to the MR level, women's female instinct activates the behavioral programs intended to govern interactions with mid- and low-ranking males – namely, sex for food. Or food without sex. In rich Western countries, most women can earn a living independently without too much trouble, which is why the “no food *or* sex” paradigm is so prevalent there. Thanks to these factors, male-female relationships in a matriarchal society can be described according to an economic model.

### Sex as a Commodity

Let's consider how sex can function as a commodity. As a product for sale, it's unique in that its innate value is essentially zero. Therefore, its market value is determined exclusively by supply and demand, which in turn depends on which sector of the sexual substructure of the social hierarchy it occupies, or, in other words, in which sector of the sexual marketplace the “transaction” takes place. Let's take a look at these different sectors.

1. High-ranking men. This is pretty simple. Women's female instinct sees them as genetically promising. Women want them as much as they want women, so supply and demand are basically the same on both sides. Female sex and male sex are thus exchanged without any additional fees - “for love,” as it were. So high-ranking men aren't interested in paying for sex.

2. Mid-ranking men. Women's female instinct will see them as genetically promising only if they're also a good provider. Women aren't exactly crazy about them, but they are crazy about taking advantage of their resources. Therefore, supply and demand are unbalanced. The MR men's demand for female sex exceeds the women's demand for male sex, so female sex is worth more, and the men have no choice but to make up the difference with presents, services, and money. This can be either an arrangement for life (marriage) or a temporary situation (sponsor and “kept woman”). Free, high-quality sex is available to mid-ranking men only as an advertisement, and even then only once or twice. After the trial period is over, the woman turns the tables on

the man, creating a situation where he has to “get” her. In other words, she demands payment, and the quantity and quality of sex starts to vary depending on the nature of that payment. There’s a whole host of different tactics for pressuring the man into paying up. For example, the woman might tell the man she’s really upset or really busy because of some problem. This means that, in order to get access to her body, the man has to fix her problem for her first, whether by cracking open the old wallet or by doing something else for her. Or the woman might say she’s “tired.” Then the man has to do her housework for her; and so on, and so forth. Sometimes it might turn out that the woman has as much biological need for sex as the man. In these couples, a mid-ranking man can consistently get sex for free. However, most couples in a given society are formed according to its stereotypical sexual relations, and most of the time, this means that the man still has to pay for sex because that’s “just how it’s done.” Plus, mid-level males have had their self-esteem reduced to the extent that they can’t believe they’re actually worth something and shouldn’t have to pony up the dough.

3. Low-ranking men. Female instinct finds mid-ranking males genetically defective, so women don’t want them at all. Their sexual value for women is thus effectively zero. These men have extremely low self-esteem, and women are generally afraid of them. If one of these men actually gets married, he gets nothing but minuscule amounts of pathetically low-quality pity sex, and even then only when he’s been a very good boy. Therefore, if these men have the money, they become johns for prostitutes. They also tend toward non-sanctioned or criminal methods for acquiring this specific salable item - in other words, rape and pedophilia. By the way, the criminal world’s traditional disrespect for men convicted of sex crimes is connected with this. A high-ranking “real man” has no need to rape women and produce unwanted babies. He’s got plenty of sex as it is. A sex crime therefore speaks to a man’s general sexual dissatisfaction, or, in other words, it shows that he’s an LR.

The question of how prestigious and morally satisfying sex is for a man is also directly connected with the way in which that sex is provided. Whether or not he has to pay for sex is a testament to a male’s position in the hierarchy of the stone-age herd, and, thanks to the way the subconscious (instinctual programming) works, having sex for free will raise a man’s self-esteem, while paying for sex will lower it. For example, sex with a prostitute has absolutely no value for a high-ranking man. Moreover, he finds having to pay a woman for sex – whether she’s a prostitute or a kept woman – to be demeaning. No matter how much sex for pay a man might have, it won’t give him any psychological satisfaction, and it’ll also give him serious doubts about how high his rank is. All sex for pay can do is “clean out the pipes” on a purely physiological level. Instinct’s logic is pretty simple - as soon as a guy’s paid for it once, he’s not going to get it for free. In other words, it means he’s not a leader. As a rule, a high-ranking male never brags about having sex. For him, getting sex and love from women is as ordinary as eating, and the only people who brag about eating are those that are usually starving. A low-ranking man, on the other hand, will brag to all and sundry about his imaginary sexual conquests. And, if some woman actually gives him some free sex, his self-esteem goes through the roof. In traditional societies, where people are poor, the free sexual marketplace is curbed by the powerful force of religion. In these cultures, a woman’s sex is worth no less than the cost of caring for her for life. This means that many men who don’t earn much have to go without sex altogether; in other words, they’re forced into the LR position. For this kind of man, even a single sexual encounter with a prostitute is something to be proud of. A mid-ranking man is usually flattered when a woman loves him and gives him free sex. This moves him to a leadership level. However, sex with a prostitute might also interest him as a change of scenery. Paying for sex is a pretty ordinary thing for him.

How prestigious sex is for a woman is a question of how great the demand for her body is, and therefore her potential access to the resources of the men that want her. This is why married women like to brag about the resources they’ve acquired: “What does my husband do for a living? Why, he’s a millionaire.” Unmarried women, on the other hand, brag about their potential – how many men they’ve turned away, what kinds of men are after them, etc. Moreover, it’s also in a woman’s best interest to drag down a man’s rank so that she doesn’t have to give away what she could potentially sell. This is why she’ll do everything in her power to undercut and break a man, no matter how high his rank might have been when they met. This is why women (unlike men, who only brag about having sex with women) tend to boast about how many and what kinds of men they’ve rejected.

There’s also a specific segment of the sexual marketplace where the demand for male sex is higher than that for female sex. Some physically attractive men also sell their sex. Their clients are usually unattractive, older women.



The matriarchal sexual marketplace also has a criminal segment. Women use sex not just as a commodity, but also as a means for racketeering and the liquidation of men. All a woman has to do is claim that her husband raped her in order for him to lose his freedom.

Over the last few decades, the legal systems of many countries have come to provide women with a number of ways to quickly and legally rob men blind. The reigning indulgence of women has thus bled into the criminal segment of the sexual marketplace. Women have started to band together in order to purposefully dedicate themselves to learning practical methods for stealing men's resources. Tons of books have appeared on this theme, as well training centers and other instruments for developing this criminal segment of the sexual marketplace.

Women today have no cultural mechanisms to protect them from their own animal instincts. As a result, a girl will tend, under the influence of these instincts, to choose her first sexual partner poorly, which is then followed by the activation of her MR level sex instinct. Moreover, matriarchal marriage nowadays has too much risk and too few rewards for men, so smart men try to avoid it in order to remain free and not burden themselves with responsibilities for processes they can't control. Meanwhile, the free sexual marketplace is constantly becoming more and more developed. Women relish the chance to make a quick profit from weakened, disoriented men. The combination of these factors has led to an increase in the number of perpetually single women with negative experiences in their personal lives - and they're out there, actively hunting for men's resources. There's also been a corresponding glut of related information in society. Bookstore shelves groan under the weight of books with titles like *Honey Money* and *A Gold Digger's Guide*. Television and movie screens are plastered with images of adventuresses who, with the legal system's help, use their bodies as a lure to steal money from men. Little girls can't wait to grow up to be gold diggers. And, in order to help them along, their experienced mothers send them to the hosts of "modeling schools" that have sprung up overnight, where they're taught techniques for sexual provocation and sex-selling. It goes without saying that only the best and brightest will be able to sell themselves at a high price to a single rich buyer, while the others add to the glut of female hunters. But not every hunter is a gold digger.

A gold digger is a female hunter with a personality disorder. This is a woman whose ultimate goal isn't just to snag a man and make him submit to her so that she can take his material resources, thereby providing for her offspring and her other future interests - her goal is to make him as uncomfortable as possible, and, if possible, break him. This is usually connected with the fact that the woman has herself been psychologically broken. She's got an inferiority complex. Some man or other (usually the one she loved) got away, and maybe even "hurt" her somehow. Now she wants a rematch; she wants to show what's she's worth and get revenge. She can't take her frustrations out on the man that actually hurt her, since he's not available, so she goes after men in general. And since breaking a weakling just isn't satisfying, these women pick strong men to sharpen their claws on. You see, it's much more convenient to justify her array of criminal sexual techniques if it's all in the name of noble vengeance. Or because "all men are pigs," and they have it coming anyway. In essence, the cult of the gold digger is the cult of unbridled, pathological, diseased man-hating.

The modern cult of the gold digger has changed the way men relate to women. Women have collectively begun to position themselves as gold diggers, that is, as the enemies of men, as hunters after their resources. And only there are only two ways you can relate to an enemy: you can avoid contact with them, if you're weaker, or you can fight them for resources, if you're stronger. I know a lot of younger guys who have lost all interest in women. They understand that relationships with women are a scam. I also know a lot of younger guys who understand this, but, rather than getting scammed, they've become scammers and players themselves. There are fewer and fewer "normal" men all the time, i.e. guys who are willing to enter into a long-term, serious relationship with a woman. This is how emancipated women have, by destroying traditional morality and creating a matriarchal culture that promotes disrespect for men and utilitarian relationships with them, created a threat for all women in the form of an equal but opposite reaction among men.

A few more words about the "world's oldest profession." Prostitution exists in all societies as a remnant of the older sexual marketplace of the herd, all traditional societies condemn it. But, since it serves as a buffer between the layer of LR males and the rest of society, it's almost never completely liquidated. It's tolerated as a way to satisfy their need for sexual activity. If you don't give low-ranking men a way to find affordable retail sex to pull them in the MR direction, then they'll steal it (rape). Therefore, making prostitution

more expensive or forbidding it outright will automatically lead to a rise in the number of rapes. And harsher punishment for rape will automatically lead to more rapists murdering women. Which is what we see happening right now. It's a simple market mechanism at work.

"How can this be?" you ask. "Why have men let this happen? Why aren't they doing anything to change the situation?" Well, let's think about it.

The biggest mistake a man can make is to idealize women as such. This is a case of inaccurate perception. Even if a man understands that he's giving a woman everything and that she's giving him nothing in return, he'll still assume that she's basically honest at heart; that she's interested in a relationship, and not in asserting herself or making a profit from him; that all her women's tricks aren't an elaborate scheme, but just a mistake, a misunderstanding, the result of a temporary failure to communicate; that it's all essentially fixable, that it's possible to fix the situation by appealing to common sense. But in reality, you might as well try explaining to a mugger that his behavior is indecent and absurd, when he's knows full well that, be that as it may, it's also profitable and effective. A man who's been blinded by love is completely unable to understand that a woman is deeply cynical and has no moral principles whatsoever, that she's acting only in her own best interests, that she sees him as nothing more than a unit of currency and a source of resources. The women who raised him have been carefully working his brain over in such a way that he now thinks that all women are good and honest. Plus, aside from his upbringing, there are also at least two subconscious mechanisms preventing him from realizing that he's being duped. First of all, there's his pride. It's hard for a man to admit that's he's been lead around by the nose in the most shameless and obvious way - especially is it's been going on for a long time. It's hard to admit that you're an idiot. It's much easier to see yourself as a noble knight. It's hard for a man to admit that he's paying for sex, or that, from the woman's point of view, he's not really worthy of sex at all, even for pay, because this automatically drags him down to a low rank. This is why men are so likely to wait forever in the vain hope that the situation will somehow improve. Second, there's a very interesting natural mechanism at play here, namely the reduced accuracy of his perception. This is the idealization of the object, the perception of the woman as beautiful and lovable. It's extremely tricky to consciously combine an idealized image with its object's dangerous behavior. No matter how disgusting the behavior of a beautiful, beloved woman might be, the man will always try to find some kind of reasonable explanation for it. He's convinced that she's kind and charming, that she's "special." However, if another man or an ugly woman were to act the same way, his perception would be accurate. I remember how a friend of mine (a pretty intelligent guy with a lot of life experience) once asked me for advice about his family troubles. After I'd laid out my theory for him, he thought for a moment and replied, "...You know, I understand intellectually that you're right, that it's all the way you say it is. But I feel such a powerful protest from my sense of beauty that I just can't agree with you..." The psychologists who work for the advertising industry know all about this. That's why we see pictures of half-naked beauties everywhere - even on billboards for tractors. A man's instinctive reaction is, "nothing so beautiful could ever be bad."

One fraudulent trick that women are particularly fond of is changing the terms of an agreement after it's already been made. As soon a woman reaches the next step in a romantic relationship - whether by feeling that the man's become attached to her, acquiring official wife status, having children, or attaining financial independence - she'll immediately change her behavior in order to reevaluate her relationship with the man in her favor. This usually manifests itself as a sharp increase in her application of psychological pressure and is accompanied by an obvious reduction in the amount of sex she gives him. Since the man's usually unprepared for these changes, the result is conflict. This can lead to the degradation of the relationship, a break-up, or (more rarely) a return to the original state of affairs. However, in the case of weak, sickly, and non-survival-capable men, that is, in the majority of men nowadays, the result is an increase in the man's obligations. In other words, the price of sex skyrockets.

This is why experienced men never rush into a second marriage. There are just too many opportunities for fraud. Divorced women, on the other hand, can't wait to get married again.

During the first stage of a relationship, a woman will usually try to show a man that her sex will be available on a free, exclusive, and unlimited basis. She pretends to be faithful, gentle, tender, and understanding. However, as soon as she's sealed the deal, she does everything in her power to bring down her partner's self-esteem and will reduce his dose of sex under the first available pretense in order to get as much pay as she out of

him.

How can you avoid falling for this? There's only one way – understand it. Understand that any time a woman places any condition whatsoever on having sex with a man, this means she has no love or respect for him. Understand that any woman who sells sex is a prostitute. Understand that it's humiliating to be a woman's "friend."

### **The Friend Zone**

A woman's friend always works to serve the best interests of the other men he's competing with for her attention. By providing services to a woman, the "friend" frees up her time for other men. By dumping her problems in her "friend's" lap, she frees up the time she would have wasted solving them herself and can now spend it either with the man she loves or in searching for him. The friend hopes that his exertions will be appreciated, but it's all for nothing. He's kidding himself. She doesn't see him as a sexual object, but only as a henchman who's willing to work for free, a source of benefits and a shoulder to cry on. He's a useful thing to have around. "Friendship" with a woman is the most shameful, degrading, and pointless role a man can have. There's only one way out – blitzkrieg. Try to storm the walls and take up the position of lover immediately. If it doesn't work, break off all relations with her forever.

Every now and then this can actually work, and the "friend" becomes the beloved or husband. But not very often. It's more common for a woman to reduce a man's status from beloved to sponsor (husband) or all the way down to "friend." It's more convenient for her to have a bench full of available "substitutions." The more men there are who serve her and court her, the higher her level of success in life. It's easy to figure out whether you're being used as a hopeless "friend" or actually have a chance to become the beloved. For example, let's say you're both college students, and the girl gives you her homework and says she doesn't have time to do it herself. She's gotta run, she has a ton of problems, she has to be at work later, her roommate's having a crisis, etc. If this happens to you, then you have your answer right there – you're a "friend." She sees you as nothing more than a free service machine. As a test, tell her that it'd be a lot more useful to do the homework together, then watch her reaction. If she seems genuinely glad and invites you back to her room while her roommate's away, then you have a chance – take it. But, if she grimaces, cooks up some excuse, and tries to get you to do it for her and show her how you did it – it's hopeless. Whisper to her that you're meeting another girl later and going to a party in the city. Give her lots of details, tell how everything's planned out to the minute, and you don't have time to do her homework. Then take off. Don't be a chump, don't demean yourself, and don't believe her when she says she's not ready for a relationship right now, that she's thinking about it and needs time. A woman decides a man's status during the first few minutes of their conversation and knows whether she's going to sleep with him or not. Remember this rule: "If a woman doesn't know what she wants, that means that, whatever it might be, it ain't you." It's blitzkrieg or nothing.

And one more thing: whatever you do, don't give a woman expensive presents. This is a serious and unforgivable mistake. She'll immediately turn you into a dairy cow. I once wanted to do something nice for a girlfriend, so I gave her a little emerald in a diamond frame. I immediately ceased to be her beloved and became her sponsor - her behavior immediately changed to fit the new market. I had to immediately create a situation where she was forced to pay for me in order to switch her instinctual reception back into "beloved" mode. Any presents you give women should be strictly symbolic, and they should never resemble payment for sex. And don't refuse if a woman gives you presents. It's actually a very good sign. Appreciate it, and show a reasonable level of gratitude. But don't let it go to your head.

### **Exes**

A woman will always try to "bench" her exes as a "friends" in order to use them to obtain free services. This is very practical – she already knows how to pull their strings. And she'll always try to goad her ex

psychologically and provoke him. Her goal is to increase her own self-esteem, test the reliability of her old system of manipulation, and train. For example, a woman might spend the night with her ex and tell him that he seems different. Or, if she knows he's single, she might take a sympathetic interest in his personal life.

If she feels particularly hurt after the break-up, the woman might try to take revenge on her ex at the first opportunity. For example, she might crawl into bed with him, then change her mind at the last minute, saying that she loves someone else and doesn't want to cheat on him. Or she'll sleep with him, then tell the cops he raped her and get him thrown in jail. Or start seeing him again just so she can dump him and humiliate him. There's nothing an ex-girlfriend won't do to nourish her wounded vanity. To put it simply, an ex-girlfriend is almost always a gold digger. And you're her "friend." Or even her enemy. Stay as far away from your exes as you possibly can, and keep one eye open.

### **The Sexual Showroom**

This basically doesn't exist in traditional cultures. In these cultures, couples are formed by their parents and professional clergymen in order to ensure the selection of the best possible human material, taking into account the partners' cultural compatibility and the involved parties' opportunity to protect their investments in the family and their children.

Ever since our matriarchal society was established and the free sexual marketplace appeared, various structures that serve that market have received a major impetus. This includes, among other things, the creation of meeting-places, whether naturally occurring or specially organized, where men and women can find each other. Since the downfall of traditional culture, the selection process has been hijacked by a system of testing according to instinctual, animal criteria, which has given birth to an entire culture of bad matches. The sexual showroom includes bars, clubs, resorts, beaches, parks, internet dating sites, and any other place, whether real or virtual, where everyone can show off their goods, including their body, youth, health, manliness, beauty, charm, money, services, etc. However, how well a given commodity sells on the floor of the sexual showroom depends on how well it's marketed. This is why the sexual marketplace automatically produces a culture in which sex is advertised as a commodity – in other words, a culture of sexual provocation.

Moreover, exclusive items aren't usually sold in the supermarket right next to the corn flakes, and it's the same with the sexual marketplace. Men and women who enjoy a high level of demand don't haggle with everyone else. For example, they might go to dance clubs and not dance, thereby showing that this kind of advertising is beneath them.

### **The Culture of Sexual Provocation**

Being attractive to men is one of a woman's biological functions. It's therefore natural for a woman to decorate herself and show off her body, emphasizing signs of youth, health, and fertility. Showing off her body isn't the only tool in her toolbox, of course. There's also a ton of potential behavioral methods for attracting male attention. There's "checking you out," and words, and intonation, and copying, and gestures, and odors, and make-up, and tattoos – you name it. It's all designed to send men's sex instinct the signal that they have the opportunity to continue their genetic line and thus provoke them to sexual activity.

There are a number of techniques for provocation that women are simply born with. I once went to a friend's place for dinner. As soon as his two-year-old daughter saw a strange man walk in the door, she immediately started posing in the same way that adult women pose in order to appear seductive, and she was obviously observing my reaction. She couldn't have learned it from her mother, since at that point her mother was already in full dominance mode and had pretty much cut off all sexual relations with her husband. They didn't let her watch TV. This was quite simply a precocious example of women's in-born behavioral programming at work.

In the stone-age herd, human females would provoke the leader to mate with them in order to produce offspring and provoke the mid-ranking males to try to earn the right to mate with them for food. Low-ranking males wouldn't have any food to give them, but they might try to take a female by force. However, the leader and the mid-ranking males would keep an eye on them, and the opportunity would almost never arise.

Later, after the appearance of efficient weapons, this kind of scheme for gender relations started to lead to murders within the group, and thus to threaten the very existence of society. Even in primitive cultures, women started to cover the parts of their bodies associated with reproduction, i.e. those body parts that are most likely to provoke men to sexual behavior.

In traditional cultures, the battle against female sexual provocation is conducted in a harsher and more focused way, up to and including covering a woman's entire body, and sometimes even her face, with clothing. This is the origin of the cult of female modesty. The infamous medieval "witch hunts" were pursuing the same goal – reducing the destructive activity of provocative and dominant women. You see, everyone knows that a woman who sexually provokes the men around her will inevitably become the cause of conflict within the family, the clan, the tribe, or even society at large. This makes the family, the clan, and society weaker. It reduces its efficiency and competitiveness. In a traditional culture, a man is positioned as the leader of a family hierarchy and as such is obligated to nip any appearance of sexual provocation in the bud.

## Marketing

In order to inflate prices by increase the demand for themselves and their sex, women employ standard market tactics. Here are a few of them:

- Eye-catching packaging. For example, bright clothes, make-up.
- The display case. For example, showing off legs or breasts, skimpy clothes.
- Anti-dumping practices. Female society does its best to portray women who have sex for free as ditzy, slutty, trashy, etc.
- Marketing. For example, creating the myth that men need more sex than women. If a man needs it so badly, that means he's got to win a woman's favor and pay for sex, while the woman remains modest and self-sufficient. Another example would be creating an artificial demand by promoting the commodity as something prestigious. Women give the entire section of their audience that doesn't have their commodity an inferiority complex. They carefully create an image of a man who's inferior because he doesn't have a kept woman, then they constantly try to set him up with one or get him married. They're convinced that every man's resources should be under a woman's control. When offering sex as a commodity, women generally form an organized, unified front.

The primary catalyst for promoting the culture of sexual provocation is show-business. From time immemorial, the theater, circuses, singing, and other kinds of public entertainments have appealed to the "baser" emotions. In other words, they go right for people's animal instincts, which has made the clergy's job a lot harder and brought about a sharp negative reaction from them. It used to be that performers weren't even allowed into respectable households and were buried outside of the graveyard. By the same token, art was carefully divided into two opposing categories: "low" art, which enflames our animal instincts, and "high" art, which initiates and develops our altruistic human instincts. But, as soon as religious restrictions had been lifted and traditional morality was destroyed, pop-culture became inextricably intertwined with sexual provocation. The theme of sex dominates both the large and small screens, as well as the press and popular music. It's profitable because it stimulates the viewers' emotions and, as a result, makes it easy to surreptitiously manipulate them. In other words, it gets them to cough up the cash.

When Christian preachers say that the devil is watching us through the television screen, that he's taken over the airwaves and our minds, this is exactly what they're referring to – the dominance of the culture of provocation, i.e. modern man's enslavement to his own instincts and those who manipulate them. They don't call it the "boob tube" and the "idiot box" for nothing, after all.

The culture of sexual provocation has also brought with it an intensification of anti-male punishment mechanism. Not every man who's been provoked to sexual actions is willing to pay. But most of them just can't afford it. That's why there are so many men who end up taking the commodity without paying. In other words, the number of rapes is increasing. Some peoples' psyches just can't withstand being simultaneously sexually provoked and denied sex itself. More and more of them are basically losing their shit. Find a group of starving people and try setting up tables in front of them decked out with incredibly expensive, delicious food. I don't need to tell you that these people, tormented by starvation, are going to steal whatever they can. So you'll have to

set up a whole battalion of security guards and a guillotine in order to scare these people, starving and dripping with saliva, away from your potential clients.

As an example, let's take a look at the standard female marketplace trick of "show me you love me." Up until the "sexual transaction" has been completed, that is, before a sexual relationship has begun, the woman obliges the man to show her how much she's worth to him. The man's programming's in full swing, so he goes whole hog: he gives her expensive presents and performs services for her; in other words, he pays as much as he possibly can in advance for the sex he expects to get. Don't forget that he's offering this advance payment without any contract or other guarantee that she'll hold up her end of the bargain. And, while this kind of arrangement would be considered insane on the real market, in the sexual marketplace it's a matter of course. Obviously, if the man blows all his energy and all his potential on the advance payment, then, once the "deal's been sealed" (assuming that it's actually completed and he hasn't had the wool pulled over his eyes), there's no way he'll be able to keep coughing up the same level of payment. However, the woman expects her pay to steadily increase, whereas the guy's now broke and can only reduce it.

Women have learned a variety of ways to avoid this situation. The first and most simple one is to find a new partner after the first one's been squeezed dry. "He doesn't love me anymore (i.e. he doesn't pay as much for sex as he used to)" is all the justification she needs. Women can also look for a man who still hasn't come into his own and thus won't pay less over time, but more. But as soon as he runs out of money he goes the way of the first. Although this particularly extensive method for getting a large payment is very common in female society, there are other ones, too. For example, there's the game where a man who's already paid more than his fair share trying to seal the deal and expects to possess a woman eventually gets her, but not completely – she constantly slips between his fingers, always remaining just a little bit inaccessible. Maybe she flirts with other men to demonstrate the demand for her. Maybe she puts some kind of obstacle in the way of sex that the man then has to remove with more money or services. So the man turns into a dairy cow, and the woman becomes his white whale. However, once he's been squeezed for all he's worth, his reward is the same as the first guy's – he gets traded in for a new model. In the market for real goods and services, this technique is called a "shell game," and it's used by all kinds of disingenuous merchants.

Once they're in resource-acquisition mode, women are insatiable. This is why they always becomes disappointed in men who, once they've gained access to their bodies, can no longer able to pay as much as they'd hoped. And, of course, men can also become disenchanted with women who turn out to be nothing more than audacious, mercantile gold diggers.

Here's something interesting: the value of sex is extremely flexible. A woman from a small town in a poor part of the country will be more than happy to sell herself for a nice dinner out. However, the same woman in a wealthy megalopolis will demand diamond earrings. In general, the average cost of sex in a given marketplace is equal to the average income of its men. Women will take men for everything they're worth. And marketing experts selling goods and services understand this very well. That's why the richer the community, the more products and the more advertisements are aimed at a purely female audience. This is connected with the fact that, in the prehistoric herd, males would give away all of the resources not needed for their own survival in exchange for sex. This is why a woman is such an insatiable, ravenous consumer. She's like a black hole, swallowing up everything that enters her gravitational field. Moreover, the quantity of resources a woman's sucked from men is a sign of her demand on the market. In a matriarchal society, this indicates her level of prestige, it's a sign that she's made it as a woman. This is the source of women's infamous avarice and insatiability as consumers.

### **The Free Sexual Marketplace and Society**

Let's take a look at why the free sexual marketplace represents a danger to society. The first factor is, of course, the paralysis of reproduction. The sexual marketplace tries to make paying for sex a universal phenomenon. But low-ranking males aren't supposed to reproduce, and mid-ranking males are only supposed to reproduce under specific, limited circumstances. In other words, a man who pays for sex is unworthy to carry on the species. That's why women living in a society of such men practically never reproduce. As a result, the

sexual marketplace leads social entropy. That's why all traditional cultures work carefully to regulate sexual relationships between men and women. It's very important that these relationships not be allowed to develop according to the model of food for controlled doses of sex that reigned in the human herd – otherwise the result will be the development of a free sexual marketplace and a matriarchal society.

But even beyond that, there's still the purely economic mechanism of the reduction of the efficiency of a society once it's been infected with the herd-like illness of sex for pay and the culture of sexual provocation. Men's resources, their entire lives, are wasted not on raising and educating the next generation, not on strengthening the community, but on satisfying women's changeable, momentary whims in an attempt to buy sex. Moreover, instead of planting a tree, building a house, starting a business, or raising children, a man now buys expensive clothes for a woman so that she can show off in front of her girlfriends and other men. He buys himself an expensive car and accessories in order to be a big shot in front of other men and seem more important to women. Meanwhile, society squanders its resources, its scientific and productive potential, not on creating new resources, science, and improving environment, but on creating newer and newer ways to show off. In other words, everything goes toward maintaining the free sexual marketplace of the herd and the culture of sexual provocation. Simply put, every dollar a man spends on buying an expensive car for himself or a present for his girlfriend is a dollar he doesn't spend on his son's education.

And there's more. Women's so-called "liberation" is nothing more than an opportunity for women to go out on the free market and hunt for men's resources in the most bloodthirsty and unmediated way possible - at the expense of other women, of course. This is why the free sexual marketplace leads to the very uneven distribution both of sex as a commodity and of men's resources as pay for that commodity. And, as a result, a significant number of men and women are forced to completely vacate the market. They either can't stand up to the competition, or aren't willing to conduct their relationships in market terms. A lot of them are forced to adapt solitary, asexual lifestyles. But there are more than just the purely free-market causes of asexuality - psychological mechanisms typical of low-ranking males also come into play. The logic of these mechanisms is pretty simple: if nature's made it so that low-ranking males aren't supposed to mate, their sex drive is reduced, and they become afraid of women. Their male hormones stop working. This is why, in modern matriarchal societies, more and more men are developing sexual problems every year.

So, what have we learned? In the conditions of the free sexual marketplace of the herd, men waste their lives feeding women and hoping for sex, women waste their lives being sexually provocative and hoping for a morsel of food, and society wastes its resources on maintaining a culture of sexual provocation. In the end, most women don't get enough to eat, most men don't get decent sex, and society expends all of its resources, degrades, and withers away. The free sexual marketplace reduces the efficiency of society and ultimately leads to its downfall.

## **Chapter 4. HOW WOMEN CONTROL MEN**

### **The Human Female's Interactions with Various Males.**

We've already talked about how the biological role of the human female is to search for a genetically promising male inseminator, continue his line, and take control of a male provider who will support herself and the inseminator's children. Generally speaking, the male inseminator and the male provider are almost never the same male. Regardless, the female needs to make use of her in-born capability to control men in order to make them provide for her and her children. And this is what she does. In this chapter, we'll take a look at the basic techniques she uses to take control.

The simplest example for our purposes will be the interaction between a female and a low-ranking male. In order to control a weak man and make him her doormat, a dominant female uses the standard methods of directly enforcing submission – ordering him around, smacking him, and, in the modern world, blackmail in the form of threatening to divorce the man and take away his children and property. These are the basic forms of violence that a strong woman uses when controlling her pussy-whipped husband. It's been universally approved by matriarchal legal and moral codes.

When interacting with a high-ranking man, especially a man with active leadership instincts, a woman has two methods of influence at her disposal – direct requests and pity. The leadership instinct will reliably protect a high-ranking man from any kind of control. Control is the leader's own function, it's his purpose in a state of nature. And it includes control over human females. Therefore, the leadership instincts give a man immunity against all methods of female control. Moreover, women have no similar immunity. This is why, generally speaking, a leader cannot be controlled by a woman. When dealing with a leader, a woman has no choice but to limit herself to tiny, mild provocations. However, in modern society, men have all been demoted, and very few have their leadership instincts switched on.

What's much more interesting is the human female's array of techniques for interacting with mid-level males. Using direct orders or brute force against a sufficiently strong and active mid-level man is a risky venture. Therefore, women's methods for controlling MR's are more subtle than those for controlling LR's. The thing about these males is that they're usually well-off, but have no immunity to control. That's why it's precisely the MR's who are the best choice for a woman who needs to exploit a man in the interests of providing for herself and her offspring. Female instinct is thus built for indirect control over precisely this category of males. "Indirect control" is another word for manipulation. It's easy to see that, when talking to a man (or, for that matter, a woman who's replaced a man), a woman's speech is composed primarily of manipulative techniques and other constructions designed to smooth the way for their use.

The most well-known ones are the methods of day-to-day manipulation that women use to control men:

- myths
- lies, bending the truth
- double standard
- “women's logic” (soapbox rhetoric)
- emotional pressure (hysterics)
- creating a guilt complex



- creating an inferiority complex (making a man feel like he's not a "real man")
- provocation
- manipulative games
- sexual blackmail
- emotional terror
- never-ending, exhausting psychological pressure (the vice)

These are all methods of emotional/psychological violence. Let's look more closely at each of them.

### **Myths.**

If you want to control someone on the sly, the first thing to do is to confuse your victim, to replace his accurate perception of reality with a mythical, illusory perception.

Women accomplish this by exploiting the biological nature of men's perception of them, i.e. by taking advantage of the male sex instinct. A natural instrument for switching off a man's perceptual accuracy when it comes to women is female beauty. I can easily demonstrate this with the following example: imagine that you're sitting across from a beautiful girl with a great body. She's being coy and putting on a show, batting her eyelashes at you seductively and giving you come-hither looks. "Wow, she's really cute," you think, "this girl's got lots of charm and personality." But now imagine that you're sitting across from an ugly old hag who's batting her eyelashes at you "seductively" and giving you come-hither looks. "Ugh, she's nasty," you think, "and dumb, too." Your reaction is the exact opposite. Now let's analyze our experiment. Nothing changed except for one thing: beauty. However, in the first case, your perception was inaccurate, while in the second, it was accurate. So what's our conclusion? Beauty is nothing more than a way to switch off the beholder's perceptual accuracy. It's a way to mask a woman's goals and methods when she's controlling a man. By the way, this is related to the reason for certain aspects of female perception: women are more oriented toward form than content. Draw him in with form while simultaneously masking the content of your discourse – this is the basis of all female methods of control.

However, not all women are beautiful, which means that men's don't get switched off in this natural way every single time. So women have had to develop an additional system for artificially making men incapable of accurately perceiving their actions. They do this by filling men's heads with myths that make them easier to control while surrounding themselves with a web of illusions and fairy tales so dense that it rivals *The Matrix*.

Here's a few of them:

"Women are kind." This myth successfully convinces men to let down their guard so that women can work their way onto their confidence. However, all you have to do is take a look at legal records to see that women are much more inclined than men toward slow, elaborate, and virtually unmotivated torture; that they're inclined toward aggression; that relations in women's prisons and other purely female collectives are much harsher than among their male counterparts. It's easy to mistake motherly concern for children, sexual caresses, and the psychic attunement that is really a precursor to reverse domination, for feminine kindness - which helps to support this handy myth. It's handy for women because it convinces men to let their guard down and ignore imminent danger. A man under the sway of this myth might not even suspect that the danger exists until it's too late - and even then, he'll sometimes refuse to believe it. This is partly because he associates women with his mother and her care for him as a child. Women cooed over him when he was a baby, so he thinks that's how it'll always be. And then his sex instinct shuts off his perceptual accuracy and forces him to idolize women.

"Women should be mysterious." This myth helps to mask a woman's goals and methods when she's trying to control a man. She's so mysterious, she so unpredictable, and that's the way it should be, right? So men don't need to worry about women's logic or motives; all they have to do is love them and do whatever they want. It's a handy myth, huh? I know I wouldn't complain if someone did whatever I wanted without asking questions or looking for anything in return. Here's the thing: a man is a hunter. He observes the world around him and studies its patterns - say, weather patterns, or the behavior of prey or predators - then thinks in terms of the concepts his brain's formed from his observations. That's how his mind works. But a woman is something else. She's an opportunist motivated by the play of animal instincts, that is, emotions and desires. There's a kind of logic in there, but it's visible only to the leader, whose instinct is equipped with a few analogous devices. But,

for the majority of men, women's behavior can be truly mysterious and unpredictable (until they read this book, that is). And, since this unpredictability is to their benefit, they do their best to support it and make it accepted as a truism.

"Women are weak, men are strong." This is a handy myth if you want men to do difficult or dangerous jobs for you. "You're the strong ones, so get to work. We're weak, what do you want from us..." Very practical. However, believe it or not, this myth never stops women from taking men's resources, oppressing them in modern society, or winning the war of the sexes. The funny thing is, however, that men continue to believe in this myth. This is connected with ancient instinctual conditions formed in the Stone Age, back when physical strength was really all that mattered. In reality, when taken as whole, neither gender is really stronger.

"Women are faithful and modest, men are always on the make." This one cracks me up. The funniest thing about it is that men still believe in it and feel guilty. But let's ask ourselves a simple question: who do men cheat on their women with? Other men? The answer is obvious – every time a man cheats, a woman cheats too. The purpose of this myth is to give men a guilt complex and mask women's betrayals.

"A woman's work is never done." This myth, which claims that housework is complex and difficult, helps women retain their monopoly on easy work. It makes them seem more valuable and forces the men to do the more difficult, dangerous, and important work. I (that's me, the author) am a man with 20 years' experience as a bachelor, 10 years' experience as a married man, professional experience in agriculture, heavy industry, and engineering, and a tremendous amount of campaign experience, some of it in dense forest terrain without any modern conveniences. And I can tell you beyond a shadow of a doubt that any and all housework, with or without the benefits of civilization, is infinitely simpler and easier than making money. To say nothing of the fact that, in the modern world, housework amounts to pushing a few buttons on the washing machine and dishwasher. You can't even call it work. And if a housewife living in a modern apartment says she's tired, that means she's just bored. If she's got less than four kids, of course.

"Women love children more than men do." By over-emphasizing the function of motherhood, this myth helps women make it seem like they and their responsibilities are worth more than they are. In reality, women love themselves more than anything and bear children to satisfy their own reproductive instincts. Or they see children as part of their insurance and pension plan, someone to take care of them when they get old. In this case, a woman might raise her child in such a way that he becomes unable to start his own family. A woman can also see a child as a way to get at a man's resources and might get pregnant for this purpose alone. As soon as a woman's children have outlived their usefulness, she won't think twice about sacrificing them out of purely material considerations. Nowadays she'll even kill them before they're born (abortion), but before abortions became widespread she would kill them as newborns. How much a woman loves her child is also influenced by whose child it is. If it's from the beloved man, the tribal inseminator, she'll love it. If it's from a husband/breadwinner, forget about it.

The various myths about the sacredness of love, motherhood, woman, etc. – it's all just a taboo, a booby-trap, blowing smoke. You can't touch any of it with a ten-foot pole, it's off limits. Back off, hands off the household privileges, don't as much as look in that direction! Go kill me a mammoth!

"Men are more primitive than women." I've never understood how women who try to make judgments about men, including their internal emotional state, can come up with something so stupid. "Soulless horn-dogs," etc. On the one hand, their statistics are based on a limited amount of experience with attacks by low-ranking, sexually frustrated men, guys who automatically work their way through as many women as possible in order to have at least some slim chance of getting laid... but on the other hand, it's very easy to see a creature you exploit as something beneath you. Then, no matter how disgusting your treatment of him might be, your conscious stays squeaky clean. Even though a woman perfectly understands the nuances of her relationship with a man, she'll never stop to think about whether she's hurting him with her behavior. As far as she's concerned, he's a thick-skinned primitive, and his emotions are only there so that she can play with them and control him. She thinks about him the same way a butcher thinks about the cow whose throat he's about to slit. He doesn't worry about whether the cow's in pain, or whether it's suffering, since he doesn't see it as an equal, i.e. a being worthy of sympathy. All he's worried about is how much meat he's going to get out of it. One woman I knew was completely shocked when I explained to her that a man has a sense of personal dignity and suffers terrible torments when a woman degrades him. I don't think she believed me. The utilitarian approach to men doesn't

require any deep study of them. If any details about men's internal lives interest a woman, then it's only because she wants to exploit them to control him. Moreover, women have quite simply been spoiled by their privileged position. For every man who barely has enough time and resources to satisfy his most basic needs, there's a woman wallowing in a morass of hedonistic delights. And it goes without saying that someone who's recently dined on oysters will look down on someone who's never eaten anything but boiled potatoes.

And so on, and so forth. Myths about women are formed easily and naturally. We're not going to bother with the simple, everyday myths; we'll just subsume them all under the category of typical female "systematic bullshitting" and move on to the next group of methods women use to control men.

### **The Double Standard**

In every society, in every period in history, there has been a double standard in relation to men and women. It's assimilated during childhood, then becomes accepted as a given. Men give in to women, give them their income, court them, protect them, take care of them, etc. And yet it's men who get sent off and get killed during wartime. However, in balanced societies, this is compensated by certain privileges that men enjoy. For example, primary control over property or the right to be active in the public sphere. In the modern, unbalanced world, however, men have been deprived of these privileges, while women have preserved and even increased their own advantages. Therefore, the combination of the traditional double standard in regard to the sexes with "equality" has led to severe discrimination against men. On the day-to-day level, women take advantage of this situation as a method of control. For example, when it's time to earn a lot of money, then it's the man's job, because that's how it's always been - he's a man, the stronger sex. But when it's time to do the housework, the man's supposed to help the woman because we live in the age of equality. As a result, the man has a double burden on his shoulders, while the woman has the opportunity parasitize him.

It's interesting to see how the double standard works in regard to sex. In a traditional society, cultural norms work to restrain female sexuality while keeping men's sexual needs exclusive. But in a matriarchal society, it's the other way around. It's the same double standard, but inside-out. A man's desire for sex is "lust, animal needs, sexual frustration, sexual harassment, rape," etc., while a woman's desire for sex is "sexual freedom, liberty, and sensuality..."

### **Collective Female Solidarity**

When men unite to do battle against a common foe or to extract resources from nature, they're acting in complete accordance with their biological purpose. By the same token, when women unite against men in the event of a conflict or to extract resources from them, they're also acting in accordance with their biological purpose. Moreover, women act harmoniously, helping each other to manipulate men. Women call this "fine-tuning a relationship." They also exchange experience in the application of psychological techniques. This is the primary function of communication among women, that is, exchanging experience about how to manipulate men. It's just like when a group of male colleagues meet to exchange professional experience. Controlling men is a woman's business, her profession. Nowadays there are a whole slew of books dedicated to this topic. Women team up with their mothers and daughters to apply as much psychological pressure as possible on a man. This is why the image of the mother-in-law has become the most hated image in men's folklore. The mother-in-law, who, as an older woman, has a lifetime of experience and is more likely to be in full dominance mode, usually exerts the most psychological pressure on her son-in-law. This way she doesn't just help her daughter to pull off reverse domination, but also instructs her with various techniques. Most women, if they see another woman in conflict with a man, will come to her aid automatically, even if they don't know her. Meanwhile, a man, as a rule, will never interfere in other people's family squabbles. That is, unless a woman pushes him into it. A woman can even team up with her husband's mistress to put pressure on him if he's got enough resources for both of them. They both feed his guilt complex over the fact that he's living a double life, so he's forced to make it up to them by being even more generous and ready to please. In this case, the women become useful to one another as a way to increase their yield from milking him. They come to an agreement about control methods they can exploit together, and this *ménage-a-trois* can last for a long time. However, as soon as one of them makes a tactical

error, the other will move to immediately monopolize the man. It's just business. Women work carefully to make sure that as much of a man's resources as possible stay in the hands of women. That's why they do their best to make sure that a bachelor with resources marries one of their friends, thereby transferring his resources to female management. If a man somehow extricates himself from a woman's claws and gets free, other women will immediately start telling him, "so it didn't work out the first time, next time it'll be better, you just need to find yourself a good woman." It's just like a game of three-card monte run by a group of hustlers: one of them is the dealer, while another one pretends to be a bystander and whispers in the mark's ear: "try again, you're sure to get it this time."

## Women's Logic

Let's take a crack at an age-old mystery of the human condition: women's logic. First of all, I'll ask you a question: why is it that women's logic is different from men's logic? The key to this riddle lies, as always, in the biological natures of man and women.

A man's biological purposes are hunting, fighting, and reconnaissance. His goal is to use logical methods to make sense of a given situation, whether it's the behavior of game, the actions of the enemy, or the consequences of any other action. In other words, he tries to form an accurate prediction on the basis of a given set of data, common sense, and causal logic. In this way, he attains a result the correctness of which he can gauge by comparing it to his original goal, i.e. catching his game or defeating his enemy. Natural selection has brought it about that men think in focused logical chains. That's why they reason out loud – in order to transmit their thoughts in a correct and productive way to their fellow hunters, warriors, and colleagues.

I'll demonstrate this with a simple example. A husband (a male provider) gets a bonus at work, and he and his wife are deciding how to spend it. This is how the man thinks: in order for me to drive to work, earn money, provide for my family, take my kids to school, etc. (fulfill a man's biological purpose), I have to make sure my car is safe and in good working order. Therefore, I need to use this money to get a tune-up and get my breaks fixed. This is called man's logic. It's perfectly rational and comprehensible.

As we already know, a woman's biological function is different. Her function is to look for a genetically promising inseminator and control a submissive husband. So she's got a goal (if perhaps only on an unconscious, instinctual level): find herself a male inseminator as efficiently as possible. This goal requires her to be sexually attractive. Therefore, she needs this money to buy fashionable clothes and stylish boots. Everything in this logical chain is also rational and comprehensible. Her logic is absolutely identical to the man's. However, she has to justify this decision somehow to her husband while hiding her real chain of reasoning. She has to convince him that the money needs to be spent on clothes rather than brakes, to make him agree with her, or, in other words, to take control of him. So, in order to make her decision a reality, she cooks up an indirect pseudo-chain of reasoning from irrelevant elements. For example, the woman's pseudo-chain might start with the standard phrase: "I've got absolutely nothing to wear." The second link in the pseudo-chain might be "I can't leave the house in these old rags, nobody's wearing this stuff anymore." The third element's already manipulative: "You're such a big man, but your wife walking around in old clothes. Is that what you want? Your employee's wife has better clothes than me!" So the wife's now playing with her husband's hierarchical instinct, manipulating him into agreeing with her decision. If he tries to argue with her logically, saying "you're the one who's always on my case about how we're broke and the car's no good," she'll devise another chain, or make him feel guilty, or show that her "feelings are hurt" and sex-starve him. Women's logic is a pseudo-logical chain with irrelevant elements thrown in. Or it's just a chain of manipulative elements with no logic whatsoever.

Her goal in building this pseudo-logical chain can be more than just getting gifts, money, or services from her husband. More often than not, the woman creates these chains in order to blame her husband for something. She needs this in order to give her husband a guilt complex and seize the psychological advantage. And, since there's usually no real reason to blame her husband for anything, she develops a pseudo-logical chain of reasoning for what he's done wrong.

Women usually don't even realize that they're doing this; it happens automatically, like a reflex. So the man's got no other option than to understand the real goal and meaning behind his woman's logical constructions.

When men use similar speech constructions, it's called "soapbox rhetoric." Women use this art-form primarily with men. Other women already understand their real female motivations. Therefore, if women want to talk to each other without any extra rhetoric, they always try to do it when there are no men around. When men are around, women don't talk to each other that much, and when they do, it's usually in half-hints, so that men can't understand their real meaning.

Rhetoric isn't something used just by women. It's a standard instrument of manipulation. Men use it quite successfully in a variety of contexts - anytime they need to get someone to do something for them or to convince someone of something while hiding their real motivations. This happens primarily in politics and business. I know men who are past masters at soapbox rhetoric and women who refuse to lower themselves to it.

A favorite rhetorical method used by women in an argument is to switch from one topic to another one that's somewhat related, but meets her needs better. These usually amount to *ad hominem* attacks. If you're having a discussion with a woman and touch on a theme that's not useful for her, she'll either try to change the subject, or confuse you, or start criticizing your personality. Or she'll build a series of critical elements into her speech and try to make you start justifying yourself for something. Or she'll start openly insulting you - as long as she's sure that she's got nothing to fear from you, that is. If she's not sure, she'll limit herself to veiled insults. Women have a number of techniques for arguing. However, there are a finite number of manipulative techniques they can use in an argument, and each of them can be taken separately and diffused with a counter-technique. Then the argument with the woman will turn into a playful, humorous duel. You won't change her mind about anything, of course, but you'll show her that you're no dumber than she is and will end up the victor in the eyes of any other spectators. Actually mastering soapbox rhetoric is another matter, mind you, but you don't need to worry about this unless you're a politician, a college professor, or a member of any other profession that has to give public performances. In everyday life, it's sufficient just to see rhetoric for what it is. There are less time-consuming ways to put a verbal con-man in his place than engaging in an extended firefight.

There are also other situations in which a man might not be able understand a woman's behavior, but the underlying reason is always the same: the woman's hiding her real motivations. For example, let's say you ask your girlfriend if she wants to go out, but she says "no" and gives you some kind of strange excuse. So you start trying to guess her real motives and get suspicious. But in reality the only thing going on is that she didn't bother to shave her legs that morning and she's worried you'll notice. This isn't a big deal for you, but it is for a woman - showing up with unshaven legs and shabby clothes to meet a man she loves, but still hasn't brought to submission, is the same as for a businessman to go to an important meeting hung over and without his visual aids. It's totally unprofessional. It's embarrassing and absurd. The only thing you can do is come up with some excuse to reschedule the meeting.

### **Creating a Guilt Complex**

**WARNING!!! THIS IS WOMEN'S PRIMARY TACTIC FOR MAIPULATING MEN!!!** I just remembered why I started working on this book. It all started when I was considering the following (as it seemed to me at the time) paradox: So, you live alone. You work, you create, you build, and everything's great. You've got lots of friends, a good reputation, people respect you, your family loves you, you've got professional success, lots of money, plenty of free time, self-esteem through the roof. And then you get a girlfriend. And you do lots of nice, useful things for her. Gifts, services, signs of attention, etc. You understand each other, you have amazing sex, everything's going great. But after a while your life starts to change. For some reason you start to feel like there's something wrong with you, sometimes you feel like an idiot, your money's disappearing like crazy and you've got nothing to show for it, and all your free time's being consumed by some bullshit. And on top of that, you're always guilty of something and have to constantly justify yourself for some absurd reason. But, as soon as you try to drive her away, she doesn't go anywhere - love just switches gears on you. "Why should you do anything at all for a woman if it's just going to make your life worse?" I thought one day after I'd tried to get rid of a girl for the eighth time. "And why does this always happen?" So I got interested, and I started carefully observing women and systematizing the material I'd collected.

Now I understand that the cycle I was experiencing was the formula for love, and that all the complaints and the guilt complex were nothing more than the bog-standard female control method. A woman will try to make every situation into a man's fault. She'll twist things in such a way that the man ends up in a position where he has to either justify himself or apologize. In other words, the position of a guilty person. It doesn't matter what he did wrong, the main thing is to force him to justify himself and feel guilty. Here's an example from ordinary, everyday life. A man means to call up a friend, but accidentally dials his girlfriend's number instead.

*Hey there. I meant to call Dave, but I accidentally called you instead.*

*Oh, I get it. You didn't mean to call me, but you called me anyway.*

She could have said something positive, like: "*That's cool, you must love me so much you dialed my number without thinking, etc.*," but that's not what happened. The woman picks the response that's guaranteed to make the man start justifying himself and feel guilty. And, of course, as soon as she can, she'll bring her hurt tone of voice into the conversation, saying something like: "*Ok, fine, we'll talk later, you didn't mean to call me anyway.*"

An honest man who doesn't understand that this is a psychological game will be utterly baffled. He'll feel awkward, like he did something wrong, and he'll be forced to explain himself and make excuses. And the woman will seize the psychological advantage. And, needless to say, she'll lose her respect for him.

A woman can find a way to blame a man for absolutely anything whatsoever.

If he doesn't give her flowers, she'll blame him for being inattentive. If he does give her flowers that means he's trying to make up for something he did wrong (the woman can conjure up some reason for this instantly, without doubting herself).

If the man's young, he'll get blamed for not having established himself yet. If he's established, he'll get blamed for being too old.

If the man's poor, he'll get blamed for being a loser. If he's rich, he'll get blamed for trapping her in a "golden cage."

If the man cheats, then it's his fault he couldn't keep it in his pants. But if the woman cheats, well, that's his fault too, because he pissed her off, or didn't satisfy her, or didn't try hard enough to keep her, or didn't give her what she needs, or didn't pay enough, or isn't man enough, or didn't give her enough attention, etc.

If the man dumps the woman, then it's his fault for being a jerk. If she dumps him, it's his fault for being an asshole.

If the woman works, then it's the man's fault that his income can't satisfy her every whim. If the woman hangs herself around his neck and doesn't do anything but heat up microwave dinners for him and press the "start" button on the washing machine, then it's his fault for standing in the way of her self-actualization.

If the man needs more sex than the woman, it's his fault that he "won't leave her alone." If he needs less, it's his fault that "her needs aren't being satisfied."

If the man doesn't set the woman up as a long-term partner, she'll complain that she "wasted so much time on him." If he does, she'll complain that "I wasted the best years of my life on you." Or even: "you've ruined my entire life." The fact that he also wasted the same years of his own life on her obviously doesn't even enter into the equation.

Even if the man's perfect and the woman genuinely love him, she'll still follow him around the house until he has to go to work. And then he'll see the reproach in her eyes: "I'm sorry, is my love stifling you? Don't you love me at all?"

It's also the man's fault that he talks to his friends, that he works ("you never have any time for me"), that he likes to go fishing, that he's fixing his car, that he allows himself to relax on the couch after work, that he dared to spend money that he earned without her permission, that the woman's in a bad mood, that he didn't meet her womanly expectations, that he doesn't fit with her illusions about what a real man is supposed to be, etc., etc., etc.

It goes without saying that the list of potential female guilt trips is endless – there's no way this book could possibly contain all of them. Just listen to the women around you and put together your own collection of female complaints and accusations.

So what's the point of all this? It's actually pretty simple. If a man feels guilty or is just afraid to get into a fight with a woman, he'll try to make up for whatever he's supposed to have done wrong or give in to her in

order to avoid conflict. This could involve doing things for her, giving her presents, etc. In other words, he becomes manageable and profitable.

This is precisely why a woman will, as a rule, never admit she's wrong, no matter how patently obvious it might be that everything is her fault. If this happens, she'll try to flip the situation around so that the man ends up being the guilty one. She'll change the subject or try any other means at her disposal. It doesn't matter, as long as she can avoid admitting she's guilty. That is, as long as she can avoid surrendering the control lever and becoming controlled herself.

However, taking and maintaining control isn't a woman's only goal when she blames a man for something. If you carefully observe women when you first meet them, you'll notice that they like to make tiny little accusations in a provocative way so they can observe your reaction. If you meet a woman's complaint with a sense of humor and brush it off with your own joking complaint, this will signal to her female instinct that she's dealing with a high-ranking, strong male with active leadership instincts. And the love switch will flip on. For example, one provocative accusation that women are particularly fond of is the phrase: "Guys like you only care about one thing." If you start with the excuses and explanations, this shows that you're a pussy, and you'll get rejected. But if you answer with your own little joke: "Listen, honey, one thing's never enough. I like me some variety when it comes to sex," then she'll realize that she's dealing with a worthy contender.

In a long-term couple, the woman will also frequently break into complaints, accusations, and hysterics. If all she gets in return is firm resistance, this will send her instinctual programming the signal that the man has strength of character, and she'll keep loving him. His resistance might take a number of different forms: he might laugh in her face, make a cutting remark, ignore her – it doesn't matter, as long it demonstrates to her that her complaints are insignificant and ridiculous. The only thing that doesn't work is logical argument. This will be taken a sign of weakness, as making excuses. If the man gives in, love and respect get switched off, and the woman switches into dominance mode. This is why experienced men understand that women need to be "but in their place" from time to time. And you can never waver. What's more, women actually want nothing more than to be put in their place, since they want strong man and despise weaklings.

Here's a scene I witnessed once: a woman was going after her man with a whole slew of provocative accusations. Without paying any attention whatsoever to what she was saying, the guy laughed and said, "Ok, here we go – here comes the heavy artillery." He showed her that he knows what women's techniques are worth, so he's in control of them and therefore a leader. He's got a bunch of kinds, and his family's stable and gets along great.

A woman who's satisfied with her man has nothing to accuse him of, so she automatically loses her chance at gripping the control lever. Because of this, it's easy to tell a dominating woman from one who loves her man based on this sign alone. The dominating woman's complaints and accusations against her man are systematic, hysterical, oppressive, and overwhelming. The loving woman's complaints, on the other hand, are nothing more than an occasional provocation.

Now, this isn't to say that a woman might sometimes have a legitimate reason for blaming her man. It's easy to tell whether an accusation has any basis or not just by having the parties switch places with each other. For example, if a girl complains to you that "she's got nothing to wear," just try to imagine yourself making the same accusation to her: "Damn it Mary, you don't love me at all, I haven't a thing to wear!" If you switch places with the woman and the result is an absurdity, this means that her accusations are complete and utter bullshit. But if she complains that she can't sleep at night because you're cranking your music, well, she might have something there. That is, if you're really doing it, of course. If she was keeping you up all night you'd probably get pissed off too, right?

Here's a little provocative trick that women use all the time to make men feel guilty. They act as if their feelings are hurt, but they won't tell you why. So you wring your hands trying to figure out what you did wrong, but eventually you have no choice but to try to make up for something, even though you have no idea what it's supposed to be. If you've got some little sin on your conscious, then so much the worse for you – she'll figure it out immediately based on your reaction.

A woman's basic tactic is to win as many minor psychological victories as possible. Eventually these little defeats will combine to form unbearable pressure and give the man a guilt or inferiority complex, thereby making him totally controllable. It's the most standard manipulative technique in the female arsenal. Some

women do this on a subconscious level, but most of them do it on purpose, calculating and planning their attacks on their man's psyche with the aid of advice from other women and books.

In many matriarchal countries, women's natural tendency to blame men has led to an incredibly widespread image of men as ogres - not just in the media, but even in legal practice. During court cases between men and women, men have essentially been deprived of their right to be innocent until proven guilty.

Women will very frequently give their children guilt complexes (not just their sons, but their daughters, too) in order to manipulate them. After all, it's much easier and more useful than actually raising a child to be a healthy, happy adult.

Sometimes, a woman might, without thinking, put her beloved man in a position where he has to justify himself, then realize in the nick of time what she's doing. Since she doesn't actually want to see him in this pathetic, humiliating position, she'll say something like, "It's ok, you don't have to explain yourself."

Aside from transparent accusations and complaints, this method can also take the form of hurt feelings, boycotts, moping, phony depression, tears, and other basic female theatrical productions.

It's easy to defend yourself against this method. For example, if she tries to make it seem like everything's your fault, just say "Hey, I'm not the one who's to blame here." This will completely take her off guard and disarm her. Of course, she'll immediately try to say something like, "That's a nice thing to say, huh? Well I'm sick of it, that's enough." But don't give in. Be firm and mocking. Trust me, this counter-technique works - it's been field-tested against more than one controlling harpy.

### **Creating an Inferiority Complex (The Illusive "Real Man" and How You're not Him)**

Here's a phrase you've probably heard before: "A real man should..." "A real man would never act like that..." etc. First off, let's think about this: if there's such a thing as a "real man," does that mean that all the other ones are counterfeit? Who made them, and why? Or, if they're not counterfeit, but just fake, then what's the difference between a real man and a fake one? And how come no one ever talks about what a "real woman" should or shouldn't do? By the way, I've only heard the phrase "a real woman" once. A long time ago, I was dumb enough to tell a woman about how another woman had cheated on me. But, instead of feeling sorry for me, she cried out ecstatically, "There's a real woman for you!" For a long time I was surprised, that is, until I realized that the kind of "real woman" that other women are so enamored of is, by definition, a skank. But we're getting off track. The thing about the "real man" is that no one's even seen him. No matter how hard you try to get a woman to point one out for you, you'll just be wasting your breath. He doesn't exist. He's a phantom. A ghost. Seriously, though, the image of the real man has two interesting qualities: first of all, he's a female ideal, the product of female daydreams. And, like any ideal, he's got nothing to do with reality. There's a simple reason for this. When creating the image of an ideal man, women try to combine into one pile all of the qualities that they value in a high-ranking man, a leader, as well as all the ones they like best in a mid-ranking man, that is, a breadwinner. These qualities are, obviously, totally incompatible. And second, this ideal image exists only so that it can be shoved in the faces of real men at every opportunity.

The image of the real man is the most powerful psychological lever women use to successfully control the stronger sex. Mothers and other female caregivers start to nurture this control lever in boys from a very young age. They justify their demands on them with the argument, "You're going to be a man someday." And, if they want to encourage a boy, they praise him by saying, "Good job! You acted just like a real man." The boy reacts to the compliment's encouraging intonational coloration, and his subconscious starts to form the link: "real man = respected, and therefore high-ranking." This is how women make it possible to manipulate him via this connection in the long run. If you do what we need you to do, we'll acknowledge you as a real (high-ranking) man, but if you don't, you won't be a real man in our eyes (i.e. you'll be unworthy to mate). Weak men instinctively fear this kind of female judgment like fire, so they'll do everything they can to try and become a "real man."

Generally speaking, anytime I hear someone talking to me about what a "real man" should or shouldn't do, I immediately inform them that I'm not a real man, but a fake one. Either that, or I tell them that only a sucker would ever owe anyone anything without a signed I.O.U., and a real man can't be a sucker. And that's the end of the discussion. I recommend it - it's an effective anti-manipulation technique.



If you ever hear the expression “a real man,” be ready – this means that someone’s trying to get you to do something that’s not in your best interest. But the main thing to keep in mind is that the person using this phrase doesn’t respect you, since they think you’re a sucker. Other similar manipulative phrases that work the same way include “What kind of man are you?,” “A man ought to...,” “Are you a man or a mouse,” etc. Just hearing the word “man” should be enough to put you on your guard and make you think long and hard about why someone’s using it.

Here’s a standard counter-manipulation that can protect you like a magic word against basic female manipulation techniques, i.e. guilt and inferiority complexes: “I know I’m the best. Anyone who thinks otherwise is inferior.” Memorize this, and don’t be afraid to say it out loud. But the best thing you can do is actually believe it. Given how unique each individual human personality is and how subjective it is to apply the words “better” and “worse” to them, this is a perfectly reasonable, healthy, and useful thing to believe.

A man can be given an inferiority complex in another way, too: by making him doubt his competence and adequacy. The algorithm of manipulation is pretty simple. If a man is sloppy enough to tell a woman about his plans or ask for her advice, she can make him focus his attention on insignificant details and isolated incidents. This will allow her to cast doubt on his plans and decisions, then convince him that he isn’t able to make good decisions on his own. In the end she’ll snatch his decision-making abilities, along with his confidence, right out from under him. This is how an active go-getter can end up turning into a passive tool for the realization of a woman’s decisions and whims. The whole simple procedure is conducted in the guise of support and help. It’s not uncommon for a married man to suddenly remember the way he used to be before he got married and recoil from himself in horror. He used to be active, full of plans and hopes, but now he’s afraid to speak his mind. He’s afraid to get laughed at and criticized by his wife. A lot of newly divorced men have to learn to make their own decisions again. At first, they’re actually shocked when they realize that no one’s belittling or laughing at their decisions. It’s not what they’re used to. Mothers act the same way. Try not to let women in on your affairs, plans, and dreams. Otherwise it’ll be easier for them to clip your wings.

## **Provocations**

When pursuing their manipulative goals, woman often find it convenient to provoke a certain reaction from a man so they can then blame him for it, or, in the best case, just to convince themselves of his psychological firmness.

A common provocation is to say something on a particularly ticklish topic, say, the man’s personal life, success, relationships with his friends, etc. The woman touches on the topic and observes the man’s reaction. If he reacts emotionally, the woman knows she can use it later to manipulate him. For example, after a provocation, a man tells a woman that he’s on the outs with one of his friends. If she needs to worm her way into his trust, she’ll bring the conversation around to this painful topic in order to demonstrate her sympathy and solidarity. But, if it’s in her best interest to bring down his self-esteem, she’ll take advantage of it as a way to insinuate that he’s insignificant and useless. If she needs to monopolize her influence on the man, to cut him off from his friends, she’ll use the fight with his friend to get him to isolate himself from whomever she doesn’t find useful for her own ends.

Another standard provocation is to play with a man’s jealousy. Young people do this all the time. A girl might get down on her knees for some guy or spend the night with him just to provoke one of his friends into paying more attention to her or taking a more active interest in her.

Here’s another standard sexual provocation. A woman might use skimpy clothes, seductive behavior, and make-up to make herself seem sexually available in order to provoke a man to active sexual actions. In an unbalanced society without meaningful traditions, the boundaries of acceptability for active sexual actions are undefined. A man might think that a woman wants to have sex with him, while the woman thinks that he should buy her a diamond ring. A lot of misunderstandings happen this way, and men are naturally the ones who always pay for them.

Provocations can also be of a completely different character. I once had an employee, a calm, inoffensive guy who didn’t even drink. He had a family – a wife, a daughter, a house with a “woman’s touch”

(I'll take care of decorating the place, ok? You trust me, right honey?"). The wife didn't make much money, nor did he, but they were pretty stable. You know, average. However, one day the wife's brother died, and she inherited his house, so they suddenly had the option of living in one house while renting out the other. So they were instantly a lot better off. However, once this happened, the husband stopped being a partner and became an opponent who could be easily beaten. So, in order to get rid of him, the wife came up with the following operation: she waited for one of the rare occasions when he came home tipsy, then started to provoke him. She pushed all his buttons, then ran out into the street and started knocking on her neighbors' doors. So she ensured there would be a number of eye-witnesses who would be willing to testify that her husband regularly drank and beat her up. He had no clue about any of this until she called the cops and they dragged him away. When he came home the next day, the locks had already been changed. The wife turned the daughter against him, too. Classic. The man ended up on the street. Then the wife started to make the rounds, manipulating public opinion in the usual way, and before you knew it everyone was convinced that the man was a cruel tyrant, a drunk, and a generally terrible person.

## **Cons**

There are a lot of different kinds of cons. A girl might walk up to you in a bar and start checking you out. Her goal is to get you by yourself, get you drunk, and rip you off, all while laughing at how you think you have a chance with her. When I used to go to clubs, I would regularly see little scenes like this where girls who'd just been living it up gratis thanks to their new acquaintances would run out into the hallway and call their boyfriends, who would then come and collect them from the poor saps who'd been buying them food and drinks all night.

Here's a common con: "Show me you love me." Another variety: "You don't really love me." This is nothing more than a way to get men to "show their love" with presents and services.

But the most dangerous kind of con for men is the long con: snagging a rich husband in order to divorce him according to the laws of a modern matriarchal society. Thanks to the cons perpetrated at once by the gold digger and the legal system, the man loses his children, his long-term investments in his family, his property, and even a portion of his future earnings. Women call this "taking a man to the cleaners," in other words, taking advantage of the marriage scam to steal a man's resources.

## **Women's Psychological Combat Tactics**

Women employ a number of standard tactics to disorient and demoralize a man prior to manipulating him.

1. "The Low Blow." The woman knows her man's psychological weaknesses. She intentionally noses them out, studies them, and sometimes even creates new ones. For example, she might know you're upset because you bought a car that turned out to be a lemon. Next time you get into a fight, you'll be sure to hear the phrase: "Shut up, you don't even know how to buy a car." I used to entertain myself with a little game: I would show a woman an ostensible weakness. You know, give her a false target. Then I would watch as she tried in vain to use it against me, aiming one useless psychological shot after another in fruitless attempts to manipulate me. You should try it some time, it's pretty amusing.

2. "We Need to Talk." The key to this trick is that the woman gets to choose the time for the discussion according to one basic criterion: it's whatever time is worst for the man. For example, he just came home tired after a long day's work, he's too worn out to argue with a woman, but she decides to start a conversation with him about where to go on vacation. He wants to lie down on the couch and watch football, and he's dying of hunger. And it'll be no simple thing to stand up for his point of view and work his way through a bunch of logical arguments. Or another example: a woman might whine during sex about how she really likes some piece of jewelry. Or she might fly into hysterics with suicidal blackmail just as he's exhausted and trying to get to bed so he can get up for a big day at work. He needs to get up at the crack of dawn so he can head out on a business trip, and he's just getting ready to go to sleep, anticipating some long-awaited rest, and he's just starting to drift off. That's the precise moment when the woman utters the phrase "we need to talk" in that special tone of voice that produces in men a combination of dread and the gag reflex. When he says, quite naturally, "listen, honey, I'm

exhausted, I've got to be on the road by five tomorrow, can't it wait till later?" there follows another phrase, pronounced in tone that's half shrill whine, half threat: "You never have any time for me." And that's when the all-night "concert" begins. The woman doesn't care if the man's half-dead all day the next day, falls asleep at the wheel, and kills himself and a bunch of other people in a multi-car pile-up. She needs to perform her little technical operation and break the man in half psychologically. She's already prepared herself, got a good night's sleep, put together a laundry list of complaints and accusations, got herself all worked up, picked the moment when the man's at his most vulnerable, and started her psychological tune-up. It's just like when a professional fighter tries to pick the moment when his opponent's at his absolute worst, whether it's by making sure the sun's in his eyes, or whatever, then works him over with his best moves. It's all in the technique. A dominant woman is a professional psychological fighter.

3. "Problem Dumping." The human mind is capable of dealing with a finite amount of information at any one time. By the same token, a person can only try to solve so many problems at once. What a woman cares about, however, is how a man can solve precisely those problems that are most important for her. This is why she tries to overload his brain with maximally intense information about her problems and why she needs them to be solved. She's trying to smother the man's thoughts and emotions with her own in order to take total control of him. She's trying to make sure that he can't think about anything other than her and her problems, so that all his intellectual resources go to her. Otherwise those resources might go to another woman or to himself, in which case she would lose a means of solving her problems. A woman will try to overload a man with herself through a number of different stages over the length of their relationship. She'll carpet-bomb him with text messages, emails, calls, and requests. She'll consume all of his time and attention.

4. "The High-Pitched Conversation." Intonation is an extremely powerful means of control. Didn't you ever wonder why women's voices are higher than men's?" It's easy to explain. When people converse, they're doing more than just transmitting information to each other. They're also using their tone of voice to signal the relative importance of that information. If the information is unreliable, it'll be conveyed in an uncertain tone. If it's regular information, it'll get a neutral tone. If the information is extremely important (say, information about an incoming threat), the speaker's tone becomes higher. And finally, the highest-priority information receives "authoritative intonation." This is the special intonational coloration of the leader, of a person used to giving orders. Women have higher-pitched voices in order to signal to men's subconscious that the information and commands they have to convey are of a high priority. And, if an instruction doesn't just come from a woman, but is also, in her opinion, extremely important, she might raise the pitch of her voice even higher than usual. To a screech. Sometimes it might even approach the ultrasound range when she's communicating information about danger to herself or her offspring.

So, to summarize, people have a kind of idiosyncratic scale for determining the priority of the information conveyed with a particular intonation. Here they are, in ascending order:

- Uncertain intonation.
- Neutral tone of voice.
- A raised male or female voice – yellow alert.
- A raised woman's voice.
- The leader's authoritative intonation.

Women are past masters at actively using shrieking intonations and mimicry as an auxiliary means to control men by making the information they have to convey seem to be of a high priority.

For example, all a woman has to do when laying out her arguments for a certain opinion is to say, in a high-pitched voice, "See! Do you see!" and the man will agree with her, even if he's forced to create a whole logical foundation for her opinion himself.

Another example: in order to show a man he's wrong, all a woman has to do is shout hysterically: "How could you!" and the man will retreat right then and there without even asking for more substantial arguments.

5. "I'm Just a Frail, Powerless Little Female in Danger and I've Got Lots of Problems, Come Protect Me, O Mighty Male." Women use this technique all the time to control strangers. For example, if a woman needs some free help with her computer or her car, she can make herself look helpless and ask some guy for help. She looks at him, beaming with gratitude and batting her eyes. By combining this technique with constant complaining, women have managed to create the illusion that they have a harder time of things than men.

However, the only difference is that women complain, and men don't. There are a lot of women who've found ways to turn this technique into a means for parasitically existing at the expense of naïve men.

6. "Sudden Disorientation." The woman finds it useful to hide the real motivations for her decision from a man, so she tries to disorient the man, disarming him and neutralizing his arguments. For example, a girl I was seeing once turned to me in the middle of a conversation and said, "Stop shouting at me!" While I was trying to figure out what was going on (I was speaking in a regular tone of voice, and it would have been stupid to start explaining that I wasn't shouting), I lost my train of thought, and she easily seized the initiative. A harsher variant of this technique is to apply pressure to a man's confidence in his own adequacy. A man who's unsure about his own adequacy can hardly stand up for his opinion.

7. "Tears." This is a universal and highly effective weapon that women use to help them lie to men while nurturing their guilt complex. It also disorients them, allows the woman to play at helplessness, and increasing the perceived importance of what she has to say. The moment a man starts to catch a woman in the act of lying or pretending, she'll instantly burst into tears and start swearing oaths, and the man will either believe her or soften up. Sometimes he'll even start to believe that he did something wrong by bringing the woman to tears. A woman can squeeze out a few tears and sobs just as easily as a man can clear his throat. Women are well aware of this quality in them and hold it in high regard. A woman will tell her girlfriend or lover all about how she fooled her husband or her boss, laughing about it all the while and patting herself on the back for being such a "good actress." If a woman forgets or is unable to tear up, she can still tell a man about how she "was crying before" and how it's obviously his fault. For a woman, tears can be a last-ditch method to win an argument once all her other techniques have been exhausted. Why even bother talking, if all you have to do is stick your face in a pillow and shake as though you're sobbing, all while reacting to your interlocutor's words with nothing but gasps and groans? Chances are, he won't be able to take it, and you'll end up being right.

8. "Grow Up." This is a kind of derisive mockery. If the man's standing up for his own interests, but they happen to conflict with the woman's, she can say something like, "grow up!" or, sarcastically, "Poor baby, he got sick. Poor baby's all tuckered out. A woman hurt his feelings, the poor little baby. The poor baby's throwing a temper tantrum," etc. By using this tactic, the woman is demonstrating her doubt in the man as a strong male worthy of mating. She might display offensive pity to show him how pathetic he is. In other words, she's representing his behavior as childish or reckless, something unworthy of a "real man." If the man's psychologically weak, this will make him stop standing up for his own interests. For example, despite the fact that he's tired or sick, he'll still do whatever it is the woman wants him to do. Of course, it goes without saying that the woman, as a member of the "weaker sex," can act like a baby, i.e. make her own desires and interests known, whenever she feels like it. This technique is designed to put the woman in a privileged position.

9. "What a Jerk." Women are usually more than ready to give away huge amounts of negative information about their man or another woman's. The goals of this activity are multi-faceted. First of all, it's a way for a woman to ensure in advance that she'll have psychological in case she has a conflict with her man. Second, it's a way for her to make it known that, as a woman, she's always good and always right. Third, it's a way to send out a female distress signal. Once the signal's being broadcast, chances are some man or other will respond to it and try to save her, which means she'll have another source of income and support. Fourth, the man gets cut off from everyone he knows. Their acquaintances will prefer to solve the issue through the "good" woman, and not through "jerk," which means that she effectively monopolizes all communications with other people. Nowadays, this technique gets used all the time by the feminists as a way to push men out of political life. The women who spread negative information about their man are usually also parasitizing him. The ones who aren't parasites, but are still dissatisfied with their men, will try not to talk about it, since a poor image of their man will reflect poorly on their own image. If the guy's so lousy, and you live with him, that must mean you can't get a good one. You're a loser. A woman will always do her best to turn every situation around so that she ends up in the best possible light and the man looks like the villain. She might complain about how her man's trying to go fishing, or go to a bar with his buddies, or go out and do something without giving all his income to her. But she'll never tell anyone about how she's created such a psychological hell for him at home that he can't stand to be there anymore, or that he'd rather sleep at work, or in the garage, or in the woods by a campfire, than at home in bed with his wife.

10. "Dragging Strangers into It." This works well when combined with the last technique. If a woman

needs to win a psychological victory over a man, she'll drag other women or submissive men into her camp. She'll say, "Just look at him," then paint the other party a picture of her man based on convenient interpretations and evaluations of his behavior. The other people who get dragged into the argument bring additional psychological pressure to bear on the man. Women are moved by female solidarity, which is why they always try to monopolize the information-delivery zone with gossip. But gossip's unworthy of a man, right?

11. "Where Have You Been?" (What were you doing, who were you with, etc., which in the age of the cell phone has turned into "where are you?"). The woman needs this question to make the man "account for his whereabouts," thereby putting herself in the position of boss and him in the position of subordinate. It's also handy because she can look for weak points in his answer and grab onto them, eventually forcing him to start explaining himself. He's a standard "where are you?" dialog:

*"Where are you?"*

*"At work."*

*"What are you doing there? (this question is designed to cast doubt on the value of the man's activities)"*

*"Making money." (he's forced to explain the obvious)*

*"I'm lonely here all by myself." (hidden complaint)*

*"Sorry honey, I've got a deadline coming up and a meeting later." (now he's already justifying himself)*

*"Why don't you come home? I'm bored." (an impossible demand under the sweet sauce of promised sex)*

*"I'm sorry honey, I can't, there's just no way." (again justifying himself)*

*"You're with somebody, aren't you?" (accusations)*

*"Come on, you know better than that." (again with the explanations)*

*"You don't really love me" (here comes the heavy artillery)*

*Etc.*

The man ends up feeling like he did something wrong. He's uneasy.

Once she's in full dominance mode, a woman will ask questions without even listening to the answer. At that point the man's life as such is of no interest to her whatsoever. He's already submitted. Controlling him has become routine; all she's doing now is sharpening her psychological claws. The man's answer isn't information to her, it's more like a scratching post for a cat.

When she's in lure mode, however, a woman will listen attentively and remember a man's answers. She's interested in scouting him out and starting the process of psychologically tuning him up in order to get into his good graces. Even her provocations are softer than usual.

12. "Please, Call Me 'Mom.'" This is the mother-in-law's special technique. She starts out by pretending to be fond of her son-in-law and tells him to call her "Mom," then, once she's established that has a mother's rights over him, she starts treating him in a domineering way, giving him orders and putting additional psychological pressure on him. The mother-in-law in a woman in the full, post-reproductive stage of dominance mode. She's already used to dominating her own family, so now she's trying to bring a new family under her heel and make herself the leader of another hierarchy. Whatever you do, never let your mother-in-law get too close to you. Demand that she call you by your full name and vice-versa. Make sure she keeps her distance. Otherwise you'll end up under fire from two points at once. Your mother-in-law isn't a member of your family; she's an outsider without any rights whatsoever, without so much as an advisory position. She's like a neighbor. Of course, some mothers-in-law are sweet and well-intentioned, but they're the exception to the rule.

Never, ever allow your mother-in-law the slightest opportunity to interfere in your family affairs. NEVER let her live with you. You might as well willingly surrender the role of head of the household. The same goes for your own mother.

All of the techniques used by women combine to form a generally unhealthy emotional and informational background to society. Traditional societies counter it with a cult of respect for men. In these societies, men also have the option of countering psychological and emotional violence physically.

If it turns out that there are just too many women around and this background has no cultural or religious tradition to act against it, the crushing psychological pressure on a man can turn into an unceasing attack. Which

is what we see everywhere around us. All you have to do is find yourself in a mostly female group to hear more than you can stand about “how much men suck.” This’ll be the primary topic of conversation. Just turn on the TV, and you’ll find yourself in an atmosphere permeated by the hysterical demonization of men. Most of what you hear about men is negative. This mechanism provides informational/psychological support to our matriarchal society.

## Sexual Blackmail

It’s a law of nature: among *Homo sapiens*, the female is the one who controls the process of mating with mid-ranking males. This means that, in a society where men have been pushed from their rightful pedestal as leader of the family hierarchy, women use sex as a reward for material support, i.e. as a way to control men. A woman will carefully pick the time for sex, carefully dosing it in terms of quantity and quality. And right after the man’s given her a present or taken her out to eat is the perfect time for sex. By the same token, if the man doesn’t do things for her or give her presents, she’s not in the mood. Animal trainers call this “classical conditioning.” If you’re good, you get a treat. If you’re bad, you don’t. We already know that this type of behavior has its roots in the Paleolithic Age. Unlike ancient female hominids, modern women have learned to mask the fact that their willingness to have sex depends on material support by using an irrelevant element: their mood. But that changes nothing. If you want sex, improve the female’s mood with offerings. Unless you’re a leader, that is.

Since being sexually rejected is so humiliating for a man, a lot of men start to become generally afraid to show any initiative in this direction. It’s not uncommon for a man to prefer to relieve himself with masturbation, pretending that he doesn’t really need it that badly anyway. Moreover, sex for pay doesn’t provide any emotional satisfaction. And so, in many families, sex becomes a rare occurrence. If the woman still needs sex, then after the man’s demand starts to slacken off, she can switch to a new kind of sexual terror: accusing the man of sexual inattention. She forces the man to have sex with her, which completely disorients his sex instinct. The human male’s instinctual firmware has no way to deal with sex with a dominant, aggressive female, so he’ll automatically react to her as if she were an old or inadequate female.

I was once leaving the house with a girl I was seeing, when she said to me, “If you take a look at women’s faces as you walk by, you can tell which ones take advantage of their man’s morning wood and which ones don’t.” And it’s true. Most of the women were walking down the street with angry or distracted expressions on their faces. Only a few were beaming and had a real twinkle in their eye. It’s a very useful example, morning wood – for some women, it’s a way to get close to their beloved man, to get some pleasure and be in a good mood all day. Other women use it to complain that their man won’t let them sleep, or they’ll say that he got hard not because he loves her, but for purely physiological reasons. Most women are more concerned with trying to establish a guilt complex. Moreover, women who use sex as a training method know that they have nothing to reward their man for first thing in the morning. He just woke up, he hasn’t even had time to do anything for her yet, hasn’t cracked open his wallet to satisfy any of her whims. So it’s not in her best interests to set a precedent of free sex. There’s no technique in it. This kind of approach will sometimes give a man a phobia of morning sex, or even a phobia of sex in general. Rather than face sexual rejection from their wife or girlfriend, they’d rather jerk off lying next to her. This is totally humiliating for a man, and it’s a relationship-killer. This is the reason why weak men with low self-esteem become asexual or homosexual.

By the way, a word about impotence: I once read in some magazine a letter to the editor from a man who was afflicted with impotence. He wrote that impotence had set him free. He no longer had to waste all his money, time, and resources on looking for and paying for a partner. And he refused to get treated, even though he could have. He preferred to remain impotent. But he became impotent while he was a bachelor. If this happens to a married man, his woman will, without a doubt, take advantage of it to develop his inferiority complex. “You’re defective, you’re good for nothing, I’ll put up with you for now, but if you don’t do whatever I say...” And so the man turns into a free lackey. I know an example of this from personal experience. Dominant women would rather have her man be impotent. He wouldn’t be getting any sex anyway (by the way, this is the cause of the impotence, problems with the prostate of urinary tract are the standard situation), and now he’s got a nasty inferiority

complex to boot. His wife pushes him around, mocks him, and even beats him.

When women use sex as a training method, they lead men to a subordinate position, and the result is a matriarchal society. This is why many religious and cultural traditions preach abstinence. Abstinence is nothing more than people refusing to be trained. They'd rather be free. Even if it means going without sex, they'd rather have free reign over their own minds, wallets, and time. Especially since dosed sex for pay isn't even satisfying. This is why all traditional cultures see providing sex as a spousal obligation and failure to do so as grounds for divorce. The legal institutions of traditional societies are concerned about the health, freedom, and high status of their men. But in a modern matriarchal culture, expecting your wife to provide unlimited sex is considered marital rape. The legal institutions of matriarchal countries are ensuring that the sexual marketplace extends into the family and the power dynamic between men and women.

A woman can also use sex as an ancillary means of controlling a man. She uses it to worm her way into his trust, she gets him to relax and put his guard down with caresses and sex, then apply one of her methods of psychological combat, such as:

### **Emotional Terror. The Vice. Hysterics. Hysteria.**

Women say that "a woman controls a man by controlling his state of mind." A woman can easily affect a man's subconscious, especially his instincts. The easiest instinct for her to influence is his hierarchical instinct. For example, if she wants to send a man off so he can bring home the bacon, she does it by wounding his pride. She'll give him examples of other men who make more, talking about them in an ecstatic tone of voice. But she'll refer to him only with a tone of condescending pity. In this way, she tells his instinct that she considers his rank to be lower than that of other potential rivals. She's tightening the vice around the man's ego. He enters a stressful state of mind and feels compelled to run out and get some more resources in order to avoid losing his woman's respect and sex. If the woman wants to intensify the effect, she can crank the vice on a much higher emotional level. This is called "hysterics."

For example, a woman might want to cut her man off from a single friend. If she tries to forbid him to see his friend, she'll meet with resistance, but, if she knows his weak points and can act on them, she'll get what she wants. If she knows her man is the envious type, she might tell him an emotional story about his friend's success and achievements. If he's the jealous type, she'll go ahead and tell him his friend made a pass at her. This will cause the man to have a negative emotional reaction against his friend, and they'll argue and stop talking to each other.

But the most common and intense hysterics happen when a woman is blaming her man for being "inattentive" to her. The goal of her hysterical behavior is to give him a guilt complex, forcing him to crack open the old wallet and show her how attentive he can be.

If a woman needs to break a man psychologically, she'll fly into hysterics on a regular basis and with a high level of intensity until the broken, demoralized man starts to fulfill her orders without arguing.

This effect can also be achieved with constant, but less emotionally intense hysterics. The goal is the same, however. The difference between emotional terror and gradual "grinding" is the same as that between taking a fortress by storm or by siege. The woman quite simply wears him down until he can't take any more.

### **Blackmailing with Break-up or Divorce**

Women have an old saying: "a man should always be a little unsure about his woman, but a woman should always be completely sure about her man."

This is a very handy position for a woman to be in. She's the winner in every way. She's sure that the man won't wriggle off the hook, and she can lead him around by it wherever she wants, manipulating him with his attachment to her and his fear of losing her. This kind of blackmail comes in countless varieties. The woman might start packing, run out of the house, go to live with her mom, run out of a party in an unknown direction while pretending her feelings are hurt, receive attention from other men in order to play with his jealousy, etc.

If the woman isn't totally confident that the man cares about her, she won't be able to manipulate him out

of fear of losing him. If the man's confident that she cares about him, she has no leg to stand on, since she can't manipulate him by playing on his fear of losing her. There's nothing to threaten him with. This is why a woman with always try, usually successfully, to build their relationships according to the model I've described.

The woman starts by advertising herself in such a way that all other rivals are cut off and the man's attention is focused on her alone. Then she makes him jealous by demonstrating her independence and readiness to walk away. The man, tormented by doubt and mental anguish, showers the woman with gifts, services, and other signs of attention (paying for her company and sex, if there is any).

Another version of this kind of manipulative technique is suicidal blackmail. This is when a woman threatens to throw herself under a train or off a balcony.

In a matriarchal legal system, divorcing your wife means losing your children, property, investments, and future earnings. Therefore, women actively blackmail their husbands with divorce in order to obtain their obedience.

### **Employers and Women Joining Forces to Exploit Men**

This is a matriarchal standard. A man should be predictable, manageable, and under a woman's control.

A married woman will usually chew her husband's ear, repressing a weak man's personality and controlling him in such a way that he ends up in a mode where he regularly, PREDICTABLY provides for the woman and her children. A practical employer will take advantage of this and set a man of this sort up as a tiny cog in his business machine. The man becomes nothing more than a functional apparatus for doing work and providing the woman with pay. He's crushed in a vice of other people's needs, with his woman on one side, pressuring him with morality and the image of the "real man," the breadwinner who fulfills his woman's every whim, and with the inexorable demands of his employer on the other. All of this also receives additional support from the image of the "good citizen." The woman and the employer enter into a subtle contract to control the man. The woman insists that he should work and have a career. The employer insists that he should be married if wants to have a position of responsibility. Once he's in this mode, the man completely loses the ability to think in terms of his own interests; he can only think about things in terms of the interests of his employer (overwork) and his wife (drop his paychecks in her lap). Which is what the people controlling him want.

There can be positive examples of this, too. A strong woman who can artfully manipulate a weak man with a low self-esteem can provide him with the motivation he needs to better himself. Then the man can become successful and have a career he wouldn't otherwise have had. Further results depend on the control method the woman uses. If she controls the man harshly, exceeding his pain threshold, as women in many matriarchal societies do, she'll eventually end up alone. The man, who's made a career for himself and increased his self-esteem, will go looking for a less agonizing relationship. But, if she makes intelligent use of the "carrot and stick" method and other games, as women in traditional societies do, the man will either remain the woman's secret doormat or grow into the position of leader. In a matriarchal society, it can sometimes happen that a hen-pecked man will reach the highest level of the social hierarchy – just look at Bill Clinton. Of course, the results of extended leadership by doormats and hen-pecked weaklings – namely, the downfall of the government and everything that comes with it – is not so pretty.

In a matriarchal society, smart employers will use their employees' domineering wives to their own ends. They provide their employees with a more comfortable and interesting environment at work than they have at home so that they'll prefer to work late rather than go home. The employees hide from their wives at work. By giving his employees a double motivation to work, the employer saves on wages.

### **Relationship Planning**

Just as a man plans and sets up his job or his business, a woman is constantly planning and setting up her relationship. You just slept with a woman for the first time, and the only thing you're thinking about is that the sex was decent and that maybe it wouldn't be such a bad thing to meet up again in a couple days. Meanwhile, the woman's already absorbed in strategic planning. She's thinking about how to introduce you to her mom, when the wedding will be, how many kids you'll have together, what kind of house you'll live in, and how much she can



take you for in the divorce. She's also planning her relationship tactics. She's thinking about how to dose sex with you, how good it should be, which provocations to set up and when, and how and when to get her mom involved in the relationship. She'll try to plan every little thing. For example, she'll put serious thought into the problem of whether to change a burnt-out light bulb herself or wait for three days with a dark hallway until the handyman comes back from vacation. Otherwise, if, God forbid, she should show that she can perform this complex operation herself, she might dispel the myth about women's weakness and ruin her chance to play the helpless little female. For example, a woman doesn't want to have sex right at the beginning of the relationship, but she wants to start her "lure" technique. In this case, she might devise a script for her interaction with a man and fulfill it precisely, right down to the second – she knows when to kiss you passionately, when she'll "have to" run off because she's "running late," and when, before any of this happens, she should eat a breath mint so that it'll be nicer to kiss her. And this whole performance will seem just like a spontaneous emotional event. And it actually will be genuinely emotional. Generally speaking, women are very practical and forward-thinking, but they know how to hide this behind a veil of emotionality. Moreover, believe it or not, their practicality and emotionality don't contradict each other, but actually dovetail quite well.

This is very important. A woman's capacity for strategic planning is limited only to her biological function, that is, her relationship with a man. Planning a business strategy, for example, is something that is totally beyond her. This is why you see so few women among serious entrepreneurs.

### **Craving and Displaying Power**

When observing women, I've noticed time and time again that they love nothing more than to display their power over a man to those around them. For example, the wife of one of my friends manipulates him at home in a pretty mild mode, but, as soon as she ends up with him in a social setting, she transforms. She starts to show those around her how well she's trained him. Her voice suddenly adopts high-pitched, commanding tones, and she starts tugging at his sleeve, following him with her gaze, giving him one order after another and forcing him to serve her, all while purposely remaining seated in one place. She treats him like her butler. A lot of people actually get uncomfortable watching them.

Here's another very common trick. A man and a woman arrive at a party. Everything's great, everyone's having fun and hanging out. Then suddenly, for no apparent reason, the woman drags the man from the party under an obviously invented pretext. This way she lets those around them know that the man is her property. She's demonstrating her power over him.

When a woman's demonstrating her power over a man to other people, the important thing isn't just to show that he's submissive, but also to show how he can tolerate being demeaned. This is why she'll constantly make fun of the man when other people are around. Some of the most prominent methods include: making him kiss her in public and not kissing him back; verbally or physically humiliating him in front of his friends; flirting with other men in front of him, etc. If you're with your woman in a social situation and feel awkward, depressed, and embarrassed, you can rest assured that this is the result of her public performance. Your suffering and pain usually won't bother her at all.

### **Forming Public Opinion and Demonstrating the Relationship as a Means of Power**

Thanks to their instinct for cooperative solidarity within the collective, women band together and act in unison. Men, on the other hand, are divided within the community, where they are in constant competition for a spot in the hierarchy. They only band together in the event of danger, to protect the females and young, or to help bring down large game. This is why women in human society have the ability to practice collective control. Their primary method for controlling men collectively is by forming public opinion. The system of public opinion enables them to create a resource stream that travels from men to women. This is accomplished by giving a positive image to the men who serve women's interests and a negative image for those who don't. This negative image can also place obstacles in the way of men as they move up the hierarchy. I'll demonstrate how this works with four examples of identical men with identical resources. The only difference between them is how accessible their resources are to women.

1. A successful man, proud of his accomplishments, who's also a hen-pecked provider. When women talk about him, they say, "What a responsible, hard-working guy." He's useful to the female community, so women give him a positive image and rub him the faces of the other men around them.

2. A successful man, proud of accomplishments, who's also a bachelor. Women will do their best to downplay his achievements by giving him the image of someone who's still not quite made it and pretending to feel sorry for the way he has to independently distribute his own resources. They'll say, "it's time he settled down," with the underlying assumption that his real success in life can't happen prior to this. A man's success thus starts to depend on which direction his resources are flowing, on who's directing them. The goal of the female collective is to direct the bachelor's resources into the hands of some woman or other.

3. A successful confirmed bachelor. He's satisfied with his accomplishments; he enjoys distributing his money on his own and has no intention of giving it to anyone else. People will start saying that "he's not as great as he thinks he is," etc. They'll usually talk about him with a pitying or adversarial intonation as a greedy, sick, or inadequate man. He's a poor precedent for the female community and a fiendishly dangerous example for men who are already under women's control. Women will therefore do their best to isolate this kind of man from others by an impenetrable wall of negative public opinion.

4. A successful man who openly contends with a woman for resources. For example, he refuses to give away his money in a divorce or to keep a woman as payment for sex. So he becomes a degenerate monster. In other words, women sick the men under their control on him. The "degenerate monster" sign around his neck means "get him!" Cisterns of verbal offal are poured over the man, and he's subject to the most intense psychological pressure imaginable. Public opinion intentionally forms a maximally negative image of him.

Men who don't have much by way of resources aren't interesting to women, so public opinion has practically nothing to say about them. There's no point.

But the cruelest, most intense psychological pressure gets brought to bear on a man who uncovers women's system of trading resources for sex. One time, while I was studying women's oratorical techniques, I compelled the participants on an online women's forum to talk about a topic they would have preferred to avoid at all costs: amateur prostitution. They refused to talk about it, and all I got was an avalanche of thinly veiled insults. I heard a stream of offensive statements about my mental health, my success with women, the size of my penis, my sexual orientation, my intelligence, etc. A man unprepared for this kind of massive pressure on the conventional mind-control levers will usually give in and retreat. But I had to hone my counter-techniques against female rhetoric until they became automatic, so I stood my ground against their on-line assaults for three days. It was hilarious. You should try it some time. This kind of work-out will serve you well in real life.

### **Surrogate Men**

The methods of domination, just like the need to dominate, are hard-wired into women's instincts. Therefore, if a woman can't find a man, she'll use the same methods to dominate some other replacement for a man. It could be a girlfriend, a lesbian lover, a mother, daughter, son, son-in-law, or employee at work, or even society at large. Anyone will do. All you have to do is watch old single ladies and it'll be obvious. Since they don't have an appropriate object to act upon, their domination instinct crashes down on everyone around them in the form of complaints, reproaches, and nasty comments. A classic example of a surrogate pair is a mother and her unmarried daughter. These kinds of pairing are, as a rule, stable. More often than not, if the daughter has a child, she'll use her mother as a surrogate man and manipulate her accordingly. If she doesn't have a kid, then it'll be the other way around, and the mother will manipulate her daughter and force her to serve her. An older woman will often use a son or a son-in-law as a surrogate husband, a psychological replacement. This is why our matriarchal culture has made the mother-in-law out to be the archetypal character most hated by men.

### **The Trick of "I've Got a Headache (or My Leg Hurts, or My Back, or My Butt, or Whatever)," "I'm Tired."**

This is a basic method women employ to get a man to do their work for them or to get out of sex. In other words, it's a way to turn a man into a free lackey. The bases for this method are the myth that women are weak

and men's instinctive urge to take care of them and protect them. The guilt complex, the image of the real man, and sexual blackmail all come into play here, too. There are some women who turn a pretending to be sick into a way of life.

### **Seizing and Marking Territory and Resources**

Perhaps the most interesting topic for our discussion in this chapter is the human female's territorial and nesting instinct. Once a woman's made her way into a man's home, she'll inevitably try to mark her territory. She'll "accidentally" leave her underwear, hairpin, or hair gel in the man's bathroom, bedroom, or car, or leave some hair somewhere, or spray perfume so that it smells like her, etc. What she's doing is signaling to other women that she's laying claim to this territory. The woman might also mark the man himself by wiping hair gel on his clothes, giving him a hickey, or scratching his back during sex. This can create a conflict between the man and a rival, if there is one, which will make it easier to snatch up the man and his resources.

Once she's moved in with a man, a woman will immediately start "tidying up" – moving the furniture around, reorganizing things, etc. In other words, she's changing the way the man's home is arranged. It's just like how an ancient female who'd made her way into a male's cave would immediately take all his game and hide it. She would take control of it. The basis of the woman's behavior in the man's home is thus to hide all the most important things away from him under the pretext of "tidying up" and cooking. She's also creating a psychological barrier of "this isn't something a man should worry about." In the end, the man, if he wants to eat or put on clean socks, has to go to the woman with a request. She's acting as a middleman between the man and his own resources. Nowadays, when food has lost its prehistoric value, women have focused their attention on a man's money as his primary resource. But the instinctive drive to move his stuff around still remains.

The foundation of all life in the animal kingdom is control over food. This is why a woman will instinctively take over the kitchen, monopolizing the most abundant, warm, and safe location in the home. Any man who's ever been drafted into military service knows how sought after the positions of cook or stockroom manager are. And they only go to the slickest weasels out there. However, women have figured out to take over the most privileged place in the home and blame men for it at the same time.

### **Power-Seizing Techniques of the "Puppet Master" Type**

One of the basic tenets of the female double standard is: "a man should love a woman, but a woman should only allow herself to be loved." The position of beloved is a very beneficial one. In the first place, the lover idealizes the indifferent beloved. The beloved, on the other hand, retains her accurate perception. It's the same advantage a sighted person has over a blind one. The lover thus becomes dependent on the beloved. He's in her power, and it goes without saying that women benefit from having men and men alone play the part of lover. It makes it easier for them to take control of them and get at their resources. There's a common women's saying: "In order for a woman to find happiness with a man, she has to understand him well and love him a little bit. But in order for a man to find happiness with a woman, he has to love her like crazy without even trying to understand her."

In the sexual hunt, women also assume the most beneficial position of a pseudo-prey that hunts for the hunter. This is beneficial for a woman because it means she can control the situation, she can hunt and get results, while the one who spend his resources and his energy is the naïve male hunter who thinks he's the one on the prowl.

In her life with a man, a woman will take up the position of a prestigious object that he possesses. In other words, he's got her, so he should take care of her. Given the fact that this strange possession can allow itself to be owned and not owned at the same time (that is, it can make the possessor work to earn the right to keep possessing it), it would be impossible to imagine a more beneficial position to be in.

After a first superficial glance, it might seem like the woman is the commodity, and the man is the buyer. She's for sale. The man works hard to get her, pays for her, and keeps paying for her. But, for some reason, it turns out that the man, the supposed buyer, is the one being used, and the female commodity is the end consumer. That's some slick commodity, if it can consume its buyer.

A woman is a master con artist. She also assumes the most beneficial position in every stage and in every aspect of a relationship. By the same token, when it comes time to make a decision, she takes up the best possible position. She makes the decision, but the one who has to act on it and deal with the consequences is the man. (But of course! He's the man!)

The system by which a couple makes decisions is simple:

1. The woman makes the decision.
2. By erecting logical and emotional barriers while pressuring and manipulating the man, she leads him by the nose through a labyrinth of women's logic to the decision she's made.
3. He "makes" the appropriate decision "on his own." Now it's HIS decision.
4. Now that it's his decision, he puts it in motion and suffers the consequences.
5. If the decision turns out to be the right one, the woman is content. She made it, and she reaps the rewards. If it's not the right one – it's the man's fault.

One trick that women love is to take a man into a store to go shopping for HER. He has to pick out her shoes, her dress, etc. So the man ends up carrying everything, he gets pushed into making additional purchases, and afterward she can even blame him if the stuff she bought doesn't fit or isn't as good as she thought it was. He picked it out, right? He should have known better. He's the man.

A woman is a puppet master. She tries to snatch up the real power while giving the man all the formal trappings of power. She makes all the real decisions herself and forces the man to enact them and answer for the consequences. By the way, this is why so there are so few women in jobs that require personal responsibility for the decision-making process. They feel awkward in that kind of situation.

Here's another technique: the woman initiates some kind of process that serves her own best interests but is inopportune from the man's perspective. But somewhere along the way, she dumps all of the work and responsibility into the man's lap. For example, she might start some kind of building or remodeling project at home, hire contractors, then screw the whole thing up and start acting like a "weak little female." She'll "ask for a man's advice." Once the man sees that the whole thing's gone to hell, he'll have no choice but to yoke himself to the process and take it over.

The way to fight this tactic is simple. When a woman suggests something like this, just say to her, "Ok, honey, no problem. If you want to do this so badly, then you can pay for and be responsible for the entire project yourself from beginning to end."

## **Smart Women**

A smart woman will quite simply not apply most of these techniques. She's smart enough to understand that an enslaved man is going to lose all his initiative and effectiveness. If she does use any manipulative techniques, then she'll do it in a gentle way. Rather than outright controlling her man, she'll help him "grow his wings" so that he can soar as high as possible. She wants him to succeed – it's in both their best interests. You can tell a smart woman from your everyday female precisely by her ability to repress her own animal striving for domination.

What does it mean to "help a man grow his wings?" I'll give you a few basic examples. Let's say a man's building a garage. He just poured the foundation, and now he's resting for a second after a hard morning's work. A woman in dominance mode would walk up and say, "Why's it slanted like that?" In this case, the man feels compelled to make excuses, he gets a load of negative feedback, he feels bad, and next time he'll probably go to the bar with his buddies rather than work on the house. The garage never gets finished, and the guy takes to drink. On the other hand, a woman who wants to make her man more effective would say, "Wow, that's great! Do you mind if I take some cement? I want to smooth this part out a little bit so I can draw some pretty flowers on it." In this case, the man feels happy, he's proud of his work and his woman, and he gets a powerful motivation to keep working. This is the kind of family that has its own house, and two cars, and a little vacation home, and family trips to Yellowstone, and a ton of money and happiness.

A smart woman loves and respects her husband the way he is; she doesn't want to train him, she wants to be his teammate. These women don't usually parasitize their men, but they also don't try to work their way into

male spheres of activity. They're active, but in their own sphere. And they actively control the rear-guard part of the family, that is, the upbringing of their children and grandchildren, housework, communication, everyday life, rear-guard purchases and jobs (repairs, furniture, home design), planning vacations and time off, etc. This is their social function as the ones in charge of the rear guard. At first, while they still don't have any, or at least many, children, they usually participate in their husband's business, but as soon as the family starts to grow, they take over the entire rear section of the family, which frees the husband up to worry about external functions. This is the most effective type of family in the modern world – the half-partnership, half-traditional type. It's based on a simple principle: the more activity for the benefit of the family, the stronger and better off the family is. And, by the same token, the more energy and time wasted outside of the family on the parents' own entertainments, the weaker the family. If a woman spends an hour on shopping, watching a soap opera, or doing low-paying work that of no use to the family, that's an hour that's not spent on the family, i.e. stolen from them. The work, social activity, and business of adequate women are thus all concentrated on the family. Focus on adequate women in your own life. Or force women who aren't totally adequate to become adequate.

## **Defending Yourself against Manipulation**

Some men might find this chapter extremely painful. It may touch on some traumatic personal experiences.

If you read this chapter and say, "What the hell!? I've never even heard of women doing stuff like this! If my wife ever tried any of this on me, she'd be sorry!" or, "Well, there you go. My wife and I are always using these techniques on each other. And she says that, since I'm the only person they don't work on, I'm the only one she's really interested in," or, "Only stupid women act like that. Any man who puts up with stupid women is even stupider than they are," then I congratulate you! You're a leader, and your woman knows it. You're all set! So we've got nothing more to talk about. Enjoy your life and love!

If, on the other hand, you read about the situations I described and saw your own life, then steel yourself for what's to come, because you're not going to live it. But keep reading. First of all, keep your cool. Just be honest with yourself. Yes, you're being manipulated. And you've got to do something about it. The first thing to do is to decide exactly what you really want. Either way, the situation is under your control. If, after thinking about it for a bit, you say to yourself, "Generally speaking, I've got a pretty good thing going here. My woman's got a better head on her shoulders than I do, and I'm grateful to her for managing me so well. Without her I would have started boozing all the time or done something else equally stupid, since I've got no willpower," - well, so be it. As a couple, you work. If, however, you feel certain that you don't want to continue your relationship the way it is, if she's driving you crazy, if you're being manipulated, then you need to either break it off with your woman or rebuilt your relationship with her from scratch. I don't know which one's better. Only you can decide that. All I know is that you're going to need a lot of strength and patience either way. The fact that she's manipulating you means that she doesn't respect you, and the only one who can make a woman respect him is a leader. You need to make her instincts see you as a leader. All I can do right now is provide you with the tools you'll need the most during the first stage of this battle:

1. Camouflage. Never show your weapon to the enemy, and never, under any circumstances, talk about what you've read in this book with women. You'll end up being called a misogynist, which is the same as being labeled a pathetic, dangerous, sexually frustrated loser, someone women don't want, etc. In other words, people will lean on your "image-of-a-real-man" lever and drive you back into your milking-stall so you can start producing for women again. Not everyone can stand up to this kind of mass psychological attack. If you really, really want to talk about these things with women, then at least do it with women you don't know. Train yourself on them.

2. Night vision goggles. If your brain doesn't seem to be capable of perceiving things accurately, a sure-fire technique to combat this is to imagine that, instead of a woman, you're dealing with another man. For example, a businessman I knew once told me about how his wife and mother-in-law got it into their head that they could fix a hole in the roof. Needless to say, it didn't work out. They ended up hiring some jerk-offs who did nothing but ruin the shingles. So now his wife complains to him about how he's too busy at work to fix the roof.

He actually looked guilty and confused. I explained to him then and there that the women had cooked the whole thing up not with the intention of fixing the roof, but just to force him to play along and fix it himself. It's the old "puppet master" technique. And then I added, "Imagine that this wasn't your wife and mother-in-law, but me. I took it upon myself to fix the roof; I took your money and hired a bunch of strangers. Then, when they screwed it up, I blamed it all on you. How would you react?" Without missing a beat, he said, "I'd murder you." Now, obviously he wasn't going to murder anyone, it's just a figure of speech. But you should have seen his face! He'd just understood that he, an experienced businessman, was being manipulated and made a fool of. Try this yourself. An identical standard for evaluating the actions of men and women needs to be the basis for any accurate perception of life situations.

Here's another simple method for analyzing similar situations. When you're trying to figure out a woman's motivations, ignore her words and intonations. Just pay attention to what she does.

### 3. Arming yourself and combat tactics. It's not all bad for men.

When a man and a woman get into a fight, the woman's goal is to achieve psychological victory at any cost. The man, who doesn't understand that the woman started the fight intentionally and with precisely this purpose, tries in vain to determine the cause of the conflict and rectify it. This is why he loses. He mistakenly thinks that the reasons for the fight are the ones the woman used in order to start it. At the beginning of the fight, a woman will try to put a man in an awkward situation, that is, in the position of the guilty party, and make him start justifying himself. The major mistake most men make in this situation is that they try to explain their actions. Any explanations will be taken as excuses, or, in other words, as evidence of guilt. And, if he thinks that the cause of the fight is something he did, if he's being blamed for his actions, then he's guaranteed not just a global guilt complex, but also a loss of faith in his own adequacy. The more in the wrong the woman is, the more she'll make a show of being "hurt." And she can even work herself up emotionally to a point where she really feels this way. The fact that there's nothing to be upset about is totally beside the point.

In order to extinguish a conflict, it's enough to have the following counter-manipulations at your disposal:

- Never explain anything or try to justify yourself.
- Get really offended right at the beginning of the fight, seizing on the woman's disrespectful tone and nonsensical accusations.

- In extreme circumstances, if the woman tries a high-caliber tactic like threatening to kill herself, you can, without hurting her, tie her up and have her committed. That way, you can be absolutely sure that her threats of suicide will be officially recorded. You win either way. If it was really all just for show, it sure as hell won't happen again. She won't want to go back to the funny farm. Or, if it was a real threat, that is, a real mental illness, you'll have an official record in the event of any legal problems. Don't be afraid to take this step. War is hell. The main thing is not to forget to tell the woman that you're calling in the men in white coats because you're concerned about HER welfare, HER health, and HER safety.

If you have absolutely no idea how to behave in a fight, stop for a second and think, "How would Don Corleone act in this situation?" In other words, imitate the behavior of someone who is obviously a leader.

Since a man's brain is so much more powerful and universal than a woman's, a man should be able to use all the techniques of manipulation much more effectively than a woman ever could. Moreover, controlling women is hard-wired into the male brain just as controlling men is part of women's instinctual firmware. All you have to do to access this programming is switch on your leadership instincts. How do you do this? Well, that's the whole point of this book. It's all about activating the highest level of your hierarchical instinct. You can tell a leader from a mid-ranking male by whether or not he's used to being in control and whether he can see all the relationships in his herd at a glance. This book will give you all of these habits through the medium of understanding, which will in turn switch on all of your programming. Beside the other benefits he enjoys, a leader is also immune to manipulation. Since I've described the techniques of manipulation in this book and you've read about them, you'll be able to see it all happening. And resist it. If we want to continue the computer analogy, we could say that this book will install mental antivirus software on your onboard computer.

If you've ever been in combat, boxed, fenced, or done anything similar, then you know that, no matter how physically tough a dilettante might be, a professional armed with good technique will beat him in a fight every time. More often than not, a man is in the position of the strong dilettante. But not anymore – now you know

all the techniques of combat. Train yourself. Read, take these control methods, and use them in your relationships with women. And always remember that the leader lives according to his own interests. Think first and foremost about what's best for YOU. A healthy dose of egoism is a good quality to have, no matter what the women pointing their fingers at you might say. A woman is weaker than a leader. She's an opportunist. She can adjust to new circumstances, and she can fall in love with you if her female senses tell her that you have the inner strength of the leader.

And here's one more very important thing to keep in mind: for a leader, interactions with females is a game, not a fight for survival. Therefore, you should play the game gently, easily, with a sense of humor, and without taking women's manipulations the least bit seriously. For you, they should be nothing more than a means to a joke or a counter-manipulation. It's like chess, or like a 1<sup>st</sup>-person shooter video game – it's just fun, and nobody ever gets hurt. It's never to the death.

A strong, confident man's way of life excludes any attempts to assert himself at the expense of any other person whatsoever. He doesn't need to assert himself because he's confident in his own worth. This is especially true in his relations with women, whether they're close to him or complete strangers. They're *a priori* weaker than a strong man. Be strong, gracious leaders!

## Chapter 5. MEN

### It's a Man's World?

Believe it or not, women actually have a very poor understanding of men and their world. The variety of women's illusions about men is simply staggering. You'll come across the full spectrum of women's opinions, beginning with open hostility. If we wanted to sum up the entire morass of primitive nonsense that women have developed through contact with the professional players who attack them and the goody-two-shoes who love them to the point of inadequacy, we could say that, from a woman's perspective, a man is nothing more than a crude, stupid animal – something between a tomcat and a dairy cow.

Men, on the other hand, don't think at all about who they are, preferring to occupy themselves with things of greater interest to them, so they blindly accept women's absurd notions about them. Women's ideas about men have been beaten into their long-suffering heads by their teachers and mommies since they were little boys. This is why most men today have lost their sense of self-identification; they're disoriented and have low-esteem. Let's finally liquidate this unfortunate misunderstanding and try to figure out just what a man is supposed to be.

The biologically predetermined place of a man in this world is that of the male – the creator, the hunter, and the warrior. In a state of nature, he would defend and provide for a woman and her young, make weapons and tools, build shelter, vie with other men for a position in the tribe, and compete for the right to continue his genetic line. After millions of years of evolution, this has naturally become fixed in his internal programming, and he instinctively occupies precisely this position in life – the border between the community and the hostile outside environment. Where does this line exist in the modern world, which is so far from our primordial origins? This is something we each have to decide for ourselves. For one man, it's the top of Mount Everest, so he tries to climb it. For another, it's the confectionary market, so he creates a new kind of cookie and tries to make it succeed there. For yet another, it's the process of writing computer programs.

The entire civilized world around us has been created by men, by creators. Just look around you. The chair you're sitting on was made by men. The house you're living in was built by men. Your computer and your car were invented and made by men. The raw materials and energy for these activities were harnessed by men. And the world on which all of this happens has been conquered, mastered, and continues to be protected by men. Women have played a purely auxiliary role in all of this.

Therefore, in our time, men, in full accord with their nature and with the way the world works, need,

first and foremost, an OCCUPATION, a front for their interaction with the outside world and the production that characterizes it. It's in this OCCUPATION that their ancient instinct to create, hunt, and fight is satisfied, and it's here that it manifests itself emotionally in the passion for work or play that a man experiences via the process of grappling with an occupation and receiving satisfaction from positive results. If that instinct is satisfied by his work or business, the man becomes fixated on it and is successful at it. However, this instinct also has two parts, each of which provides a man with a different motivation for action. The first part is the instinct of the hunter. It manifests itself as passion, as an obsession with the man's occupation. He enjoys it for its own sake - it's the process itself that matters. A writer can write "for his desk." A scientist can study a dung-beetle just *because*, "because it's interesting," without worrying about publishing anything. The other part, the hierarchical instinct, is oriented toward attaining results and manifests itself as ambition and a need to demonstrate your accomplishments to those around you in order to improve their opinion of you, to raise your position in the hierarchical structure of society. This is the instinct that motivates a writer to publish his works and thirst for fame, or a scientist to dream about the Nobel Prize. If a man's work doesn't totally satisfy this instinct, he'll look for satisfaction in a hobby (hunting, fishing, collecting). For example, I know one guy whose hierarchical instinct is satisfied by his successful business, while his hunting instinct is satisfied by collecting coins.

Needless to say, a hunter or a warrior needs a safe place where he can take it easy, relax after a battle, and tend to his wounds. This is why every man needs a FALLBACK POSITION away from the front lines, a cozy lair, a cave, as well as a faithful, loving woman whom he doesn't have to fight with, but who, on the contrary, he can trust. The lair might also have some little ones in it that look like him. And everyone acknowledges him as the leader, and they're grateful to him for taking care of them. And the man is happy.

A man without an OCCUPATION is lost, he's useless. His life has no meaning. Some men have chosen to make hunting for women their OCCUPATION. Since these are the men that many women come into contact with the most, they're the ones they've foolishly taken as the basis for their whole judgment of men in general. Other men have allowed themselves to be convinced that their OCCUPATION is to pamper and care for a beloved woman. But this can't go on forever, since every man has a finite amount of material and moral resources. Simply put, if you decide to waste all your money and time on a woman rather than an OCCUPATION, your money won't go very far.

A man without a lair, with no place to lick his wounds and take a deep breath, suffers from exhaustion, stress, and the negative impact of the surrounding environment. So he'll get sick, and he won't live very long. A man can live without a woman, but he'll still suffer from an inferiority complex, since the same complex that gets formed by his social-sexual instincts is also nurtured by the female collective, which has no desire to allow the existence of an untapped source of resources and an example to the men whom they already own. So single men feel lonely and useless.

A man with a defective partner, a man who has to lock horns and clarify his relationship every time he goes home, will also never get any rest or relaxation in his lair. So he won't live long, either. More often than not, he'll die of a heart attack, a stroke, or another condition brought on by excessive anxiety and exhaustion, such as an ulcer or a reduced immune system.

A man can function in two active modes. The first one is single mode, when he knows that he has no FALLBACK POSITION. Then he's a free hunter looking for resources and a fallback position. Or he can be in couple mode, when he knows that he has a FALLBACK POSITION (his woman and his children). In this case, he's functioning according to his design specifications, and he works at maximum efficiency. If the woman dominates him and exceeds his pain threshold, the man will feel his FALLBACK POSITION growing weaker, and he can declare war on her. Needless to say, this will make him less effective in his ongoing war with his environment. If he's a strong man (a leader), then he'll be certain that he can find another, more adequate woman. And, in order to avoid a war on two fronts, he'll switch to single mode as a "leader without a heard or FALLBACK POSITION" and he'll start looking for another place to call his FALLBACK POSITION. If he's a weak man (low-ranking or mid-ranking), then he won't be sure that he can find a new FALLBACK POSITION, so he'll stay with the dominant female and end up psychologically broken. Then he'll cease to be proactive and will lose his effectiveness as a provider. Nowadays, in matriarchal societies, there's a huge stratum of weak men who've been crushed and enslaved by aggressive women. Their wives take their income from them and distribute it as they see fit. Matriarchal societies have thus seen a strange kind of inversion of the man's world. The lair and



the partner have become a battleground; at home, the wife starts fights and drowns him in complaints. So the OCCUPATION turns into the FALLBACK POSITION, into the cave, where he hides in order to rest and lick his wounds. Things are just easier at work. His colleagues respect him, and his boss appreciates him. He runs away from his wife and hides at work. Or goes hunting, or fishing, or to the bar, or to other women who are currently in advertising mode. In this case, success at work loses all meaning for the man, since its result – money – gets snatched up by his wife, who's his enemy in war and in the lair. The man's instinct gets confused, he ends up disoriented, demoralized, weakened, and unfocused. More often than not, he takes to drink.

Logically convincing a woman about the importance of your OCCUPATION is almost always going to be impossible, since casting doubt on the importance of a man's OCCUPATION is usually part of a woman's psychological attack tactics for reverse domination. And, of course, her ultimate goal is to get at the resources he's invested in his OCCUPATION and use them to her own ends. This is her instinct at play. Therefore, common sense is of no use here. For example, one guy I know made a successful career for himself in a promising firm. But his wife and mother-in-law constantly pressured him to spend all of his resources of time and energy not on work, but on themselves. "What are you doing there all the time, take me to such-and-such a place, do this and that around the house," etc. In the end, the man started to burn the candle at both ends trying to succeed at work while also making the women happy. And, since this is impossible, he started to show up late and exhausted to work and make mistakes. So he got fired from a good job, and his family lost half its income.

Moreover, the only person who can understand whether an OCCUPATION is worthwhile or not is a person who's competent in that OCCUPATION - in other words, a man who does it himself. A man who starts justifying himself and tries to convince a woman about the value of his OCCUPATION is doing nothing other than displaying his weakness and vulnerability to her. "He's making excuses, so he must be wrong." The only way you convince someone who has no idea what you're talking about is with a confident tone and soapbox rhetoric. This has nothing in common with objectively evaluating the potential value of an activity.

Therefore, a truly smart woman won't cast doubt on the value of her man's OCCUPATION. She'll pick a man with a worthwhile OCCUPATION. And she'll start psychologically supporting him, taking care of his FALLBACK POSITION and even helping him in his OCCUPATION. And the man will instantly grow wings; he'll move mountains and attain success in his OCCUPATION. Then she'll have something to love and respect, and everybody wins. This is the most effective kind of modern couple. These families have a bunch of kids, money, and happiness. Unfortunately, truly smart women like this are becoming rarer and rarer all the time in our matriarchal society. Most women nowadays either dominate their men even though it hurts them, or they parasitize them.

### **Men through Women's Eyes**

Let's take a little stroll through the illusions and stereotypes that comprise women's perception of men. First of all, I'll immediately specify that a woman will judge all men in general exclusively on the basis of the ones she's in contact with. And she's in contact primarily with men who are either attacking her or attacked by her. So in the end, women judge all men based on a thin layer of professional players who try to satisfy their hunting and hierarchical instincts by collecting female sexual trophies. And on loud-mouthed jackasses, scumbags, and lowlifes, the failed leaders of the stone-age tribe to whom her female instinct pulls her. In other words, she judges all men based on men that normal, civilized men wouldn't even shake hands with. Most women almost never meet normal men, or at least never see them up close. So we'll go easy on them.

"Men are made to serve women and satisfy their desires." This illusion developed as a result of the glut of men who, weakened by a matriarchal culture, act in precisely this way. They're the humiliated servants of women, hoping in vain for a favorable glance.

"Men are stupider than women." This illusion developed as the result of a men's failure to understand women. Relationships between men and women are a field in which women are actually more competent than men. It just like how men think women are stupider than they are because they don't know how to fix a car. If a man's car breaks down, he pops the hood, finds out what's wrong, fixes it, and keeps driving. And he thinks that a woman who can't do this is an idiot. In the same situation, a woman will pop the hood and start looking helpless. And, as a rule, some man will turn up who feels compelled to help her based on vague hopes of sex. Or

he could be motivated by his instinct to protect females, which, thanks to his upbringing by women, has taught him that “a real man helps a woman for nothing.” And afterwards the woman will giggle to herself and call the man an idiot. Both the man and the woman solve their car problems by acting within their own area of competence: the man acts on the car, the woman acts on the man.

So women are competent in one sphere, men in another. However, while I personally know a few men who understand relationships with women, I’ve never even heard of a woman who could take apart an engine. So men definitely have the advantage when it comes to intellect.

“Men are emotionally more primitive than women. They’re thick-skinned.” This illusion developed because men are raised to repress and hide their emotional life (“take it like a man”). A slave should never show his emotions – they’ll just make it harder for the master to control him. As a result, men experience stress “internally,” and the result is heart attacks and the myth about men’s insensibility. Moreover, women’s instincts dictate their behavior more than their reason does. As we know, our instincts drive us via our emotions, so women seem to be more emotional. Women also use emotional pressure as a means to control men, which contributes to the illusion that they’re more complex. The myth of men’s primitive nature is very beneficial to women in a matriarchal society, since it positions women as the higher being and men as the lower. This is a very familiar tactic. A similar ideology was employed by the Nazis to justify genocide. The lower race, higher race, etc. It’s the same way a farmer relates to his animals. A cow can only have a functional purpose, i.e. to bring in money. It’s a commodity, nothing more.

“Men have no dignity, they like being degraded.” “Men like it when you tell them what to do.” This illusion developed because men nowadays are “raised right,” i.e. they’ve agreed to accept being degraded by women. And frequently, when they’re in love and thus stupefied by adrenaline and testosterone, they idealize a woman to the extent that they don’t even realize they’re being degraded. A woman, on the other hand, will humiliate a man on purpose, especially during the courtship period. And, since modern men have agreed to accept even extreme forms of degradation from women, she’ll lose all respect for him. I once got into a debate with a girl about this, and it cost me a good deal of effort to convince her that men have a sense of personal dignity.

“Men aren’t able to solve day-to-day problems on their own.” Women in a couple will very frequently monopolize day-to-day functions and take them over. I mean, it’s much easier to do the laundry when all you have to do is press a couple buttons on the washing machine than it is to make money, provide for your family, or fix a car. I know what I’m talking about: I’ve had a lot of experience as a bachelor, as well as experience living without benefits of civilization such as electricity, heat, gas, etc., so I’ve had a meaningful opportunity to consider the different angles and appreciate the differences in labor. Trust me, keeping house is incomparably easier, safer, and carries less responsibility than making money. But, by monopolizing easy housework and refusing to let men anywhere near it (“it isn’t man’s work”), women have, on the one hand, formed a psychological barrier for men dividing them from that kind of labor, and on the other, they’ve made sure that men just aren’t used to it (“I’ve never once done the laundry and I’m not about to do it now”). And so women have ended up believing that men are incapable of doing day-to-day chores - despite the fact that, as we all know, “confirmed bachelors” have no trouble keeping their houses spotless and can’t stand the clutter and dirt that a woman brings into their homes. Single women, on the contrary, usually neglect their homes.

“All men need from women is sex.” This is a universal, multi-functional female thesis. On the one hand, women use it to make men feel guilty, on the other, they use it to make themselves more valuable. I mean, after this phrase has been pronounced in an accusatory tone, any sexual initiative from a man will only confirm it. So, in order to disprove it and justify his need for sex, a man will feel obligated to provide the woman with additional signs of attention. However, women also honestly believe in this thesis, since they’re usually attacked by precisely those men who really want nothing from them but sex. When a woman tries this kind of manipulation on me, I usually just say something like, “Come on, darling, I need a lot more besides sex. But sex should be of the highest quality, unlimited, and free.” But I’ve already dedicated an entire section to manipulation.

“Men are either pigs or jerks, but it’s nice to have sex with them, because they’re either not men at all, or they’re fit to be “milked” and taken advantage of.” From the perspective of the female that sits in every woman, males are divided into two groups: high-ranking men, and everything else. The female “prefers” the first group, but will “take” the second. The female terms “jerk” and “pig,” when translated into male language, refer

to varieties of independent, high-ranking men, especially those who're loved by women and are motivated by their own interests even in their interactions with women. So, in other words, in our modern, unbalanced world dominated by a bacchanalia of animal instincts, being called a "jerk" is a compliment.

"Men love big tits." Well, sure. Our interest in tits is just a natural reaction to the most obvious external sign of a female's fertility. There's nothing special going on here. And yet women still use this normal male reaction as a way to blame men for something. It's stupid. We don't blame women for liking our dicks.

"Men love beer and baseball."

1. Like any other alcoholic beverage, beer will temporarily increase the rank of a low-ranking man and lower the rank of a high-ranking man. In other words, a fondness for booze is a sign of male weakness. I'll note here that, when in a group, women drink less than men. The boss always drinks less than his employees. As a rule. In the lower classes, people drink more than in the upper classes. In the UK, the English drink less than the Irish, etc. A sober person maintains their control over the situation and doesn't sacrifice their high rank. This is why alcoholism is more of a problem in the lower strata of society, especially among weak and oppressed men. In a matriarchal society, men have been weakened, and their ranks have been reduced. This is why alcohol abuse is much more common in matriarchal societies than in traditional ones.

2. People use alcohol as a way to blow off psychological and emotional steam. A woman can't keep her emotional tension to herself, but a man will constantly stifle his emotions and let them build up over time. This is why alcoholism is more of a problem in the lower classes, especially among weak and oppressed men. In a matriarchal society, men have been weakened, and their ranks have been reduced, so alcohol consumption continues to increase.

3. Alcohol has a unifying function. Instinct tells us: "let your guard down only with your own people, and never with your enemies." In social situations, people use drinking alcohol to get closer, tighten a group, and demonstrate trust. Therefore, the urge to have a drink and talk with friends is an instinct left over from warriors and hunters who wanted to support the unity of their combat group. So here's the conclusion: have a drink with friends every now and then, just don't go at it like a pig. However, weakened men are instinctively drawn to chemical surrogates as a way to increase their rank and let their guard down, and they don't limit themselves to the unifying function of alcohol.

By the way, a word about pigs: I know about an experiment where scientists poured some beer into a pig-trough. When the pigs got drunk, they started fighting amongst themselves and the hierarchy of their herd was destroyed. After a while they sobered up, and the herd hierarchy was restored. So they poured some more beer into the trough. The lead pig upended it. The scientists thought it was a coincidence, so they poured some more beer. And the leader upended the trough again. Even among pigs, the leader not only won't drink, he won't even let the others get drunk.

Besides alcohol, a similar unifying function can be fulfilled by an open flame or by food. In the Stone Age, the fireside area in a cave was reserved for members of the immediate group, and only those people were given access to the available game. This is all hard-wired into our instincts. Therefore, if we want to smooth things over with a woman, we ask her out to dinner, light some candles, and pour her a glass of wine. We throw a party for our friends the same way - anywhere there's food, drink, and a lit fireplace or campfire.

So, about baseball: if the warrior and hunter instincts don't find an outlet in real life, they can manifest themselves in a passion for sports, including extreme excitement when watching a baseball game. It's the same reaction a hunter with a stone axe would have had watching from the ambush point as his comrades drove a wild boar or a group of enemies in his direction.

"Men come up with all kinds of dumb stuff to do (fishing, hunting, staying late at work for no reason, hanging out in the garage) instead of making women happy." Weak men pretty much just run into the garage to hide from their wives. It's either that, or get crushed by their psychological and emotional terror and have a heart attack. The only place where a man can relax is his fallback position, his cave. That's where his instinct for self-preservation drives him. It's the same with fishing, but a man can satisfy his hunting instinct there, too. By the way, strong men with a developed warrior/hunter instinct also satisfy it with things like extreme tourism, hunting, and other male activities.

"A man is just one more child in the house." This attitude is based on women's impressions of men's incompetence in the spheres of male-female relations, housework, and caring for small children. In other words,

the spheres of the female herself. And it also comes from the fact that women don't understand men or their functional role. They don't get, for example, that repairing a car or working at home on the computer is something that absolutely has to be done. They think it's some kind of toy, like a child's toy. But what do you expect...

## Lines of Destiny

We already know that a man in the prehistoric herd would move from the bottom to the top of the hierarchy. A boy would be raised and taught in precisely the same way as the offspring of other animals, that is, he would learn by imitating the behavior of the adults around him and by submitting to those above him in the hierarchy. He would submit to women only during the earliest, most helpless period of his development, i.e. before puberty. At that point he would enter the male hierarchy and would obey only the most authoritative men located above him. Boys are hard-wired to receive new information this way, especially when it comes to learning. Starting at about 10 years old, it becomes unnatural for a boy to submit to women or learn from them. The young male's instinct filters information on the basis of a very simple principle: it regards information as valuable if and only if it comes from a high-ranking (respected) person. He can assume that it was that information and those skills that allowed this person to reach the top of the hierarchy. He sees information from any other source as worthless. Moreover, given the principle differences in gender-role functions, boys and girls were taught completely different things.

Therefore, in traditional cultures where men are brought up to become the leaders of family hierarchies, boys and girls are raised separately, and boys are taught only by men. The status of the teacher in such a society is also very prestigious, which allows them to teach boys without suppressing their initiative or hierarchical ambitions. As a result, the boys become strong men worthy to be the head of a household. After their education was complete and they were ready to enter the hierarchy as adults, their self-esteem and rank would receive an additional boost from various initiation ceremonies. The wedding ritual would also serve to signify that a man had become the leader of a real family hierarchy.

For example, in classical English schools where boys and girls are taught separately, boys' hierarchical ambitions are still nurtured in a more traditional way. This is why "difficult" children at these schools aren't crushed and humiliated, but developed and used as a way to instill the boys with the spirit of leadership, initiative, and an active attitude toward life. In other words, the goal of these schools is to switch on the boys' leadership instincts. This is why they have such a huge focus on competitive, team-based games. The children obey their teachers because of their high level of authority and qualifications, not because of the threat of humiliation. The result is easy to see. Even with its limited resources, this island country remains one of the most powerful in the world. A country can be strong only if its men are strong. However, the modern matriarchal society is leading even Great Britain to its downfall.

In a modern matriarchal society, everything about education is upside-down. Boys are taught alongside girls, the status of the teacher is low, and most teachers are women. Moreover, men are intentionally pushed excluded from the educational process. In order to ensure that a boy will obey his female teachers and adopt a mode of behavior more appropriate for girls, he's subjected to psychological reconstruction. In the end, he's forced into a behavioral pattern characteristic of a low-ranking male. The systems of education and upbringing are thus designed to bring down a man's rank. It's nothing more than a conveyor belt for wearing down boys psychologically, crushing their initiative, and turning them into obedient, low-ranking slaves. Let's take a look at a stereotypical algorithm for a boy's life.

Behold the man on whose shoulder the future of our civilization rests: his hierarchical ambitions were repressed during childhood so that he could be "brought up," taught, and made malleable; he was told what he could do and what he couldn't. He's absorbed the new principles of the artificial hierarchy. Nevertheless, he's still reasonably active, so he tries to rise up, but, unfortunately, he's got no idea how to do it. So when people tell him that the way to rise up is to make money and have a career, he believes them. And he works like a dog. He believes that he's supposed to be honest, even though other people are dishonest with him; that he should obey the law, even though it's biased against him as a man; that he should pay his taxes and listen to his mommy all his life; that he should get married and provide for a family; that he owes something to society. To his parents. To women. To his teachers. All he does is owe things to people. He owes something to everybody, but no one owes

anything to him. And, most importantly, he's successfully implanted with the idea that he should respect women, i.e. acknowledge them their superior place in the hierarchy. He's taught to believe that a woman is a higher being with a high status than his. And he's easily kept at the MR level, always dreaming of becoming a leader. So he's simultaneously active and obedient, a good citizen who's useful for everybody - he believes everything he's told, and he follows the rules. He has an active lifestyle. He has a successful career. He makes money. And he spends it on "prestigious" consumer items, i.e. junk that's advertised as belonging to a high-ranking male - an expensive watch, expensive clothes, an expensive cell phone, an expensive car, a seaside villa, a yacht, and beautiful women.

Let's not forget that women are still something he has to buy. If, back when he was still in school and hadn't been completely "educated" yet, he managed to get a few homely female classmates to fall in love with him, then now, as a controlled member of society - forget about it. If he's lucky, he was good-looking and "sowed his wild oats" before he got married. His ideas about women are a bizarre, idiosyncratic tossed salad of tearful poetic ecstasy, few passages from Freud, impressions from real life, stories he heard from experienced players about their conquests, jokes, and illusions he's imbibed from the women he's met. So he's out in left field somewhere. Either that, or some woman put him through the wringer, and now he's tormented by the discrepancy between his ideas about women and real life. He suffers, endures, and becomes disenchanted with life. Nevertheless, some woman or other, in the goodness of her heart, found him worthy, married him, bore him one child, maybe two, quickly reverse-dominated him, made him submit, and, of course, lost all respect for him.

By the time he hits 34-35, the guy's already become established as a professional; he's successful and has a position of responsibility. He's become confident. Maybe he already has some subordinates at work, or even his own business. He's learned how to be a manager. In other words, he's restored some of the leadership qualities that were quashed in him by his "education," and he's even taken on some of the external signs of a high-ranking male. His self-esteem starts to increase, and over time it begins to contradict his real position in relation to women. Eventually the scales fall from his eyes, and he realizes that his wife doesn't really love him, and definitely doesn't respect him. All she does is take advantage of him and put moral pressure on him. If his success has enabled him to take on some of the signs of an HR male, then he's already started to see young women around him in advertising mode, which increases the effect of the new contrast he sees. At the same time, he starts to develop chronic complexes connected with a dissatisfied sexual/hierarchical instinct (to put it simply, he didn't get enough ass when he was younger because he was too busy studying). The man starts to feel that this horniness and emotional immaturity is more than he can take - he can't live like this anymore. And the so-called "mid-life crisis" strikes. The discrepancy between his sexual activity as a MR and his self-image as an HR demands to be rectified. To put it simply, the man realizes that he's been had. He realizes that he's worth a lot more than he has, and he starts try to finally get this *more*. He starts chasing skirts. He starts keeping young women, tries to start a second family, etc. His wife is shocked to discover that her throw-rug has revolted against her. They get divorced, and she takes his children and a significant portion of the resources he's earned away from him. The situation I'm describing is international; it's typical of all modern matriarchal cultures. Remember the movie *Groundhog Day*? It's about this theme, among others. Bill Murray's character is someone with a lot of natural abilities that haven't been developed, so he has an inferiority complex and tries to assert himself at the expense of others. When, as part of the movie's central premise, he gets a new level of freedom, the first thing he does is overcome various social taboos. He tries to get laid and become self-actualized, but it's only after he's liquidated his emotional and spiritual immaturity that he becomes a truly worthy individual. By the way, the love interest's female instincts are depicted very accurately. No matter how hard Phil tries to please her, no matter how much he betters himself, no matter how hard he tries to win her over, she refuses him sexually up until the moment when her female instinct vaguely reacts to his popularity as a sign of his high rank.

In the real, matriarchal world, a man who makes a go at starting a new life usually just walks right into the same snare a second (or sometimes a third or fourth) time. The new woman very quickly switches from advertising mode to dominance mode. Once she's started dominating him, she quickly exceeds the man's pain threshold, and everything starts all over again. Children, fights, divorce, divided property, custody battles, alimony. And it all ends when the man drops dead of a heart attack or some other condition brought on by constant stress. More often than not, the new woman sees the man only as a source of income and is only pretending to have feelings for him. In this case, the man's sexual needs remain unsatisfied. Paying for love from

a wife doesn't do any more to satisfy a high-ranking man than paying for a prostitute.

This man's sexual problems don't begin and end with his lack of sex as such. It's first and foremost about his need for a woman's love. It's not just physiological sexual dissatisfaction, but also psychological dissatisfaction. The sex-instinct's needs are unsatisfied. In other words, he needs intimacy. This is why a man like this can fall in love with a hairdresser if he reacts to her touch as though it were a caress. And he usually prefers the girls who work at erotic massage parlors to regular prostitutes.

If this kind of man ends up with a wife who loves him instead of dominating him and provides him with emotional support rather than emotional terror, his potential as a provider will be exceeded that of any other man. Smart women understand this and fight their instinctive striving for domination. Instead of making a man's home life a living hell, a smart woman will provide him with a fallback position, thus raising his self-esteem from the depths to which it was reduced by his "education" to the level of a leader. Then the man's leadership instincts will switch on, and he'll become a maximally active and successful provider. In the end, everybody wins.

### **Man and his Offspring**

We've already talked about how a man is, on the one hand, designed to fulfill an external functional role, namely that of defending and caring for a female and her offspring. On the other hand, he's also the bearer of a gene pool that he's obligated to pass on to posterity. From the perspective of his instinct, that is. However, whether or not he can actually propagate his genetic line isn't up to him – it's up to the female, or, more precisely, her instinct. If the female's instinct decides that a male isn't worthy to continue his line, or if she already has offspring, then this mid- or low-ranking male will end up having to protect and care for the female and her offspring from another male. This is why a weak human male will tend to become attached to the offspring of other males and feed them as if they were his own. His attitude toward the female is extended to her offspring. If a weak man loves a woman, he'll also get attached to her kids.

By the same token, a high-ranking male can see someone else's child as a regular member of his herd and tolerate his presence. In a state of nature, the *Homo sapiens* species couldn't allow a male to kill another male's children as, for example, lions do. The time needed for a child's gestation and development is simply way too long – every child is valuable for the species as a whole. But a leader will only love his own children. They're the ones he'll raise, nurture, and send out into the world.

If a weak man goes through a messy divorce, he'll frequently forget about the children he had with his ex. This is connected with the fact that a mid- or low-ranking male will subconsciously doubt that a child is really his. He doesn't feel responsible for it because he isn't a leader. He only loves the children of whichever woman is giving him sex. It's in his programming.

A strong man who goes through a divorce, on the other hand, will do everything he can to retain custody of his children. This is connected with the leader's love for his children and his desire to preserve the integrity of his herd despite the fact that an irresponsible female abandoned it. He feels responsible for his herd.

This is why there's a huge stratum of fathers who, motivated by genuine and intense love for the children a woman has snatched away from them with the help of the legal system, try in vain to see their children and to get custody of them from a mother who doesn't care about them. But as soon as the man becomes convinced that all his exertions will be fruitless, his interest in his offspring slackens. A leader has no responsibility for someone else's herd. It's unnatural. He'll either go and find another female and build a new family or switch to single mode.

In traditional cultures, a man is positioned as the responsible leader of the family hierarchy, and his children are positioned as members of the herd. And they're actually his inalienable property. In the event of a divorce, the woman leaves the children with their father.

In a modern matriarchal culture, a woman's right to take away her husband's children has been firmly established by the legal system and is strongly sanctioned by matriarchal morality. In most matriarchal cultures, a woman has all the rights to a child, as well as the legal opportunity to take advantage of this fact to blackmail a man. Generally speaking, men are severely discriminated against when it comes to reproductive rights. This is why a man, who, no matter how much he loves his child, has no right to see it, will end up finding it difficult to regard this alienated child as his own. It doesn't help that the mother will inevitably have turned the child against

its father and taught it to hate him. It's just like how a businessman, no matter how much of his soul and his resources he's poured into creating a company, won't be able to see it as his property anymore once it's been sold or seized by a court order.

If a man is strong, his woman loves him, and the baby isn't an accident, his fatherhood instinct will switch on while the woman is still pregnant. During this period, the woman feels content, and the man sees her as the woman of his dreams. He wants to take care of her and the baby, and he'll love any children she bears him and will even enjoy playing with them. Having a lot of children is proof of his genetic caliber and his high status as the leader of a hierarchy. Moreover, the more children he has, the bigger the community of people under his leadership, and the stronger he feels. This is why, in traditional communities where men are raised to be leaders, people have big families. They see children as something to be proud of, as well as the object of the parents' strategic investments. During the later stages of the child's development, when it's time to teach it to interact as an adult with its environment and the rest of the community, a new fundamental fatherhood instinct switches on. In the prehistoric herd, the leader/father would help his offspring to attain a worthy position in the hierarchy. Nowadays, women take advantage of this characteristic of the fatherhood instinct as a way to blame men who've had their children taken away from them – that is, they actually have the audacity to blame them for not being attentive to their children: “He's supposed to be a father, he cared about his son when he was little, but not anymore,” etc.

If a man is weak and had a kid forced on him against his will by, say, getting blackmailed with a rape charge or pressured into “doing the right thing,” then the situation will be reversed. In this case, the man sees both the woman and her child as a problem, a burden, and a competitor for the use of his resources. He instinctively sees the child as not his, since, in the prehistoric herd, a baby would be guaranteed only from the leader, and not from him. By the way, the baby very well might not be his. The woman will also have her doubts about the weak man, and even during her pregnancy she'll create an anxious atmosphere, drive the guy crazy, and reverse-dominate him. If this happens, the baby will be born anxious, which won't help keep the family together.

After the (virtually inevitable) disintegration of this kind of family and the man's loss of his child and his resources, the woman will extend her negative feeling about the man to the child. She may even start to hate the child. She'll turn it against the father and raise it to be her personal servant, deforming its psyche. Obviously a man in this situation will usually not be able to see the child as a part of himself or his responsibility. He realizes that he's been duped, he's hurt and humiliated, so he forms an adversarial relationship with the woman and the child.

To call things by their right names, the modern version of the family is nothing more than a conveyor belt for robbing men and mutilating the minds of children.

## **Chapter 6. HOW THE SEXES CAN WORK TOGETHER**

### **Men and Women as Partners.**

Let's take a look at how men and women can be partners. For the sake of discussion, let's start by forgetting that we're dealing with relationships between the different genders of single biological species. We've already talked about that. For now we can assume that a man and a woman are two absolutely equal human beings. Nothing personal, it's just business. We've already examined male-female relationships in some detail, and we'll come back to the topic later on. And don't worry, no one's going to accuse us of being calculating, or greedy, or dump soapy dishwater on our heads, or rub dirt in our faces, or eradicate us with a single wrathful glance, or treat us with cold derision, etc. In other words, no one's going to do any of those things that women and their doormats usually do to men who pry into the female holy of holies – the economics of relationships. You see, so one can see us. And we're not gonna tell anybody. We're just talking. So let's think about the kinds of services these two human beings can provide each other when interacting and coexisting.

*Nota bene:* love isn't something a person can give his partner; it's something he feels. So it won't be included in the relationship tables.

The values of categories such as sex, intimacy, and conversation can vary depending on whether the

partners are simply exchanging them or whether one partner is buying them from the other, as in prostitution. In the latter case, the category's value will be determined according to the laws of the free market.

By the same token, everything relating to categories with a concrete value that can be measured in dollars should be readily comprehensible - for example, living expenses or gifts. In this case, everything is paid for in cash, and the costs of everything are known.

Table of Human Relationships.

<b>What the two people in a couple can give each other.</b>	
<b>Man gives woman</b>	<b>Woman gives man</b>
Sex	Sex
Emotional support	Emotional support
Intimacy	Intimacy
Money	Money
Services	Services
Gifts	Gifts
Living expenses	Living expenses
Training	Training
Conversation	Conversation
Social position	Social position
Shelter	Shelter
<b>The cooperative project "children"</b>	
Conception	Giving birth
Raising children	Raising children
Taking care of children	Taking care of children
Providing for children	Providing for children
Paying for education	Paying for education
Paying for prenatal care and childbirth	Paying for prenatal care and childbirth

The vaguest of categories are things like "conception," "giving birth," and "services," although even they can be evaluated in terms of their financial market equivalents. For example, carrying and giving birth to a baby can be evaluated in market prices (the cost of hiring a surrogate mother). Giving birth to and caring for the baby are actions directed not at the partner, but at the baby. However, the child can be seen as a cooperative project between the man and the woman as long as its conception and birth were desired by both parties. It's necessary to keep in mind that a consumer pays for a service only if he's requested them and if their quality is satisfactory. Therefore, if a woman gives birth to a child that the man didn't want (for example, by "forgetting" to take her pill) or one from another man, then the man is in no way obligated to pay for a service he never ordered. Various day-to-day services can also be evaluated in money terms. For example, a certain "housewives' union" has decided that a woman's work when cleaning an apartment can be evaluated in terms of the cost of hiring a cleaning company, or that the cost of making dinner can be determined by looking at restaurant menus. If we apply their method here, we could say that providing a wife with a home has the same monetary value as staying in a hotel, or that changing a light bulb is worth the same as hiring an electrician, or that taking her to the movies is equal to the cost of hiring a professional security guard. We could also determine the value of conceiving children by looking at the costs of artificial insemination clinics, as well as lost wages. For example, providing living expenses and a decent education to three or four children without daycare could be compared to running a business. So, in other words, you can easily describe the different aspects of a relationship on paper, write some figures down, and decide whatever the hell you want about who owes what to whom. The most important thing is to make sure that nobody ever catches you doing this.



If one partner is a college student, and the other works and provides for the first one, than this situation can be described as an investment. The second person is investing their resources into the education of the first person in the hope that, after the first person's education is complete, their contribution to the family budget will be larger than it was before. If they break up after that, then these investments are lost by the second partner and are assumed by the first. It's the same with children. As the result of a divorce, one of the partners can lose both the children themselves and the investments they made in providing for their living expenses and education. Moreover, the most valuable resource a person has is time. You can spend time on any number of things: pleasure, education, teaching, making money for yourself, making money for your partner and your children together, raising your own children, etc. Since this resource is, thanks to the fact of human mortality, irreplaceable, divorce doesn't just deprive a partner of their investments in their children and the other partner – it also costs them the part of their life they had invested in these people. And they may never get the chance to try again. It goes without saying that, when one partner invests their resources in the other, the first partner can benefit by getting a return on their investment. But the person who's being invested in stands to gain the most by *not* returning the investment, as well as by taking over the first partner's resources. It's all simple, and it's all logical. Therefore, in a traditional culture, in order to prevent this kind of scam from happening, marriages are always for life. And, by the same token, a wise investor who lives in an unbalanced culture will refuse to invest his means in a cooperative project if he has no guarantee of getting a return on his investment. And let's not forget that the only people who talk about trust are con-artists who want to pull the wool over your eyes. Decent folk write up a contract and stick to it.

Let's take a look at a few different types of male-female relationships:

1. Female prostitution. Male prostitution is basically the same. The person who needs sex more, pays. This is the most basic example.

<b>What the two people can give each other</b>	
<b>Man gives woman</b>	<b>Woman gives man</b>
Sex	Sex
Money	

2. Sponsor and kept woman.

<b>What the two people can give each other.</b>	
<b>Man gives woman</b>	<b>Woman gives man</b>
Sex	Sex
Conversation	Conversation
Money	
Services	
Gifts	
Living expenses	

3. A man courting a woman.

<b>What the two people can give each other</b>	
<b>Man gives woman</b>	<b>Woman gives man</b>
Conversation	Conversation
Emotional support	
Intimacy	
Money	
Services	
Gifts	

4. Lovers.

--	--

<b>What the two people can give each other</b>	
<b>Man gives woman</b>	<b>Woman gives man</b>
Sex	Sex
Emotional support	Emotional support
Intimacy	Intimacy
Gifts	Gifts
Conversation	Conversation

It should be pretty obvious that, with the exception of professional gigolos and seducers, the man as a partner practically always gives the woman more than she gives him. This is precisely why women try to confuse financial relationships with personal ones while bathing everything in as much emotional smoke as possible. This is precisely why women show so much scorn for men who can separate their personal and financial relationships with women. Taking a calculating approach to relationships just isn't "chivalrous," it's "unworthy of a man." On the contrary, loving a woman to the point of madness and giving her everything you own except a pair of old socks – that's "dashing," women eat that right up. Taking a calculating approach doesn't leave any room for a scam, which is why it's the last thing a con-artist wants from his potential victims. He wants to make sure the sucker stays a sucker.

### **The Family**

First of all, let's clarify out terminology. A family is a group of people who are closely related by blood and live together. This includes a husband, a wife, children, and sometimes grandchildren. A marriage is a legal and ritual act by which a man and a woman form a family. It includes a marriage certificate, a wedding, pre-nuptial agreements, traditional and legal divisions of responsibility, the regularization of relations in terms of property, household, sex, etc.

In order for people to survive in a state of nature, and, in part, to provide for their reproductive functions, they had to form into family units comprised of a woman, a strong male provider, and their offspring. The structure of a natural family mirrors the basic structure of human society.

A traditional society has a religion and traditions that work to maintain and support precisely this family structure. The fact that civilized people live in conditions different from a state of nature is compensated for by upbringing. This kind of grouping is called a traditional family or a traditional marriage.

Without the compensation that traditional culture provides, this grouping becomes a matriarchal one, and the family degenerates from the stable format of "strong man + woman in love mode + their offspring" into the unstable format of "dominant woman + weak man." In this format, the family no longer has any meaning for either the man or the woman. In a matriarchal family, the man has no rear guard-support and no decent sex, and, as an ineffectual provider and undesired sexual partner, he can't establish his wife and make her effective.

As a result, the institution of the family degrades, its reproductive function is compromised, and a demographic crisis ensues. Moreover, everything described here also pertains to the families of men in position of power. Since women in a matriarchal society occupy a dominant position in the family, the wives of prominent men can dictate their will to them. The wives of submissive politicians thus work together with female politicians to ensure that this degeneration of the family becomes legally mandated.

The ubiquity of matriarchal marriage leads to the establishment of a legal system that enforces women's dominant position, as well as discrimination against men, within the family. Partial families, childless couples, and unnatural pairings, such as, for example, homosexual couples, also receive official status and state support. In order to provide for themselves and the few children they've managed to produce (and turn against their fathers), dominant women establish a matriarchal system for distributing resources within society based on discrimination against men and a system of taxation, welfare, quotas, and privileges for women. Traditional

families still exist, but there are less of them all the time. Every generation, the percentage of women in full dominance mode increases, and men become weaker and weaker. Moreover, in the matriarchal system, a male head of the household carries a double burden. He not only has to provide directly for his own family, but, thanks to the government's system of taxation, he's also burdened with caring for all the surrogate pseudo-families, too. An unbalanced society thus finances its own downfall, destroying the family structure and suppressing its reproductive function.

## Marriage

When they form a family, a man and a woman also enter into a legal relationship. This relationship is called a marriage. A marriage can be formed legally (marriage certificate) by government institutions or by the church. From the moment the man and the woman enter into the marriage, their relationship is regulated by the state in accordance with family law, the marriage contract, and court practice.

Traditional societies have systems for regulating marital relations that have developed over centuries. These systems' primary goals are to prevent the sexual marketplace from appearing within the family, stop women from switching into dominance mode, keep women in the "love cycle," and keep men in the mode of an effective provider and protector with his own "fallback position." In a traditional culture, marriage is for life. This guarantees both parties' investments in their cooperative projects of family, children, and property.

In a modern, unbalanced society, the traditional system for regulating relationships and protecting investments has been destroyed. As a result, marriage has become much less attractive, which has led to a demographic crisis, a family crisis, a drop in the economical effectiveness of men, an increase in crime, and other unpleasant things. The state works furiously to do something about all this, to react to it somehow, but, thanks to its incompetence, all it can do is try in vain to influence a diseased biological system with economic and legal methods. And this further destabilizes the fundamental biological disharmony at play. The state gives aid to single mothers, registers homosexual marriages as regular ones, forces employers to provide maternity leave to their female employees, and does other equally stupid things. Some European countries even tax couples for not having children. By trying to solve short-term problems with ineffectual methods, the state only deepens the global crisis. It struggles lamely against the symptoms while ignoring the underlying disease. In other words, it acts like a faith healer, trying to cure cancer with prayer and the laying on of hands.

Cohabitation is when a man and a woman unite, but refuse to allow their relationship to be infiltrated by a third party – the government. However, the government is still doing everything it can to interfere with these relationships and impose its interests on them. It either makes long-term cohabitation equivalent to marriage ("common-law" marriage) or creates legal inconveniences for these couples. For example, in Germany, cohabitation has been made legally equivalent to an official marriage. So couples who don't want to end up bound by the insane legal machinations of a matriarchal marriage have no choice but to live separately and visit each other. They call it a "walking marriage" (*besuchsehe*).

Let's take a look at the criteria for choosing a marriage partner. As in any other domestic or legal relationship, the fundamental characteristics of a marriage partner include:

- being "a good fit," i.e. an identical understanding of ethics, morality, and decency
- competency, having the skills necessary for practical activity
- reliability.

Note that the requirements for a marriage partner are not the same as the criteria for sexual attractiveness. And, if a criterion for sexual attractiveness such as beauty doesn't contradict the requirements for a marriage partner, we know that a woman's female instinct evaluates a partner's survival-capability on the basis of stone-age criteria. In other words, it looks for a cocky narcissist. But a cocky narcissist is no good as marriage partner, since he'll be unreliable, inadequate, unskilled, and incompetent. He'll constantly be called away to various adventures and conflicts.

By the same token, a man's male instinct will push him into the chill embrace of a gold digger. And, needless to say, as a wife, a gold digger can only turn a man's life into a living hell. She won't give him a fallback position.

This is why traditional cultures quite rightly don't trust the instinctual criteria of sexual attractiveness,

i.e. love. Their marriage partners are selected on the basis of practical criteria by experienced, responsible people such as clergymen, family elders, professional matchmakers, etc. Once the couple's been formed, there then begins a ritual courtship conducted according to established cultural tradition. And nature takes over. The newlyweds' instincts set them on the path to the Formula for Love and into the love cycle; in other words, it directs them to their best chance at worthy reproduction. Moreover, their satisfaction with each other as marriage partners will eventually be transferred to the field of sexual attractiveness, which will nurture their mutual love and respect. It's like the song says, "Love the one you're with." These words contain a profound biological truth. The marriage is consecrated as a union for life between the man and the woman, "for better or for worse, 'till death do us part." Any appearance of destructive animal instinctual reactions can, at any point in the married couple's lives, be neutralized by the professional clergy.

In a modern, unbalanced society, the choice of a marriage partner is usually made instinctively, "for love." And, after it becomes clear that one or both partners is unfit for married life, the result is divorce, the division of property, custody battles, alimony, and all the other nightmarish affairs that have become commonplace for us. There's also a tradition being formed that sanctions cheating, that is, "open marriages." The man and the woman keep a common household within the marriage, but have sexual partners on the side. The consequences arising from this kind of arrangement have already been thoroughly described in detective novels and real-life court cases. In an unbalanced society, the likelihood of finding a decent marriage partner is many times lower than in a traditional culture.

The potential for finding a partner who's a "good fit" (i.e. someone with an identical understanding of ethics and decency) can be ensured by the way children are raised in a cultural-religious tradition. Since young people in a traditional culture have all been instilled with the same values, their chances of finding an appropriate partner are at maximum. In the absence of a unified cultural tradition, children are raised haphazardly, and the perception of a "good fit" will depend on a number of subjective factors, including perception of one's teachers and parents, life experience, personality, the influence of propaganda and the social environment, etc. Finding a good fit is thus much more complex nowadays than it was in our grandparents' time. Competency and the acquisition of necessary skills for practical activity are determined by the family a person grows up in. But the majority of modern people have been raised in broken homes, or as only children, or in families made up of people from various social and ethnic groups who see the functional divisions within the family very differently. Cultural and practical standards for the interactions between a man and a woman in a marriage, as well as basic rules for living together, don't exist. The chance of a man and woman getting together who have similar ideas about functional divisions in a couple is therefore pretty slim. Nowadays, it frequently becomes clear only after the wedding's over that the woman doesn't know how to cook and refuses to learn, or that the man wasn't expecting to have to make money in order to provide for children, or that the newlyweds can't agree about who's supposed to clean the toilet or take out the trash. And they break up. When this happens, we say "they failed the life test."

Based on my personal experience, the only people in the modern world who are still able to create stable families with more than one child are people who grew up in complete themselves. In these kinds of families, relationships are automatically established in a way that's pretty close to the format found in a traditional culture. It's almost like a piece of shrapnel from the traditional world embedded in the unbalanced modern herd.

I listed the partner's reliability separately because it's determined to a large extent by the reigning legal field. Simply put, a partner will be reliable if it's in their best interests to be reliable. If it's in their best interest to be unreliable, then "see ya later." Needless to say, in an environment where the matriarchal legal system provides women with legal opportunities for cheating, blackmail, assault, fraud, intentionally fabricated accusations, and other criminal activities, they'll take advantage of these opportunities. And it'll be in men's best interests to avoid making commitments to women in the first place.

Women often ask me why men don't want to get married - so often, in fact, that I've come up with a standard response. I give them a very obvious analogy in the form of a potential business relationship. Here it is:

*"Just imagine that some businessman offers you the chance to participate in a business project with him under the following conditions:*

*1. You finance the project with your own resources.*

2. When it comes to distributing money and making decisions, you'll only have an advisory position, while your partner will make all the final decisions.

3. If the project fails, you won't get any of your investments back, but will probably lose everything you own. Plus, you'll pay your partner additional payments for years to come.

4. You already know that most people who agree to similar arrangements end up with nothing, while their partners reap all the benefits.

5. If you agree to the proposal, your partner will think you're a chump and will start spreading rumors about you.

6. New laws will be passed all the time that will make your project increasingly risky for you. Would you be excited about these prospects, or this partner? Would you sign a contract with this guy?

In a modern matriarchal marriage, the man has no rights. He has no right to make reproductive decisions, but he's bound by them nevertheless. The hammer really comes down during the divorce, when all the property that HE'S earned, as well as his children, get taken away from him, and he's forced to depend on the whims of his ex-wife. It's a classic situation. Men aren't blind, and they aren't stupid. They know either from experience, or from hearsay, or just from intuition, that marriage is a scam.

But when a man's in love, he's in a special position, and he doesn't fear anything at all, including an official marriage on unfavorable terms.

Moreover, getting married serves as a launch mechanism for the female instinct. Knowing the advantages she enjoys, a woman will become arrogant, and she'll start undercutting the man psychologically. And men hate that."

When they hear this explanation, women usually stop being surprised when a man doesn't exactly jump at the chance to get married or have children.

Now, at long last, let's take a look at the basic formats for marital relationships.

**Traditional Marriage**

In a family constructed according to the traditional plan, it's the man's responsibility to provide for the family and fulfill other external functions, and the woman's to raise the children, do the housework, and fulfill other rear-guard functions. In our age of high-tech household gadgets and microwave dinners, a woman in a traditional marriage doesn't have the same kind of burden she would have had 50 years ago, so she can help her husband in his activity as long as there aren't too many children around. For example, if a man has his own business, she might do his bookkeeping and business correspondence. In the modern legal context, the traditional type of marriage is possible only if there's a very high level of trust between well-suited, competent, skilled, and reliable partners.

<b>What the two people in the couple can give each other</b>	
<b>Man gives woman</b>	<b>Woman gives man</b>
Sex	Sex
Emotional support	Emotional support
Intimacy	Intimacy
Money	
Services	Services
Gifts	Gifts
Living expenses	
Training	
Conversation	Conversation
Social position	Social position
Shelter	
<b>The cooperative project "children"</b>	

Conceiving children	Giving birth
Raising children	Raising children
Taking care of children	
Providing for children	
Paying for education	
Paying for prenatal care and childbirth	

From a biological perspective, the hierarchy of a traditional marriage is maximally similar to the natural hierarchy at the top of the herd. The husband occupies the position of strong, responsible, and productive male, a worthy leader. The woman's female instinct thus identifies her husband precisely as a high-ranking male, as a leader, so she loves him and wants to have his children. In this kind of hierarchical structure, the man's leadership instinct is switched on, so he's as active and responsible as possible. He sees his children as members of his herd and takes care of them. The leader's children are a testament to his leadership status and his genetic value - they show that he's made it as a man. So he's instinctively certain that they're a continuation of his genetic line, and he loves them. This is why this kind of natural and firm marriage format is the one that the cultural and religious traditions of a traditional society support.

More often than not, a traditional marriage is formed when both partners have been raised in the same cultural/religious environment.

To use an economic model, a traditional marriage is a unified enterprise with a unified management and finances.

**Partnership Marriage**

In a modern partnership marriage, both the man and the woman work and have their own money, property, and bank accounts. The financial interests of both parties are defended by a pre-nuptial agreement. They split all their expenses for their household and their children evenly, as well the work involved in keeping house and raising the children. This type of marriage has become very common throughout the West.

<b>What the two people in the couple can give each other</b>	
<b>Man gives woman</b>	<b>Woman gives man</b>
Sex	Sex
Emotional support	Emotional support
Intimacy	Intimacy
Money	Money
Services	Services
Gifts	Gifts
Living expenses	Living expenses
Training	Training
Conversation	Conversation
Social position	Social position
Shelter	Shelter
<b>The cooperative project "children"</b>	
Conceiving children	Giving birth
Raising children	Raising children
Caring for children	Caring for children
Providing for children	Providing for children
Paying for education	Paying for education
Paying for prenatal care and childbirth	Paying for prenatal care and childbirth

From a biological perspective, this type of marriage is less natural than a traditional one. The woman

fulfills the external function of a man. And, of course, she doesn't have the time and energy to adequately fulfill her own native reproductive and rear-guard function. In the modern world, the most effective and successful couple are the ones who combine a partnership with a traditional marriage. As long as they don't have many children and the man hasn't quite got his career going yet, the marriage remains a partnership. Both partners make money. But then, when the man starts doing better financially and the couple starts to have more children, the woman switches to fulfilling her natural functions, and the marriage turns into a traditional one.

In economic terms, a partnership marriage is two independent enterprises, each with its own management, accounting, and finances. However, the offices of these two independent firms are in the same complex. Moreover, the firms cooperate; they have common projects and cooperative ventures (children, sex, etc.).

### **Parasitic Marriage (Amateur Prostitution)**

In a parasitic marriage, one partner provides independently for the life of the other. More often than not, the first partner is a man with low self-esteem who provides for a dominant woman in exchange for strictly dosed sex. Every now and then the opposite can also happen, such as a woman keeping a boy-toy. In the absence of any strictly regulated, age-old religious tradition, the relationship between the man and the woman usually descends into irresponsibility: "whoever comes out on top, wins." Most modern marriages are more or less parasitic.

<b>What the two people in the couple can give each other</b>	
<b>Man gives woman</b>	<b>Woman gives man</b>
Sex	Sex
Emotional support	
Intimacy	
Money	
Services	
Gifts	
Living expenses	
Training	
Conversation	
Social position	
Shelter	

From a biological perspective, modern matriarchal, i.e. parasitic marriage is unnatural and senseless. The government occupies the biological and hierarchical position of the leader of an amorphous herd-state. Meanwhile, this virtual leader also fulfills the role of surrogate leader in the hierarchy of every family. A woman ends up as a mid-level female. The state feeds her, takes money away from men, gives her a steady job in the civil service or the public sector, and protects her from private employers. She also gets her own low-ranking, weak, inefficient, and irresponsible man to feed her - a slave-husband. With the aid of the educational, legal, penal, and propaganda systems, the government forces the slave-husband to provide for the woman and her offspring. If the slave-husband can't take it anymore and runs off, the state tracks him down and sucks money out of him in the form of alimony. To accomplish this, a whole system has been erected for stealing a man's income and property and giving it to a woman. Not to the children, mind you, because the woman's the one who gets to distribute the funds she's stolen as she sees fit. The man's rank in the family hierarchy is artificially established as LR. The legal system accomplishes this by depriving him of his right to have sex with his wife and to counter her psychological terror with his physical strength. So the woman is in full dominance mode. Her instinct senses that the state is a strong, reliable, and generous leader. And this virtual leader keeps her slave-husband, who is constantly trying and failing to escape to freedom and sabotage his mistress's orders, in a state of fear and obedience.

The woman uses her slave-husband as a functional appendage and a source of resources. Since nature has

decreed that low-ranking males aren't supposed to continue their genetic line, he usually gets almost no sex at all - or love, of course. If the woman actually has a kid, it usually has no genetic relation to the husband. So a man in this situation will often instinctively see his children as a burden, as competitors he's been forced to support. They're not his children, and this isn't his herd. The surrogate leader, that is, the state, still hasn't found a way to impregnate a woman. The matriarchal type of marriage brings no satisfaction to either the man or the woman. The man instinctively expects his marriage to provide him with a fallback position and emotional support, but instead he gets only exploitation and emotional terror. The woman expects to get either a strong, responsible male leader, or an opportunity to get at some material benefits without having to fulfill her obligations. But instead of that, she gets nothing but a lame, ineffectual, irresponsible slave-husband and pathetic hand-outs from the government. And the government gets screwed over, too. Instead of order and a flourishing civilization, it gets drug addiction, sabotage, crime, alcoholism, deadbeat dads, and a demographic catastrophe. In other words, it loses everything. But the biggest loser in this kind of marital relationship is, of course, the man, since it's all directed against him. So smart men avoid it like the plague - that is, unless their perceptual accuracy's been damaged by a huge hormone overdose while they're in love.

In economic terms, I guess parasitic marriage could be compared to an insane company where the director has no authority whatsoever and all the administrative decisions are made by a housekeeper on the basis of the horoscope.

Most real families are combinations of these three basic types of marital relationships in various proportions.

In conclusion, I'll note that, in order for a family to exist for a long time and remain stable, it needs to maintain marital relations that are natural for human beings, i.e. the traditional variety.

However, during the last few centuries, post-Christian states seem to have made a pact to do everything they can to destroy the traditional family as such. And the institutions that have done the most to undermine the family structure within society are the same ones that are designed to support motherhood and childhood. This includes welfare for single mothers, the increased stringency of the anti-male and anti-child alimony system, food stamps, and other kinds of government hand-outs. It all combines to make divorce a very profitable business for women. In many countries, all a woman needs to do is get married, and she'll start to see a significant portion of her man's property as her own - as well as a portion of his future earnings. All of this has transformed marriage from the legal underpinning of the family and reproduction into an ordinary scam. It's all commonly referred to as the downfall of the institution of the family.

A man's fundamental problem in a marriage is his illusions regarding the legal system and the legal practices regulating marital relations. When a man gets married, he usually assumes that he's entering into the same kind of marriage for life that his grandfather and great-grandfather lived happily in. But instead he falls into a legal field with exactly the opposite foundation, and as a result the poor sap ends up nothing but significant material and moral losses. Women don't have these illusions and usually see marriage to a man as temporary from the start. They see it as a profitable women's business, just one more rung up the hierarchical ladder. This is why women have both the legal and the psychological advantage.

## **Chapter 7. THE WAR OF THE SEXES**

### **Failed Females**

Let's start with a historical sketch. The battle for women's rights began with public appearances by prostitutes. There were a number of reasons for this, including the fact that sailors had their pay withheld and got into debt with the prostitutes. But the real reason lies in the fact that the appearance of street lights and matches made it possible for a john to get a good look at just what he was about to fuck. This automatically meant that aging prostitutes lost their income. So they suddenly needed social guarantees - in other words, a free meal. Since then, the meaning behind the fight for women's rights has remained pretty much unchanged. It's a battle fought by sexually undesirable women for the resources created and produce by men.

There have always been con-artists and adventurers who wanted to play on people's animal instincts, and this has cost humanity an arm and a leg. The Nazis and other nationalists groups have exploited the human



instinct to distrust the stranger to sic one nationality on another for their own ends, and the was the loss of tens of millions of human lives over the course of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The Communists took advantage of people's hierarchical instincts and their animal need for sustenance. They used their feelings of envy to sic the poor on the rich. The cost was the same – tens of millions of human lives. The feminists haven't discovered something new. They use our animal instincts to sic women on men, and they do in the name of filthy lucre. The cost has been the simultaneous degradation and gradual demise of all of post-Christian society.

Men waged war against nature and built a safe and abundant world. Nowadays, the defense that was once provided by concrete men has now been taken on by society as a whole via the army, the police, and the legal system. Day-to-day survival has also ceased to be a relevant problem. A certain quantity of material benefits has already been accrued, and some of it is distributed by the government in the form of welfare and social security. Women's instinctual fear of the surrounding world, as well their fear of ending up without a man, is weakening. If, in a state of nature, a woman knew full well that without a man around she would get eaten by a saber-tooth tiger or starve along with her children, today the situation has changed. She feels safer and more confident. And the recent generation of men has been raised by women to be more useful for her on a day-to-day basis – they're weakened and easy to control. And this has had a chain reaction. Every generation of men is becoming weaker and more controllable. In other words, men's rank is being lowered, and society has begun to develop according along matriarchal lines.

The fact that men have acquired and amassed such a large quantity of material resources has led to a few different consequences at once. First, the external functional role of getting resources has become comparatively easy and safe. Second, men have become less active. Third, women are becoming more active in their desire to re-distribute these resources. Fourth, the role of leader, at least from the perspective of a woman's instinctual female reception, belongs to the government, not the husband. Fifth, there's something to fight for. And that's why we're now seeing "women fighting for their rights." In other words, now that they don't have to risk being eaten by a tiger, or killed by the enemy, or starving to death if they fail, women have declared war on men and are fighting for the right to take the very material resources that men have acquired away from them. It goes without saying that women have no fear of men in their current weakened state. The most active and enterprising women are the ones leading the fight, that is, the ones who have the most to gain from it. Let's try to figure out what kind of women these are.

First of all, your usual, normal woman will never "fight for her rights." She simply has no need to – she's already in a privileged position. She's sitting around in the most cozy, abundant, and safe place on the planet – at home. She's busy with her favorite activity – looking after her children and her own comfort. She's provided for by her beloved man, the father of her children. Fighting for rights equal to a man's would mean fighting to be deprived of the traditional women's privileges she so enjoys – in other words, it would be a completely stupid thing to do. Take a look at Arab women. They just laugh at the feminists' call to arms, and they have nothing but pity for single, childless American women who have to work for a living.

The only women who stand to benefit from having equal rights with men are the ones who don't have a man to serve as a source of resources and women's privileges, i.e. the women who haven't become self-actualized as women. They've got no one to bring home the bacon. They're sexually unsatisfied. They're offended. They're mad at the world. They're aggressive. So they hate men, and they're jealous of successful women who have children and a man to provide for them. I've seen plenty of cases where a single woman, foaming at the mouth, stood up for equal rights for men and women. But the instant she finally found a man, she forgot all about feminism and became a happy wife and mother.

However, there are three categories of women for whom building a life that would be natural and correspond to their biologically determined function is difficult or even impossible. The first category is lesbians. More often than not, their mother's hormones got rerouted while they were still in the womb, and this caused irreversible changes to their brains. As a result, their female instinctual programming is operating alongside male programming. This is why they frequently have a more masculine appearance. They're women who've had their sex instinct re-routed. Simply put, they're profoundly unwell, so they can't form a couple with a man. The second category is sexually unattractive women with a repellant appearance and a lousy personality, usually with a hypertrophied domination urge to boot. The third are intelligent, educated women with a strong personality and high standards who can't find a man worthy to set them up. It's a standard problem for

emancipated female intellectuals. These three types of women have no choice but to provide for themselves independently, which means that they have to enter into direct competition with men in business and on the job market. They feel like they've gotten the shaft in comparison to other women. Since they're in no position to get women's privileges on the level of the family, they try to get the same privileges on the level of society. Given their physiological, intellectual, and other characteristics, average women don't stand a chance in direct competition with men in the male sphere of competence, so they need additional structures that will weaken their male opponents. These women who can't actualize themselves in either the male or female spheres of competence make up the backbone of feminism. They hate men who are more professional and more able to compete on the job market. But they also hate normal women with husbands and children. They're jealous of both. They even hate children, since children only serve to remind them of their own losses and failures.

If an indolent loser is jealous of a neighbor who has a job and makes a good living, that doesn't make him any less of an indolent loser. However, a bunch of indolent losers who unite to form a Communist or nationalist party can become a powerful and destructive force. It's the same with the failed females who've united to form feminist organizations and, armed with professionally constructed rhetoric masquerading as theory, have now become just as powerful and just as destructive a force. And today this destructive force has acquired real power over society.

The goal of every struggle is either the opponent's resources or his death. By the same token, the goal of these failed females is nothing other than filthy lucre. In other words, the goal of their struggle is to redistribute the financial streams flowing through our society in such a way that the greater part of the resources acquired by men ends up in the hands of failed females living without a man. And it's absolutely *men's* resources that they're after. Men make up the vast majority of laborers, engineers, pilots, miners, drivers, refinery workers, scientists, computer programmers, and farmers. Women are biologically less suited to interacting with their surrounding environment than men are, so they work with resources that have already been acquired. At most, they can help maintain the process of acquiring and re-working these resources. This is why the failed females aren't trying to vie with men on an equal footing for the acquisition of new resources. They're not trying to become miners, sailors, or fishermen (we're not going to worry about the odd exception right now – we're only concerned with general patterns here). Since they don't have the desire or the ability to get resources on their own, they try to take resources away from other members of society. The failed females' is to ensure that the resources acquired by men end up in precisely their hands. And it goes without saying that, in order to increase their own share when distributing resources, the portions going to men, normal women, and children have to be reduced.

### **The Strategy of the War of the Sexes**

The goal I've just outlined determines the failed females' battle strategy. It's pretty simple:

1. Increase the ranks of their own "infantry," i.e. the number of failed females. In order to do this, they need to deprive normal women of their men and children by destroying existing families, as well as making it less likely that heterosexual couples can be formed and have children in the future.
2. Make men as weak and submissive as possible while pushing women into full dominance mode.
3. Once they've attained real power, use the massive scale of their "infantry" to transfer the resources they've taken into their leaders' pockets.

A woman is egoistic and egocentric. She lives instinctively and has no capacity for strategic thought. This is her biological nature. As a result, she is categorically unable to form a long-term perspective or feel a sense of responsibility for anything other than herself and her children. This is also, by the way, why traditional societies don't let her anywhere near public or political activity. A woman lives primarily on the basis of her own immediate interests. Therefore, consequence such as a demographic crisis or the fact that their goals run counter to the state's interests have quite simply never occurred to the feminists. All they care about is getting as much money and power as quickly as they can, no matter the cost.

### **The Tactics of the War of the Sexes**

The feminists' methods are absolutely identical to the ordinary, everyday methods that any woman will instinctively use when trying to control her man. But if an ordinary woman applies them on the scale of an individual couple, then the failed female, who has no man, applies them on the scale of society at large. Her instinctual programming operates independently of her desires. The only question is the program's object. In this case at hand, the object is all of society in general and the leadership elite in particular.

We've already discussed the following ordinary techniques women use to control men on a day-to-day basis:

- myths;
- lies, misrepresenting facts, soapbox rhetoric (i.e. women's logic);
- emotional pressure (hysteria);
- creating a guilt complex;
- creating an inferiority complex;
- manipulation;
- provocation.

Any of the standard myths can serve as a universal example. Let's take the basic myth about the oppressed state of women. Generally speaking, it's made up of a number of different myths, including: the myth about domestic violence; the myth about the enslavement of Eastern women; the myth about kitchen slavery; the myth about men as oppressors; and a whole lot more. This entire system of myths is founded on nothing but lies, rhetoric, and misrepresented facts. In recent times, new myths have been added to these standard ones, including some exotic sleight-of-hand masquerading as "research." For example, the myth about the defective nature of the male chromosome, or the myth about how stone-age females could somehow live without men.

As a warm-up, let's examine the myth about kitchen slavery. It goes something like this: women have been forced to cook and clean for men, who have cruelly exploited them as a household slave for millennia, but now they're trying to break free. First of all, let's not forget that, for tens of thousands of years, the spot near the hearth was the coziest, warmest, and safest place in the world. The choice was simple – you could either sit in a cave by the fire in warmth and safety, wrapped in a soft, warm animal skin, doing light work around the home, or you could go to war with neighboring tribes, where there was a very real chance of getting a spear through the gut. Or you could stand around freezing in torrential rain, waiting to ambush for mammoth. Back then, and even in relatively recent times, women were pretty far from protesting against "kitchen slavery," since they knew full well that they actually had a privileged place in society. The reason should be obvious – they weren't stupid enough to refuse their privileges, especially on their own initiative. So what's happened since then? Why is it that women want so desperately to give up their seat by the family hearth? Well, that's simple, too. Men have made the world around them safe. Women can now leave the hearth and have nothing to fear. And this means that they can grow arrogant and start haggling with men for an even more privileged position than the one they had before.

An example of creating an inferiority complex is the myth about men being primitive, the demonization and undermining of the image of men in the media and in educational institutions. Under the influence of this myth, many men have themselves come to believe that they're inferior to women and are guilty of something before them.

To the list of typical provocations we can add the anti-male bathroom brigade. All over the world, men are being blamed for missing the toilet with their urine streams. But, instead of solving this minor issue in the most obvious way possible – putting urinals in shared bathrooms – some European countries have reached a point of real hysteria. It's gotten to the point where, in Germany, boys in schools are made to urinate sitting down like girls. And even though independent studies have confirmed that, when a woman stands up after peeing, she also drips urine onto the toilet seat, for some reason there's no hysteria at all about that. The only purpose of the feminists' bathroom campaign is to give men a guilt complex and make them look ridiculous. If men don't fight for their right to piss standing up, they'll end up being elaborately degraded. But if they do stand up for their rights (no pun intended), they'll look ridiculous. Either way, the victory goes to the feminists.

Any kind of constructive discussion with the feminists about topics that aren't in their best interests is entirely impossible. They're women, which mean they're professional masters at "women's logic," i.e. soapbox rhetoric. The result of any conversation with them has already decided and will remain inviolable: all money and

power goes to the feminists as quickly as possible and at any price. Any arguments you can make will run smack into a powerful flood of hysterical rhetoric pronounced in a shrill manner calculated to produce the most potent effect possible on men's instincts.

I could go on for a long time analyzing the standard rhetorical techniques and myths employed by the feminists, since I've carefully studied and systematized them in detail. But it doesn't really matter. There are other things that are much more important and more interesting, such as, for example, how they've come to power.

How have the feminists come to power? Well, let's see. Their primary method is to swell their own ranks. They've done everything in their power to increase the number of failed females in all of the three categories mentioned above. And, of course, they've formed a massive army of sympathizers. Here are their methods:

- increasing the number of homosexuals;
- breaking up existing couples and families;
- preventing new couples and families from forming, destroying mankind's reproductive function;
- destroying children;
- disorienting children in regard to gender;

Now we'll take a more detailed look at each of these methods.

### **Increasing the Size of Sexual Minority Groups**

This is being accomplished via an intentional pro-homosexuality propaganda program in the media. Part of the audience is children. They also have special PR events, such as gay pride parades. Celebrities come out of the closet. Homosexuality is surrounded by a halo of elitism and prestige. There's even pseudo-scientific rhetoric about the naturalness of homosexuality. Dissenters are suppressed by propaganda preaching tolerance and the condemnation of "homophobia." By the way, the term "homophobia" has been invented in order to discredit the healthy revulsion we all feel for this unnatural, diseased disruption of the sex instinct. The term's similarity to the names of psychological disorders (for example, claustrophobia) has led normal people to fear revealing their negative reaction to being overcome by homosexual propaganda. At the risk of being seen as an old-fashioned or politically incorrect homophobe, I will say right now that heterosexuality is the only normal sexual orientation. Moreover, homosexuality makes normal people sick. This is a normal reaction to something unnatural. If a healthy person sees someone who's deformed, sickly, or inadequate, their normal, natural reaction is one of revulsion. The object is potentially dangerous. You could get infected or subjected to other unpleasant things. Therefore, you automatically try to keep your distance and stay on your guard. This is the source of our feeling of squeamishness, unease, disgust, and hostility. It's an absolutely normal, and it's justified by millions of years of the flourishing human race. Nature doesn't make mistakes. And so-called tolerance and political correctness is nothing more than an instrument for political rhetoric and the restriction of free speech. It's censorship. Politicians plant these concepts in order to justify their unwillingness and powerlessness to struggle against society's ills.

One time while I was visiting a female friend at home I noticed that her cat was humping a stuffed rabbit, and I started thinking: that poor cat, he's never even been outside the apartment... how could he still have a normal sexual orientation? He's got no access to female cats, since he's lived his entire life locked inside an apartment on the 14<sup>th</sup> floor. It's the same with people, however rational they might be. According to biological logic, a male is supposed to be oriented toward mature, fertile females. But they're either unavailable (they charge too much for access to their bodies), or they're so terrifying (in a matriarchal society women are stronger and more dangerous than men) that the male's sex instinct is motivated by his survival instinct to change course. So the male gets reoriented toward less attractive, yet safer objects (children, adolescent girls, other males, rubber dolls, corpses, animals, etc.). The weak man is afraid of strong women and instinctively doesn't see them as females, but he does see another weak man as a female. By the same token, a strong woman doesn't see a weak man as a male, but she does see other strong women as males. A young girl with a still-undeveloped brain

can also get her head filled with feminist propaganda about how men are pigs, aggressors, and rapists, so she becomes afraid of them and gets reoriented towards her girlfriends. It's all pretty logical.

In other words, the growth in the numbers of homosexuals and perverts that we see today has been set in motion by the matriarchal tendencies in our developing society, which have in turn been served by feminism.

But that poor cat... one day he'll probably decide he's had enough and tosses himself out of that 14<sup>th</sup>-storey window. And his owner will think the dumb animal just leaped out by mistake while chasing a bird...

### **Breaking up Existing Couples and Families**

Not every woman can be turned into a lesbian. So, besides increasing the number of lesbians, the feminists also do their best to increase the number of heterosexual women without a man. In order to accomplish this, they take steps to break up existing couples and put obstacles in the way of the formation of new ones. They do this by intensifying the hysterical campaigns against "domestic violence," "spousal rape," "sexual exploitation," "kitchen slavery," and other feminist boogeymen.

Thanks to the "struggle against domestic violence," any fight between a couple brought about by the woman's psychological provocation can now end with the man in jail if he can't endure his woman's emotional assault. If the man has nothing at his disposal with which to oppose the woman's emotional/psychological terror, then either the woman, secure in her invulnerability, will crush his personality, or the couple will break up. The man's family life simply becomes unbearable. I recently read a note in a newspaper about how a man who was released from jail turned around and asked to be let back in. He was motivated by the fact that his wife had made his home such a psychological hell on earth that things were just easier in jail. I wouldn't be quick to call this a mere curiosity.

The battle against "sexual exploitation" and "spousal rape," which has convinced men and women that any sexual encounter initiated by the man is rape, has resulted in a situation where, more often than not, sexual relations between a couple will disappear entirely. The place in the relationship that should be occupied by sex and love is now occupied by fear, mistrust, sexual blackmail, etc. Which also leads to a lot of break-ups.

The struggle against "kitchen slavery" represents a blow against any kind of partnership between the spouses when it comes to housework, which has also weakened the family. Instead of its very important unifying function within the family, food has now become an additional means of manipulation and provoking discontent. Nowadays, if anyone in the US reads instructions for wives based on correct male-female relationships (like, say, the one found in the chapter on cultures) that advises women to cook for their man and not refuse him sex, he'll be branded an exploiter of women, an aggressor, and a psychopath – with all the resulting problems for his career and reputation.

From a biological perspective, the struggle to diminish the husband's rights and status in the family is nothing more than an attempt to transfer him from the position of a high-ranking male to that of an MR or LR. And, as I've already shown, this will automatically lead the wife to become more dominant and disturb the reproductive function of society as a whole, since, from a biological perspective, it's unnatural for low-ranking males to carry on their genetic line. In the best case scenario, he'll occasionally have strictly dosed sex for pay and a false hope of continuing his line. In the worst case, he'll have neither one, nor the other. Such is the law of nature.

The feminist propaganda campaign for a biologically unnatural distribution of gender responsibilities also breaks up couples, since it leads to a loss of each partner's sexual identification. The woman might think it's nice that her husband washes the dishes for her, but she can't respect him for it. And that means she can't love him.

### **Destroying Mankind's Reproductive Function**

In order to make it harder for new couples to form, the feminists intentionally influence men's and women's sex instinct with the goal of disrupting the algorithm of the Formula for Love and preventing the creation of new heterosexual couples. And, if couples do actually form, they try to prevent love mode from activating, since this is the state in which children are most likely to be conceived. Let's follow the feminists'

methods and make some adjustments to the Formula.

The central arena in which today's war of the sexes is being waged is the feminists' struggle against "sexual harassment." In other words, a male's natural behavior is now regarded as a criminal act. Before a man and a woman have even met, the feminists have already given each of them an intentionally negative attitude toward members of the opposite sex. A woman who's been brought to an emotional pitch by the hysterical media will automatically see a man not as a potential partner, but as a potential aggressor, a sexual harasser and rapist, or as a potential victim who can be blackmailed with accusations of sexual harassment and forced to buy his way out. The female's timidity and fear in the face of the world around her is the emotional background of every woman. They've inherited it from their prehistoric ancestors. The feminists have, among other things, slyly taken advantage of female timidity. A single emotional push from an article or a TV program can give a woman a chronic phobia, and a regularly occurring impetus to fear can easily turn into a mental disorder bordering on psychosis. In this case, a man will see a woman not as a potential partner for sex or family, but as a source of danger and legal persecution leading to massive moral and material expenses, as well as the brand of sex criminal, getting fired, jail time, etc.

So instead of a natural attraction between the sexes, we see only mistrust, fear, and animosity. Instead of cooperation, we see the "war of the sexes." The sex instinct is suppressed by either the survival instinct or the instinct for sustenance. The algorithm of the Formula for Love is broken. Men show no initiative because they're afraid, and, since female instinct drives women to show initiative only with elite males, and since scared men don't exactly come off as elite, women show no initiative either. Moreover, most of a Western person's life is spent at work. And this is a great place to meet a partner with similar interests, education, and social status. But, by making it impossible for couples to form at work through their especially furious battle against sexual harassment in the workplace, the feminists have significantly reduced the likelihood of couples forming in general.

But, if a man and a woman can somehow choke down their fear and distrust enough to talk to each other, this is hardly cause to celebrate the formation of a new couple. The woman will never even get to the preliminary testing phase. The feminists have already convinced her that, as a man, her new acquaintance is a biological error, an evolutionary dead end with a defective chromosome. He's a lower being whose job is to serve women. So, if a woman's taken this rhetoric even a tiny bit seriously, her female instinct will bypass the love cycle entirely and move right into dominance mode. Since she's a dominant female, the man's instinct will perceive her as old or inadequate, i.e. unfit to form a couple. The female's instinct will thus set out on the path of the sex instinct's algorithm for interacting with low-ranking males. But, as if this isn't enough, the feminists are doing everything in their power to keep women in precisely this mode. Every traditional culture considers a husband to have an inalienable right to sex with his wife. In other words, according to the sexual and hierarchical instincts of both the man and the woman, he's positioned as a high-ranking male, the leader of the family hierarchy. But now the feminists have implanted the legal system and public opinion with the idea that a husband has no right whatsoever to sex with his wife. So, according to the sexual and hierarchical instincts of the man and the woman, he's now positioned as a low-ranking male, and the role of leader of the family hierarchy and high-ranking male is fulfilled by the state, whose job it is to drive low-ranking males away from the female.

The woman also finds herself unable to transition into lure mode, since she's been intimidated by the feminists' hysteria over "date rape." But the man's also been intimidated by this hysteria, and his desire for sex is overcome by his fear of it. It's gotten to the point where, in some Western countries, lawyers have cooked up a contract that a man and a woman are supposed to sign before every sexual encounter. And one clever Brit has even created a special type of condom with a wrapper that a woman can leave her thumbprint on to signify that she's consenting to sexual contact. That way the man doesn't have to be afraid of being accused of rape. However, there's still nothing to prevent the woman from turning around and saying that she changed her mind afterwards – you know, in the middle. So the guy gets tossed in the slammer unless he can pay her off. The fact is, even if the woman changes her mind during sex and tells the man to stop, and he doesn't, this is considered rape. Of course, it's also impossible to prove. So all the woman needs to do is say one word, and the man gets thrown in jail.

A Western man also has no way to court a woman according to the established ritual, since the feminists

have convinced women that letting a man court them is degrading. Therefore, by showing any sign of chivalry or giving a woman a sign of attention, a man risks inviting hostility and accusations of sexual harassment, sexism, treating women as property, etc. This is how everything that civilization has built up over thousands of years is being torn down by a band of furious adventuresses in a single generation.

As a result, not just marriage, but any sexual contact at all presents a man with a threat. As for women, they don't exactly relish the thought, but it's still in their best interests as an instrument for legalized racketeering. In some countries, the feminists have intimidated men to the point where they've become too scared to so much as approach a woman. The first whiff of sexual harassment or sexual exploitation will cause them to run away from a woman as though she were a leper, since they realize that, by engaging in perfectly natural male sexual behavior, they risk getting sent to prison or the loony bin.

So, by joining hands with the state and forcing their way into people's families and beds, by using the human survival instinct to tear apart the sexual and instinctual bonds between men and women wherever they can, the feminists are making it much harder for heterosexual couples to form. Human society, deprived of its reproductive and familial structures, is turning into something resembling the prehistoric herd.

The struggle against sexual harassment runs parallel to the saturation of our culture with sexual provocation. On the one hand, women paint their faces with make-up, reveal and emphasize previously concealed parts of their bodies, and strike seductive poses everywhere you look. The theme of sex has completely taken over the media. In other words, men are being provoked in every conceivable way to manifest their natural, active sexual behavior. But as soon as they actually engage in this natural behavior, they get punished. And it's all their fault. It's the same as if you lured a hungry dog over to you with a piece of sausage, then, as soon as he walked up to you, trustfully wagging his tail, you kicked him as hard as you could. The poor mutt would never go anywhere near you again, no matter how hungry he was. The same old Pavlovian games are being played right now in the Western world by the feminists and the politicians who serve them by playing on the sexual instincts and reflexes of their constituents. By the way, there are some dogs out there that, if you played this little trick on them, just might bite you. And, just between you and me, they'd be right.

This intentional, focused attack, as well as the weakening of men and the strengthening of women in general, is leading to a reduction in the number of couples. A strong woman will find it essentially impossible to find a man she could love, since the only man she could love would be one who's stronger than her. She basically has no other choice than to join the ranks of the failed females.

Cutting men off from their children is another very effective method for destroying the reproductive and familial structure of society. Tearing apart the family and depriving men of custody after a divorce are just the most familiar methods for cutting a man off from his children – there's also another, very effective method. We're currently seeing a rapidly growing hysteria in the media about male pedophiles and rapists. Why is this? "To protect children," you say. But it's not that simple. Let's take a look.

First of all, let's put a few facts together:

1. Way more children die in car crashes than at the hands of pedophiles, but we don't see any hysteria about car crashes.
2. There's just as many female pedophiles as there are males, but the hysteria is only about the male pedophiles, while we hear nothing at all about the female ones.
3. There's an ongoing discussion about whether or not we should chemically castrate male pedophiles, but no one's said anything about which part of the female pedophiles' body we should nuke.

Doesn't that seem weird? You're damn right it does – at least, until you realize that the problem of pedophilia is being blown out of proportion not with the goal of protecting children, but in order to cut men off from the process of raising them. Then everything falls into place. The goal of this campaign is to brand EVERY man as a potential pedophile and make it harder for him to talk to children.

This serves several goals:

- It makes society and the criminal justice system more suspicious of men.
- It dulls suspicion regarding women. And we already know that lesbians make up the backbone of feminism. You figure it out.
- No man would dare to work as a school teacher knowing that he could be blacklisted and thrown in jail thanks to the slightest misunderstanding.

- Fewer men dare to have their own child, much less adopt someone else's.
- It makes women more suspicious of men and less likely to let them near their families and children.
- One way or another, women will have the advantage when it comes to child custody and the

opportunity for blackmail after a divorce. All a woman has to do is inform the court of her husband's ostensible pedophilic tendencies. Well, he kissed a child once, so you can see for yourself that he's a pedophile. What do you think, will all of this serve to strengthen the family? It's not hard to decide.

Now, don't get me wrong, the last thing in the world I want to do here is defend the real pedophiles who corrupt the bodies and spirits of children. We obviously have to have a very serious attitude toward fighting this repulsive phenomenon. But that means that we also have to fight female pedophilia. Moreover, our first priority should be to fight the underlying cause of pedophilia – the matriarchal distortion of our society.

### **Feminism and Normal Women**

Why is it that the feminists are so popular with the majority of normal women? I mean, isn't it obvious that they're working against women's interests by making them into losers, corrupting their children, creating a host of psychopaths, and destroying all of society?

In the first place, most women, generally speaking, lack the ability to see the big picture and consider society's long-term interests. The human female's weak brain just isn't built for this. Moreover, feminist rhetoric is designed to play precisely on the emotions and short-term interests of women while remaining silent about more distant consequences.

For example, the myth about kitchen slavery is extremely handy for housewives.

-They can make themselves seem more valuable to a man and haggle with him right here and now in the kitchen.

-They can give their men an additional guilt complex right now via a planned fight.

-They can spend less time on housework and make their husband pick up the slack. Right now.

-Won over by the opportunity to realize their short-term interests and stupefied by mass propaganda, women are occupied with things that are either unnatural for them or, while natural only in the context of the prehistoric herd, are unnatural for civilized society. Instead of having children, caring for a family, and providing a productive husband with a fallback position, the modern woman has been indoctrinated by feminist propaganda. As a result, she:

- competes with men on the job market, reducing the value of labor and depriving men of the opportunity to provide for themselves and their children;

- uses marriage and children as a means to rob men via divorce, thereby depriving herself of her own potential for self-actualization within the family, her children of a decent upbringing, and men of a desire to have relationships with women;

- uses sex as a commodity, thereby depriving herself of the joys of love;

- getting involved in politics and upending the structure of the government;

- killing children in the womb, thereby depriving herself of health and the joys of motherhood and depriving the state of its future.

### **Feminism and Power**

The way in which feminism has become intertwined with power is also an interesting process. Western democracy has made it easy for them. The feminists offer politicians the most malleable electorate they could want – that is, the women they've indoctrinated and the men who've become their doormats. Western politicians have taken the bait, and now they're being reeled in. By giving the feminists power, privileges, and money, they've lost that power for themselves. The feminists are now in a position to decide the fates of men who aren't even loyal to them. They got the Israeli prime minister fired, and they bought Bill Clinton's support by allowing him to finish his presidential term in the wake of the Monica Lewinsky scandal. The feminists have got Western politicians shaking in their boots. Moreover, feminism is useful for the state because, by repressing men, teaching boys to be weak, and strengthening women, it makes men more manageable and thus easier to work with. This is



why the lazy, irresponsible powers that be continue to support feminism.

But the seeming benefits for feminism in attaining power are strictly short-term, since the ineffectual mid-ranking man it's created can't cope with his function in society. He's demotivated and doesn't feel a sense of responsibility. Moreover, women's reproductive instincts are weakening. As a result, society as a whole is growing weaker, and a demographic catastrophe is brewing. All of this is exerting a destructive influence on the state as a whole. I'll repeat it again: a slave can't be a good worker, or a good soldier, or a responsible citizen, or the head of a family, or a father and a caregiver to children. Nor can he be a successful businessman who can create new jobs and pay his taxes. Without strong men, strong government, a stable family, and healthy children are all impossible.

The feminists also use the male instinct to protect females to emotionally manipulate men in positions of authority. It's the same everyday technique that any woman might use when turning to one strange man for protection against another, or if she needs to find someone to change her tire for free. She makes a show of her helplessness and creates an atmosphere of emotional intensity, using her intonation and gestures to send the signal: "defenseless female in danger." Every man will automatically have the same subconscious reaction: "She's helpless, so if I can show her how strong I am, she'll spread her legs for me." So he runs to the woman's aid – in other words, he gets played. But if the man's in a position of authority, then, by the same token, he instinctively sees all females of his group (whether it's a tribe or a country) as his own personal harem. This is how his instinct operates, so he also gets duped, but on a much larger scale. This is why every attempt men have made to stand up for their rights have been a failure. The men in power automatically react to the feminists' emotional intensity as the female distress signal, and they work against the interest of men, society, and even themselves. For a politician, it would be hard to imagine anything more irresponsible and treacherous to your own country than supporting feminism. But it's hard to do anything about it while politicians' common sense has been deactivated and only their instincts are working. In a traditional society, this kind of situation is avoided by ensuring that the clergy have a hand in all government decisions. Today this no longer exists, and society is degrading.

The fact that there are still women attaining self-actualization in the female sphere of competence, that is, in motherhood, is extremely detrimental to the feminist cause. This is why they've united with an international system for controlling the birth of children and are currently waging a massive propaganda campaign in favor of contraception, abortion, and a "free and independent" childless lifestyle. In other words, they're working to make sure that women place their own comfort ahead of motherhood.

Feminism has also successfully used women's timid and egocentric nature to suppress their motherhood instincts. In order to accomplish this, they're encouraged women to develop a subconscious view of children as a source of problems, danger, and competition. They've attuned women to the idea that they deserve to be able to consume unlimited material pleasures. But, since each person's resources are, for the most part, limited, women have only one means to get at these pleasures – by taking them away from men while minimizing any competition from children. Women see a man only as a source of resources and benefits and children as unwanted competitors ready to limit their personal freedom and get in the way of their pleasure. This is where the concept of "family planning" comes into play. Pregnancy is presented as an undesirable illness that can be avoided with the help of medication and treated with the operations provided by modern "medicine." Women are quite simply being scared away from pregnancy and children.

By the way, these methods are nothing new. The Nazis used similar propaganda in the occupied countries to eliminate the native populace from conquered territory.

Female tourists returning from China have said how shocked they were by what they considered to be the remarkable love Chinese people have for their children. For women who've been physically mutilated by abortions and morally deformed by emancipation, simple love for one's children seems like an amazing discovery. These women's maternal instincts have been so effectively suppressed that they they're surprised to learn that children are, as it turns out, something you can love. They're not just an obstacle in the way of their mad rush for pleasure.

I could also write about how the feminists have established a system designed to disorient children sexually and socially, as well as a host of other crimes perpetrated by this destructive ideology. I could write

about how feminism is nothing more than a weapon of mass destruction that's been fired against the entire civilized world. I could write about how, since the introduction of universal suffrage, Western democracy has essentially died, and the political process has degenerated into a mechanism for manipulating the electorate. But this book is dedicated to other problems.

So for now I'll just make the point that feminism is a movement spearheaded by deeply infuriated and mentally ill people with the goal of making healthy people equally sick and inadequate. And it's attained global success in the pursuit of this goal.

And, lastly, I would really like to believe that one day, after the war of the sexes is over, the leaders of the feminist movement will be subjected to a legal process similar to the Nuremburg Trials held for the Nazi leadership in the wake of World War II.

## **Chapter 8. CONTROL OVER THE SITUATION**

### **Happiness and the Meaning of Life**

So, at long last we come to the end of our map of the real world. The description I've provided is a little simplified, but it should be more than enough to orient yourself in your life and your relationships. You now have enough knowledge to switch on your leadership instincts and take control of your happiness.

First of all, let's remember that happiness is a human emotional state. And, as we know, emotions are the levers our instinct use to control us. Positive emotions are, among other things, encouragement that our instincts give us for following them. For example, a person submits to his instinct for sustenance and eats something. Or he submits to his sex instinct and does the nasty with some chick. Or he submits to his hierarchical instinct and knocks his rival's teeth out. In all of these cases, the person's instinct will immediately reward him for following its directives by giving him feelings of pleasure and satisfaction. It's just like how an animal trainer in the circus trains a lion rewarding him with a tasty morsel. By the same token, happiness is a kind of satisfaction of a heightened intensity that our instincts give us as a reward for correctly engaging in extremely important behavior, that is, for meeting our strategic goals as human beings. If only the tactical, and not the strategic, elements of our behavioral paradigms are fulfilled, the result is pleasure or joy, but not happiness. The sensation of happiness is formed by a few different programs, but the most fundamental aspect of happiness is formed by our hierarchical programming.

Unhappiness, on the other hand, is an opposite emotional state that comes about as the result of an unsatisfied instinct. It's part of how a person's motivation to action is formed. For example, if a woman has no family or children, her reproductive instinct remains unsatisfied, and she's unhappy. So she either puts additional effort into searching for a partner or lowers hers standards.

More often than not, reason an instinct remains unsatisfied lies in some kind of deep-seated contradiction that causes it to come into conflict with another instinct or with the intellect. As an example, let's take a look at a woman's reception of an aggressive man. Her intellect tells her the guy's a loser. But her instinctive criteria from the Lower Paleolithic Age say he's a strong male. So the woman falls in love with the man and has an unhappy life with him. Or it could be the other way around. According to her intellectual criteria, an intelligent, civilized man seems to be great – he's rich, smart, and active. But he's been "raised right," i.e. he's soft on the outside. So her female instinct can't acknowledge him as a beloved leader despite the fact that her mind sees him as too good a match to pass up. The woman develops an inner conflict and becomes unhappy. This sort of man will also be unhappy, since he's effectively a leader and feels the part, but the woman's rejection of him positions him as an MR. A conflict arises between his self-esteem and the external confirmation of his rank.

The source could also be a conflict between real life and the illusions a person has imbibed as part of his upbringing. For example, a man gets taught as a child that women are kind, gentle, modest, weak, loving, and caring. But in reality, they don't love him – on the contrary, they take advantage of him and rob him blind. So the man grows disenchanted with women and life in general and becomes unhappy.

## Happiness Formed by the Hierarchical and Reproductive Programs

Let's recall the key to understanding human instinctual behavior – the three-tiered hierarchical structure of the human herd. And the fact that the sexual and hierarchical structure of the human instinct are inextricably intertwined. A man achieves success in the structure of human society by occupying the position of leader. Therefore, a man's happiness is attained when his personal life corresponds to this position – when he gets the best sex possible in unlimited quantities from a woman he loves (it's better if it's just one woman, since having a bunch of women around is more trouble than it's worth) and who provides him with the feeling that he has a fallback position. This kind of happiness is called “happiness in one's personal life” or “happiness in love.” If you know the Formula for Love, this is something you can pull off pretty easily. All you have to do is lead a woman through the algorithm of the Formula and keep her in the love cycle. Then you'll both be happy.

If a leader has children with this kind of woman, this will act as a confirmation of his status as leader and the continuation of his genetic line. The man feels like his life has meaning, since the territory and resources he's acquired now have heirs. In other words, the man is happy because he's fulfilled his biological purpose. This is the happiness of fatherhood.

The man receives satisfaction and pleasure on every tactical step along the way to this strategic goal. For example, an independent man makes a career for himself, raises his qualifications, expands his business, acquires real estate, builds a house, makes money, etc. By doing all this, he increases his rank in the social hierarchy, and his instinct rewards him with positive emotions for each tactical victory. The man feels the thrill of the solitary hunter and the joy of a wartime victory. However, if a married low-ranking or mid-ranking man does the same thing, he won't feel nearly the same level of pleasure. His rank's already been determined – he's a breadwinner and the functional appendage of a dominant female. And the game from his hunt doesn't belong to him. But the man will get pleasure whenever he receives a confirmation of his increase from women. For example, from praise, or reward-sex. Although a mid-ranking or low-ranking man has limited possibilities for tactical pleasure, he has no chance at happiness unless he can become the leader of his own family.

A strategic error that modern, weakened men make is that they enter an extended relationship with a woman without becoming a leader. And the woman establishes her relationship with him as with a MR or LR. Then, even if he becomes stronger, the man usually won't be able to change his established relationship with her. So he'll either remain in a lower position in the family hierarchy forever or be forced to leave his family in order to try and establish a new one under conditions than are more natural for him. The second unfortunate mistake a man can make is to fail to see that marriage has ceased to become a life-long commitment and that emancipated women see men and getting married as a temporary episode, as another notch on their bedpost in pursuit of their female career. The man makes strategic investments in his family. Then, when the family's been destroyed and his strategic investments are lost, he feels unhappy. His hierarchical instinct punishes him for loses his herd.

A woman's strategic happiness lies in assuming the position of a leader's permanent female, receiving food and protection from him on an exclusive basis. A woman can thus only be happy when she lives with a beloved, productive man on territory controlled by him and bears him children. This is the structure produced by the institution of monogamous, life-long patriarchal marriage. In this format for the human community, the chance for the man and the woman to achieve happiness is much greater than in a matriarchal or other unnatural format. This is why it's precisely the patriarchal, monogamous format that became the most widespread variant among all human societies on earth.

A modern, emancipated woman has been deceived by the PR campaign for an “independent,” childless lifestyle focused on the consumption of material goods and tiny pleasures. By setting out on this path, the woman makes a strategic error. And, given the nature of the female hierarchy as I've outlined it in the first chapter, this error is irreversible. So the woman ends up depriving herself of the opportunity to achieve happiness by fulfilling her function as a woman. She can stuff her belly with tasty and abundance food, show off in front of other women, convince herself of her popularity with men, and get a little bit of pleasure. These are the pittance doled out by our most basic animal programming as a reward for minor tactical victories. But happiness will remain forever beyond her reach, because her strategic goal will never be met. Since she can't think strategically, but lives only in the here and now, the average woman can't bring herself to refuse minor pleasures. In the end,

this is the objective cause of her unhappiness. It's extremely hard for her to find a truly strong man worthy of love and respect. The men around her have simply been too weakened by their matriarchal upbringing.

### **Happiness Formed by the Territorial and Construction Programs**

In the animal kingdom, a strong male usually has his own lair and hunting ground, and they make up his primary occupation. If he's got these things, females will find him on their own - there's no need for him to chase after them. As an inheritance from our distant ancestors, our brains come equipped with similar programming. This is why a man's sense of self-esteem, his ability to switch on his leadership programming and attain happiness, is largely dependent on whether or not he has his own place to live and financial independence. This is why most men would prefer owning their own home with at least a little bit of land to living in an apartment. Home ownership corresponds more closely with the template installed in our brains. By the same token, he'll also prefer owning his own business to working for someone else. He'd rather be his own boss and depend only on his own responsibility and initiative. These are the qualities of a leader. Therefore, before committing yourself to a long-term relationship with a woman, it's better to figure out these extremely important goals first.

A lot of people see the meaning of their lives in creation. This is also easily explained - it's precisely by creating material and spiritual culture that man raised himself above the other animals. And this element of human behavior - creating material and spiritual culture - has become fixed in human instincts as strategically important. And our instinct rewards us with feelings of happiness for engaging in what it considers to be strategically important behavior. Ancient humans would never have spent days after day hollowing out a rock and wearing it down with another rock if they hadn't received some joy from this process and a very large dose of pleasure when it was done - for example, the pleasure of making weapons that we as humans aren't born with. In other words, this is the joy of transcending previously limited possibilities. Modern man feels this pleasure when he takes a blade or a machine gun into his hands. By making a crude stone axe, he enhanced his ability to defend his territory and hunt successfully, which in turn meant that his rank in the hierarchy would grow and he would take another step toward becoming the leader. Therefore, the ultimate goal of the construction instinct is still to ascend within the hierarchy. It's the same with the territorial instinct. This is why, if a person is successful in his creative work or his business, but still doesn't have any confirmation of his increased rank in the form of acknowledgment and respect from men and love from women, he's still unhappy. His ultimate goal remains unmet. If he's failed to actualize himself in the biological sense with a complete family and children, his success in creative enterprises will only sharpen his failure to self-actualize. He's instantly faced with the question: "What's the point of it all? Who will I give my resources, skills, and territory to? What good are all my accomplishments if they end with me?" And the man will feel unhappy and diminished. Wealth will only intensify his negative emotions, since all it does is emphasize the contradiction between the quantity of his acquired resources and his reproductive failure. Therefore, happiness in creation is still not enough by itself; it's just one piece of the puzzle. It's strictly a one-sided, strategic goal. Many people manage to combine creative and biological self-actualization by taking a creative approach to raising their children, organizing their family's life, fixing up the house, participating in neighborhood associations, etc.

In the conditions of a matriarchal society, it becomes all the harder to receive a feeling of happiness in the biological direction, so people tend to either work more toward the one-sided happiness of creation or surrender happiness entirely in the name of tiny, but more frequent tactical pleasures. They try to sublimate their biological needs, which only ends up making them either partly or completely unhappy.

The meaning of life lies in self-actualization in both the directions that nature (God) has implanted in our biological species - in the biological and creative directions. The meaning of life also involves doing whatever we can to help other people actualize themselves in this way. Our instinct for mutual assistance within the group or the species (love thy neighbor) is still running - nobody's shut it off yet. Moreover, the smarter, happy people there are around us, the better our own lives will be.

But if we want to get there, the first thing we have to do is live in the real world, and not the illusory one. In other words, we need to understand what happiness is, how to get it, and what obstacles there are in our path to it. And now you know. And this means that your happiness is entirely under your control.

## Strategic Planning for a Man's Life

Anytime you perform some kind of action (it can be in your business or your personal life, it doesn't matter), you need to be sure that the results of this action will make things better than they were before. Otherwise the action is pointless. You need to understand clearly what you're getting into, what you'll get as a result, what you're going to pay, whether your resources are sufficient for it, what the risks are, what the laws are, how likely they are to change, and what precedents there are (the experience of other people in similar situations). And, of course, you need to have a precise financial plan for what to do in the event of circumstances outside your control. And, needless to say, you need to have an official contract with your partner that's been drawn up and analyzed by your lawyer.

For example, let's say you get a girlfriend. Do you know what her plans are? She does them, you know. A woman always plans out her relationships in advance. You've still got our pants on, and she's already concocted a whole fantasy about how to introduce you to her mother, when the wedding will be, who your children will be when they grow up, what kind of house you'll have together, and how much she can get out of you in the divorce. You didn't think she just wanted sex and love without any responsibilities, did you? Or that she just wanted to squeeze some money out of you? Or that she just needs a place to live, and it's easier to live with you for free than to rent her own apartment? Or that she's a week pregnant and is looking for someone to convince he's her baby's daddy? What do you know about her, and what are your own plans? What do you want in a day? A week? A month? A year? Twenty years?

Or let's say you're getting ready to get married. Are you sure your life will be better after the wedding? Are you sure that, now that she has the legal opportunity to rob you, your wife won't do it? Have you done everything you can to protect yourself and your investments in your family? Are you sure that, after the wedding, you're going to have the unlimited and excellent sex you need? Do you know which kind of marriage you want? A traditional marriage? But are you ready to be responsible within the male sphere of competence? A partnership marriage? But are you ready to be a partner yourself and respect your partner's interests? A parasitic marriage? But are you ready to play host to a parasite? Are you sure that you're in a position to establish a relationship with this woman, that is, are you certain you'll be the one to establish the terms of the relationship? Have you drawn up a pre-nup with terms that are in your best interests? Or maybe you just have your head in the sand like an ostrich and aren't thinking about anything? Do you really think everything will just work out on its own without your participation? Take a look around you, try to figure out what percentage of the men you know are satisfied with their lives and their marriages. And think about why. Think with your head, not with your heart or your dick. Don't do something because you're "supposed to" or because you "want to;" do it because it's "what's best for you." You don't owe a woman a damn thing unless she owes you something too. In a relationship, debts can only be mutual. But this is all tactics.

Your strategic plan should be based on an understanding of what happiness is and what the meaning of life is. The strategic goal of a man's life is to be happy, i.e. to attain self-actualization in every direction, both creative and biological. So you need to have your own lair – your house. You need to have your own hunting ground – an occupation that brings in a decent income and provides you with the joy of creative self-actualization. And you need your own pack – you need to be the responsible leader of a family hierarchy.

But in order to make sure he has enough time and resources, a man needs to be able to independently plan his life, controlling and managing his resources without letting them slip through his fingers. And he needs to pick a woman to be his partner who will be oriented toward strategic collaboration with him, and not parasitize him or try to get at his resources. This is especially important in a matriarchal society with an anti-male legal system.

Moreover, it's also important to remember that religion is currently weak. It can't cope with its own functions. Traditions are also no longer followed. This means that there's nothing to ensure that your woman's instincts will continue to correspond to your family's objective needs. On the contrary, an entire army of professional psychologists in service to feminism and consumer culture will provoke her to egoistic behavior and try to break you up. As a result, there's an excellent chance that you will, in fact, eventually break up. Therefore, first of all, think long and hard about whether you really need an official marriage. Second, think about whether you're ready to assume the function of the professional clergy, i.e. keeping female instinct in the love

cycle, that is, in a state of love and respect for you. Third, think about whether you're ready to face the prospect of failure and the losses that could result, and whether you've done everything you can to make sure those losses will be minimal.

Let me put it as simply as possible. Build your life according to the following scheme: "A leader has his own lair and territory. And all his game is HIS. If a female and children live in his lair and eat his game, she and the children will live according to HIS rules." Otherwise everything will collapse. Or you can pick this scheme: "A male and a female build a lair together, and they both drag game back to their lair and will raise their young together." But no matter what you do, avoid the scheme: "A low-ranking male drags game back to a female's lair. And if she's not satisfied with him, she'll send him packing."

### Sex as a Commodity

How can we relate to sex other than as a commodity purchased by a man? First of all, ignore the way the topic of sex has been overwrought and overcooked by women and the media. It's just a natural physiological need, just like eating, sleeping, and going to the bathroom. There's no need to run a PR campaign or get all worked up about something so simple. Just think about sex as a natural psycho-physiological form of interaction between a man and a woman who care about each other. It's a means for strengthening a relationship and developing love within a couple. Which is the whole point of it in the first place. By the way, there's a trap door here. Matriarchal culture is trying to hang all the work and all the responsibility for sex on the man. This includes the female orgasm: "*There are no frigid women, just men who don't know what they're doing,*" we read in books about sex. What kind of nonsensical gibberish is this? Let's take a closer look.

On the one hand, an orgasm, just like any other kind of pleasure, is a reward our instinctual programming gives us for correctly fulfilling an action it desires. For a male, it's a reward for mating with a female. For a female, it's a reward for mating with the right male. However, the criteria for correctness are many and varied, and the modern world isn't the same as the prehistoric world. So it follows that the female orgasm is an unstable thing.

A full-on, "bright" female orgasm is a psycho-physiological reaction whose goal is to increase the chance of conception precisely from an alpha-male, a leader. A woman will only experience it with a beloved man. During a full orgasm, the uterus acts like a pump and sucks sperm into it. In a state of nature (and right now, too), a female *homo sapiens* will mate not just with the alpha for love, but also with gammas, and sometimes even with omegas, either for food or unwillingly. In these cases she can also have an orgasm, but not a bright one. And the uterus doesn't suck in sperm, since the female's just trying to earn a meal. This reduces the chance of conception from males who aren't considered elite from the perspective of the female's instinct. Therefore, a low-ranking male can dig around in there all he wants, but the woman's emotional reaction to a leader, i.e. a full orgasm, just isn't going to happen. Even if the female gets some physical pleasure from it. You can't replace quality with quantity. But if an alpha, whether condescendingly or playfully, makes even a half-hearted go at it (and there's no other way he can exert himself here, since alphas don't serve anyone else, but only get served by others), then the woman will be happy. But the main thing to keep in mind is that the leader never forgets about his own pleasure.

Therefore, the "right" man doesn't really try that hard when he's in bed with a woman. He leaves the bulk of the initiative to her. If the woman sees that the man's trying too hard, she'll subconsciously jump to the conclusion that he's trying his best to hang on to her. To serve her. And that he only wants to hang on to her because he's of no interest to other women, so if she leaves, he'll have no one else to screw. And, needless to say, if he's not popular with women, that means he's an LR. An experienced man understands that a woman's arousal and orgasm don't depend as much on his technical know-how as her emotional attunement, i.e. to degree to which her female instinct acknowledges his genes as elite. It's a lot easier to correctly conduct the courting ritual and lead a woman to the point of sex than it is to break records in some kind of sexual marathon. It's easier to convince her instinct that you're genetically worthy. If you really want to do something nice or exotic for a woman in bed, you need to do it in such a way that it doesn't look even remotely like service or a sacrifice. Women look down on men who go out of their way to serve them in bed, and they'll frequently try to discourage a man from trying too hard: "relax, we're not trying to break any records, let me do you."

Moreover, the most basic female method for psychologically undermining a man is to give him guilt and inferiority complexes. If a woman puts all the burden of the orgasm on a man, she can easily nurture these complexes in him, undermine him, demoralize him, and make him her doormat. And she'll immediately fall out of love with him and run off to find a stronger man. It's a standard situation we see all over the place among real married couples. Instead of love, people develop feelings of fear and revulsion about sex. Instead of uniting a man and a woman and strengthening the family, matriarchal society is tearing sex down. Who does this help?

By the way, this is why some traditional cultures place the responsibility for both the woman's orgasm and the man's erection squarely on the woman's shoulders. And this is profoundly logical.

### **How to Relate to Women**

It might be a good idea to figure out exactly where you stand when it comes to women in general. Some men worship them. Some despise them. Some hate them. Some are scared of them. But most men are just confused and have no idea what to think. So who's right?

Let try to take a logical approach and call things by their right names. And don't worry about being accused of chauvinism. First of all, it's just the two of us. And second, life has now becomes so saturated with female chauvinism that we simply have to add a little of the male variety. The partners in a male-female relationship two creatures with different anatomies, physiologies, psychologies, and interests, but they're connect by sexual attraction. Moreover, the woman is an emotional creature. She's run by instinct, and her emotions are much more powerful than her intellect. Her actions are frequently illogical or even absurd. In other words, a woman cannot control her own behavior. She doesn't have the ability to think in terms of long logical chains. She has weak brain. As I said before, this is why there are almost no women among Nobel laureates for physics, and why word chess championships have separate competitions for men and women. Moreover, a modern, emancipated woman, by not fulfilling her reproductive function (by having less than three children), is not a fully realized female. She's also active on the labor market, in business, and in other fields of activity where she competes with men. If she has two or fewer children, a woman has too much free time and energy, and she uses it to exert psychological pressure on her man. And, in a matriarchal society, she has the opportunity to rob him blind and live like a queen without his day-to-day support. This is why an emancipated woman is more dangerous than one with three or more children. There was a special term during the cold war: "potential enemy." This is a subject who still isn't an enemy, but who could begin to display aggressive action at any moment. Are soon as they start to show their teeth, they become an enemy, but for now you can still work together with them on a mutually beneficial basis. This can be true of a partner, but never of a friend. And if an emancipated woman is waging the "war of the sexes," i.e. fighting to take resources and rights away from a man, then in this case she becomes the man's enemy. And we shouldn't be afraid of this word – she's the enemy. Therefore, your most important task is to develop a system for guaranteeing your financial and emotional security when working together with a potential enemy. And you should always be prepared for the possibility of treachery and aggressive action on her part. In other words, sleep with one eye open and keep your wits about you. First of all, remember that we live in a matriarchal society with an anti-male legal system. And every year it's becoming more and more anti-male. So, when you sign your marriage certificate, you're allowing the matriarchal state to become a third wheel. And you need to think long and hard about whether you want an anti-male, matriarchal legal system to climb into bed with you and your wife. A woman who really loves and respects her man won't be overly concerned about whether she has a legal advantage over him or not. She's not planning to blackmail and rob him, so the advantage is useless to her. On the other hand, a woman who's planning for events to develop in this way will insist on a legal marriage and won't rest until she's got her hands on your real estate, your accounts, and your property. If a woman starts to routinely talk about marriage, your money, or your house – think about whether this is something you want, and talk to a male lawyer. And don't forget that about 10-20% of husbands are, in their naiveté, providing for children who have no genetic relation to them.

By the way, a word about emotional safety: it's very important. I once somehow ended up with a diary entry a lady wrote about her rich ex. She was furious because the "swine," as she called him, had her "tailed" via his connections and found out that she was spending time with another man while on vacation. So he ended their relationship. "The bastard," she called him... my point right now isn't that the one who acted like a swinish

bastard wasn't him, but her, by trying to string multiple men along at the same time; my point is the man was acting entirely correctly. He didn't just blindly trust the woman; he tested her, took control of her behavior. He didn't allow himself to lose control over the situation. He was taking care of his emotional security. After all, if he had trusted her, got attached, and fell in love, then this woman in "gold-digger mode" would have, without a doubt, betrayed him and screwed him over. She would have hurt him. She might even have cost him his career. A business, including the fates of all its employees and their families, depends on the emotional stability of its boss. This is an enormous responsibility.

Emotional security means security in your personal life. Security for your health. Financial security. Security for the people you're responsible for – your relatives, your business partners, and your employees. And all of this is directly connected with the reliability and adequacy of your sexual partner. The higher your stakes in the "game of life," the more you're obligated to treat your sexual partner as part of your business. You're obligated to count your money, collect information, make plans, and take control of the situation. It's a question of responsibility and self-respect.

Ever since I read that diary entry, the word "bastard" has, as far as I'm concerned, become the highest compliment a man can receive. It refers to a man who knows how to live according to his own interests.

And don't listen to manipulative female fairy tales like: "whoever sees a woman for what she is, loses a lot." A person doesn't lose the ability to enjoy the taste of food or wine just because he knows how it's made. On the contrary, it'll only make his palate more refined, and he won't make a mistake in selecting a quality product. It's the same with women. The better you understand their behavior, the safer and more fun it is to play with them. A man who has a real understanding of male-female relationships is like a businessman who knows finances, management, and business law. He can easily orient himself in the business world and attain lots of success and wealth. On the other hand, a man who doesn't understand the nature of male-female relationships is like an illiterate dishwasher who suddenly decides to start his own business. He's practically guaranteed to lose his shirt. He'll make poorly considered decisions, get scammed and robbed by his own employees and partners, and end up with a devastating audit.

So, how should you relate to a concrete woman in a concrete situation? Well, it all depends on the concrete situation. How far her domination has gone. How cruel she is. Whether your pain threshold's been exceeded. Sometimes, it might be better to get divorced and find yourself a more suitable mate. Sometimes, you might be able to haggle a little, and, by arming yourself with patience, gradually change your relationship. Sometimes (for example, if you can't bear to abandon your children), you can change how you think about your relationship with the woman. Stop taking your relationship so seriously and expecting the impossible from a dominant woman – friendship, support, kindness, reliability, and other mythological characteristics. To put it simply, stop "going full steam." Start treating the woman like a kind of pet, a domestic animal that has little in common with a man. Which is what she really is. For example, if you get a dog, you know that it's going to shed, stink, and have to be fed, walked, and trained. You don't expect it to start drinking beer and talking football with you. And, most importantly, you don't suffer because of it. "She's a woman, what do you expect," said our grandparents, and they were absolutely right.

Should you respect a woman? First of all, let's try to define the word "respect." To be exact, respect is just an instinctive acknowledgement of someone's status, that is, their position within the group hierarchy. For example, if you relate to your boss with a feeling of "respect," this means that your hierarchical instinct acknowledges his right to tell you what to do; it considers his decisions correct. By respecting him, you place your boss either above you or on an equal footing with you in the hierarchy. People with a poorly developed intellect who live in the conditions of a primitive social hierarchy only apply purely animal criteria for respect: "he's afraid of me, so that means he respects me." These people respect only strength and the refusal to back down. However, in civilized types of hierarchies, people are taught to respect other elements of the hierarchy, such as the law, the court, the police, bureaucrats, etc. In other words, the individual comes to accept the existence of a concrete hierarchical structure. A liberal society will also cultivate respect for man in general. Within the structure of high-tech production, a boss might be instilled with a sense of respect for a subordinate who's highly qualified and therefore valuable to the production process. In a traditional society, respect goes to a man who has a family. A matriarchal society cultivates a universal respect for women as such and a lack of respect for men in general.



It's precisely in the respect for women that our matriarchal society has cooked up that the trap is concealed. Freud realized that respect for a woman could lead to psychosomatic impotence. This is no coincidence. By acknowledging women as either equal to or higher than him in the hierarchy, a man positions himself as a mid- or low-ranking male. And, according to nature, low-ranking men aren't supposed to reproduce. A weak man's genetic line isn't supposed to continue. This is why LR's opportunities to reproduce are blocked at every turn. A woman doesn't want an LR, she just uses him. And the LR himself is sexually limited; his potency is reduced. And a dominant female is sexually unattractive to a man. So several mechanisms are launched simultaneously that reduce the chances for mating. This is why sex tourism has become so popular. Civilized women prefer to travel to Arab countries and sleep with men who despise them. But their male compatriots, who were raised in a spirit of respect for women, either remain alone with their respect or travel to Thailand to sleep with women who have no respect for them.

Generally speaking, it's up to you - but if you ask me, it's a lot better to desire and love women than to respect them. But it's important to remember that there are different kinds of love. A number of different emotional states all get called by the same name of "love." You can love a woman as a higher being - this is a love characterized by servitude, worship, and respect, the love of an LR. So-called platonic love belongs to this category of emotions. It's also the kind of love that kills the libido. You can also love a woman as a lower being - this is a love characterized by care, control, and instruction given with a gently condescending attitude, the love of the leader. Unlike the first, it intensifies the libido. One of my girlfriends, who had a body like a model, used to complain that decent men were much more likely to proclaim their respect for her than their love. They were afraid to approach her and show initiative in a relationship. Either that, or they would love her from afar, sighing and never daring to get closer. If she showed initiative on her own, these men would get scared and run off. The only guys who ever showed her any initiative were drunken rejects who would come up and hit on her in an arrogant, unceremonious way. She was really upset about this.

The only way a woman can be acknowledged as having a place in the male hierarchy (i.e. be respected as an emancipated woman) is if she occupies that position according to male criteria, that is, if she earns it through real success in business or professional activity. And not because she ruined her husband in a divorce, or makes goo-goo eyes at her supervisor, or sleeps with the boss, or got hired thanks to quotas established by the feminist legal system. Acknowledging a woman's place in the female hierarchy (respecting a woman who has her husband's children and provides him with a fallback position) is fine - no problem. But again, this is only if she successfully fulfills the female responsibilities, i.e. if the house and the kids are in good shape and her man's happy. This kind of respect for a woman as a mother and the keeper of the domestic hearth is the one disseminated and upheld in traditional cultures everywhere on earth. You have to have a reason to respect someone, although you can love someone in spite of common sense or whether they really deserve it. However, it doesn't follow from all of this that you should turn your nose up at women and degrade them for no reason. On the contrary, be polite and reserved, and put them in their place only when absolutely necessary, and only if the woman is the first one to cross the line. Moreover, "love thy neighbor" is still in effect, i.e. our altruistic instincts. So love women as females and as members of your community, but respect a woman only if she really deserves it, if she's really a top-notch professional or a good mother. Respect your wife for raising your children and making a great pot of chili, or for being a wildcat in the sack. But it's a mistake to respect women as such. And really, why should you respect some dolled-up tramp, dreaming of selling limited access to her artificially tanned, perfume-saturated carcass? It's ridiculous!

If you're single, young, and have a hard time meeting girls, just learn from the pick-up artists. These are younger guys who intentionally learn to imitate the behavior of high-ranking males in their interactions with women. And it works. All the complexes that their matriarchal upbringing has given them fade away, and they get the hang of talking to girls, at least during the initial getting-to-know-you period. Movements of this type arise immediately whenever the matriarchal distortion appears in society or its upper layers. The fundamentals of ancient pick-up tactics were spelled out by Ovid in his *Ars Amatoria* ("The Art of Love"). Nowadays you can acquaint yourself with modern pick-up methods through a variety of websites, seminars, and countless books. Pick-up artists are trying to break into the female holy of holies - control over mating. And most women hate them and slander them for it. It makes sense. But you don't need to worry about this. Just learn about it and do whatever you think is best.

## How to Interact with a Woman

First of all, you have to remember that a woman can, in principle, never be a man's equal. They're another kind of creature altogether. A woman sees a man as a part of her surrounding environment, part of the outside world. So she doesn't feel any responsibility to him. A woman lives instinctually. She's run by her emotions, even when they lead her to do what's worst for you, your relationship, and her. She can't think in strategic terms, so she'll destroy a relationship with her actions even if what she really wants is to preserve it. You can't come to an understanding with women, because they don't think the way we do and can't reckon with other people's interests. Simply put, your average woman is only partially responsible for her own actions. She's an animal to a much greater degree than a man is. Very rare exceptions can be found among extremely intelligent women and women who have been raised in the cultural/religious tradition of a traditional culture. Therefore, you can interact successfully with a woman only if you understand this about her. Don't expect the impossible from her, and take control of the relationship yourself. You need to help her come to grips with her animal nature and keep her in the "love cycle." If religion and the government are powerless to control women's instincts, there's only one way out – they have to be controlled by a man. By the more rational being. There's just no one else who can do it. How can this be accomplished on a day-to-day basis?

First of all, never take anything a woman says too seriously. This is a stupid mistake. Her speech is comprised primarily of manipulative constructions and provocative elements. So reacting to what she says amounts to taking the bait and allowing yourself to be manipulated. The only exceptions are purely informational phrases like, "dinner's ready," "I've got my period," "the electric bill came," etc. A smart man won't react to the manipulative part of a woman's speech, but he *will* secretly follow her hidden motives and figure out exactly what she's trying to accomplish with her manipulations. He watches what she does and ignores how she explains it. He's not interested in conversation, only in the results of the woman's actions - for example, whether they make things better for himself and his children. And he keeps track of which programs and instincts are controlling the woman at any given moment.

It's a law of nature: a female will make a weak male submit and provide for her and the children she's already had from an elite inseminator. But if the male puts up a worthy opposition to this process, then that means he must be the elite inseminator himself. Because he's strong. It's all basic biology. The problem is that, in a modern matriarchal society, men are raised in a spirit of respect for women – in other words, they're *a priori* too weak to stand up to them. They're oriented toward fulfilling their whims, not toward confronting them and asserting themselves, so they give away too much. And a woman has no trouble breaking them in half. This is why it's so hard for a woman to find a man she can love – everywhere you look, they're all doormats. And a man has a hard time finding a woman with enough brains not to exceed his pain threshold with her manipulations. Therefore, the main trap isn't in nature, but in the matriarchal relationship scheme. How can we avoid these problems?

If a man and a woman in the modern world want to be happy as a heterosexual couple, they both have to intentionally establish their relationship hierarchy along patriarchal lines. Sure, they can throw in a healthy dose of partnership, and even make a show of it if they want to. But the man nevertheless has to be noticeably higher in the family hierarchy. Otherwise the sexual and hierarchical instincts of the woman, the children, and the man himself will get misdirected. And this will lead to all the different relationship problems I've already described in previous chapters.

It's therefore the woman's responsibility to fight her instinctive, animal urge to dominate. And this means that manipulation, provocation, rhetoric, and all the other instruments of female domination have to be excised from her conversation with her man. The man, for his part, has to know the nature of his relationship. He has to be familiar with the whole arsenal of female techniques so he can react to them condescendingly and with a sense of humor while nipping any psychological attacks in the bud. Now, this isn't to say he should look down his nose at his woman, bellow at her, or hit her. This will only show his weakness. Excessive aggression is a sign of fear, not of strength. All he needs to do is make a cutting remark, something like, "yeah, ok, I know all about your female mind games." There are a million different ways to respond to female manipulations and provocations. You've got to see it as a game, at least until the woman crosses the line. Needless to say, the only

person who can draw this line in the sand is the man, and he does it on the basis of common sense and an awareness of his own pain threshold. But once a woman's crossed the line, the man is obligated to put her in her place. But it's best to do it without breaking the law. Supervising the family hierarchy is just as elementary an aspect of a man's day-to-day responsibilities as shaving. But let me repeat: you need to position yourself as the leader of the hierarchy in the playful manner of a strong male, and not in the aggressive manner of a weak male. The ability to confidently and naturally turn the beginnings of a conflict into a light, playful ritual is what is usually referred to as "having a sense of humor." It's a leadership trait. But rage and excessive aggression are the traits of a weak man; they're a testament to his fear and lack of self-confidence. This is why women value confident men with a sense of humor and avoid men who are angry or excessively aggressive.

And, of course, sexual rejection should be seen as precisely what it is – a deeply offensive refusal to acknowledge a man's status in the family hierarchy. If we consider ourselves people, then sex is a kind of interaction. So refusing to have sex with your man is the same as refusing to interact with him, i.e. the equivalent of direct conflict. If we go back to our animal comparison, then sexual rejection speaks to the inadequacy of a female who can't clearly distinguish a male's rank. A leader has unlimited rights to sex – this is the basis of male-female relationships. If there's some objective reason why traditional sex is impossible, then (we live in the 21<sup>st</sup> century; we're way past snobbishness or squeamishness about these things) the woman still has hands, lips, and a tongue. There's no question of excuses here. A woman's family should be far more important to her than a headache, or being sleepy, or tired, or busy, or all of these at once. Now, I'm not in any way advocating spousal rape here. We've got no choice but to abide by the anti-male legal system. It's a lot easier and safer to drive a woman away than to insist on sex. Regardless, an adequate man isn't about to insist on having sex with a woman with a 102-degree fever, or who's literally falling over from exhaustion. A wise leader knows the difference between overwhelming circumstances and sabotage. He also knows how to draw correct conclusions from a woman's behavior and act accordingly. For example, he knows to break up with a woman who puts her own caprice above the good of her family. And really, think about it – what does a leader need with a woman who forces him to jerk off in the bathroom like a teenager?

The most important thing is that the man has to be a genuine, responsible leader, and not just a nominal one. His voice is decisive. His word is final. In other words, he's obligated to treat his pack responsibly, to control it and organize its life. Raising children. Acquiring and distributing resources. It's unacceptable to be just a breadwinner, laying all the functions of decision-making on a woman, i.e. the party least suited to it. The leader makes his own decisions. The other members of the hierarchy have only an advisory vote. The leader can sometimes delegate the right to make a decision, but he still reserves the right to cancel that decision if he sees fit.

However, this isn't to say that a man has the right to conduct an ignorant dictatorship on the principle of: "right or wrong, what I say goes." If the woman is skilled and competent in some aspect of life, then there's no reason to control her activity in that sphere. For example, there's no reason at all to control a woman's lasagna recipe if it's already delicious. That would be stupid.

If your woman is intelligent, adequate, competent, and capable of a partnership-type relationship, then, generally speaking, all you need is a purely formal, hands-off version of the traditional hierarchy. For example, say your friend calls and invites you and your wife to come over for a barbecue. You need to talk to your wife about this and make a decision. You could say, "Honey, Mike invited us over for lunch. What should I tell him?" Or you could say, "Honey, you don't have any plans for Saturday, do you? Okay, good, then we're going to Mike's for lunch." Technically speaking, both versions are the same. But in the first example, you left the formal decision-making process up to your wife. Her female instinct will react to you as an LR. And she'll get mad. In the second case, you made the formal decision by yourself. Her female instinct will react to you as a leader. And she'll feel happy. And it's totally unacceptable to ask questions like, "do you mind if I kiss you?" or "can we have sex tonight?" Generally speaking, the fewer unnecessary questions, the better. All that extra questions will do is sew doubts in the woman's mind about her security and about her man. But you still need to make sure she has an advisory vote – you don't want to smother her completely. A leader will sense this balance in a relationship and know how to easily maintain it.

Moreover, you always have to remember that the most important thing to an HR is control over his hunting-ground, his territory. As long as he has some kind of hunting-ground, some female or other is bound to

wander into it. And if it's a nice spot, he'll be fighting them off with a stick. Then he can pick the best one. Therefore, no matter how they might advertise sex as a hot commodity in the modern world, no matter how much they might try to get you to earn it or buy it, don't be taken in by this idiocy. The only males who buy sex or trade their last bit of game for it are MR's and LR's. Focus first and foremost on your career, your business, your property, your health, your fitness, and your education, and women will run to you of their own accord. You'll have more than you can handle. And then you'll have the best chance of finding one of who's kind, smart, selfless, and capable of love, i.e. the one worthy of a strong and intelligent man. And you'll present her with the exclusive right to assume a privileged position next to the leader in his own territory – right next to you.

### **How to Pick a Woman**

Which woman's the one for you, and which should you avoid? Let's consider it.

First of all, this situation is essentially the same as basic business etiquette: begin by finding out everything you can about the woman who's entering your life. This is important if you want to conserve your time, effort, and resources – not to mention your security. You should know the following thing about a woman:

- her current situation with any male admirers;
- the history of her previous relationships and marriages;
- her short-term and long-term plans for the future;
- her bad habits, drug use and/or dependence;
- the general state of her health and HIV-status;
- any history of mental illness;
- whether she's epileptic or schizophrenic;
- whether she's ever been convicted of a crime;
- her relationships with her family and relatives; her own family situation;
- her credit history, property, and bank balance;
- her education, profession, and career.

And this is nothing to be embarrassed about. It's in your best interests. And doing what's in your best interests is your responsibility. And don't get it mixed up. You need to make sure everything's crystal clear, i.e. get reliable information; don't just believe whatever touching yarns she might spin you herself. These are totally different things.

Furthermore, you need to keep in mind that the human female is open to finding love with a leader until she's about 23 years old. After 30 she enters biological old age, with all the consequences it brings. Generally speaking, women raised by single mothers without a father around are no good for establishing long-term relationships. The same goes for girls who grew up with hen-pecked, submissive fathers. These women don't have an adequate family scenario. Women who worry too much about their appearance are suspicious, especially if they wear very high heels. They're willing to make themselves extremely uncomfortable in order to advertise their bodies. In other words, they smack of amateur prostitution. You should be especially careful with divorced women. Why did their family fall apart? If she cheated on her husband, she'll cheat on you, too. If her husband cheated on her, what wasn't he getting from the marriage? Could it be sex? If she picked a dud, that means she like bad boys. And why should a woman who likes bad boys be interested in a good man? There's a lot of questions you'll get answers too only when it's too late. You should also never consider a "divorcee with a ready-made family" to be a serious candidate for a long-term relationship. A woman like that will see you as nothing more than a breadwinner who can feed her kids. So don't waste your time on her. No matter what advertising campaigns they might aim at you during the early part of the relationship, they're guaranteed to be dominant, mid-ranking females.

I'll remind you about the nature of the dominant female's "love" in a matriarchal society. It goes like this: "I am a woman in love / And I do anything / To get you into my world / And hold you within" (Barbara Streisand, "Woman in Love"). She's not interested in entering a man's world and becoming part of it, but only the other way around.

This kind of "love" is usually accompanied by an undertaking that goes by the name of "changing a man." Translated from women's language, this means undermining a man, breaking him, and cutting him off from

everything he loves. From his relaxation, his free time, his friends, his hobby. And taking up all of his newly available time and attention with love for the woman herself. This means depriving the man of his life and his personality, then taking the pathetic, useless, broken, spineless creature that remains and making him do nothing but fulfill her female whims. Until he drops dead from stress or exhaustion, or hits the bottle out of despair when he realizes the pointlessness of his existence. Is this what you want for yourself?

Obviously every strong, adequate man wants to avoid this scenario. A genuinely loving woman wants a leader to love, not a weakling to dominate. She'll try to enter a man's life on her own, becoming his like-minded partner in a serious way and for a long time. In an extreme case, if she's professionally successful, she'll try to establish a collaborative relationship on an equal footing. But she'll never try to worm her way into your trust and attack you from the rear.

How can you tell a woman who's looking for love from one looking to dominate? Unfortunately, CVS doesn't sell "skank tests" like they do pregnancy tests. All you can do is rely on your own experience and common sense.

Just for the sake of an example, I can provide you with a few of the easiest ways to tell these women apart. They're based on the good old rule of "a spy will give himself away with spontaneous reactions and insignificant details." In the first place, women who are looking for love and women who are looking to dominate think about their relationship with a man in different ways.

Try to tell them your own basic requirements for a decent partner, then watch their immediate reactions. Tell them casually, in passing, that, in your opinion, a woman:

1. Should be an excellent and perpetually willing lover.
2. Should have a great body, since sloppy looks are a sign of disrespect for her partner.
3. Should know how to cook delicious and healthy meals.
4. Should be supportive, friendly, and positive.
5. Should be erudite enough to have an interesting conversation with a man.
6. Should be hard-working, high-spirited, and lively.
7. Should be faithful, decent, and honest.
8. Should never lower herself to manipulation in a relationship.
9. Should love children and know how to raise them.
10. Should love her man.
11. Should economically and efficiently set up the family budget.
12. Should earn a living independently and be a real professional. Or be the right hand in her man's business. As long as they've got less than three children.

The key word here is "should." You're finding out whether this woman is able to accept any responsibilities in principle. A woman looking for love and a partner for a relationship will find these requirements reasonable and will agree. Maybe she'll have a proviso or two. That's fine. However, a woman who's looking for someone to dominate and parasitize will make a face, look indignant, and cock her own arrow at you, something like:

*"A woman doesn't owe anything to anyone.*

*"All a woman has to do is keep a man interested and make him want to fight for her approval. Her qualities, like her skills, habits, and physical traits, shouldn't matter at all."*

The problem here is that, in real life, a woman can just spew lies at you and try to butter you up. So don't just take her word for it, but observe how she acts. Especially when it comes to the little stuff. If a woman tries to help you with something, give you something, or open a door for you - that's a good sign. The desire to be helpful is a quality of the leader's woman. But don't abuse this, and don't let it go to your head. You should appreciate this kind of woman.

A dominant woman will give herself away with tiny, yet clear signs of disrespect for the man she's hunting for, as well as for men in general. She's running late, but didn't call and apologize first. She talks disrespectfully about her ex or her father. Her girlfriend got into a fight with her husband because she cheated on him, and she takes her girlfriend's side.

We know that, in the modern matriarchal world, women interested in love and partnership are few and far between. There just aren't enough for everyone. But don't worry. With enough experience, you might be able

to re-educate a young woman who's been spoiled and thrown for a loop by matriarchal propaganda and make her adequate. But not with your fists, of course. The most important thing is for you to be strong, successful, and confident. You can assume that the woman will resist at first, since working is a lot harder than being a parasite. But if she loves you, and you're firm and consistent, success will definitely be a possibility. When she's next to a strong, intelligent man, your average woman can sometimes grow some brains.

The less experience at domination the woman has, the easier it'll be to put her brain in order. This is why so many men prefer to marry women who are significantly younger than they are. It also helps if the woman's brain is already in order, that is, if she was brought up not in the culture of gold-digging and the sexual marketplace, but in a decent family with clearly delineated gender-roles. It's even better if she's from a culture with traditional values and was raised in a spirit of respect for men. But the thing of all is if she had a religious upbringing. In this case, you'll need to do your best to protect her from the influence of matriarchal propaganda, even to the point of throwing the TV in the dumpster and keeping women who might be a bad influence on her out of the house.

But if you do your best and still don't manage to re-educate her, well, too bad. Treating this kind of woman as a serious potential partner would just be a waste. Use her for some safe sex, then dump her without a second thought. Otherwise you'll end up letting a ravenous, irresponsible parasite weigh you down for the rest of your natural life. And she'll oppress you and milk you until you drop dead from a heart attack or go bankrupt. Is that what you want? Pick a woman who won't declare war on you and attack you from the rear. On the contrary, she should be your reliable and comfortable rear guard in your war with the aggressive outside world. Pick a woman who'll be worthy of the highest honor – the title of the leader's woman. Your woman.

### **Afterword**

And so, dear reader, you've come to the end of the book. You now know how to control your life, your happiness, and your women. Maybe this ability won't come right away. It'll take some time for your brain to re-tune your instincts and alter your habits. Or maybe you're feeling unsettled. You're in a state of shock. That's normal. Just don't let it bother you. You've just started to change, that's all. But one day, you'll notice clearly and distinctly that everything around you just isn't the way it used to be. You're acting differently, and your relationships with women are different. And women have suddenly become much more interested in you. When that happens, read this book again. The changes will start to become permanent. By reading this book, you've already become stronger and more effective. Your actions will now be better thought-out and more rational. You won't make stupid mistakes in your relationships. You'll be able to correctly establish a relationship with a woman because you now know the principles it's based on. And, if they're still slumbering, your leadership instincts will switch on. And this means that the woman beside you will be happier. Good luck in the real world!

One last thing: thanks to this book, the scales have fallen from your eyes. You still haven't gotten used to your new state, so it's not in your best interests to let women know you've got your sight back. They'll decide you're dangerous and slap you with a negative image. So, don't try to discuss any of this with them. Just observe their behavior and learn to see their games. But it *is* in your best interests to help other men get their sight back. Form a group of sighted men in the land of the blind, an oasis of reason in a world gone mad.