

A Springless Autumn

2nd Edition

John Young

November 19, 2021

Copyright 2012, 2021 by European Americans United

Contents

1	Forward to the 2nd Edition	5
2	The Problem	9
3	Economic Causation	17
3.1	Tax Policy	18
3.2	Cost of Living	20
4	Debt Slavery	33
4.1	Finance Capitalism	33
4.2	Debt and Natality	36
5	Employeeism and Natality	43
5.1	Employer Expectations	44
5.2	Employeeism as a Novel Condition	46
5.3	Work Hours and Economic Insecurity Versus Natality	49
6	Materialist and Consumerist Causation	55
6.1	The New Mercantile Value System	56
6.2	A Psycho-Spiritual Illness	58
7	Radical Feminism	67
7.1	Modern Feminism	72
7.2	False History	74

Contents

7.3	Unfairness Leads to Poisoning	84
7.4	The Unprecedented Power of Housewives . .	87
7.5	The Sexual Harassment Industry	91
7.6	Denying College for Men	95
7.7	Deliberate Destruction of Marriage	99
7.8	The Marriage Strike	103
7.9	All Agenda, No Principles	106
7.10	Spousal Abuse: The Reality	109
8	Unattractive and Unsuitable	113
8.1	Get Fit	114
8.2	Important Appearance Factors	115
8.3	Unrealistic Expectations	116
8.4	Productive Steady Work	118
8.5	Video Sites and Women	118
8.6	Dating Apps	119
9	Solutions	123
9.1	Dealing with Taxes	125
9.2	Tax Change Advocacy	129
9.3	Family Finance	132
9.4	Rebuild the Extended Family	135
9.5	Managing Economic Expectations	137
9.6	Be Kind to the Childless, But Change the Values	138
9.7	Immigration and Offshoring	139
9.8	Increasing Effective Income	141
9.9	Women's Responsibility to Repudiate Femi- nism	145
9.10	It's Up to You	148
10	Afterward	149

1 Forward to the 2nd Edition

I'll discuss European Americans United in more detail in the Afterward. Germane to the Forward is that one of our missions is to "support and advance the two-parent European-American family." The reality is that we do not sit at the nexus points of power in this society, which lie in the organized media, institutional academia, major social media, permanent bureaucracies, finance houses and the like. Instead, we are sitting outside of them, which means our ability to accomplish that mission cannot use the means that people typically associate with power. We cannot propagandize people via 24x7 media, we cannot selectively decide what people see – or don't see – in their social media feeds. We cannot decide who gets, or doesn't get, government grants for NGOs. We can't decide which organizations do or do not get funding. We don't choose curriculum materials for government schools.

But does that mean we are powerless? Absolutely not. In any society, at any given point in time, the amount of power is finite, which means that power exercised by any institution that goes against its dominant forces will come at their expense. As our society was being overtaken, the power exercised by media and government schools weakened the

1 Forward to the 2nd Edition

power of families and churches, and the power exercised by regulators and hidden bankers weakened civic organizations and extended families. But a lot of that power transfer occurred because people were unaware of what was going on, or that they were being manipulated at all, what the effects were going to be, and how to counteract them.

You, as an individual, are an institution. And even though you are small, you have power. And the power you keep for yourself is power that Apostles of Epic Evil do not have. Your family and extended families are also institutions, and these institutions can increase in power through self-conscious action, and thereby work symbiotically with their constituent individuals to provide more power yet. Home schooling, your local church and even EAU are likewise institutions. Though these institutions lack the imprint of acceptance of our enemies, something establishment Republicans seem to crave, they are nevertheless legitimate and to the extent we serve the purposes for which we are created, we gain power and gain acceptance and in turn have even more power. And as all of these institutions gain power, those who have gained it through subterfuge, fraud and sometimes outright violence will lose it.

You have the power, right now, today, to make a lot of very important decisions that will impact whether or not you have children, the conditions under which those children will grow up, and the health of your immediate and extended family.

And that is the power of this book, and part of the way in which EAU fulfills this mission. By putting knowledge in your hands of what is arrayed against you and how its mechanisms work, you see how to escape many of the traps that

have been laid. A lot of our enemies' power works simply by us not being explicitly conscious of what is going on around us, accompanied by our passive acceptance that "what is" also "must be." The moment we gain knowledge, the moment we can see things differently, a certain amount of that power becomes ours. And the extent to which we exercise it is the measure of both our freedom and responsibility.

This book is not a total solution because many will not read it. And even if everybody did, some people would disregard it for whatever reason. And even if nobody disregarded it, it is dealing with complex systems, some of which need to be addressed in different ways and at a different level. For example, this book makes no attempt to address problems of institutionalized corruption or a "deep state," or even ethnic violence. Those are subjects for a different treatment.

But this book is *part* of the solution. And really, that is all that is needed. A car is not one monolithic chunk of metal, but is rather composed of many parts, all of which added together will get you to the grocery store. But any part of it missing ... leaves you stranded. So even though this is only part of the solution, it is important because it addresses the most important aspect of our existence: making little bundles of joy that cry when they are uncomfortable, puke on our shirts, and then grow up to be hopefully even more amazing than their parents as part of a sacred chain starting in antiquity. It is our job to make sure that chain never ends.

2 The Problem

While culture can reinforce our genes; and genes create the culture, this is NOT a "chicken and egg" conundrum because genes absolutely positively must come FIRST.

About once a week, I receive earnestly written email from folks lamenting the low natality of European-Americans, especially compared to those of ethnic groups who have invaded our country illegally. My friend and colleague Frank Roman has spoken at length about the upcoming demographics shift, what it means for our future generations, and how it can be averted. Clearly, unless something is done, the future looks pretty bleak. Fortunately, there is a growing awareness among our Folk that we are on a road to extinction.

The smallest unit of our Folk capable of reproducing itself and carrying on our culture is not the individual, but the family. Anything that affects the family, automatically affects our people. Many lament the fact that, across the globe, European numbers are dwindling both in absolute terms and relative to incoming replacement Third World populations. If current low natality rates continue, even if our lands were emptied of invaders; most of our unique genes that have persisted for untold millennia will cease to exist in about 250 years. When taking inter-racial marriage, the

2 *The Problem*

rates at which our people are the victims of violence and similar phenomena into account, the end of our people will be even sooner. For an idea of how quickly and violently that has happened in the past, look up the history of Haiti.

This is no small matter. We are talking about an entire human race being wiped from the face of the earth in two centuries or less. We will be gone just as certainly and just as irrevocably as if we had all been lined up for mass gas-chamber execution and incineration. No more Michelangelos, Lois Pasteurs, Thomas Edisons, Elizabeth Brownings or William Shockleys will be born. The idea that what is important about us is our culture, and that our culture can continue without us flies in the face of reality.

Haiti inherited French governmental, language, philosophical and constitutional systems in their entirety; yet even neglecting obvious differences of appearance, no rational person would argue that Haiti bears even the slightest resemblance to France. Rather, it is a hell-hole from which inhabitants seek escape. The same situation prevails in South Africa. South Africa inherited hundreds of years of European traditions, cultures, governmental forms and law. Once European-derived people abandoned governance, South Africa has become a cruel caricature just like Haiti from which people, even African people, seek to escape. Rhodesia was given European culture and technology; and when the Europeans turned over the reins of government to non-Europeans ... it went from being a food exporter to widespread starvation.

Every place in the world where Europeans planted a culture and then abandoned that culture to non-Europeans has seen that culture die. That's reality. Yes, culture is

important; but it cannot survive without our genes. So our physical survival as a distinct genetic group of people is the paramount consideration¹. While culture can reinforce our genes; and genes create the culture, this is NOT a "chicken and egg" conundrum because genes absolutely positively must come FIRST.

So we cannot allow ourselves to fall into the Michael Savage trap of "Borders, Language and Culture." Yes, by all means, these things are important and they need to be defended in order to create an hospitable environment for our folk. But they interact with, and depend upon our critical and irreplaceable genes FIRST.

Two things should be obvious. The first, is that any ideology, governmental form or policy that results in (or contributes to) the extinction of an entire ethnic group is, in and of itself, genocidal. Genocide is the ultimate wrong; because it cannot ever be undone. The second is that males do not reproduce and neither do females, individually. A COUPLE is required to reproduce, and anything that adversely affects the bonding and relationship of that couple will ultimately have a genocidal effect. A lone individual cannot carry on our genes or preserve our culture. Only families can do that, and the dynamic of relations between European men and European women for purposes of courtship and marriage is a crucial consideration in our continued ex-

¹This is indicative of something very important. Long before Europeans ever came to Africa, the Africans were feeding themselves just fine at population levels sustainable by their own indigenous technology. It is only in the wake of widespread dissemination of European culture and our technological artifacts that starvation has become widespread in Africa. When non-Europeans adopt European culture, it is to their detriment.

2 The Problem

istence.

The damage that has been done to the European-American family can be measured, in aggregate, in stark terms. Even though there are many contributing factors, and quantifying the precise contribution of each individual factor would be difficult, the aggregate impact is worth examining.

In 1965, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan issued what has become known as The Moynihan Report for the Department of Labor. In this report, Senator Moynihan revealed the damage being done to African-Americans in unambiguous terms by discussing the illegitimacy rate in the African-American community. At that time, the illegitimacy rate for black mothers was an unacceptably high 23.6%. Misunderstanding the big picture, Senator Moynihan blamed this troubling statistic on the legacy of slavery and so-called "racism."

What you may be shocked to learn is that, while the illegitimacy rate among white women in 1975 was only 7.1%, by 2002 the illegitimacy rate among white women was 28.5% and rising. That's five percentage points *higher* than the illegitimacy rates that Moynihan considered to be a *crisis* in the black community in 1965².

But that's not all. Fully ONE THIRD of the white children in America are growing up in homes without both biological parents. 29% of white children are growing up in families receiving welfare assistance; and that number is roughly DOUBLE the number of black children whose families were receiving welfare back in 1965. Since 1980, the

²Eberstadt, N. (2005), White Families Are in Trouble, Too; Published by the American Enterprise Institute, http://www.aei.org/publications/filter.all,pubID.23048/pub_detail.asp

percentage of white men under the age of 30 in jail has doubled³.

Our divorce epidemic has also reared its ugly head, to the extent that nearly a third of the white kids in America don't share a home with their biological fathers, and a stunning 40% of the kids in these fatherless homes haven't laid eyes on their fathers for at least a year⁴. There are many reasons for this. No doubt, some very small percentage of these fathers are simply uncaring. But as I will explain in greater depth later, the PRIMARY cause for the absence of fathers from the lives of their kids is a punitive marital court system that actively encourages the absence of the father; and has become so lopsidedly biased against fathers that Wendy McElroy reports that men are undertaking a marriage – and hence, reproductive – strike in ever-greater numbers.

Men are deliberately avoiding marriage, and they are actively avoiding fathering children. Ms. McElroy states:

"As a critic of anti-male bias in the family courts, the reasons I hear most frequently from non-marrying men are fear of financial devastation in divorce and of losing meaningful contact with children afterward."⁵

Ms. McElroy continues:

"A significant number of men are loudly stating their reasons (for the marriage strike): anti-male bias in the current marriage law and in the

³Ibid.

⁴Effects of Divorce (2001)

⁵McElroy, Wendy (2003) The Marriage Strike,
<http://www.ejfi.org/Civilization/Civilization-12.htm>

2 *The Problem*

family courts. Solving this piece of the "marriage crisis" is not difficult. Allow people to draw up their own private marriage contracts, without government law acting as a third party; have unbiased family courts adjudicate breaches of contracts. If men participated equally in forging the terms of the most important commitment in their lives, perhaps they would cease to view marriage as a form of indentured servitude and divorce as slavery."⁶

Here, then, is the reality that I want you to understand. Our birth rate is so low that, if things don't change, within 250 years we'll cease to exist. In practical terms, considering interracial marriage and the sort of treatment European-derived people usually receive at the hands of non-white governments, it will likely be sooner. And men are avoiding marriage and children due to the extreme anti-male bias of our court system, further exacerbating that problem. Those white children who manage to get born aren't facing a picnic. The chance of being illegitimate is 1 in 3. The chance of being on welfare is 1 in 3. The chance of never laying eyes on your biological father is increasing steadily. The odds of inhabiting a jail cell have more than doubled.

In short, we are facing a complex and inter-related set of problems affecting our families. It is for this reason that, when EAU was created, one of the objectives that we placed in our Constitution was as follows: "To support the preservation and advancement of the two-parent European American family."

⁶Ibid.

It is from the foregoing background that I would like to launch our exploration of this topic. As I described earlier, I get a lot of correspondence from people who are concerned about our low birth rates. Along with the lamentation regarding low natality, this email usually contains advice, urging me to encourage women to have more babies. Quite often, the correspondent focuses blame on what is perceived to be a primary causative factor. Examples include tax policy, radical feminism, a business climate that is unfriendly to families, and so forth.

No doubt, all of these factors contribute. Because they are all interrelated to such a profound degree, it is simply impossible to truly and accurately attribute degrees of culpability. But, because we aren't in the lawsuit business and therefore aren't going for the "deep pockets" or applying concepts such as "joint and several liability," it makes no sense for us to just address one aspect of the problem. That's because we aren't seeking compensation for a tort, but are rather seeking to solve a problem; and solving a problem with multiple causation requires dealing with ALL of the larger causative factors. So, I am going to deal with economics, the demands of employers, radical feminism and the relationships of married couples among other things. Throughout all of these, will be an undercurrent of white psychology; because the way white people react to environmental influences is unique to our people and relevant to specifying solutions.

So ... first we will be looking at the causative factors of our low natality rate. Then, we will look at solutions we can implement in our daily lives. Finally, we will look at public policy proposals we can advance to help solve our problem.

2 *The Problem*

Let's start with exploring economics.

3 Economic Causation

In 1950, the average American family with children paid only 2% of its income to the federal government in taxes. Today (in 1994) that same family pays 24.5%. ... This tax loss exceeds the annual cost of the average home mortgage.

Economics is a key factor in the well-being of our people. It may not seem that something as easy as a back yard garden could help us have more children, but because of the unique nature of European-Americans, the lower our cost of living, the more children we have. The higher our cost of living, the fewer children we have.¹ A comprehensive approach to a home garden effectively lowers the cost of living by the value of the food it replaces, thereby exerting a positive effect on European-American birth rates. Simple.

Starting your victory garden is certainly very valuable, but there are other economic factors at work that need to be explored, and that we need to effectively counter. As our cost of living climbs, our birthrates fall. But there is a lot more to this straightforward equation than meets the eye.

The effective cost of living is affected by many factors. The largest factor, and the toughest for us to counter, is

¹Sailer, Steve (2008), Value Voters,
<http://amconmag.com/article/2008/feb/11/00016/>

3 *Economic Causation*

the fact that over the past forty years wages for average white Americans have been falling relative to what can be purchased with those wages. In 1970, the median home price was \$23,400. In 1970, the median wage was \$6,670. This means that an average home cost a little less than four years of wages. In 2004, the median home price was \$221,000, but the median wage was \$30,516. So 34 years later, it cost over 7 years wages to buy a home.²³ Since 1970, then, the purchasing power of the average white worker has declined precipitously. Or, looking at it from the other direction, the cost of living has risen dramatically. Thus, our birth rates have declined. The causes of this falling standard of living can primarily be traced to our Federal Reserve System, offshoring and immigration policies.

3.1 Tax Policy

But there are other aspects of economic impact as well, including taxation. This trend in taxation was explored by the Heritage Foundation, and affects our birth rates as well. According to a Heritage Foundation report – this is a long quote, but pay attention because you'll find this shocking:

"The Federal government has put American families under financial siege. ... To a large degree, this is because of an explosive rise in the burden of federal taxation. In 1950, the average American family with children paid only 2%

²<http://therealreturns.blogspot.com/2005/08/us-median-house-price.html>

³<http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/income/histinc/p05ar.html>

3.1 Tax Policy

of its income to the federal government in taxes. Today (in 1994) that same family pays 24.5%. ... This tax loss exceeds the annual cost of the average home mortgage. When state and local taxes are included, the government now takes 37.6% of the income of the average family with children. *Most employed wives are not aware that they are really working to support Uncle Sam.* Among married-couple families where both the husband and wife are employed, two-thirds of the wife's earnings go to pay for increased federal taxes; only one-third goes to supporting the family. During the past four decades, the federal income tax burden on a family of four has increased by over 300% as a share of family income. Single Americans and couples without children have escaped most of this tax increase. Measured by average per-capita after-tax income, families with children now are the lowest income group in America. Their average after-tax income is lower than that of elderly households, single persons, and couples without children. ... The income loss due to increased taxation has seriously strained American family finances and profoundly affected American family life."⁴

The Supreme Court noted appropriately in 1819 that "The power to tax is the power to destroy."⁵ It most certainly is. Unfortunately, most people don't understand the full context in which the statist justice John Marshall penned those

⁴http://www.heritage.org/Research/Taxes/upload/89274_1.pdf

⁵McCulloch v. Maryland, 17 U.S. 319

3 Economic Causation

words. At issue was whether or not the State of Maryland could tax notes issued by the Second Bank of the United States. It was with this decision that the Supreme Court paved the way for the "legality" of today's abominable Federal Reserve System and the absolute power of a tax code which is destroying our people.

Nobody wants to be impoverished, so when you combine the rising cost of living compared to incomes – caused by our Federal Reserve, trade and immigration policies, with the fact that having a child is the single largest predictor of poverty, and a tax system that penalizes taxpayers for having children ... you have an extremely powerful motivator against having children.

3.2 Cost of Living

Our Congress has, as a whole, demonstrated a remarkable lack of both restraint and candor for so long – since long before most of us were born – that their dishonesty and desire for a free lunch can almost be considered institutional attributes.

This, in fact, is one of the largest factors affecting our birth rates. When you look across Europe at the low birth rates of our brethren, you will find that their socialist systems effectively tax them at even higher rates than us, while they have undergone the same rise in the cost of living. So it should come as no surprise that birth rates have plummeted across the white world. There are a few white populations that are either unaffected or less affected. In almost every case,

3.2 *Cost of Living*

such as among the Amish, it is because the population has effectively isolated itself from outside economic and social forces.

I have, as I mentioned, received correspondence from a number of people recommending that I urge white women to have more babies. Unfortunately, it's just not that simple. Women don't reproduce asexually – a man is also required. And white folks, as a rule, are not well-disposed to having children under circumstances where they aren't sure the kids will be properly supported. Obviously, there are a growing number of exceptions to this in the form of illegitimate births where women effectively marry the government as provider, but white folks as a whole are failing to even replace themselves – and now you know one of the major reasons why. Steve Sailer supports this contention when he says:

"Whites appear more sensitive to cost-of-living calculations about marriage and babies. While white parents of small children in Manhattan have a median income of \$284,208, the NYT reports, "In comparison, the median income of other Manhattan households with toddlers was \$66,213 for Asians, \$31,171 for blacks and \$25,467 for Hispanic families." Similarly, demographer Hans Johnson of the Public Policy Institute of California finds that American-born white women in costly California are having babies at a rate of only 1.6 per lifetime, while immigrant Latinas are having 3.7."⁶

⁶Sailer, Steve (2008), Value Voters,

3 *Economic Causation*

So I can sit here and urge people to make babies all day, and it won't do any good unless that urging comes with concrete solutions to the problems of taxation and cost of living. If we were to solve this problem, I strongly suspect that our families wouldn't require urging in the first place. Raising a child to age 18 costs about \$204,000 on average for middle-income families.⁷ This cost has simply become insurmountable in an economic environment where the average prospective white parent is earning less than \$31,000 year.

Why, in spite of Bureau of Labor Statistics legerdemain, has the cost of core necessities risen so much faster than income? The answer is a combination of pyramid-scheme social welfare programs with the Federal Reserve. Our system is designed to require constant expansion to avoid collapsing of its own weight. But you don't have to take my word for this. Instead, you can hear what Alan Greenspan has said on the subject.

No matter what you may think of the Federal Reserve system, (and we will discuss that shortly) former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan is an extremely informed man, and in 2003 he testified in front of the Senate Committee on Aging, describing the effect our low birth rates would have on the work force. Specifically, by 2030 the growth in the American work force would decrease from its current 1% annual growth to only 1/2%. In addition, by 2030 fully 20% of the U.S. population will be over age 65. He described the impact of that eventuality this way:

<http://amconmag.com/article/2008/feb/11/00016/>

⁷Expenditures on Children by Families, 2007. United States Department of Agriculture

3.2 *Cost of Living*

“In particular, it makes our social security and Medicare programs unsustainable in the long run, short of a major increase in immigration rates, a dramatic acceleration in productivity growth well beyond historic experience, a significant increase in the age of eligibility for benefits, or the use of general revenues to fund benefits...”⁸

I want you to think about this for just a moment, because what Alan Greenspan said is true. Our social security and Medicare programs can only be sustained with an indefinitely growing population. Otherwise, the rug gets pulled out from under them. In a world of 2030 where four people are in the work force for every person drawing social security and medical benefits, not to mention other social services which will make the ratio three-to-one, the sheer tax burden would be too great to bear. It would be like every family having to support an additional two or three children - and that doesn't count anything else in the federal budget. Obviously, if you are already supporting two or three children of illegal aliens, that makes it really hard to support any children of your own.

So ... why is it that these old-age benefits require an indefinitely expanding population? Any system like that is ultimately unsustainable. After all, even if America had the required infinite expansion of population, ultimately we'd fill all available space - then what would we do? This is where the Federal Reserve comes in.

Under a constant currency with no inflation, a currency whose value would be the same fifty years from now as it is today, a mandatory retirement funding system like Social Security would work just fine without the need for popula-

⁸Greenspan, Alan (March 27, 2003) Senate Testimony

3 Economic Causation

tion growth. BUT we do not have such a system. President Wilson saw to that with the Federal Reserve Act and the 16th Amendment allowing for an income tax. Then Franklin Roosevelt came along and when he layered Social Security and other welfare spending programs onto the heap, the die was cast that led us to the situation we find ourselves in today.

Our current monetary and banking system has been in place since President Wilson capitulated to a bunch of moneyed interests, and our money loses value so rapidly that it is impossible to save it securely for retirement. In fact, since 1913, the purchasing power of a dollar has lost an astonishing 96% of its value.⁹ That means that, back in 1913, you could purchase for four cents what requires a dollar to buy today. As a person's working lifespan is usually fifty years or so, you can see that inflation makes it impossible to save money for retirement by simply setting it aside safely in a bank account. If you do that, in terms of purchasing power, you will actually retire with less than half of the spending power that you had set aside. Since our government can't invest your money in a fashion that earns interest, government-based retirement programs must *always* therefore draw upon current taxes.¹⁰

In an article entitled "Gold and Economic Freedom," Greenspan stated the following: (please bear with me as the quote is rather long)

"Under a gold standard, the amount of credit

⁹U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics

¹⁰Yes, it is possible for people in the higher income brackets or on specialized pensions (usually related to public employment) to have a secure retirement, but for most people this is not possible.

that an economy can support is determined by the economy's tangible assets, since every credit instrument is ultimately a claim on some tangible asset. But government bonds are not backed by tangible wealth, only by the government's promise to pay out of future tax revenues, and cannot easily be absorbed by the financial markets. A large volume of new government bonds can be sold to the public only at progressively higher interest rates. Thus, government deficit spending under a gold standard is severely limited. The abandonment of the gold standard made it possible for the welfare statist to use the banking system as a means to an unlimited expansion of credit. They have created paper reserves in the form of government bonds which – through a complex series of steps – the banks accept in place of tangible assets and treat as if they were an actual deposit, i.e., as the equivalent of what was formerly a deposit of gold. The holder of a government bond or of a bank deposit created by paper reserves believes that he has a valid claim on a real asset. But the fact is that there are now more claims outstanding than real assets. The law of supply and demand is not to be conned. As the supply of money (of claims) increases relative to the supply of tangible assets in the economy, prices must eventually rise. Thus the earnings saved by the productive members of the society lose value in terms of goods. When the economy's books are finally balanced,

3 *Economic Causation*

one finds that this loss in value represents the goods purchased by the government for welfare or other purposes with the money proceeds of the government bonds financed by bank credit expansion. In the absence of the gold standard, there is no way to protect savings from confiscation through inflation."¹¹

I am not arguing for a gold standard per se, but rather demonstrating that our Federal Reserve's fiscal policies are responsible for the problems we are seeing. So, when you combine welfare statism with an inflationary fiat currency, you end up ultimately with a pyramid scheme in which the base of the pyramid in the form of productive taxable workers has to constantly expand or the whole thing collapses. This is what our grandparents and great-grandparents accepted from Wilson and FDR, what our parents and WE are allowing to continue, and the inevitable consequence - replacing our people with another that breeds more prolifically - is bearing bitter fruit today. If you have ever wondered why neither Democrats nor Republicans have addressed the illegal alien issue substantively, now you know at least one reason why, in addition to the explicit hatred of white people borne by certain lobbies such as the ADL. They have taxed us until we can't afford babies, and in order to avoid a complete collapse and kick the can down the road they have to import a replacement population with high birth rates.

I don't want to be too hard on our parents, grandparents and great-grandparents with regard to the Federal Reserve

¹¹Greenspan, Alan, "Gold and Economic Freedom"

Act, to the extent that mostly they were not in a position to even be informed of the issue. A great many of the most fierce opponents of the Act “just happened” to die aboard the Titanic, and its greatest supporters “just happened” to cancel their spots at the last minute. Further, that act was passed, likely illegally, by a handful of people in Congress during the Christmas holiday and signed by Woodrow Wilson under the heavy influence of Brandeis and others. The entire thing was pushed by a highly organized effort (one might even call it a conspiracy) that one can read about in *The Creature from Jekyll Island* by G. Edward Griffin. The subject is complex enough to require its own treatment of the issue, so I am just relating its effects on our birthrates.

Right now, the Federal Reserve is between a rock and a hard spot. As you have no doubt heard, the Federal Reserve controls inflation by raising and lowering the interest rate it charges banks. Let me explain how this mechanism works.

As Greenspan explained above, additional money is injected into our economy through government deficit spending. But new money also enters the system through lending. In a fractional-reserve banking system like what we have, the bank can “lend” out twenty-five or thirty dollars for every dollar on deposit. Where does the bank get the extra money? It borrows it from the Federal Reserve. Where does the Fed get it? It creates it out of thin air.

When the Fed rate is low, more borrowing occurs, thus more money enters the economy relative to tangible assets and more inflation occurs. When the Fed rate is high, less borrowing occurs and thus less money is injected and inflation is lower. But always – *always* there is inflation. In fairness, not all lending ultimately comes from the Federal

3 *Economic Causation*

Reserve. A lot of it is financed with long and short term bonds. But since practically all money issued into circulation by the Federal Reserve is issued as a debt that must be repaid with interest, and since the Federal Reserve does *not* simultaneously distribute adequate funds into the economy to pay back the interest, our economy is structured so that shaking off debt is extremely difficult if not impossible for many, and depends on constant expansion of future debt in order to pay interest on the debts of the past. This, too, is ultimately unsustainable.

A lot of the inflation created by our banking system is hidden by the process of shipping production to relatively poor countries where labor is cheap. Thus, a television set that cost \$200 in 1987 still costs \$200 today. But in 1987 that television was made in America. Then it was made in Japan. Then it was made in Taiwan. Then it was made in Mexico. Finally, it is made in China, very often with labor that could best be described as slavery. A certain amount of this inflation is also offset by improvements in processes, such as replacing thru-hole electronics construction with surface mount devices and automated wave soldering. But as Greenspan noted, increases in productivity that are sufficient to offset inflation are simply unprecedented.

Of course, there are certain things that just can't be outsourced to a foreign factory – like housing, gasoline, medical care, college tuition, mechanical work on your car and so forth. These sorts of home-grown resources have become much more expensive to the point that they have finally become beyond the reach of many Americans. And this is where the Fed is between the rock and hard spot I described earlier. The real estate market is the source of a huge per-

3.2 *Cost of Living*

centage of the lending in this country. The median price of a home compared to median wages is now 400% higher than it was just thirty years ago. Foreclosures have increased dramatically, and the feds and banks are doing everything they can to keep that market from falling off a cliff. At times, they put the resale of foreclosed properties on hold because flooding the market with that many foreclosures would exacerbate the problem we already have with people owing more on their property than it is worth.

Meanwhile, the price of gas has gone sky high and a reasonable observer can conclude that in the long run, it will continue to climb. Most recently, that has been driven by CEO Fink of Blackrock pushing an ESG (Environmental, Social, Governance) agenda that deliberately starves oil drilling efforts of needed capital. This has exerted very real upward pressure on the prices of everything affected by petroleum. So our economy is now being affected by inflationary pressure from a source other than the Federal Reserve; which is the law of supply and demand as it applies to a crucial commodity. Because people have little alternative to driving to work or heating their homes, demand for gas and oil is not especially elastic, so money that goes into the tank becomes unavailable for other things.¹²

So what is the Federal Reserve supposed to do? If they lower interest rates, the inflation that is already being fueled by their many rounds of stimulus (most of which went to connected insiders rather than ordinary people), supply chains that were so efficient they had no resiliency, and spiraling oil and gas prices will go through the roof. But if they

¹²Crutsinger, Martin (2007) Gas Prices Hurt Consumer Spending;
<http://www.recordonline.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20070512/BIZ/70512031>

3 *Economic Causation*

raise interest rates to curb the inflation caused by tight oil supplies, they will hamper the real estate market. So, basically, in terms of monetary policy, the Federal Reserve is in a position where anything it can do will hurt a lot of people. So what is the solution?

According to Greenspan, "[T]he only point I make in my prepared remarks...the point that I've been making for quite a while is, I don't know where the level [of unemployment] will trigger pressures [toward inflation], but I do know, because the law of supply and demand has got to work eventually, that there is a point at which if that pool of people seeking jobs continues to decline, at some point it must have an impact. If we can open up our immigration rolls significantly, that clearly will make that less and less of a potential problem."¹³

Did you hear what he was saying? Basically, flood the labor market and force wages lower to offset inflation. In fairness to the former Fed chairman, he has pointed out to Congress the fact that immigration policy is the realm of our elected officials and that there are many aspects to immigration other than the purely economic. No doubt.

But that is where this situation stands. Our President, Senators and Congressmen are not about to tell you that because of their decades of buying votes with deficit spending and their addiction to free money courtesy of the Federal Reserve they have painted themselves into a box where the only way they can see to save this country is to destroy it. Of course, even that, like so many of our Congress' propos-

¹³Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan's semi-annual economic report to Congress before the House Banking Committee (July 22, 1999), Question and Answer period.

3.2 Cost of Living

als would only postpone the inevitable at best. At worst, since 26% of the third-worlders we are importing are on welfare and a huge proportion is illiterate, they actually cost more than they bring to the economy so they hasten the coming collapse. But in the process, they provide downward pressure on wages relative to prices, just as is done with offshoring.

Our Congress has, as a whole, demonstrated a remarkable lack of both restraint and candor for so long – since long before most of us were born – that their dishonesty and desire for a free lunch can almost be considered institutional attributes. Their behavior is very like that of a child who has told a lie, and then has to keep telling more and bigger lies to cover up the first one. Turning over our nation's currency to a cartel of private bankers via the Federal Reserve was a huge deception, and this was followed by removing any relationship between money and tangible assets. This was again followed by the most addictive drug ever invented for politicians: the ability to spend money in order to buy votes today without having to tax people to pay for it, and instead postpone the day of reckoning until they are safely retired from public life.

But just because our Congress is so beholden to covering its own backside, slavishly catering to special interests and tugging their forelocks to the demagogues of political correctness doesn't mean that real solutions aren't available. Real solutions are available, they simply require courage. Naturally, this attribute is in short supply among politicians with a pathological need to bask in the glory of unearned adulation purchased at the expense of our future.

Matters are certainly not improved by the fact that the

3 *Economic Causation*

franchise has been expanded such that most voters aren't smart enough to understand the long-term implications of their votes and thereby foist self-serving mediocre leaders upon the body politic.¹⁴ This is why the franchise was so limited in our original Constitution. Most people don't realize this, but our Constitution never provided for Senators to be popularly elected. Rather, they were appointed by their respective States in order to specifically represent the interests of the States as sovereign entities and protect against Federal encroachments. Of the four houses of government – the Judicial, Executive, Senate and House of Representatives, only members of the House of Representatives was popularly elected, and even then under a rather restrictive franchise that was designed to keep people who were dependent on the public teat or ignorant from voting.

At this point, it is of course impossible to restrict the franchise. This is one of those horses that won't go back into the barn. And even if we could put it back in the barn, the pervasive corruption of our political class has become so bad that there is little real choice between them. Better voters won't help when the choices they have are bought and paid for in advance by an unaccountable oligarchy.¹⁵

¹⁴Wolchover, Natalie (2012), People Aren't Smart Enough for Democracy to Flourish, Scientists Say, Live Science Feb 28, 2012

¹⁵www.opensecrets.org

4 Debt Slavery

In Chapter 2, I explained how our banking system issues new money into the economy via debt, and that how additional debt needs to be incurred in order to obtain the money to pay the interest on prior debt. If this sounds like a system in which everyone is in debt up to their eyeballs and never has anything to show for it, well, that's because that's exactly what is happening. Those who sit at the top of the finance pyramid in our banking system skim money every which way and live like kings while everyone else is increasingly impoverished while working harder and harder.

4.1 Finance Capitalism

I'm going to illustrate this problem using the example of mortgages. Mortgages raise the price of housing by placing buyers who plan to pay back loans over a period of thirty years in competition with buyers who have saved up their money to buy the house outright. A person can much more easily come up with a large loan than actually save money; and the amount of money accessible by financing far exceeds what the average person is able to save in a reasonable amount of time. Likewise, the availability of financing raises demand, and thus prices. Since not all houses go up for sale simultaneously, just a small proportion of buyers

4 Debt Slavery

using mortgages can raise the price of houses outside the range of people who are trying to save the money to buy a house without a mortgage. In practice, then, wide availability of mortgages causes prices to rise at a rate faster than the rise in wages, meaning that saving to buy a house outright without a mortgage is impossible for most people. So the mechanism of mortgages in and of itself serves to raise the price of housing high enough that mortgage loans are required in order to purchase a house at all.

Here is a case where finance capitalism in the form of banking is obviously in play, but the actual free market is distorted rather than facilitated by capital, and the distortion is to the detriment of people who wish to own a house, both in terms of absolute price, and in terms of the excessive costs incurred through purchasing via a mortgage. In practice, using a mortgage to purchase a house destroys, in absolute terms, any financial benefits of ownership.

As an example, take the case of a house purchased for \$170,000 using 100% financing at an interest rate of 7.5%. The average person stays in a particular home for five years. Assume that the price of the property appreciates at 4% compounded annually, which is double the rate of inflation, so that the property sells in five years for \$206,830, at which point he still owes \$160,850 on the mortgage - netting the owner \$45,980 in cash, minus the 6% real estate commission of \$12,400 for a net profit of \$33,580. Not including any upkeep and maintenance requirements, what did the owner have to invest in order to net \$33,580?

First, he paid about \$9,000 in closing costs for the loan. Then he made sixty monthly payments of \$1,189, for a total of \$71,340. Then, he paid \$3,100 a year in property taxes

4.1 Finance Capitalism

for a total of \$15,500. Finally, he paid homeowner's insurance of \$710/year for a total of \$3,550. The grand total of his investments over five years, from which he has netted \$33,580, is \$99,390. So, over a five year period, even with the value of his house increasing at a compound rate double the rate of inflation, he has actually spent \$65,810.

So, if the owner has lost - who has gained? Mainly the bank. Over the same five year period, the bank has collected about \$80,000 including closing costs. The bank's cost for the money from the Federal Reserve was only \$8,500, netting the bank a cool \$71,500 without ever breaking a sweat. Since the property owner needs to earn about \$62,000 yearly in order to afford such a large mortgage, that means that over the prior sixty months, he has worked fifteen months for the bank - or fully 25% of all of his productive effort has gone to producing \$71,500 in free and clear profit to the bank and \$8,500 to the Federal Reserve. At the end of the five years, he still has no practical ownership since, if he gets injured and misses just a couple of payments, the bank will simply take ownership of the property, sell it themselves for \$206,830, and distribute far less than the \$33,580 to the erstwhile owner since they get to deduct all of their "reasonable" legal costs. In practice then, after sixty months of hard work - the bank has everything, and the owner has nothing.

Believe it or not, once upon a time, young people could live with their parents and save money for a few years and then walk into married life with a mortgage-free home. But the widespread use of debt ultimately made this all but impossible for even the most meticulous savers. Now, real estate has been turned into nothing more than a constantly

4 Debt Slavery

churning racket from which banks get fat while people work and slave for what really amounts to a hotel room.

As if this were not enough, the same problem has occurred with nearly all major purchases. As a whole, since 2009, the savings rate is literally *negative*, meaning people are routinely spending more than they earn.¹ As of July of 2012, the average indebted household's revolving credit card debt was over \$15,000², and average student loan debt for a student who graduated in 2011 is \$26,500.³ Non-revolving debt, such as car loans, amounted to \$15,723 per household in August of 2012.⁴ In short, the way our economy is designed, the average American household is in debt up to their eyeballs.

Matters got worse during the (still ongoing as I write) pandemic. As of 2020, the average member of Gen Z up to age 23 has \$16,000 in unsecured debt, and the average millennial (up to age 39) has a staggering \$87k in debt.⁵ These are our primary reproductive demographics, and they are mired in debt.

4.2 Debt and Natality

Modern finances are dramatically more complex than those faced by our grandparents. Who

¹Jones, D. (2010), Personal Savings Rate: Worse than we Thought, CNN, June 30, 2010

²NerdWallet(2012), American Household Credit Card Debt

³New York Times, Student-Loan Borrowers Average \$26,500 in Debt, Oct 18, 2012

⁴Federal Reserve System, G.19 Release

⁵<https://www.debt.org/faqs/americans-in-debt/demographics/>

carries the health insurance and which plan must be chosen? 401k? Roth IRA? Points and closing costs? Umbrella insurance policy? Whole life versus term? Considering that just a couple hundred years ago most of our people had never even *seen* currency, the financial complexity of the modern environment is daunting.

In a debt-driven economy, consumer debt fuels economic growth because it is how new money is introduced into the system. But the simple fact is that at a personal level, debt has limits. If you are so indebted that you can't save any money, even if you are paying all your bills, you'll default if you lose your job. This creates an economic system that is not very resilient because it has very few reserves. As a result, people are extremely conscious of their economic vulnerability. Furthermore, debt takes away your options and makes you a slave to your current job because you can't afford risks.

What does this have to do with birth rates? Quite a lot, because it adversely affects our birth rates in three ways. First, it increases the costs of everything at a rate more quickly than our wages increase, thereby making it more difficult to afford a baby. Second, by increasing our monthly mandatory payments, it reduces our economic certainty, thus making us less comfortable in assuming the costs of a child. Finally, and most importantly, it is an extremely large contributor to divorce. Couples who divorce have, in most cases, ended their reproductive phase – the man cannot afford more offspring while paying child support and the woman is a less attractive mate because she has another man's child. Though there are obviously exceptions

4 Debt Slavery

to this, most people realize that moving forward with outstanding obligations from a prior relationship (also called “baggage”) diminishes a person’s mating possibilities in the future.

Money matters for couples are far more complicated today than they were fifty or one hundred years ago. In past decades, people tended to marry while young, and they married debt-free. Any debt assumed thereafter was minimal because banking standards were quite stringent regarding total indebtedness. Because inflation wasn’t so steep, and debts were low, couples could save for the future. As previously noted, a family of four also paid only 2% of its income in taxes, leaving a lot more from which to provide needs and save for the future. From 1929 to 1985, savings rates in the U.S. varied from 7.5% to 10%, with a couple of bad years during the Great Depression and some really good years during WWII. During times of low inflation, saving that much money consistently provided families with a buffer that gave them options and economic security. They could even put that money in a simple savings account and do okay.

Today, we marry later. Today, the median age of first marriage for a woman is 28.1 and for a man is 30.5.⁶ In 1950, the median age of marriage for women was 20.3 and for men it was 22.8. There are many factors contributing to later marriage, which will be explored later. And the impact of a woman’s age on her fertility is profound. For example, while a woman’s odds of getting pregnant at age 20 are 86%, by the time she is 28 her odds of getting pregnant have fallen to 73%. At first, that doesn’t look like a big

⁶<https://www.bgsu.edu/ncfmr/resources/data/family-profiles/payne-median-age-marriage-2019-fp-21-12.html>

deal, but it is thirteen fewer babies per 100 women, which is quite significant. Of course, women don't usually try to become pregnant instantly upon marrying. Usually the new couple waits a couple of years. But by the time a woman is 30, her chance of becoming pregnant after trying for a year is only 63%. This equates to 23 fewer babies per 100 women. Obviously, as women let their fertility take a back seat to careers, they are reducing their odds of ever having a baby at all dramatically. But I'll discuss that aspect in another chapter.

In this chapter, the big problem is that when people marry older, they are not marrying debt free. They are usually carrying debt into their marriages - debt for cars, credit cards and education at a bare minimum. They are entering marriage as a financial liability for each other. Modern finances are dramatically more complex than those faced by our grandparents. Who carries the health insurance and which plan must be chosen? 401k? Roth IRA? Points and closing costs? Umbrella insurance policy? Whole life versus term? Considering that just a couple hundred years ago most of our people had never even *seen* currency, the financial complexity of the modern environment is daunting. By the time someone is 28 or 30 years old, he or she has already had to contend with this environment for a while and has developed an individual approach to managing finances - an individual approach that may or may not be compatible with the priorities of a potential mate.

In a nation where the savings rate is now negative, the average person over-spends. To some extent, this is a matter of self-discipline and learning how to manage money. Our schools typically graduate kids who are under-educated in

4 Debt Slavery

the first place given how much money is invested by taxpayers, but few if any schools give kids the tools they need to properly manage monetary decisions when they graduate. But at the same time, given that we have a debt-driven economy such that the money necessary to pay interest on past debt gets issued as further debt, in aggregate it is hard to escape indebtedness. Practically everything costs more than it should relative to income, with costs far outstripping income.

Of course, it doesn't help that the deities of commerce have raised the art of advertising into an art-form. Just last week on the radio I heard an interview with someone who felt embarrassed about having an Android(tm) rather than the latest iPhone(tm). Think about that for a moment. A modern cellular phone of any of these types is an amazing device with capabilities far exceeding the computational power of the Space Shuttle. It will play music, send and receive email, browse the Internet and all manner of things. Any of them is perfectly fine. But most importantly, the high-end Samsung and Apple devices are all quite expensive. The average wage earner in the United States takes home \$580/week after taxes. Any of these phones, if purchased outright, will cost between \$900 and \$1200 dollars. Usually, they are acquired for a couple of hundred dollars in exchange for signing a two year contract with a cellular carrier. The average service plan that will allow you to take full advantage of the phone's capabilities (phone, text, email, Internet, etc.) is over \$100 monthly. When people acquire one of these "must have so I am not embarrassed" phones to replace a perfectly functional phone, their service contract is extended another couple of years. In other

words, they are obligating themselves to thousands of dollars just to feel trendy around people they don't even know. Scary.

But the bottom line is that as a result of poor financial literacy, commercial culture and an economic system that has stacked the deck against them, by the time people marry at 28 or 30 years of age, they are bringing a host of debts and monthly obligations with them. When this is combined with the unprecedented complexity of financial dealings expected of the average person, it's a recipe for troubled marriages. According to an article in USA Today, debt, under-saving and over-spending figure very prominently in the causes of divorce.⁷ Since people are *starting* marriages in this condition, it's almost as dangerous to future marital bliss as having a liaison with one's paramour during the wedding reception.

Ignoring for the moment those of our people for whom welfare is the "family business," people of European ancestry, or at least those inclined toward normal family formation in the first place, would prefer to bring children into a stable situation. Obviously, the position of negative net worth in which most marriages are started is less than conducive to stability. People are starting from less than zero, and then struggling to create the necessary stability for a family while combining the financial management and differing priorities of two people who have already established financial priorities that preexist and hence take precedence over their marriage.

Then there is debt acquired after marriage, including mort-

⁷Chu, K. (2006), Why Many Marriages Today are 'til Debt do us Part, USA Today, May 8, 2006

4 Debt Slavery

gages, car payments and loans to fund everything from furniture to a “man cave.” A “man cave” if you haven’t heard of one before, is a room containing a large television dedicated to brainwashing the man into needless consumerist desires such as even larger televisions and often addenda such as popcorn machines dedicated to making the man less physically fit. For this privilege, men take out loans. In practice, then, even with prudent financial management, even under the best of circumstances, child birth is delayed into the woman’s least fertile years. At best this means a reduction in total offspring and at worst it means no children at all.

But the worst is yet to come, because the best case scenario is by definition the exception rather than the rule. Most often, money is a taboo subject and marital partners make financial decisions without adequately consulting each other. Differences in priorities create a circumstance where both are affected but only one party benefits. Pretty soon, divorce court looms. These financial matters get messy, but even that is not the worst of it. Our family courts are very punitive to men in particular, and every man who gets divorced and believes he got a raw deal is readily visible to many other men who are deciding whether or not to assume the risks of marriage and fatherhood. Because we give negative information far greater impact in our minds than positive information – in fact, negative information has 700% more effect – if a man who is making such a decision knows one divorced man who got a raw deal and three happily married men, the one divorced man has a lot more impact on his decision by default. These things snowball.

5 Employeeism and Natality

... there is an inverse relationship between the amount of time that parents spend working, and the number of children they have.

The next area we need to examine is, unfortunately, less susceptible to correction through public policy. Workplaces, jobs and careers are simply designed in a fashion that is incompatible with parenthood. If anything, the demands of modern employment actively discourage parenthood.

This situation applies to some degree pretty much across the board, but nowhere is it more evident than in Information Technology. A 2005 study indicates that the culture and expectations surrounding the Information Technology field create an environment in which willingness to sacrifice personal life – including children – is a prerequisite for advancement, and often a prerequisite for being employed at all.¹ The study authors report that "... although long hours are sometimes necessary to meet a deadline, they are more often a status symbol ..."

¹Ramsey, N. & McCorduck P. (2005), Where are the Women in Information Technology?

5.1 Employer Expectations

I should point out that most IT professionals receive no overtime for long hours, but putting in extra time is often seen as a sign of dedication that is a prerequisite for raises and advancement. One woman interviewed for the study indicated: "The reward structure here rewards people for doing stupid things, then working 80-hour weeks to save the day."

Like much of business today, Information Technology is also "interrupt driven" – by which I mean that a crisis can materialize at any time during the workday, or even in the middle of the night. So five minutes before you are supposed to leave work to go pick up your kid from school, somebody runs into your office wringing their hands about how a server just crashed, and if it isn't fixed immediately – preferably yesterday then the company will go out of business. At home, you are in bed when the pager your employer requires you to carry goes off at 2am. You have to drive into work and you won't return until long after you were supposed to put your kid on the bus to school. As business has gone global, the "nine to five" workday has gone the way of the dinosaur with businesses issuing cell phones to employees with the expectation of immediate responsiveness to business requirements. Sheraton hotels recently performed a survey of business travelers, 87% of whom report sleeping with their cell phones. 84% of these business travelers also reported checking their email immediately before sleeping and upon awakening.²

²Menon, V. (2008), Blackberry or Spouse? You Choose.
<http://www.thestar.com/News/Columnist/article/501286>

5.1 *Employer Expectations*

Obviously, if you expect to earn a good salary, the requirements posed by the best paying jobs are utterly incompatible with having children – particularly if this sort of career track is undertaken by both spouses.

Roberta Hall pointed this out way back in 1972 when she wrote:

"With the change from rural to urban life and from subsistence farming to employment for wages, the extended kin system is replaced by an economic pattern in which the nuclear family becomes the economic unit. The result is that a large number of children becomes an economic liability rather than an asset. In this model, fertility decline is expected to originate in and spread outward from urban areas and to be noted first among the upper classes ..."³

Here is a place where I have an argument with many feminists, including the authors of the IT study cited above. Let me express my argument this way:

It is impossible to work 15 hours a day, six days a week and simultaneously be the best parent – whether father or mother – that you can be. A man who is away from his children sixteen hours a day, six days a week or working 80-hour weeks in order to make "partner" at the law firm cannot POSSIBLY simultaneously be the best father he can be. Can he be a "good" father? Well, that is subjective and I won't issue into such value judgments because nobody came down from on-high and appointed me the avatar of a deity. But by the standard I am using, the standard of

³Hall, Roberta (1972), *The Demographic Transition: Stage Four*

being the *best* you can be, nobody can be the best father or mother possible while *absent*.

5.2 Employeeism as a Novel Condition

Notwithstanding a brief period in the middle of the last century, historically among our people, all of the adults in a household capable of working – men and women alike – have worked. The thing that changed was *where that work occurred*. For thousands of years, a family's home was also the place where the family exercised its profession. You can still see reminders of this in the form of first-floor store-fronts with apartments located overhead. Whether a family did blacksmithing, milling or tailoring; by and large that family owned its own means of production which coincided with the property of their residence. This also applied to lawyers and doctors, who overwhelmingly worked out of their homes. And who can forget the fictional Sherlock Holmes whose apartment that he shared with Dr. Watson was also the center of his business?

So it is not the idea of pursuing a profession, per se, that has been particularly problematic for our people. But for men and women alike, the real problem has been working outside the home. A hundred and fifty years ago, most doctors, lawyers, ministers, farmers and blacksmiths kept their workplace within or adjacent to their home. They owned their own means of production and their professions could be exercised within the context of their other family responsibilities, so children didn't take away from professional

5.2 *Employeeism as a Novel Condition*

pursuits or vice-versa. A man who was a blacksmith or a woman who was a seamstress didn't have to put children in the care of strangers in order to earn a living. Thus, pursuit of career and the raising of children were not "either/or" or mutually exclusive choices.

The Baby Boomer generation was the first generation raised with absentee fathers. That is, fathers predominantly left the home in order to support the home. The first hints came as early as the Whiskey Rebellion, but starting in earnest after the War Between the States, there was a concerted effort to crush and destroy the agrarian culture of the South and rural America, along with the culture of self-sufficiency that had served our people so well. Up until that point, large portions of the American populace lived with a very high quality of life through their own production and trade, but seldom had much in the way of cash or currency, because it wasn't needed. The destruction of home industry was initiated by government at the behest of business interests who were seeking, as usual, cheap labor. Using a variety of methods that took only a couple of generations, our people were deprived of their un-mortgaged property, put upon with cash requirements to pay taxes, when the only way they could obtain cash was through outside employment, and so forth. Their economic independence was taken away.

Remember, when you own the means of production – you are independent. But when you depend upon the goodwill of an employer to put food in your mouth and a roof over your head, you are dependent. Either way, at the behest of industry a new model of manhood was put forth in the media of the day in which the husband and father leaving

5 Employeeism and Natalty

home every day to go work to make somebody else rich was seen as not merely a duty – but virtuous.

As the move from self-ownership to employee-ism intensified in the early to mid 20th centuries, men whose occupations coincided with their homes – at one point the overwhelming preponderance of our people – became a minority of a minority. In this way, the men of the World War 2 generation had comparatively little time with their kids – who were raised exclusively by their mothers for five years and then turned over to Frankfurt School influenced public schools for the remainder of their education. Given this lack of fatherly guidance, it is no wonder that the "Baby Boomers" raised by this generation were so easily influenced by their college professors to turn the world on its head and put us on the march to International Socialism, Multiculturalism and Global Corporatism.

Obviously, the wholesale abandonment of the home by the men of our Folk was, and is, a bad idea. Certainly, the demands of the economy have driven that behavior and even made it a necessity; but we ought not be so foolish as to equate necessity with virtue. If being away from your family eight hours a day is virtuous, then sixteen hours a day would be even more virtuous. Well, at that rate, why not be as virtuous as possible by leaving them altogether and just sending a weekly check? Oh – wait – that happens already ... it's called child support. But the cold unforgiving materialistic logic behind child support that reduces a man's value and contributions to the household to nothing more than a check has its origin in that fatal economic move of taking men out of the home in pursuit of employment to support it economically.

5.3 Work Hours and Economic Insecurity Versus Natality

The place where I disagree with certain ideologues on this topic is with their logic that *equality* demands that "anything men do, women should also do." So if men abandon the home, women should too. This sort of logic reminds me of my mother's question about whether I should want to do whatever my friends were doing, even if they were running off a cliff. It also reminds me of my father's straightforward statement that two wrongs don't make a right. Obviously, it is undesirable for men to abandon the home, though they are sometimes forced to do so by necessity. Likewise, it is also undesirable for women to abandon the home, though they, also, are sometimes forced to do so by necessity. If it must be done, then it must be done – that is entirely understandable and I'm the last person who would pass judgment on the actions a family takes out of economic necessity. But don't try to pass this behavior off as somehow virtuous. It isn't.

5.3 Work Hours and Economic Insecurity Versus Natality

The end result was quantified by the President's Council of Economic advisors in 1999: between 1969 and 1999, parents, in aggregate, spent 22 fewer hours per week with their children, and this was caused entirely by the number of hours that parents spent on the job.⁴ Furthermore, this same study declared that *there is an inverse relationship between the amount of time that parents spend working, and*

⁴Council of Economic Advisors (1999), Families and the Labor Market 1969-1999: Analyzing the Time Crunch

5 *Employeeism and Natality*

the number of children they have. Re-read that last sentence. The greater the aggregate time that parents spend outside the home working, the fewer children they have. Two working parents = fewer children. This is not surprising, because European-Americans have developed what is called a High Investment Parenting Strategy. This sort of strategy, which focuses on time and resources devoted to children rather than sheer numbers, causes many potential parents to forego children if they believe they will have insufficient time to devote to them. This mindset was beautifully summarized by a young lady who said to me: "Why should I have kids if I'm just going to be outsourcing their care to someone else?"

And she was right to be concerned. In 2007, the National Institutes of Health issued a report on the longest, largest and most comprehensive study ever conducted that compared the differences between children raised by a full-time parent and children raised in daycare. The study established that: "The longer children had spent in day care centers before kindergarten, researchers had found, the more likely their sixth-grade teachers were to report 'problem behavior,' such as getting into fights, arguing or being disobedient." Furthermore, higher levels of aggression and defiance were reported as early as kindergarten. For purposes of the study, daycare was defined as "care by anyone other than the child's mother who was regularly scheduled for at least 10 hours per week."⁵

AND – there is another way in which employment affects our natality rate: economic insecurity. Across America, job

⁵MSNBC News, March 17, 2007 "Study Ties day care to some behavioral problems."

5.3 Work Hours and Economic Insecurity Versus Natality

security is rapidly becoming a thing of the past. According to a Population Studies Center Research Report:

"In the last several decades the labor market has undergone dramatic changes in most industrialized western countries. Economic recessions, the industrial shift from manufacturing toward service, and rising global competition have all contributed to the dramatic restructuring organizations have engaged in to enhance flexibility and competitiveness. This restructuring has led to large-scale reductions of permanent employees through layoffs or plant closings, and the substitution of involuntary part-time jobs or fixed-term contracts for permanent, full-time jobs. A critical outcome of these shifts in the way work is organized is a rising sense that the employment relationship has become less secure."⁶

A German report, after studying the causes of low birthrate, found that a sense of economic insecurity was a *primary factor* in the decision of 47% of potential mothers to forego having children.⁷

In other words, income is not enough – potential parents must feel that their income is secure before committing themselves to having and raising children; and today's job market, due primarily to the machinations of finance capitalism, has become less stable every year for decades.

⁶Burgart, Brand and House (2006), Population Studies Center Research Report: Job Insecurity and Health in the United States

⁷http://www.ifd-allensbach.de/pdf/akt_0407.pdf

5 *Employeeism and Natality*

And, the most rewarding jobs for women are also the least supportive of parenthood. Ellen Goodman writes:

"Berkeley Dean Mary Ann Mason set out to answer the question asked by her women graduate students: "Is there a good time to have a baby?" Her analysis of 160,000 Ph.D.s showed that having children early in their careers was a boon for men and a bust for women. Fathers who had children within five years of their Ph.D. were more likely to get tenure-track jobs than other men, but mothers were less likely than either fathers or other women. As for women who got on the tenure track before the baby track? Only one in three ever became mothers."⁸

The simple fact is that even workplaces that are supposed to be the most liberal make it extremely tough to be a mother, in particular. Do I also need to point out that women with Ph.D.s are among our very brightest – and that two out of three of them on a tenure track aren't having children *at all*? It seems that pursuing a PhD is, for women, as effective as removing their ovaries at preventing births. I'm not saying they should be forced to have children – because, after all, there is compelling evidence that genes play a role in our political opinions, and college Ph.D.s are disproportionately Marxists ... so their voluntary withdrawal from the gene pool could be a blessing in disguise. But, what I AM saying is that our workplaces have to become much more family

⁸Goodman, Ellen (2005), *Academia is unfriendly to professors who want to be mothers*, Deseret News (Salt Lake City), Jan 21, 2005

5.3 Work Hours and Economic Insecurity Versus Natality

friendly so that people who actually WANT to have children are able to do so.

6 Materialist and Consumerist Causation

Advertising has us chasing cars and clothes, working jobs we hate so we can buy shit we don't need. We're the middle children of history, man. No purpose or place. We have no Great War. No Great Depression. Our Great War's a spiritual war... our Great Depression is our lives. We've all been raised on television to believe that one day we'd all be millionaires, and movie gods, and rock stars. But we won't. And we're slowly learning that fact. - Fight Club

As bad as the economic factors pertaining to tax policy, rising cost of living and workplace time requirements are, the crass commercialism and hyper-materialistic sentiments absorbed by our people have an independent deleterious effect on our birth rates. As we have scrambled to meet the mobility requirements of a fungible workforce and left extended family and close neighbors behind, our window into culture has been left to television and the Internet rather than direct personal interactions and relationships. Culture

has switched from something you *do* to essentially shared visual experiences provided by television. Television, being supported by advertisers, puts forth a narrative in which happiness, sex appeal and practically everything else is determined by the house where you live, the car that you drive and where you bought your clothes. Culture then, in tract suburbs, has become a trip to the mall to buy clothes.

6.1 The New Mercantile Value System

For most of our nation's history, Christian religion, with its emphasis on judging someone based on character rather than clothes, was dominant. But such religiosity had to compete with a another narrative championed by the mercantile class in which God rewarded goodness with material wealth such that material wealth corresponded positively with virtue. Basically, anyone who was wealthy somehow deserved wealth (no matter how that wealth was obtained) and anyone who was poor somehow deserved to be poor.

As Christianity has receded as a dominant force in American culture, many of its moral precepts remain in secular form. In some cases, as with the Golden Rule, this is a good thing. In other cases, as in the extrapolation of equality before God¹ as being the same thing as equality in the material world, this has been unhealthy. Too many of our people hold a skewed value system that focuses on the appearance of material wealth, even if it must be had at the expense of crushing debts that take away all options and enslave them

¹See Acts chapter 10

6.1 *The New Mercantile Value System*

to jobs they hate. This sort of value system serves to artificially raise the cost of living much higher than it needs to be, thereby forcing far too many of our people – and a disproportionate portion of our very best and brightest who gravitate to the best paying jobs – into a cycle where they never feel secure enough to have kids. Keep in mind from the last chapter that feelings of economic insecurity are a primary motivator for forgoing parenthood among our Folk.

Everybody knows someone who has to buy a new car every three years or who eats beans in order to afford a four bedroom house with a three car garage for the purpose of appearances. European-Americans are extremely sensitive to appearances of social status, because over the past hundred years – and over the past 50 especially – we have been groomed by a corporate news media to equate a person's value NOT with virtue, but with material success. In this respect, we are largely guilty of holding the CEO of Lehman Brothers, who walked away with tens of millions of dollars while the employees who trusted him lost their jobs, in higher regard than we do a social worker who has dedicated her life to saving kids from child abuse. That's pretty messed up.

Consider the comparison between the family incomes of families of various races that Steve Sailer uncovered. In Manhattan, the median income of Hispanic families with toddlers was \$25,000. For blacks it was \$31,000. For Asians it was \$66,000. And for whites it was a staggering \$284,000.² Because the incomes for Hispanics and Blacks are low enough to qualify for government-provided housing, comparing our-

²Sailer, Steve (2008), Value Voters,
<http://amconmag.com/article/2008/feb/11/00016/>

selves to those populations isn't terribly useful. But it should tell you something important about the mindset we have bought into in terms of our economic expectations and priorities if Asian households are perfectly comfortable bringing children into the world on one-quarter the level of income of white households. I'm not saying we need to be like Asians – because even the way our eyes interface with our brains is different. What I am saying, instead, is that we need to ask ourselves some hard questions and pose them to our friends and relatives. We need to sit down and think hard about what we really want out of life, and what is really important to us. Is impressing somebody we don't even know with a flashy car, fancy clothes or a big house really so important to us that we'd happily die alone and unloved in our old age in order to accomplish it? We need to bring some perspective to our thinking – and then we need to spread that perspective further among our people.

6.2 A Psycho-Spiritual Illness

“Meaningless existence” and “unimaginable emptiness” aren't just phrases used in suicide notes left behind – those phrases are telling us something. They are giving us an important clue as to causation.

This materialistic orientation has been very bad for our people. It is, in fact, a psycho-spiritual illness as we have allowed ourselves to be reduced from complete human beings to simply economic units of production and consumption. How do I prove the widespread nature of this psycho-

6.2 A Psycho-Spiritual Illness

spiritual illness? Through just a handful of statistics you SHOULD find truly horrifying.

According to a recent article in Scientific American, "Remarkably, in 2002 more than one in three doctor's office visits by women involved the prescription of an antidepressant, either for the writing of a new prescription or for the maintenance of an existing one, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention."³

As often as violence is reported in the news, you may be shocked to learn that suicides outnumber homicides in America by 5:3,⁴ and that 72% of all suicides in the United States are committed by white men.⁵ Children are far from immune. Over the past 20 years, the suicide rate for kids aged 5-14 has doubled⁶, and suicide has become the third leading cause of death among our teens.⁷ According to the latest statistics, "As many as 8 percent of adolescents attempt suicide today. And completed suicides have increased by 300 percent over the last 30 years."⁸

Depression has become a huge problem, so pervasive that the World Health Organization projects that by 2020 it will be the second largest cause of debility in the developed world

³Barber, Charles (2008), The Medicated Americans: Antidepressant Prescriptions on the Rise, Scientific American, Feb 2008
<http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=the-medicated-americans>

⁴Suicide facts for 1999

⁵ibid.

⁶Prescott, James (2005) Suicide rates doubled for children of 5-14 years old over the past 20 years!

⁷Teenage Suicide, Wikipedia

⁸Sarafolean, Mary, PhD. "Depression in School-Age Children and Adolescents: Characteristics, Assessment and Prevention,"
<http://www.healthplace.com/communities/depression/children.asp>

6 *Materialist and Consumerist Causation*

– second only to heart disease. Just as with suicide, our children aren't immune. According to government statistics, "The statistics on teen depression are sobering. Studies indicate that one in five children have some sort of mental, behavioral, or emotional problem, and that one in ten may have a serious emotional problem. Among adolescents, one in eight may suffer from depression."⁹

Naturally, drug and alcohol abuse have skyrocketed. Among high school seniors, 6.5% have used ecstasy, 7.8% have used cocaine, 8.4% have used hallucinogens, and 11.4% have abused prescription drugs such as amphetamines, sedatives, tranquilizers and pain-killers.¹⁰ Alcohol abuse has become so endemic that the combined death toll of over 47,000 per year – and that EXCLUDES accidents and homicides – dwarfs the total number of people who die from violence in which a firearm is used. And that INCLUDES all of the gangland drive-by shootings in the inner cities.¹¹

Let's be honest. You don't have to be a genius to look at statistics like these and understand that our people suffer from a psycho-spiritual illness. And it gets even worse, as alienated young men have penned suicide notes before committing murder-suicides. Before killing innocent people and committing suicide in an Omaha, Nebraska department store ... Robert Hawkins wrote tellingly in his suicide note – and I quote – "I've just snapped. I can't take this mean-

⁹"About Teen Depression." <http://www.about-teen-depression.com/depression-statistics.html>

¹⁰Statistics from the President's office of National Drug Control Policy.

¹¹Comparison of statistics from Miguel A. Faria, Jr., MD (<http://www.haciendapub.com/edcor12.html>) and Wrong Diagnosis (http://www.wrongdiagnosis.com/a/alcohol_abuse/stats.htm#medical_st)

ingless existence anymore.” He also made note of the values he had absorbed from popular culture when he wrote: “Now I’ll be famous.”

This phenomenon isn’t only for kids. When Charles Carl Roberts murdered innocent school children, his suicide note read: “I am filled with so much hate - hate towards myself, hate towards God, and unimaginable emptiness.”

“Meaningless existence” and “unimaginable emptiness” aren’t just phrases used in suicide notes left behind – those phrases are telling us something. They are giving us an important clue as to causation. In my review of hundreds of books, articles and studies, one factor has stood out from all the rest: a sense of alienation from modern consumerist culture. As one researcher described matters, "Depression and its myriad allied disorders are symptoms of a society that has lost its way, forcing us to live in a manner inimical to our human, genetic nature ..." ¹²

In an increasingly atomized culture where many of us rush to work, rush home and spend far too much time in front of the television; work and electronic entertainment (artificial environments) have replaced real social interaction and ties with friends, family and neighbors. Our society has become increasingly mobile, with workers moving thousands of miles to improve their economic circumstances – making more permanent (and sustaining) social bonds difficult to maintain. Participation in church and religious institutions has declined dramatically; and a phony politics has served to divide our people along unnatural lines and further pre-

¹²Murray, B. & Fortinberry, A. (2004), *DEPRESSION: A Social Problem with a Relationship Solution*, AHP Perspective, June/July 2004

6 *Materialist and Consumerist Causation*

clude close ties.

Not surprisingly, since human beings evolved as community-oriented creatures, this loss of community has had a negative impact on our mental health. According to one study "It is generally agreed that social ties play a beneficial role in the maintenance of psychological well-being."¹³ According to another study, a well-developed social network correlates with positive mental health effects, whereas a non-existent or dysfunctional social network corresponds with a greater risk of depression.¹⁴

Another researcher delivers a scathing indictment of our culture:

"The faith encouraged by consumer culture is a faith in money, technology, and consumer products, and it is a faith that often has significant adverse side effects, including addiction and withdrawal. Americans who don't share the faith of such a culture will likely feel alienated from society, and alienation—from either one's humanity or one's surroundings—is painful and can be a source of depression. I believe that many people feel alienated in consumer culture ..."¹⁵

¹³Kawachi, I.I; Berkman, L.F. (2001), *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, Volume 78, Number 3, 1 September 2001 , pp. 458-467(10)

¹⁴Wade, T. D., & Kendler, K. S. (2000). The relationship between social support and major depression: Cross-sectional, longitudinal, and genetic perspectives. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 188, 251-258.

¹⁵Levine, Bruce (2007), *Surviving America's Depression Epidemic*, Chelsea Green Publishing

6.2 *A Psycho-Spiritual Illness*

Even Pope John Paul recognized that the epidemic of depression assailing our people has a cultural cause. A news article from 2003 stated: "Pope John Paul II warned Friday (Nov. 14) that a consumerist society preoccupied with material well-being has helped to make depression the most common psychiatric disease in the Western world."¹⁶ The article goes on to quote the Pope as saying: "The phenomenon of depression tells the church and all of society how important it is to offer to people, and especially to the young, models and experiences that help them to grow on the human, psychological, moral and spiritual plane."¹⁷

Most recently psychologist Oliver James has defined consumerist values to be a virus called Affluenza. He describes the matter thus:

"The Affluenza virus is a set of values which increase our vulnerability to psychological distress: placing a high value on acquiring money and possessions, looking good in the eyes of others and wanting to be famous. Many studies have shown that infection with the virus increases your susceptibility to the commonest mental illnesses: depression, anxiety, substance abuse and personality disorder."¹⁸

Going on, James pulls no punches:

"The virus values prevent you from fulfilling fundamental human needs which seem to exist

¹⁶Polk, P. (2003), Pope Says Consumerism Helps to Spread Depression, Religious News Service

¹⁷ibid.

¹⁸James, Oliver (2006), On the Money, The Observer, Jan 1, 2006

6 *Materialist and Consumerist Causation*

in every society. Whereas you want a better car or greater intelligence or bigger house, you can survive without them; the same is not true of Needs. The precise content and labeling of such needs is debatable, but four are very commonly identified: security (emotional and material), connectedness to others, authenticity and autonomy, and feeling competent. Around the world, rural communities are less prone to illness than urban ones, nonindustrialised communities less so than industrialized ones. My explanation ... is that the virus promotes Having over Being and the confusion (through advertising) of wants with needs. Only through getting us to want more and to be someone else can economic growth and the profits of a tiny elite be continuous."¹⁹

If the economic forces described in Chapter 2 were not enough of a problem all by themselves, the spiritually barren and meaningless existence of the hyper-materialistic values we have absorbed multiply those economic problems many times over, making them far worse than they would otherwise be because they artificially raise our cost of living such that we never feel sufficiently economically comfortable to afford children.

But the problems caused by these values, predominantly workaholicism, anxiety and depression depress our birthrate even further. The negative correlation between number of hours worked and natality was explored in the previous

¹⁹ibid.

chapter, but the affect of anxiety and depression merits further expansion. Anxiety and depression are primarily treated in this country with medication known as Selective Serotonin Re-uptake Inhibitors or SSRIs. SSRIs often cause sexual dysfunction,²⁰ and even after their use is discontinued, sexual dysfunction can persist for months or years. In some cases, it is permanent.²¹ So here we have a hyper-materialism that in and of itself decreases natality, and that hyper-materialism leads to depression, and the treatments for this depression can result in what amounts to lifetime castration. I wonder how this might affect our birth rates?

²⁰https://cdn.mdedge.com/files/s3fs-public/Document/September-2017/0912CP_Article1.pdf

²¹<https://rxisk.org/post-ssri-sexual-dysfunction-ssd/>

7 Radical Feminism

Many famous landmarks in the United States were built by women's organizations. For example, Constitution Hall in Washington, D.C. was built by the Daughters of the American Revolution; and Confederate Memorial Hall at Vanderbilt University was built by the Daughters of the Confederacy. From 1850 until 1950, practically every town big enough to have a road also had at least one women's organization. If you have a monument in your town to war dead or celebrating a local hero, the odds are that this monument was erected by a women's organization.

Few topics engender stronger reactions than feminism among our folk. Because of the strength of those reactions, the topic is a minefield. Nevertheless, because of the profound influence of this ideology on the daily lives of our people, no reasonable analyst who intends that our people survive can avoid it. After all, radical feminism has been instrumental in moving forward both Marxist agendas and global-corporatist agendas; with ordinary men, women and children paying a terrible price. So I'm going to address this issue, understanding that most people are plenty smart

7 *Radical Feminism*

enough to know the difference between a human-made ideology (such as capitalism, objectivism or feminism) and a definable group of people (such as men, women or Europeans); and they realize that a human-made ideology can be questioned without any ill intentions being focused on any person or group. Let me state that more simply: attacking radical feminism is not the same thing as attacking women. If you can't see the distinction between the two, put down this book because it is above your level. I can afford to say that in a book I intend to give away for free.

By criticizing "radical feminism" I'm not advocating a "barefoot and pregnant" scenario, which was itself a propaganda invention in the first place. European social systems have historically considered women as integral participants in society, with rights and responsibilities far greater than any other civilization's gender relations models. Western women have long taken leading roles in politics, religion and business, and oppression of women is, to a large degree, the result of outside influences. Look at the many heroines our people have given us: from Boudica to Senator Rebecca Latimer Felton, and Queen Isabella of Castile and Leon to Amelia Earhart, white women have been leaders and pioneers.

The "radical feminism" we're talking about truly has little to do with women's rights and freedoms, and rather is a function of cultural distortion that gained steam with the influence of various "postmodernists," "identity politics" and political correctness that aimed to undermine, and overthrow, Western cultural norms and, by extension, Western culture as well. We see the same kind of thinking at work in the so-called "gay rights" movement, as well as with var-

ious nonwhite ethnic groups, from the NAACP to La Raza. We even see this in such spheres as "advocacy" for disabled people, where special interests in areas like the pharmaceutical world, "special education" groups and others use the issues surrounding the disabled to mask their own agendas.

This kind of intentional atomizing also exists in marketing, where the entertainment industry has manufactured whole "subcultures" based on music and style to create a false sense of identity in pursuit of selling records. One example is punk music, where the concept of "anarchism" was used to publicize the Sex Pistols, yet three decades later fans still think that the anarchist marketing gimmick actually has political value. Hence the circled "A"s on the expensive jackets of teens across the Western World.

So what we call "radical feminism" is not geared towards helping women but rather towards destroying Western civilization. Leveraging some real inequities and injustices, the radicals who presume to "speak for women" have added a whole politically correct leftist agenda of their own, something some feminists themselves have realized. Camille Paglia is one such feminist who has found value in the Western culture that made feminism even possible. Another is VDare's Brenda Walker, who has realized the fact that radical feminism's politically correct agenda actually ENDANGERS women. Open borders Third World immigration has caused a wave of sexual abuse of women, and brought Third World gender norms, like genital mutilation, to our homelands. Spousal abuse of Muslim women by their husbands has essentially made legal in Germany, for example, while leaders like the head of the Church of England have declared that woman-hating Sharia law has a place in the United King-

7 *Radical Feminism*

dom.

Polygamy, a primitive and exploitative practice never before widespread in Western history, has reared its ugly head, while veiled women are to be seen in many large municipalities. Yet what do the old line "radical feminists" say about this kind of thing? Hating the West and our values MORE than they love the women they pretend to speak for, "radical feminism" has found itself on the other side of the line, standing mute about these abuses and their causes.

Even worse, many of these women actually fight in FAVOR of such outrages as the public veiling of women. In Denmark, the so-called Feminist Forum shamefully upheld the demands of an Islamist for gender segregation and the veiling of women. But the courageous Women for Freedom, who are part of the new wave of women's rights, spoke out forcefully against what they called an "insult to both Danish and Muslim women." In the United States, the leading "feminist" groups stand in favor of open borders, ignoring the pleas of abandoned wives in Mexico, whose husbands have illegally gone north. Even such horrific crimes as sexual slavery of women by illegal alien gangs goes unmentioned. Why? Again, because "radical feminism" is not about women, it's about atomizing and destroying our civilization.

So when I speak of feminism, I am speaking of radical feminism. Feminism exists in myriad forms that can be differentiated by intent. It ranges all the way from the hyper-individualistic (yet fair) Wendy McElroy of iFeminists fame all the way through the clearly collectivist/Marxist inspired Gloria Steinem and others. With all of this having been said, let me therefore define what I am NOT speaking about

when I speak of radical feminism.

European-derived peoples, men and women alike, have a certain drive to create and produce; as well as a drive to exercise control over their own destiny. While men and women may manifest these drives in different forms, they exist equally for both. In some places but by no means all, within the Western world, women have been at times been restricted from the exercise of their innate creativity and desire to produce, their occupational choices have been artificially limited, and their education was abbreviated for no good reason. These are simple facts, and anyone who cares to do a little research will discover their truth. When I speak of "radical feminism," I am absolutely NOT speaking of efforts to abolish these injustices against European-derived women. True freedom cannot exist among our people so long as half of us are subject to artificial limitations imposed and enforced by the state.

Although I disagree with democracy in general (which is a subject for another day) and thus with most men, never mind women voting, there is a big difference between the women's suffrage movement and what I'm talking about when I speak of radical feminism; and it can be described through drawing an important distinction between natural rights and civil rights.

Natural rights are a precondition for human beings to exercise their full humanity. They require NOTHING from other people, save that person exercising those rights be left alone. Natural rights hurt nobody else, and require nobody else to give anything up. When women sought, in the late 1800's through mid 1900's the right to vote, or to enter the workplace in the same professions as men and under the

7 *Radical Feminism*

same standards of competence, or to receive an education under the same conditions, or the right to own property and to correct so many injustices ... they weren't asking for anyone – man, woman or child – to give up anything they already had or to be harmed in any way. These women – and, in all fairness, I should point out a great many men – were simply seeking the recognition of the natural rights inherent in their humanity.

So women who met this profile are not the radical feminists of whom I speak, and their philosophy is not what truly defines radical feminism.

The radical feminists of whom I speak, however, pursue so-called "civil rights" that can never promote equal treatment under the law, because they depend at their core on taking something away from one group in order to advantage another. An example is affirmative action for women, which allows an objectively less qualified woman to take a job in government or slot in law school that a more qualified man would otherwise receive. It should be enough to have qualifications reviewed objectively in as gender-blind a fashion as practicable – which is simple human fairness. But feminists aren't satisfied with that because fairness is not their true objective.

7.1 Modern Feminism

In the United States, the term "feminism" didn't even exist until the late 1960's. Along with all of the other Marxist-based radicalism of that era, it's purpose was to exploit and amplify whatever injustices existed at the time in order to destroy bonds such as those of family that held precedence

7.1 Modern Feminism

over bonds of class so as to pave the way for a communist future. Furthermore, in the wake of the Third Reich, the Marxist theorists of Jewish ancestry added a new priority to their social goals: that of making sure future generations would be hostile to any form of authoritarianism – other than that imposed by communism/socialism and one-world government, of course. This goal, and the methods, were spelled out quite explicitly in the book "The Authoritarian Personality." This book was written by a Jewish psychologist named Theodore Adorno who was part of the Frankfurt School. This book essentially spells out the *necessity of removing men as authority figures from the home* in order to "break the cycle of fascism."

The Frankfurt School for Social Research is covered extensively by Patrick Buchanan in "Death of the West" and by Kevin MacDonald in "Culture of Critique," so I won't stray from our discussion to explore the Frankfurt School in depth. The gist is that the Frankfurt School was founded originally in Frankfurt, Germany somewhat before 1930 with the explicit purpose of applying Antonio Gramsci's critical theory and other neo-Marxist techniques to undermine every aspect of German society in order to implement a communist revolution and "dictatorship of the proletariat" in that country. When Hitler came to power, they fled to the United States where ethnic nepotism networks allowed them to become quickly established in prestigious universities. They used those positions very effectively to train the next generation of public school teachers, and to promulgate the theoretical basis for what would become movements – radical feminism included among them – that would simultaneously stop traditional thinking while moving us toward

7 *Radical Feminism*

a neo-Marxist neo-Liberal and globalist new world.

This is where the roots of radical feminism post-WWII lie. Like all such divisive philosophies, it promulgates a distorted view of history that focuses on setting up one definable group of people as the "victims" and another group of people as the "oppressors." Furthermore, radical feminism seeks to re-write history in such a way as to both exaggerate the wrongs that were done to women and – most importantly – to cast that suffering as unique and extraordinarily egregious. As the same group of individuals who elevated observance of the Holocaust to a national religion are largely the same individuals who brought us radical feminism, the commonality of technique is expected.

7.2 False History

Having established such a past history of victimization, this history is then used to inculcate modern people, who are suffering from no such wrongs and if anything act from a position of privilege, with a sense of shared victim-hood with a group of people that is set apart from the rest of society, and is seen to have interests that diverge from those of the rest of society, by virtue of this past history of victimization. This technique is used again and again for every conceivable group of people in order to atomize and rip apart society to make room for a “divide and rule” strategy. Then all these various people who self-identify with various victim-classes come together in coalitions to support candidates and causes who will act contrary to the best interests of society at large in order to seemingly advantage each constituency of the coalition while really only advancing the rule of a hidden

oligarchic cabal. In this way, society becomes disjointed and unfriendly – and poisoned from within so it is more easily ruled.

This victimology serves, as well, to justify a unique sort of life-boat ethics in which any affront, no matter how small or how well-intended, is seen as a prelude to the re-establishment of the victimizations of the past. In this way, severe punishments that go far beyond the acts they intend to punish, are justified. Thus, we were presented with Harvard president Larry Summers being forced to resign for making a statement that is backed up by a tremendous amount of research; namely, that the relative capacities of men and women differ – on average – in various fields of endeavor. (See, for example, the book “Brain Sex” by Moir and Jessel.) Summers certainly wasn’t advocating excluding women in any way, and was, in fact, responsible for all sorts of preferences for women. After all, the fact that men and women may differ in certain arenas on average doesn’t say anything about any particular man or woman; but what it DOES do, is explain why, in the face of preferential treatment at every level, men would outnumber women in certain fields and vice versa.

But radical feminism, like all of the philosophies issuing from the sordid underbelly of leftist radicals, isn’t interested in truth or open debate. Even statements of proven fact, or simply suggesting that research contrary to their claims exists, are greeted with calls for the most severe sanctions, including the loss of one’s livelihood or even freedom.

If this sequence of events seems familiar, it should. You need look no further than the State of Israel as a model for this sort of behavior. Every Israeli child is taught early about a past history of victimization, so that even a bunch

7 *Radical Feminism*

of Palestinian kids throwing rocks is seen as a prelude to a second Holocaust and justification for the most severe of responses, including infanticide. While the content of this situation certainly differs from the content of the peculiar ethics of radical feminism; the all-important structure which defines it is the same.

A history of past victimization is then used to establish a justification for policy proposals that go much further than righting injustices by guaranteeing the natural rights of the allegedly victimized class, but exacts retributive justice in various forms against the alleged oppressing class.

So just as German children whose parents weren't even born yet at the time of the Holocaust find themselves beholden to pay "reparations" to Israel for crimes allegedly committed by a small subset of their ancestors; today's boys and men are penalized and held accountable for not just real wrongs that really happened in the past, but for imaginary or exaggerated wrongs as well. Thus, a young man of today finds himself with fewer educational opportunities and fewer employment opportunities than he would otherwise find; because it is necessary to punish him, as a member of a class, for wrongs he never personally committed.

This is the dirty little secret behind all of the various victim classes: they ultimately seek to direct harm against people who never did anything wrong solely on the basis of their race, sex, or other attribute. So one might be harmed a hundred different ways both overtly and covertly for being born white, for being born heterosexual, for being born male, for being born intelligent – and the list goes on. Ultimately, in the cult of victimology, nobody is spared. That is because, in spite of attempts to tear us apart; the European-

American folk are one people, and anything that hurts a subset of our Folk will ultimately harm ALL of our folk.

In the case of feminism, the victims are alleged to be women, and the oppressors are alleged to be men. The retributive justice takes on many forms and creates an effective rift in the family and diminishes the level of trust between men and women. Like all of the weapons of our enemies, it thrives by appealing to the most base and least noble aspects of our character while failing to truly uplift or remove the stigma of victimization from the class of victims it defines. As I have already described, the family is the basic unit of our Folk, and the smallest unit capable of propagating itself. Anything that damages our ability to form effective families that propagate our Folk is, ipso facto, genocidal. Radical feminism, as I have defined it, then, is a philosophy of genocide against our folk.

Now, I have just made a very strong statement, and I'll stand behind it. That's because, like most pernicious evil, the Marxist leaders of feminist movements have been very careful to use ideas with which any rational person agrees as a cover to cloak their true advocacies.

That having been said, let's explore the historical record. We have to do this in order to debunk the underlying notion put forth by radical feminism of unique and egregious victimization. As we discuss the historical record, though, there are two ideas I want you to keep in mind. The first is that the events of a particular chapter of history cannot be judged by using today's moral ideas. Everything that occurs historically occurs within a particular context, which includes the available technology, the dominant religious ideas, environmental or disease factors and the inter-

7 *Radical Feminism*

ests of the rulers of the day. The culture at a given point in history often reflects necessities for survival that do not exist today. For example, in a world without antibiotics or vaccinations, if you are a settler on the prairie whose wife is the only source of food for a nursing infant, you don't send her out to do something highly risky because the potential price – the life of both mother AND child – is just too high.

The second is that there are, on average, substantive differences between men and women physically, emotionally and psychologically. Anyone who doesn't realize this has never been married or never had a child whose sex is the opposite of his or her own. In the modern era we have all sorts of surpluses, training and technology available that render many of those differences much less important – or even completely unimportant in many areas – so we can afford to re-examine prior orthodoxies and traditions. But in the past, these surpluses and technology didn't exist, so the consequences of failure would have been much higher. For example, in the modern era with excellent training, weapons-retention holsters, TASERs and pepper spray available, men and (a small minority of) women are both suited for police work; whereas in prior times when a peace officer's only option short of employing a gun was to use his hands or a stick, the differences in upper body strength between men and women were much more important to the job so that no women at all could have been capable of the work. Even under modern technological conditions, the idea of a woman being strong enough to be a firefighter and rescue someone by carrying a 200 lb person down three flights of stairs is pretty iffy. Women participating in elite fighting forces has become increasingly a joke as, in order to get women into

them, standards have had to be lowered repeatedly, thus compromising military effectiveness.

Even so, much of the substance of the historical record is distorted both by the traditionalists AND by the radical feminists. In the case of the traditionalists, they want us to believe that women have always been barefoot and pregnant while stirring dinner with one hand and nursing an infant with the other, and that up until women's suffrage they were quite happy with that circumstance. Not only were women supposedly under such constraints and happy with them, but it was even a manifestation of the will of a deity – and for women to be employed outside the home was somehow sinful and therefore automatically resulted in evil consequences. The radical feminists want us to believe pretty much the same thing in terms of the circumstances, except that women were being brutalized and oppressed. They vastly exaggerate the wrongs, take them out of context, and even add a few that never occurred in order to establish a victim status for women as a whole.

So let's look at women voting in this country. In the U.S. Constitution, only two groups of people are explicitly excluded from voting or serving in Congress outside of age and citizenship constraints; and those groups comprise slaves and indentured servants. Neither is defined by sex. Most assuredly, this latter class included European-American women, but it also included men. And indentured servitude was no small practice: fully HALF of all immigrants to the United States in the 17th and 18th centuries were indentured servants.¹ Indentures, though origi-

¹Richard Hofstaedter, White Servitude
<http://www.montgomerycollege.edu/Departments/hpolscrv/whiteser.html>

7 *Radical Feminism*

nally limited in scope, were often extended to cover a person's entire lifetime through various machinations, and one professor notes that "... the large number of servants who ran away or committed suicide suggests that the conditions of life during the period of bondage may not have been so different for the servant and the slave."²

Simply on the basis of indentured servitude, large blocks of the European-American population, male and female alike, were constitutionally prohibited from voting. The institution of indentured servitude was not abolished in this country until AFTER the franchise was extended to women. I bet you didn't know that.

Our Constitution left the details of voting requirements up to the states, and they all restricted the franchise to people who owned property exceeding a certain value. As a result, roughly 70% of white men who weren't indentured were not allowed to vote. Most of these disenfranchised men lived in the urban Northeast. Those property requirements were dropped by 1850, but were quickly followed in states like Massachusetts and Connecticut with literacy tests adopted by 1855. These tests were designed and intended to prevent Irish Catholics from voting.

The point I am making here is that during the first 100 years of America's existence as a nation, franchise restrictions were extremely common. While women, as a class, were generally (though not always) excluded from voting by state laws, their case was in no way unique. Slaves of both sexes couldn't vote, and a large population of indentured servants of both sexes couldn't vote. Poor people of both sexes couldn't vote, and Irish Catholics of either sex

²ibid.

7.2 *False History*

who couldn't pass a literacy test couldn't vote. The injustice experienced by women in that era regarding the right to vote was not qualitatively different from that of as many as 70% of men, depending upon the locale and decade. This doesn't make it right, and doesn't justify it – but it DOES indicate that the claims of radical feminists of a form of unique victimization that exalted white males – as a class and in particular – as oppressors is factually incorrect. Most white men were every bit as disenfranchised as white women. When this was the case, attempts to redefine that dynamic as being “men versus women” are factually incorrect and thus disingenuous at best.

Speaking of property requirements, radical feminists have often expressed three allegations regarding the treatment of women in past ages in America for which there is either no factual basis, or the facts have been taken out of context. The first is that women were considered to be property, the second is that women were not allowed to own property, and the third is that they were legally constrained from pursuing professions. The impression that the radical feminists seek to portray through these allegations is that women were no better off than African slaves. Obviously, both white women AND white men who were indentured servants were in a tough situation. And, certainly, white folks of either sex who were impoverished suffered from abbreviated rights. But for women who were of a social standing such that the men in their family had freedom of franchise, the situation was nowhere near as stark as the professors of "Women's Studies" departments would have us believe.

No doubt, social and cultural prejudices erected enormous hurdles for women; nevertheless, if a white woman was of a

7 *Radical Feminism*

class such that the men in her family met the requirements for voting, there was little she couldn't do with persistence. Here are some notable women whose achievements prove that the barriers that existed were in no way comparable to those of slaves, and furthermore those barriers, to the extent that they existed, were predominantly cultural and lacked the state machinery necessary for oppression.

Madam C.J. Walker was an African-American woman who founded her own cosmetics company in the Mississippi Delta in 1905. She became this country's first female African-American millionaire, and did it all before an amendment to the federal Constitution codified her right to vote as a woman. By the way, one million dollars in 1905 is about 80 million dollars in today's money.

In 1766 Mary Goddard became the owner of the *Providence Gazette*, then became the Postmaster of Baltimore in 1775, and opened her own bookstore in 1789. The fact she could do this substantively contradicts the notion that women couldn't own property or work jobs. Mary Kies filed for patent protection for a weaving technique she invented in 1809, establishing her ownership of intellectual property. Elizabeth Blackwell became a degreed Medical Doctor in 1849. Admittedly, she had to struggle against prevailing attitudes, but the fact she was even allowed to attend college first and then medical school indicates that there were no laws prohibiting it.

Arabella Mansfield was admitted to the Iowa bar in 1869, and in 1892 Myra Bradwell received her license to practice law before the Supreme Court. Back in 1868 she had already established *The Chicago Legal News*, a business that she owned. In 1869 she said something I think was extremely

worthwhile when she wrote: "You ask us, how shall this great privilege (of voting) be obtained for women? We will tell you. Not by the class who term man 'a tyrant'—but by the sensible and devoted mothers, wives and daughters of the state unifying together, we mean those who have the respect and love of their fathers, husbands and brothers, and asking them that they give to women the right to vote." Far from being a feminist in the mold of today's Marxist agitators who drive a wedge between men and women, Myra Bradwell had the insight to understand that both men and women would have to advance together in a state of mutual love and respect.

Meanwhile, in the world of politics, Susanna Salter was elected mayor of Argonia, Kansas in 1887; and Jeannette Rankin of Montana was elected to the United States Senate in 1916, before an amendment to the federal Constitution codified her right to vote. And long before this, of course, the Western world had seen many women as sovereigns, such as Queen Elizabeth and Queen Isabella.

All of the foregoing should indicate to you that even though circumstances for white women in this country were less than ideal, they fit neither the model of the traditionalists NOR the feminists. The idea that women were legally barred from professions is simply not true.

Of course, not all women were like the folks I've mentioned. The unfortunate reality was that prevailing perceptions among employers and others served to impose limitations on women that, in many cases, didn't exist for men. These weren't usually codified into law, but they were nevertheless problematic, and one of the most pernicious issues was a codification of Old Testament style headship in terms

7 *Radical Feminism*

of women and property. While this did not apply to single women, when a woman was married everything she owned automatically became her husband's in some states. Any money she earned also became her husband's. If the couple divorced, the husband retained all of the assets and property automatically, and also retained full physical and legal custody to any children with no obligation to allow the mother to even see them. If the husband wished, he could disinherit his wife in his will without her knowledge, so that when he passed on, she would be surprised to find herself penniless.

Here is a case where radical feminists have distorted an injustice to make it seem more pervasive than it really was. Single women had no prohibitions on property ownership whatsoever. In the case of married women, in many states title DID pass to the husband; and that was undoubtedly a grave injustice. But widows could inherit property, and the overwhelming preponderance of husbands dealt equitably with their wives.

7.3 Unfairness Leads to Poisoning

Luckily, the massive differential in legal power between a married man and his wife was seldom misused, but it happened often enough to create a certain environment of fear among many women, and to seriously discourage divorces that should have occurred. Thus the all-too-common cases of wives poisoning their husbands in the late 1800's through early 1900's. I have a book on forensic toxicology written in the 1920's,³ and such poisoning was sufficiently common

³Brundage, A. (1920). *A Manual of Toxicology*

7.3 *Unfairness Leads to Poisoning*

that anytime there was a shadow of a doubt, numerous tests for common poisons were performed. I think it's pretty obvious that when the wife starts poisoning the husband, the couple ought to be divorced before someone gets hurt; but the legal situation was so skewed to the detriment of women in that regard that many chose to kill their husbands rather than face divorce.

With that having been said, it should also be noted that most women, particularly women of a class such that their husbands were eligible to vote, lived lives that were empowered beyond anything radical feminists would have us believe today.

But before I describe that, let me briefly describe the conditions that men were experiencing in that era.

The first hints came as early as the Whiskey Rebellion, but starting in earnest after the Civil War, there was a concerted effort to crush and destroy the agrarian culture of the South and rural America. Up until that point, large portions of the American populace lived with a very high quality of life through their own production and trade, but seldom had much in the way of cash or currency, because it wasn't needed. The destruction of home industry was initiated by government at the behest of business interests who were seeking, as usual, cheap labor. Using a variety of methods that took only a couple of generations, our people were deprived of their un-mortgaged property, put upon with cash requirements to pay taxes, when the only way they could obtain cash was through employment, and so forth. Their economic independence was taken away. A new model of manhood was put forth in the media of the day in which the husband and father leaving home every

7 *Radical Feminism*

day to go work to make somebody else rich was seen as not merely noble – but a duty.

Men were forced into this workforce by the hundreds of thousands, with few choices and fewer protections. As a result, in 1913, which is the earliest year for which data is available, fully 23,000 men were killed on the job.⁴ To put this in context for you, during WWI, approximately 27,000 American men died in battle on a yearly basis. So the workplace carnage of white men, annually, was equivalent to that of what was, up until that time, the most breathtakingly brutal war ever fought. In that era, there was little motivation to put the safety of working men first, as accidents were cheap. About half the time, the families of workers killed on the job recovered no compensation at all, and the rest of the time the families recovered about half a year's pay.⁵

Many times – too many times – I have heard people, especially radical feminists, declare that the workplace was a source of empowerment for men, that income equated to political influence, and that the exclusion of women from such occupations as coal mining, steel work and smelting was some form of "oppression." Income, of course, does not create political influence. Income enters one hand through service to an employer, and then leaves the other hand to pay for necessities. Only income that is retained and becomes wealth can buy influence. And these tens of thousands of dead men and hundreds of thousands of maimed and broken men, I can assure you, had precious little influence.

But I should point out, as well, that women weren't ex-

⁴http://www.weitzlux.com/workaccidentshistory_725.html

⁵<http://eh.net/encyclopedia/article/aldrich.safety.workplace.us>

7.4 The Unprecedented Power of Housewives

cluded from the industrial workforce entirely. Starting in the 1820's women known collectively as "mill girls" – and children as young as ten – made the trek to textile mills that lined the rivers in the Northeastern United States, where they worked for as long as 15 hours a day. While the safety of the conditions under which women and children worked was better than for men, it should be obvious that the early robber barons were "equal opportunity exploiters." Working in the textile mill 15 hours a day was neither more, nor less, empowering than working in a coal mine for that same period.

But, in the case of that class of women whose means were sufficient that they could afford to stay home, they didn't sit idly by!

7.4 The Unprecedented Power of Housewives

I stumbled onto this hidden and very important part of history when my wife brought home an old cookbook from Bermuda that had been published by an organization called the Daughters of the British Empire. I looked up their history on the Internet, and was pleasantly shocked to discover that these creative and hard-working women had, through numerous chapters in the United States, constructed homes for the aged all over the country, built and maintained a 2,300-acre Garden of Peace, provided incalculable humanitarian relief during both World Wars and raised millions of dollars to assist soldiers during those war efforts. Understanding that European-derived women are a very pro-

7 *Radical Feminism*

ductive and hardy sort, I really shouldn't have been surprised. So I started digging, because I was certain that if this one women's organization had accomplished so much, there must have been others. Sure enough, there were dozens.

One of the most famous is the Women's Christian Temperance Union. The WCTU was originally formed to address issues pertaining to alcohol abuse that culminated in a Constitutional amendment, but these energetic women also turned their attention to labor issues, the abolition of prostitution, and public health and sanitation. The WCTU was a powerhouse that was instrumental in adopting laws that made workplaces safer, they established orphanages, 1,000 local unions, and got every state in the union to adopt temperance education in public schools. In modern times, the WCTU was pushing the Marriage Amendment to make marriage only between a man and a woman, has been cracking down on tobacco use by children and working to eradicate illegal drugs.

Many famous landmarks in the United States were built by women's organizations. For example, Constitution Hall in Washington, D.C. was built by the Daughters of the American Revolution; and Confederate Memorial Hall at Vanderbilt University was built by the Daughters of the Confederacy. From 1850 until 1950, practically every town big enough to have a road also had at least one women's organization. If you have a monument in your town to war dead or celebrating a local hero, the odds are that this monument was erected by a women's organization. These organizations wielded tremendous power and influence over the life in those towns because the industrial revolution brought that class of women something very important: leisure.

7.4 *The Unprecedented Power of Housewives*

Next to wealth, free time is another source of power and influence. People who are tied up constantly working simply don't have time to devote to charity work and political change.

If you think about it, this explains how a woman was able to become a United States Senator in an era when only men could vote. And the fact that the men actually voted for her, as well, says something about the mindset of the majority of white men eligible to vote as well – and what it says ... contradicts the history of oppression and victimization that the radical feminists in Women's Studies departments are anxious to shove down our children's throats.

Meanwhile, by the time World War II rolled around, the inequities in divorce laws had been largely eliminated so that our soldiers in WWII experienced – by the tens of thousands – something that our soldiers in World War I had not: Dear John letters. This was, paradoxically, a very beneficial development as the introduction of fairness into our divorce laws saw a dramatic decline in the number of men dying in emergency rooms from poisoning.

If you stop to think about the incredible achievements of European people over history, it isn't exactly shocking when we confront just how supremely capable our women really are. This should be a source of pride. European-derived men and European-derived women are true complementary equals. Yes, most certainly, there are differences between us both in ability in various fields AND in inclination or areas of interest. This is just a natural product of evolution, and should be embraced and understood rather than denied or swept under the rug like the so-called "National Organization for Women" would dictate. By embracing and under-

7 *Radical Feminism*

standing these differences, we can learn to build stronger families and a stronger people.

But embracing the provable fact of differences between the sexes of our Folk cannot be suffered to be prescriptive or proscriptive. We are a proud and free people – and that means ALL of our people – men and women alike – must have the same freedoms and responsibilities. Men and women are not equal in the sense that $2+2=4$. They are NOT identical. When I speak of equality of men and women, I speak in terms of their complementary nature, and the equality of regard with which they, and their unique place among our people, should be held.

Either way, the foregoing indicates that the idea of women buckling down and working hard side-by-side with men is not a recent invention for which Jewish communists like Betty Friedan or Gloria Steinem can take credit. European women have been working hard and achieving great things for all of our history, and they didn't need the pernicious "help" of Marxist infiltrators calling themselves "feminists" to do it, either – thank you very much.

When we look at the history of our country, it is evident that huge segments of the European-American population were disenfranchised for reasons of insufficient wealth, indenture or having been born Irish. This applied to men and women alike. Coming through the early industrial revolution, hours were long, protections were few, and injuries and deaths occurred at a level many times greater than had ever occurred among slaves while on this continent. There were inequities that were directed against women, yet many women strove quite successfully to overcome them. Ultimately, men – who were the only voters – voted to right

these wrongs. There could, quite literally, be thousands of pages written on just the history of those times. Because my treatment of the matter is necessarily abbreviated, I have left out many chapters. What I have attempted to do in lieu of presenting everybody's pet peeve in mind-numbing detail, is present a fair and balanced view of the history of those times that challenges everybody's views of history, not just those of the Gloria Steinem crowd.

And, speaking of the Gloria Steinem crowd – let's now look at how that group of destroyers has managed to lower our birthrates.

7.5 The Sexual Harassment Industry

The first is that, according to self-identified feminist author Daphne Patai "the efforts of some feminists – members of ... the 'sexual harassment industry' – have created an environment that stifles healthy and natural interactions between the sexes. The tremendous growth of sexual harassment legislation represents feminism's greatest contemporary success. But this victory has dubious consequences – a world where kindergarten boys face legal action for kissing female classmates and men are sued by coworkers for offenses such as unwanted hugs, uninvited compliments, or glances that last too long."⁶ Professor Patai notes that the creators of this unhealthy environment possess a "pathological aversion to men...and antipathy to heterosexuality."

⁶Patai, D. (1998) *Heterophobia: Sexual Harassment and the Future of Feminism*

7 *Radical Feminism*

The biggest problem with sexual harassment laws lies in the fact that unlike laws pertaining to sexual discrimination, murder or theft, the legal definition of sexual harassment is sufficiently ambiguous that it depends on no objectively definable action whatsoever, and depends instead on the subjective impression of the alleged victim of feelings such as "discomfort." The Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination provides the following guidance: "The legal definition of sexual harassment is broad and in addition to the above examples, other sexually oriented conduct, whether it is intended or not, that is unwelcome and has the effect of creating a work place environment that is hostile, offensive, intimidating, or humiliating to male or female workers may also constitute sexual harassment."

Yet, Professor Patai duly notes:

"The world is a place in which expressions of sexual interest are ever present, sometimes inappropriately, most often not; in which sex is an enjoyable part of life, not a constant threat; and in which women are as likely as men to experience sexual interest and attraction, enjoy sexual banter, bring sexual alertness into the workplace and classroom, and are aware that the sexual dimension in human relations adds zest to life even when not acted upon; and it usually is not."⁷

Yet, the places where, in the modern world, single men and women are MOST likely to meet potential mates who share their interests and values – at school and the workplace – are the places where sexual harassment laws are most visible. In most states, now, employers are required to

⁷Patai, D. (1998) *Heterophobia: Sexual Harassment and the Future of Feminism*

7.5 *The Sexual Harassment Industry*

provide sexual harassment training to employees on a yearly basis, so the potential hazards associated with asking a co-worker or fellow student out on a date are ever-present in their minds.

This effect is exacerbated when that system of laws – written so ambiguously as to practically encourage abuse – is abused to harm the innocent. One commentator notes:

"A woman can make a false accusation of sexual harassment against a colleague or employer at any time, and even if her accusation is proved to be untrue, the damage it has on the career of the accused is enormous. Statistics from an EEOC study performed in 1991 revealed that out of the 2,119 cases of sexual harassment that were investigated, 59% had no cause. A year later that figure had risen to 64% and false accusations also increased sharply.

The reputation of the accused is usually defamed to the point that they lose employment, find difficulty in obtaining a job in the future, and endure a large amount of financial loss due to cost of legal proceedings. Such an ordeal can lead to the development of chronic depression and anxiety. The female accuser tends to benefit from filing such a claim, as the company will pay her a financial settlement to end the issue. If her accusation is proved to be fraudulent, she is given legal impunity."⁸

Even though the actual laws are written in a gender-neutral language, 98% of sexual harassment suits are brought by women, and as of 2006, 47.5% of these suits were found to have no basis in fact.⁹ Now, that doesn't mean that the remaining 52.5% were valid reasons for suing someone,

⁸<http://www.mens-rights.net/sexism/employment.htm>

⁹Daly, J. (1998) <http://researchmagazine.uga.edu/spring98/harassment.html>

7 *Radical Feminism*

either; because remember how broadly the law is construed.

And, it should be noted, that as the above definition demonstrates, all that is required for sexual harassment laws to become operative is for someone to find a particular word, gesture or glance to be offensive. And the offended person need not even be the recipient of the behavior! Even if the recipient of a compliment (for example) is perfectly agreeable, if someone just passing by considers the behavior to be "offensive," then all hell breaks loose. This has an incalculable chilling effect on what Professor Patai calls "healthy and natural interactions between the sexes."

Realizing that employment has become increasingly demanding of one's energy and time both on and off the clock, sexual harassment laws have effectively kept an unknown number of people from meeting their mates. And that is, of course, the entire point – because the entire system of sexual harassment laws was spawned by a group of feminists that a Professor of Women's Studies even described as possessing "pathological aversion to men...and antipathy to heterosexuality."

All the above is not to say that serious sexual harassment – of both men AND women – by superiors was never a problem. There have certainly been instances where this was the case. But the overwhelming preponderance of lawsuits on the books do not involve true sexual harassment, but rather involve someone who feels – or merely claims to feel either uncomfortable or offended.

7.6 Denying College for Men

The next area where feminism has harmed the birthrate of our people is in college.

Colleges have become bastions of political correctness, as one would expect of largely Marxist institutions. But, beyond even that ... the anti-male discrimination throughout our educational system has become so pronounced that men – and that includes all of the non-European-American men – only account now for 35% of enrollment in four-year colleges and universities.¹⁰¹¹ This doesn't bode well for the future, as under-educated European-American males are not economically viable, and thus will not be marriageable in the future. Due to a woman's natural hypergamous impulse, she will prefer a man at least as educated as her, and if white women with college degrees outnumber white men with college degrees, the results are predictable. The causes of this disparity stem from attitudes and techniques employed from kindergarten all the way through college, but explicit anti-male bias in colleges makes the college environment hostile to men, who thus avoid it.

Speaking of the prevailing attitudes on college campuses, two researchers noted: "The programs may have fostered an environment in which the very presence of males on campus is a threat to a world view that sees things only in terms of oppressors and the oppressed. Deliberate misinformation about men and gender issues are an integral part of modern campus culture."¹²

¹⁰Parker, Kathleen (2008), *Save the Males*

¹¹Sommers, Christina Hoff (2000), *The War Against Boys*

¹²Cook, P. & Sacks, G. (2003), *Mysteri-*

7 *Radical Feminism*

College occurs during our peak years of fertility, when the children we create will be the healthiest and least likely to suffer from birth defects. White women are attending college, but white men – due to a dominant radical feminist agenda – are not. These men then go on to earn only about HALF of what they would otherwise,¹³ thereby exacerbating the problem of being unable to afford offspring. But the biggest problem, and the one least quantifiable, is the attitudes that are instilled in students of both sexes as a result of deliberate misinformation that is specifically intended to create distrust and barriers to the formation of sound families.

Another thing to consider is that, with white women outnumbering white men at colleges and universities, it's a game of musical chairs where some women will necessarily be left out of the dating pool who would otherwise have men from which to choose, unless – of course – they choose non-white men. The same thing happens to men, but in reverse. The men who are not in college face a shortage of women and are therefore left out of the dating pool unless they choose non-white women.

So the disparity in college attendance caused by the hostility of the college environment to men causes a loss of male income – meaning a loss of ability to afford children, an increase in inter-racial sexual unions, and worst of all the indoctrination of far too many women with a false impression of their own victim hood and an irrational fear of men

ous Decline-Where Are the Men on Campus?
http://www.glennsacks.com/mysterious_decline_where.htm

¹³Gabe, Todd (2007), Fiscal and Economic Effects of College Attainment

7.6 Denying College for Men

combined with men being indoctrinated into not just white guilt, but white male guilt as well that serves to sabotage healthy marital relationships down the road.

Before I leave the topic of education, we also need to consider what the impact of radical feminism has been in educational settings prior to college: elementary and secondary schools. Boys now comprise 80% of discipline problems in schools, get 70% of all grades of “D” or “F” and comprise 70% of all children with diagnosed learning disabilities. Meanwhile 80% of all school children being drugged with Ritalin and similar psycho-pharmaceuticals are boys: a whopping five million of them as of 2004. Boys are, on average, a year and a half behind girls in reading and writing skills. With this sort of situation, it should be no surprise that 80% of high school dropouts are boys.¹⁴

This is not shocking if one is paying attention to the trends in our society. Even former Assistant Secretary of Education Diane Ravitch has noted that schools favor girls in teaching style, curriculum material choices and behavioral requirements.¹⁵

Christine Hoff Sommers with the American Enterprise Institute wrote in 2000: “In the view that has prevailed in American education over the past decade, boys are resented, both as the unfairly privileged sex and as obstacles on the path to gender justice for girls. This perspective is promoted in schools of education, and many a teacher now feels that girls need and deserve special indemnifying consideration.”

She goes on to state in “The War Against Boys:”

¹⁴Gurian, M. & Stevens, K. (2005), *The Minds of Boys*, pg. 22

¹⁵New York Times, Dec 13, 1998, p.3 sec. 4 “How Boys Lost out to Girl Power.”

7 *Radical Feminism*

“The widening gender gap in academic achievement is real. It threatens the future of millions of American boys. Boys do not need to be rescued from their masculinity. But they are not getting the help they need. In the climate of disapproval in which boys now exist, programs designed to aid them have a very low priority. This must change. We should repudiate the partisanship that currently clouds the issues surrounding sex differences in the schools. We should call for balance, objective information, fair treatment, and a concerted national effort to get boys back on track. That means we can no longer allow the partisans of girls to write the rules.”¹⁶

Let me re-state the situation. Boys and girls, overall, manifest substantial psychological differences, and among these differences are the environments and styles in which they are best-suited to learning.¹⁷ Boys and girls manifest differences in hearing and, research demonstrates conclusively that “Best practices for teaching math differ significantly for girls and boys.”¹⁸ No matter the subject, contextualizing information and role-playing work well for girls, but leave boys disengaged.¹⁹ In fact, sex-based differences in learning are

¹⁶Christina Hoff Sommers(2000), *The War Against Boys*, The Atlantic, May 2000.

¹⁷Eva Pomerantz, Ellen Altermatt, & Jill Saxon, “Making the grade but feeling distressed: gender differences in academic performance and internal distress,” *Journal of Educational Psychology*, volume 94, number 2, pages 396-404, 2002

¹⁸<http://www.singlesexschools.org/research-learning.htm>

¹⁹ibid.

7.7 Deliberate Destruction of Marriage

so profound that numerous studies indicate that providing opportunities for single-sex education for children improves both the depth and breadth of learning for both sexes.²⁰

Now, when you consider these facts, and combine them with what Christine Hoff Sommers has described in terms of the attitudes manifested in our educational system regarding boys, it is no wonder the statistics about our boys are so horrendous.

So the educational situation brought about by radical feminism is quite serious and means that, because of very real educational and class differences between white boys and white girls, both lower birth rates and stratospheric miscegenation are on the way.

But in the present, it is with marriage that radical feminists have dealt their most deadly blow.

7.7 Deliberate Destruction of Marriage

I mentioned earlier that early divorce laws in America were modeled after an Old Testament headship principle in which women were treated extremely unfairly. While this prevented frivolous divorce, it also prevented a good many divorces that really SHOULD have occurred as well. By the 1940's, though, the major inequities in that system had been abolished and for the most part, it worked fairly well. The fact that those inequities had been addressed were evidenced in tens of thousands of "Dear John" letters received

²⁰<http://www.singlesexschools.org/research-singlesexvscoed.htm>

7 *Radical Feminism*

by our fighting men in WWII and a declining rate of husbands dying from poisons.

But radical feminists aren't really interested in fair treatment or justice. Keeping in mind that they are merely an extension of the Frankfurt School Marxist agenda, their goal is to destroy. Thus, they took a page right out of the Bolshevik revolution. Wikipedia notes:

"No-fault divorce was pioneered by the Bolsheviks following the Russian Revolution of 1917. Before the Revolution churches, mosques, and synagogues defined family life. It was the ecclesiastical law of the various denominations that controlled the family, marriage, and divorce. For example, the official registration of birth, death, marriage, and divorce was the responsibility of the church parish. Under these non-secular laws, divorce was highly restricted.

The 1918 Decree on Divorce eliminated the religious marriage and the underlying ecclesiastical law, by replacing them with civil marriage sanctioned by the state. Divorce was obtained by filing a mutual consent document with the Russian Registry Office, or by the unilateral request of one party to the court."²¹

Most certainly, the lack of ability to dissolve a marriage by mutual consent was a problem in this country as couples who wanted a divorce and should have been able to obtain

²¹Wikipedia, entry for No-Fault Divorce, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/No-fault_divorce

7.7 *Deliberate Destruction of Marriage*

one could only do so through the creation of a "legal fiction." Generally, the husband and wife would carefully arrange for one to catch the other in a pre-planned act of adultery, so that a divorce could be obtained.²² Certainly, no reasonable person would argue that in a case where both spouses earnestly desire a divorce, that they should be forced to engage in such slight-of-hand.

Unfortunately, what radical feminist lawyers pushed through legislatures with the help of left-leaning bar associations²³ was NOT the allowance of divorce in cases of mutual consent, but rather a system of punitive justice based upon a fictionalized history of oppression that manifested in a massive power differential between men and women, with women having by far the upper-hand. They created a system in which unilateral no-fault divorce could be pursued, and in which even in contested cases, women won custody of children 90% of the time along with punitive amounts of child support.

Just like in the bad old days when the power differential was the other way around, a certain percentage of women didn't take advantage of that power and insisted on fairness instead. Unfortunately, though, too many of today's women have been through the indoctrination into victimhood status, and have a sense of entitlement. When this is combined with a near-guaranteed favorable outcome in terms of child custody, the result is that 91% of divorces are initiated by women.

Most certainly, some of these filings are quite legitimate,

²²Friedman, Lawrence M. (2002). *American Law in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, pp. 435-36.

²³Parejko, J. (2002), *Stolen Vows*, ISBN 1-59196-022-3

7 *Radical Feminism*

as men are more likely than women to have serious problems with alcohol or drug abuse²⁴, for example. Nevertheless, the role played by the legal climate in women's decision to divorce is demonstrably significant, as repeated studies have shown that in states where "shared custody" is the default condition, women file substantially fewer divorces.²⁵ Let me repeat this, because it is significant. In states where "shared custody" – otherwise known as simple fairness – is the default result of divorces, women file substantially fewer divorces.

This is a case where the enemies of our people have advanced the Marxist-motivated destruction of our families by appealing to our worst traits. Power corrupts, and when combined with victim-status and even outright incentives, unsuspecting men and women are essentially being induced to file divorces under circumstances where, if a fair system of divorce prevailed, they would instead work to save their marriages. And, in fact, no-fault divorce DOES harm women. Thirty six years too late, when radical Marxist feminists initiated a move to bring unilateral no-fault divorce to the last state without it, the New York State chapter of the National Organization for Women put forth surprising resistance: "We have looked down on societies in which all a husband has to do is say, "I divorce you, I divorce you, I divorce you" to his wife and they are divorced. Should anyone be able to do this? Is unilateral no-fault any different?"²⁶

²⁴Margaret F. Brinig and Douglas A. Allen, "These Boots Are Made For Walking": Why Most Divorce Filers Are Women" *American Law and Economics Review* 2-1 (2000): 126-169

²⁵*ibid.*

²⁶http://www.nownys.org/docs/no_fault_divorce.pdf

7.8 The Marriage Strike

I am not going to spend time going into all of the statistics of the matter. Instead, I'm going to cut right to the chase and let you know that the utter brutality of our current mis-named family court system in this country to children AND to men has resulted in a bona-fide strike by men against marriage and reproduction. This strike is not a conscious thing, but it is more pervasive than you think. A fairly long quote from Dianna Thompson and Glen Sacks reveals how serious this problem is:

"Katherine is attractive, successful, witty, and educated. She also can't find a husband. Why? Because most of the men this thirtysomething software analyst dates do not want to get married. These men have Peter Pan syndrome: They refuse to commit, refuse to settle down, and refuse to "grow up."

However, given the family court policies and divorce trends of today, Peter Pan is no naive boy, but instead a wise man.

"Why should I get married and have kids when I could lose those kids and most of what I've worked for at a moment's notice?" asks Dan, a 31-year-old power plant technician who says he will never marry. "I've seen it happen to many of my friends. I know guys who came home one day to an empty house or apartment - wife gone, kids gone. They never saw it coming. Some of them were never able to see their kids regularly

again."

Census figures suggest that the marriage rate in the United States has dipped 40 percent during the last four decades to its lowest point since the rate was measured. There are many plausible explanations for this trend, but one of the least mentioned is that American men, in the face of a family court system hopelessly stacked against them, have subconsciously launched a "marriage strike."

It is not difficult to see why. Let's say that Dan defies Peter Pan, marries Katherine, and has two children. There is a 50 percent likelihood that this marriage will end in divorce within eight years, and if it does, the odds are 2-1 it will be Katherine, not Dan, who initiates the divorce. It may not matter that Dan was a decent husband. Studies show that few divorces are initiated over abuse or because the man has already abandoned the family. Nor is adultery cited as a factor by divorcing women appreciably more than by divorcing men.

While the courts may grant Dan and Katherine joint legal custody, the odds are overwhelming that it is Katherine, not Dan, who will win physical custody. Overnight, Dan, accustomed to seeing his kids every day and being an integral part of their lives, will become a "14 percent dad" - a father who is allowed to spend only one out of every seven days with his own children.

7.8 *The Marriage Strike*

Once Katherine and Dan are divorced, odds are at least even that Katherine will interfere with Dan's visitation rights. Three-quarters of divorced men surveyed say their ex-wives have interfered with their visitation, and 40 percent of mothers studied admitted that they had done so, and that they had generally acted out of spite or in order to punish their exes.

Katherine will keep the house and most of the couple's assets. Dan will need to set up a new residence and pay at least a third of his take-home pay to Katherine in child support.

As bad as all of this is, it would still make Dan one of the lucky ones. After all, he could be one of those fathers who cannot see his children at all because his ex has made a false accusation of domestic violence, child abuse, or child molestation. Or a father who can only see his own children under supervised visitation or in nightmarish visitation centers where dads are treated like criminals."²⁷

Pretty intimidating, isn't it? When you think about it, the marriage strike isn't much different than the men who are avoiding colleges. Colleges have become an environment that is hostile to men, and men are avoiding them. Marriage and reproduction have become institutions that are hostile to men, and men are avoiding them. And thus, our birthrate continues to plummet.

²⁷Dianna Thompson and Glenn Sacks (2002), A 'marriage strike' emerges as men decide not to risk loss

And now, just one example of how radical feminism has nothing to do with empowering women as women, and everything to do with advancing a left-wing agenda.

7.9 All Agenda, No Principles

Take a look at Sarah Palin, John McCain's choice as his Vice Presidential running mate in the 2008 election. The attacks that self-described feminists leveled against Sarah Palin are instructive. Sarah Palin, in many respects – at least from her public persona – reminds many men of the best aspects of their wives. She works hard, has a good sense of humor, and is extremely capable as a governor. She seems like the kind of woman who can kill and field dress a moose in the morning and still be perfectly at home going out to dinner at a fancy restaurant that evening. She has five kids, is pro-life, and espouses conservative principles. By any measure, coming from Idaho State rather than Harvard or Yale, her success in fields as diverse as running a fleet of fishing boats to governing America's largest State should impress women who value the progress of women in the workplace.

Yet, feminists have attacked her with a level of venom that is quite unseemly.

Noted feminist comedienne Sandra Bernhardt's latest show contained some choice comments regarding Ms. Palin. According to one observer:

"In fact, the play wears its politically VERY correct heart on its sleeve with its indictment of America as "A Man's World, It's a White Man's World, It's a F-ked Up White Man's Racist World"

7.9 All Agenda, No Principles

and can only be suggested to be racist in its content if one is hell-bent on protecting White Folk for Sandra's blistering indictment. When Sandra warns Sarah Palin not to come into Manhattan lest she get gang-raped by some of Sandra's big black brothers ..."²⁸

While Berhardt's comments were among the most extreme, other main-line feminists like Gloria Steinem, have also hit Palin hard. In case you didn't know, both before and after her position with the National Organization for Women, Steinem was a major communist organizer. And, I mean, *quite literally* communist. The organization dedicated to spreading communism worldwide is known as The Socialist Internationale, and Ms. Steinem proudly sat on its board of directors for decades. For some reason, when this flaming communist writes a guest editorial in the paper, that fact is never reported in the byline. Anyway, Ms. Steinem attacked Sarah Palin with a rather nasty editorial published in the Los Angeles Times on September 4th, 2008 characterizing her as a "cruel and inhumane person" completely out of touch with the real needs of women.

Feminist Sarah Seltzer said: "I was on the elliptical trainer, and my rage propelled me to the most furious workout I've had in a while ... a lot of feminists out there are appalled by the cynicism and condescension inherent in this choice

²⁸<http://media.newsbusters.org/stories/sandra-bernhard-palin-would-be-gang-raped-blacks-manhattan.html?q=blogs/timgraham/2008/09/19/sandra-bernhard-palin-would-be-gang-raped-blacks-manhattan>

7 *Radical Feminism*

... It's no rare thing for the right wing to use prominent women to keep the rest of us down. But just because Sarah Palin is a woman doesn't mean she's good for women."²⁹

You see, these self-described feminists opposed Palin because, for example, she favored a woman's right to choose whether or not she should be armed to defend herself against violent assault. Radical feminists, of course, believe that women shouldn't have that right. They oppose Palin because Palin has some moral qualms about allowing 13 year old girls – who can't even legally buy a cigarette to smoke after sex – to obtain abortion on demand without parental notification or consent. Whether one agrees with her or not, Sarah Palin's opinions on the matter certainly don't merit the sort of hateful reaction she received.

But that's the whole point. When feminists see Sarah Palin, they don't see what ordinary people see: a successful, sassy, intelligent woman with a touch of class who has climbed further on her own guts and resolve than most people of either sex will ever reach. Instead, they judge her strictly on the basis of the compliance of her politics with far-left extremist positions.

That's because, at their core, radical feminists don't really want women empowered with guns and a right of self-defense, because that would not only shut down their victimization industry; but it would also stand as a barrier to the dictatorship of the global slave plantation and endless human misery they truly favor.

²⁹Seltzer, S. (2008), A Feminist Appalled by Palin, Huffington Post

7.10 Spousal Abuse: The Reality

Finally, as part of this discussion, I want to talk a bit about the truth regarding spousal abuse.

Everybody has heard of wife-beaters and battered women's shelters, but few have heard of husband-beaters or battered men's shelters. From looking around our media culture, one would assume that men are downright dangerous to women on average and that women almost never hit men. Because of this media cocoon, the actual truth of matters is pretty shocking; but if you compare what I'm about to reveal to what you've seen with your own eyes, you'll realize it is the truth.

Any person familiar with the facts of domestic violence realizes that men and women are equally likely to be victims, as a 2007 study³⁰ conducted by the Harvard Medical School reported. In fact, in 70% of cases of unilateral violence, women are the aggressors. Another peer-reviewed study³¹ in the American Journal of Public Health confirms this.

Overall, 24% of heterosexual relationships report some degree of violence. Within that group, 50% of all domestic violence is reciprocal; and in cases of reciprocal violence, the woman is usually the first to strike, and the man is more likely to be physically injured. In cases of unilateral violence, 70% are initiated by women, and 30% by men; though, due to men's greater physical strength, women sus-

³⁰Harvard Medical School (2007), Domestic Violence: Not always one-sided

³¹Whitaker et. al. (2007), Differences in Frequency of Violence and Reported Injury Between Relationships with Reciprocal and non-Reciprocal Intimate Partner Violence, <http://www.ajph.org/cgi/content/abstract/97/5/941>

7 *Radical Feminism*

tain 6% more injuries.

The point here is that study after study confirms that domestic violence isn't a one-way street — it is “equal opportunity” for both sexes, with women being more likely than men to be the initiators of violence. This is a simple fact. Deal with it.

Meanwhile, back at the special-interest ranch, Radical Feminists — whose technique for social deconstruction depends upon inculcating victim-mentality in women while providing female supremacist rights to women over men — have spent decades procuring special (rather than equal) rights for women with regard to domestic violence. No place is this more evident than in so-called “battered women’s shelters” from which men of any sort – including men who are victims rather than perpetrators of violence – are categorically excluded just because of their sex.

In fact, such shelters – which don't even EXIST for the men who are the recipients of 70% of single-initiator acts of violence – have such an antipathy to the male sex that even young boys are excluded from them just for being boys. When a woman with both male and female children checks into such a shelter, while she is allowed to keep her girls, the boys are literally forced into foster care, simply for the crime of having been born male.³²

So let's recap.

Radical feminism is an outgrowth of the Frankfurt School's goal of destroying Western civilization. It played upon existing injustices and inequities, exaggerated them, and used them as a basis for demanding retributive justice. It demands not equality, but punitive measures taken against

³²DV Conference Report #3, <http://www.glensacks.com/blog/?p=1819>

7.10 Spousal Abuse: The Reality

men and even innocent little boys. It engenders a false sense of victim-hood in women, and encourages their worst characteristics while suppressing the best. It is hostile to heterosexuality, actively subverts the family, seeks special treatment of women as a class and actively harms the education of boys.

While the factors contributing to our low birth rates are complex and interrelated; the simple fact is that the radical feminist agenda has put men at such a disadvantage that they are engaged in a strike against marriage and reproduction. The radical feminist agenda has furthermore created class differentials between white men and white women that serve to encourage miscegenation and increase dissatisfaction, and has been a large factor in producing laws that have increased the number of our children raised without a father in the home.

Radical feminism has been an unmitigated disaster for our people and it must be utterly discredited, disinherited and destroyed if we are to survive as a people.

8 Unattractive and Unsuitable

But back to the subject at hand, consider how much time you save when you approach a woman in person whose MHC profile is not a match. Instead of silence on an app, or even worse, a couple of weeks spent messaging followed by a date and dashed hopes, you have a near instantaneous answer. But also, this gives you an opportunity to start a relationship with a woman whose misguided and superficial criteria on an app might have excluded you, but she instead discovers that, in person, you are 100% husband material.

This will be a short chapter addressing some elephants in the room that most dare not mention, but definitely need to be mentioned. Far too many of our men and women are just plain unattractive, or for some other reason unsuitable for marriage, though in many cases, both of these can be changed.

8.1 Get Fit

If you look at pictures of young men and women from 1950 and young men and women today, you will notice that those today are, on average, considerably less attractive for various reasons. A big contributing factor is obesity. Obesity is not “healthy at any size” and it is unattractive in both sexes.

I am not blaming people in some sort of moralistic way for their weight issues. Starting in the early 1970s the USDA started pushing food recommendations and dietary guidelines based on lobbying efforts of industry players rather than health, and nobody knew. Progressively, people got fatter and fatter. As mothers left the home to join the workforce and become tax cattle, we progressed to the point that now 50% of the average family’s food budget is spent on fast food rather than healthful home cooked meals. As we have moved from an agricultural and industrial economy to a service economy of paper shuffling and computer geekery, we have moved to spending 8 hours a day sitting on our asses, not counting commutes.

So the entire system has been stacked against your health. Physical attractiveness that once happened naturally to reflect underlying health has now been stymied, and in order to have it, you are going to have to take deliberate steps to counteract that system. Some people have complex psychological eating disorders, which are beyond my expertise and require a competent professional. But a lot of this can be addressed through some straightforward lifestyle changes.

First, do once a week cooking. On a Saturday or Sunday, get set up and cook large portions of a handful of dishes, put

8.2 *Important Appearance Factors*

them in serving sized containers and pop them in the freezer. This way you have them for lunch and dinner. You'll save a ton of money and also be eating more healthy. Second, and you will need to count these at first, keep your carbs under 100 grams a day for men, 75 grams a day for women while eliminating ALL added sugars. Stick to this like glue. Third, eat vegetables, especially green leafy ones (which provide nitrates to make your circulation work better) like they are going out of style. We're talking about a pound of vegetables a day. Fourth, get something to count your steps and make sure you are getting around 7,000 steps a day. Fifth, get a timer and stand up and walk around for five minutes every hour during the day. Sixth, if you are a woman get the book "Body by You" and if you are a man, get the book "You are Your Own Gym" and do no-excuses bodyweight workouts at home for about 35 minutes daily. You'll be surprised what will happen slowly but surely over just a few months.

8.2 Important Appearance Factors

But overweight is not the only attractiveness problem. Flabbiness, especially in men, is sort of gross. The workouts in the book recommended above will help fix that. But nobody is teaching men how to dress and groom themselves. Although Youtube is certainly an enemy platform that should generally be avoided and Odyssee or other alt-tech used instead, there is a lady on Youtube who gives kick-ass advice on men's dress and grooming named Courtney Ryan. Being a woman, albeit a pretty fair one, her dating tips are only 75% worthwhile, but her tips for dressing are 100%

on-point.

In terms of women ... what can I say? Pierced lips? Pierced tongue? Pierced nose? Tattoos on your neck? There's no better way I can imagine of advertising yourself as throwaway. Look, I get that we are living in a time where a lot of girls are oversexualized early, exposed to mother's sexually abusive boyfriends and all sorts of nastiness. And this has a way of manifesting in various forms of self harm and self mutilation. But you have to love yourself enough not to mutilate yourself. 100k years of evolution made you inherently beautiful, and other than maybe some lipstick and a nice hairdo, you really aren't going to improve upon that. Courtney Ryan has some good tips for you too, but you can start by doing what you can to stop and reverse the mutilation and self-harm. That includes alcohol, by the way, which disproportionately harms women and will steal your looks so quickly you'll hit the wall before you find a man, so stop it.

8.3 Unrealistic Expectations

Studies have shown that women believe 80% of men are below average. Which means, in practice, most women are chasing 20% of men. This game of musical chairs will leave a lot of women far worse off at 30 than they would have been otherwise, and with far lower reproductive possibilities.

If you go to www.igotstandardsbro.com, you will find the "Female Delusion Calculator," which will tell you what percentage of men meet women's most common criteria of age, height, income, marital status and being weight proportionate. To give you some sobering numbers, if you want a white

8.3 Unrealistic Expectations

unmarried man between 30 and 55 who isn't fat, earns at least 80k a year and is at least 5'10" tall ... that is 1.1% of men. What if you don't care about height but you have a thing for engineers? Well, setting height to 5'6" or higher, but an engineer's income of 120k ... you are still at 1.1%. Basically, 80% plus of the men who meet your criteria in that regard ... are already taken. If you want a man like that, you have to grab him while he is still in college or newly graduated and has not yet reached his full potential. If you are expecting a man who has already reached his potential, you're talking mistress territory rather than wife territory. Sorry, because we don't want to encourage home wrecking. And no, fyi, he will not leave her. So go find your own man.

Which means that if you don't want to become a cat connoisseur, you need to re-examine your criteria. Excluding men based on height and income is a one way ticket to the cat food aisle for most women. So instead, re-calibrate and learn the difference between standards and preferences. Height and income are preferences. Actual *standards* refer to a man's character. Is he loyal? Is he hard working? Is he honest? Does he share your religious values? Is he willing to learn new things? Does he have proper financial priorities?

Men are more realistic about superficial things, rating 50% of women as below average. In my experience, the larger problem for men tends to be naivete that leads to their hearts getting ripped out repeatedly in their 20's so that if they remain unmarried into their 30's, they become pretty cynical and no longer marriageable. By prioritizing looks too much when young, they set themselves up for failure. If guys prioritize attributes such as loyalty and kind-

ness from day one, and learn to avoid the women with “red flags,” (many manosphere sites have good lists of these to watch for), that will go a long way toward preserving men as marriageable.

8.4 Productive Steady Work

Okay, so the gentlemen are looking good, properly clothed and groomed, in great shape, with great attitudes and have expectations in line with what is real. What’s next? If you want babies, you have to feed them, and that means income, or a combination of income and skills. In the final chapter we’ll discuss some ideas for this, but the unfortunate bottom line is you really do need to prioritize steady productive work. You don’t have to make gobs of money, but you have to be gainfully employed and keeping your expenses low enough that you can actually save money. You want to be doing everything you can to avoid debt. If you combine being in decent shape with steady work, you will be within the marital strike zone.

8.5 Video Sites and Women

The most powerful male repellent I have ever seen is Tiktok. It seems that nearly any woman, given access to video broadcast, will sooner or later say horrendous things. Although these videos are ostensibly intended to raise a woman’s social profile and improve her access to quality men, they do the opposite. Although there are exceptions, for the most part these videos simply ooze entitlement to such a degree

that men watching them expect an unacceptably one-sided relationship. These videos tend to show a real lack of self-awareness combined with demands, criteria and hubris. The attributes I have almost never seen displayed, the ones most necessary in a wife, are empathy and kindness. Ladies, if you are doing this, you are artificially skewing your dating pool to exclude the best men. And need I mention OnlyFans? That's essentially sex work that turns men into wallets held in contempt. If you are a man and you send even \$1, you are a fool. And if you are a woman on that site, you are damaging yourself to the point of being unmarriageable. If you are a man dating a woman involved in sex work, even OnlyFans, you are not sane.

8.6 Dating Apps

Dating apps suck. With the exception of WhiteDate.net (which must still be used with caution due to infiltrators), these apps are designed to bring out the very worst in women, and discourage men into incel-dom. As already mentioned, women rate 80% of men as below average. This means that the overwhelming preponderance of men using these sites are wasting their time. But it also gives women a false impression of their own value. Getting 100 messages daily in the inbox is NOT the same as 100 men who are both desirable AND willing to commit. There is a huge difference between a man who will smash you without commitment, and a man who will take care of you if you become chronically ill, but the numbers don't convey this important information. So this serves to exacerbate existing negative dynamics. Women might think these apps are fine, but if

8 *Unattractive and Unsuitable*

they worked so fantastically, our marriage rate wouldn't be in the toilet. Objective data shows they do more harm than good.

If you are a man, let me encourage you to do it the old fashioned way: approaching women in person. Being in person bypasses all the dating app filters and gives you a chance to present yourself for an immediate answer. Get the book "The Alabaster Girl," and read it. Think about it. Put it down for a couple of weeks, read it again. Then start approaching women using what you have learned about being authentic. Learn how to offer women an immediate opportunity rather than beseeching for a potential date two weeks into the future. Learn how to tell the truth, and make it charming.

Let me be clear: I am not advocating the psychological manipulations of "game." Although there is some wisdom in that arena, the overall mindset is predatory and deceptive. Rather, as one of the *Amorati* myself (that is, a graduate of the *Ars Amorata* program), I am advocating that you learn a bit of charm and how to approach and deal with women in an authentic but charming way in person. The closest I will recommend to a book on game is Athol Kay's "Married Man Sex Life Primer," even if you are not yet married. Let me also recommend "Women's Infidelity" by Michelle Langley, which will give you the insight you need to save a relationship, or tell you when to end it and just walk away.

I know what I just said there sounds daunting, but get "The Alabaster Girl" and read it first, so you learn how to re-frame your thinking in a more positive direction so you don't fear rejection. For a lot of reasons, many of them outside

of your control, most women will not be a great match for even the most perfect of men. For example, women can sense something called MHC which is genetic, and within 60 seconds in person can tell if you are a good immunological match. If you are a bad one for her particular genetics? No dice. That's not on you. That's not even a rejection, really. Instead, that's just a simple decision to have kids with the broadest immunity profile.

Birth control pills short-circuit that in women, by the way. This leads them to picking the opposite of what they should while they are on the pill. They meet the "perfect" man while on the pill, go off it to immediately get pregnant, and then after the baby is born they can't stand to even hear their husband breathe, and divorce ensues. This doesn't always happen, but it is common enough that *nobody should marry if their entire courtship has taken place with the woman on hormonal birth control.*

But back to the subject at hand, consider how much time you save when you approach a woman in person whose MHC profile is not a match. Instead of silence on an app, or even worse, a couple of weeks spent messaging followed by a date and dashed hopes, you have a near instantaneous answer. But also, this gives you an opportunity to start a relationship with a woman whose misguided and superficial criteria on an app might have excluded you, but she instead discovers that, in person, you are 100% husband material.

Whether you are a man or a woman, I've given you a lot to think about, some reading assignments, some videos to watch and some homework. With rare exceptions, you will find a lot of this revelatory and life changing. Really. Just do it. Whether you are married or single, this will be

8 Unattractive and Unsuitable

the education you wish you had been given long ago and it addresses the elephants in the room.

9 Solutions

For thousands of years our Folk have developed interdependence within extended families in order to shield the family from economic difficulties and increase the likelihood of the survival of our young. High investment parenting wasn't just the prerogative of the biological parents, but of their blood-kin as well. This way, if a parent was sick or died the children still made it. In the past two generations, this practice has gone by the wayside as we have opted to become portable workers for corporate employers.

Across the foregoing chapters we have explored the major causes of low natality of European Americans in a fair amount of detail. We haven't hit everything, but I think the major contributors have been identified and understood. We have explored the economic factors including tax policy, cost of living and employment arrangements. We have also explored the pivotal role played by radical feminism and various issues related to communication and work-sharing between the sexes. In reading all of this, you likely found confirmation for a lot of things you already knew; but not a lot of cause for hope. This is understandable because, added all together the barriers can seem insurmountable. But let me tell you right now that they are not.

9 *Solutions*

There is a difference between the metaphysically given, and the man-made. The metaphysically given include such things as the law of gravity or the heritability of intelligence. We can't change these things, so we have to work within the framework they establish. As Francis Bacon observed, "Nature, to be commanded, must be obeyed."

One of the dirty tricks used by the Masters of Deceit running this society is they deliberately conflate these two concepts so that, to us, many very changeable man-made situations appear to be as unchangeable as the forces of nature. But, let me assure you, that while the necessary changes may be difficult, they ARE within the realm of the possible. If you are reading this, you already know that the forces of dissolution currently running our society are Masters of Deceit, so you won't let them get you down.

The problems that underlie our low birth rates are broad in that they affect practically every aspect of our lives, and deep in that they permeate even into the deepest conscious thought of our people. Rooting out these problems won't be easy, and they may seem invulnerable to assault. But, like any other problem, if we break it up in pieces, we can find the solutions.

So in this final chapter I'm going to talk about solutions, and for each problem we have discussed, we'll talk about two types of solutions: solutions that you can implement in your personal life right now without any cooperation or permission from anyone else, and solutions that focus on the political realm where cooperation as a group is essential. We're going to start with issues pertaining to economics and taxation, and move on through the rest. The solutions we'll be discussing aren't intended to be complete; but rather to

give you a good place to start. None of these solutions are sexy or dramatic; but they are the kind of things that if we work hard at them will ultimately reverse our situation.

9.1 Dealing with Taxes

So let's look at the over-taxation of families. You may recall that taxation of families with children has ballooned 300% compared with other segments of the population. This obviously makes raising children far more difficult, and disproportionately affects groups – such as European-Americans – who have adopted a high-investment parenting strategy.

At the personal level, all that can be done about taxation is to be vigilant about the income tax by using software or a good tax professional that will help you find every last legal deduction. Another thing you can do is refrain from paying taxes that are essentially voluntary such as state lottery tickets and excise taxes.

The income tax, to a certain extent, is certainly a tax on income. But it is also a test of knowledge pertaining to the tax code. Nobody who isn't in that field will have matters down pat, but quite a few software packages – such as Turbo Tax – will help you maximize your legal deductions and even plan for you to reduce your taxes over the following year. A solid CPA can help there as well. What I am encouraging, then, is that you use either professionals or software so that you aren't accidentally paying more taxes than are required. In other words, pay the government every penny to which they are legally entitled, but not one penny more.

You might also consider looking very carefully at “what-if” scenarios using tax software. Remember what the Her-

9 Solutions

itage Foundation discovered: “Among married-couple families where both the husband and wife are employed, two-thirds of the wife’s earnings go to pay for increased federal taxes; only one-third goes to supporting the family.”¹

In the modern era, if 2/3rds of a wife’s income is going for increased taxes, in all likelihood the remaining 1/3rd isn’t benefiting the family much either – it is going for daycare, commuting expenses, car payments for extra vehicles, extra car insurance costs, gas, wardrobes for work and so forth. I want to caution men here: men who are “stay at home fathers” while the woman works are dramatically more likely to end up divorced after their wives have affairs. So really, you are only going to “what-if” the woman stays home.

It makes sense to throw away all of your assumptions, sit down with a good tax package that allows you to work out “what if” scenarios, a calculator and an open mind. You should also take into account that, in families with two parents working outside the home, they tend to spend extra money that wouldn’t otherwise be spent on convenience foods, coffee while driving and so forth. When you sit down and really account for everything, you may be surprised to discover that, in many families, it is actually a net LOSS in terms of money to have both spouses working outside the home.

If yours is one of those families where this turns out to be the case, you should make plans to bring home your wife. It makes absolutely no sense to have one member of a family working full time to pay for the bastard factories in Newark to stay home with their kids while ours are stuck in multiracial daycare centers.

¹http://www.heritage.org/Research/Taxes/upload/89274_1.pdf

9.1 *Dealing with Taxes*

And, let me tell you, there are two very good reasons why you don't want your kids in daycare centers unless absolutely necessary.

The first has to do with what Dr. Kevin MacDonald has called the Human Kinds module. It turns out that a big aspect of having kids who grow up to have strong implicit inhibitions to inter-racial marriage is the racial environment in which they are raised for their first 3-5 years. If that environment is mono-racial, the children will grow up with at least implicit mechanisms for maintaining our genetic heritage intact. But if their environment for the first 3-5 years is multiracial, this critical psychological module that implicitly protects us becomes disabled.² Considering that a prerequisite for the state licensing of a daycare center is compliance with all sorts of multi-culti CRAP, putting a European-American child in one should absolutely be avoided if at all possible. Setting up a child for all of the heartbreak and personal disasters that can result from interracial romantic entanglements is a bad idea; and knowingly doing so is genocidal and child abuse.

The second reason to avoid daycare centers was revealed in 2007, when the National Institutes of Health issued a report on the longest, largest and most comprehensive study ever conducted that compared the differences between children raised by a full-time parent and children raised in daycare. The study established that:

"The longer children had spent in day care centers before kindergarten, researchers had found, the more likely their sixth-grade teachers were to report 'problem behav-

²MacDonald, K. (2006), "Psychology and White Ethnocentrism," *The Occidental Quarterly*, Winter 2006, Vol. 6 No. 4

9 Solutions

ior,’ such as getting into fights, arguing or being disobedient.” Furthermore, higher levels of aggression and defiance were reported as early as kindergarten. For purposes of the study, daycare was defined as “care by anyone other than the child’s mother who was regularly scheduled for at least 10 hours per week.”³

This shouldn’t be surprising. European-derived people have developed, over thousands of years, a high-investment parenting strategy. This was developed for thousands of years before money or careers even existed, so high-investment is not about money or career development, it is about time; our children need our time to reach their potential.⁴

So these are two very powerful reasons – in addition to saving on taxes – why, if you discover that one spouse working is actually costing you money or just barely breaking even, you should bring that spouse home. I will give you some other reasons later, but I want to continue on this topic of taxation.

Another avenue worthy of pursuit, if one has the skills to actually make a decent living by doing so, is freelancing. When you freelance, you get to deduct mileage and similar expenses from your income that you are unable to deduct as a W-2 employee. This allows you to be taxed at a much lower rate for the same level of income than might be applied to an employee.

So, at a personal level, you can control your taxation by using a tax professional or excellent software so you don’t

³MSNBC News, March 17, 2007 “Study Ties day care to some behavioral problems.”

⁴MacDonald, K. (2002), “A People That Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy, with Diaspora Peoples”

overpay your taxes, moving from employeeism to freelancing and by carefully accounting for all the costs associated with having two spouses working outside the home.

9.2 Tax Change Advocacy

But we can only do so much at a personal level. Many times, the math works out such that both parents need to be outside the home. And, after all, the government ultimately has rules mandating that we pay a certain amount of taxes. To deal with these rules, it is necessary to mount campaigns that include phone calls, petitions, letters and faxes to our members of Congress asking for these rules to be changed.

So what tax rules need to be changed?

The first, and by far the simplest, solution for the over-taxation of families is to lobby Congress to increase the personal exemption for children. Back in 1948, the personal exemption allowed for children effectively shielded 68% of a four-person family's income from taxation. As a result, in 1950, the average family of four only paid 2% of its income in taxes. The dollar-value of that exemption hasn't kept pace with inflation, so that now less than 20% of a comparable family's income is shielded, and they now pay many times what they once did.⁵

So – how much of an exemption should we demand? It is here that a website called Shadow Stats becomes useful. You see, the so-called CPI or Consumer Price Index that our government uses to describe inflation is a classic BIG LIE. Important items such as the cost of fuel, food, and hous-

⁵http://www.heritage.org/Research/Taxes/upload/89274_1.pdf

9 Solutions

ing aren't even included. Certainly, the cost of taxes isn't included. Our government lies about this for two reasons. First, because if the truth were known about inflation major changes would be required in the federal reserve system. Second, because under-reporting inflation disguises the true cost of living so that disabled veterans and elderly folks on social security can be SCREWED out of about half of what they would otherwise legitimately have coming to them.⁶ So instead of looking at bogus Bureau of Labor Statistics numbers, we'll instead turn to Walter J. Williams' more realistic inflation calculator.

Using this calculator, \$600 in 1948 equates to roughly \$12,000 in today's money. So that is what we demand from our Congressmen: instead of an inadequate \$3,500 exemption per child, we need, want and demand a \$12,000 exemption per child. This would have an enormous effect on our birth rate. One authority puts the matter quite plainly when she says: "The primary result is that the personal exemption has a positive and significant effect on the national birthrate, and this result is robust to a variety of specifications."⁷ In short, the single policy change that would have the most immediate and dramatic effect on white birth rates would be an increase in the personal exemption. This merits a call to your local oligarch's Congress-critter.

Obviously, this would be no small matter as it would in-

⁶Williams, W. (2006) "Government Economic Reports: Things you've Expected but were Afraid to Ask!" <http://www.shadowstats.com/article/56>

⁷Whittington, L. et. al. (1990) Fertility and the Personal Exemption: Implicit Pronatalist Policy in the United States, *The American Economic Review*, June 1990

9.2 Tax Change Advocacy

volve convincing government to shift the burden of taxation from young families to other segments of the population who will not be pleased. We live in a society that has become quite atomized in which each person seems to ask “What’s in it for ME” without regard for any sort of greater good. In addition, the multi-ethnic nature of the country has increased alienation⁸ while decreasing altruism.⁹ Moreover, we are heading into a period of resource scarcity with the looming specter of more pandemics and a “Great Reset” that some predict will result in a mass death. While I disagree with these more pessimistic projections, there is no doubt that people are rightfully uneasy.

So this would be a difficult task, though far from impossible. This is, on the surface, a racially-neutral issue that can lend itself well to public activism, petitioning, letter-writing campaigns and so forth. It’s the sort of issue where we can get otherwise timid people involved, and really go to town.

The second tax policy worth considering is "The Fair Tax." The Fair Tax abolishes the income tax, and replaces it with a national consumption tax of 22% from which a certain portion of spending per person is exempt. The "ins and outs" of this proposal are too complex for me to go into in this book, so you can go to www.fairtax.org to learn more about this proposal. EAU officially endorses the Fair Tax as a practical step toward reducing government bureaucracy, reducing persecution of citizens, increasing the accountabil-

⁸Tilove, Jonathan (2007) Beneath surface, Americans ambivalent about diversity, Newhouse News Service, July 08, 2007

⁹MacDonald, Kevin "The Numbers Game: Ethnic Conflict in the Contemporary World" and Nisbet, Robert "Twilight of Authority", 1975 p65

ity of government and increasing the freedom of our people. It would also have enormous benefits by putting American products on a level playing field with foreign competitors, thereby raising living standards. The Fair Tax is far from perfect, but fits in well with our strategy of incrementalism. Most importantly, it is truly an achievable objective given that there are over 90 members of the current congress who are officially on the record as supporting the proposal. It could pay BIG dividends to drop a letter in the mail to your Congressman asking him to support the Fair Tax. Again, this is the sort of racially-neutral issue where we can mobilize otherwise timid people.

9.3 Family Finance

So this covers taxation, but what about economic pressures and work environments? And how can we make sure our children have proper care without resorting to institutional daycare environments inspired by USSR collectivist indoctrination?¹⁰ Because most Americans didn't pay much attention to what went on in the USSR, we are blissfully ignorant of the fact that entire Soviet-inspired institutions have been completely implemented in the United States right under our noses. As described in one Marxist tome: ".....one of the first actions of the Institute for the Protection of Motherhood and Childhood was to found factory nurseries for the pre-kindergarten child – places where the mother could leave her children on the way to work in the morning and

¹⁰<http://www.daycaresdontcare.org/History/FormerSovietUnion.htm>

receive them back again in the evening.”¹¹ Honestly, now, you didn’t really think it was a coincidence that both the Communist Party USA and the National Organization for Women called for publicly funded child-care, did you? You don’t think it is a coincidence that daycare is tax-deductible but private school is not?

Our families need to find ways to remain economically viable and stable without sacrificing having children altogether or turning them over to the miscegenation and indoctrination factories we call “daycare.”

So let’s look at how we can decrease our expenses and increase our income.

The European-American Victory Garden is one example that can effectively reduce a family’s cost of living by thousands of dollars a year if done properly. There are, in addition, probably 100 other ways you can cut expenses. One excellent book on this topic is "How to Survive Without a Salary" by Charles Long. While the author’s techniques are unlikely to REALLY let you get by without a salary, they will most certainly help you decrease your cost of living. The key, in the author’s subtitle, is "learning how to live the conserver lifestyle." I would describe the concept somewhat differently. We need to learn, and then teach others, how to replace consumerism with conservation and producerism. Everything you make for yourself, is money in the bank. Some folks are really good at preserving food while others are good at sewing clothes or mechanical things. By doing this, you will live a lifestyle generally requiring a much higher level of income, and in this way you may be able to

¹¹Protection of Women and Children in Soviet Russia, 1932 Chapter I

9 Solutions

afford children.

Especially when it comes to items like cribs, baby clothes and so forth, you should also consider signing up for the FreeCycle or similar groups near you. Exchange groups in which members give away things they no longer need to other members is a way of reducing costs and keeping good stuff out of landfills. Creative use of resources like this can make a huge dent in the \$204,000 cost of raising a child. If you have progeny approaching college age, keep reading to learn how your kids can complete fully accredited degrees at a fraction of the cost of traditional methods.

Then there is another factor, and that factor is where you choose to live. Extended families, which I will talk about next, are so valuable to child-rearing efforts that if you have a solid extended family network, you probably shouldn't move even if doing so will substantially decrease your cost of living. But if you do NOT have such a network, changing locations is something you should strongly consider. Luckily, our federal government has given us a very handy measure of the comparative cost of living between various locales in the form of the GSA Domestic Per Diem rates. These are the rates that the federal government extends to its employees when they are engaged in government business. You can find these rates on a convenient government website. Simply compare the so-called "Max per Diem" rates between localities, and the one with the lowest per diem rates generally has the lower cost of living. For example, the Max Per Diem for Boston is \$284, whereas the Max Per Diem for Oakridge, Tennessee is \$118. After this, you should do more research to make sure the demographics, employment and housing options are suitable. The idea is that by moving to

an area with a lower cost of living, your odds of being able to have kids are greatly increased. Steve Sailer's research supports the trend that white couple have more children in areas where the cost of living is lower.

9.4 Rebuild the Extended Family

If your extended family is strong so that moving is unwise, you can use it to your advantage. The most obvious place where it can work to your advantage is with child care arrangements.

While I was researching the topic of extended-family child care, I was shocked to learn that, according to a 1999 study conducted by the University of Wisconsin in Madison, Latino and African-American mothers who work are substantially more likely to use blood kin for child care than European-American mothers.¹² The reason for this, according to the study, is that the extended families of European-Americans have become less economically interdependent over the past few decades. In other words, while in past times our extended families have all "pitched in" to help each other successfully raise children, that helping behavior has become attenuated. This situation needs to be reversed, and it is up to European-American families who want to have children to take the lead in re-establishing these family ties of mutual helpfulness. You need to think really hard about this when it comes time to chase a career all over the country.

¹²Uttal, L. (1999), Using Kin for Childcare: Embedment in the Socioeconomic Networks of Extended Families, *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 61 No. 4 Nov. 1999 pages 845-857

9 *Solutions*

Let me re-state this another way because it is very important. For thousands of years our Folk have developed interdependence within extended families in order to shield the family from economic difficulties and increase the likelihood of the survival of our young. High investment parenting wasn't just the prerogative of the biological parents, but of their blood-kin as well. This way, if a parent was sick or died the children still made it. In the past two generations, this practice has gone by the wayside as we have opted to become portable workers for corporate employers. As a result, our extended family ties have suffered dramatically – more-so for European-Americans than for any other ethnic group. It is time to rebuild those family ties because they lower expenses and increase the economic resilience of the kin-group, making it more economically viable to raise children.

Corporations want everyone to own their own chainsaw, they don't want us borrowing our brother in law's. They want our brother-in-law to own his own lawn tractor rather than borrowing ours. But with a dynamic extended family, each nuclear family doesn't have to individually bear all of those expenses – they can be shared. This makes everyone better off. And if such economic interdependence already exists, it is much easier to depend upon grandparents, uncles or aunts to provide child care than if altruism alone were the motivator.

Think about this, and think about it hard. Carefully consider what you can do to help bring your extended family together for the mutual benefit of all.

9.5 Managing Economic Expectations

There is one more factor that bears mentioning regarding the cost of living, and that is expectations. We have gone over the damage of buying into the gigantic consumerist mind-fuck in terms of lost natality, poor mental health and so on. Too many of our people hold a skewed value system that focuses on the appearance of material wealth, and this enslaves them. This sort of value system serves to artificially raise the cost of living much higher than it needs to be, thereby forcing far too many of our people – and a disproportionate portion of our very best and brightest who gravitate to the best paying jobs – into a cycle where they never feel secure enough to have kids. Remember from prior chapters that feelings of economic insecurity are a primary motivator for foregoing parenthood among our Folk.

Consider the comparison between the family incomes of families of various races that Steve Sailer uncovered. In Manhattan, the median income of Asian families with toddlers was \$66,000. And for whites it was \$284,000.¹³ This should tell you something important about our economic expectations and priorities if Asian households are perfectly comfortable bringing children into the world on one-quarter the level of income of white households. I'm not saying we need to be like Asians, but we need to ask ourselves some hard questions about what our true priorities should be. We need to consider what we really want out of life, and what

¹³Sailer, Steve (2008), Value Voters,
<http://amconmag.com/article/2008/feb/11/00016/>

is really important to us. Is impressing somebody we don't even know with a flashy car so important to us that we'd happily die alone and unremembered in our old age in order to accomplish it? We need to bring some perspective to our thinking – and then we need to spread that perspective further among our people.

9.6 Be Kind to the Childless, But Change the Values

But there is another aspect of this that we also need to keep in mind. Dr. Frank Salter's work on genetic distance has demonstrated conclusively that there ARE certain things that a person can do that are potentially more valuable than having kids. For example, for every illegal alien we keep out of this country, it is the genetic equivalent of having a baby. While the genetic impact is most obvious at such a level, there are many among us who are driven to pursue a cure for cancer, hunting down child molesters and many other things whose ultimate positive value for our folk is inestimable. People who make such choices – whether they are men or women – ought not be the subject of harsh judgments.

And, I should also add, that there are men among our folk that women just don't find attractive, and women who haven't been found marriageable by suitable men. There are adults among our people who were sexually abused as children, or raped as teenagers, and whose resultant mindset tragically removes them from parenthood. And there are those among our people who have genetic issues and have voluntarily chosen to avoid having children in order to avoid

afflicting those issues upon unsuspecting babies.

Although we need to spread the word among our people of a better value system that assigns status to virtue rather than products, we cannot sit in harsh judgment of people we do not know and who are childless. There have always been people among our folk who were childless, and quite a few of them, I should point out, have left us with something worthwhile in spite of that. Queen Elizabeth the First and George Washington come to mind. But what we need to stop is the childlessness that stems from warped value-systems.

9.7 Immigration and Offshoring

We can also attack the problems associated with cost-of-living at the public policy level. In this arena, a number of factors hold sway, including our sick and twisted Federal Reserve system. For all practical purposes, for now, we can't touch it. It's a political third-rail. We need to understand it in order to understand the big picture, but changing it right now is a political non-starter. With the Trump administration, it looked like we would get some relief on immigration, and we did in certain respects, but that chapter is over and it looks like the powers that be won't be putting any brakes on it.

Importation of cheap labor not only serves to lower our wages and living standards, but it serves as a safety valve to protect business from the pernicious effects of the Federal Reserve System while everyone else suffers. I won't say not to bother calling your Congress-critter, because in the past we have had SOME success with that, however small. If

9 Solutions

you subscribe to NumbersUSA they will help facilitate your efforts in that regard so they are more effective.

With illegals invading the low wage work force and H-1 and L-1 visas invading the higher wage workforce, the squeeze is on from both ends. The best personal advice I can give is to develop skills that will allow you to freelance so that you can deduct more of your expenses, keep more of your money, and develop a stable of clients to whom you deliver good value so they don't mind paying a fair rate.

The other factor affecting our declining standard of living is the practice of off-shoring. Billionaire Wilbur Ross stated the matter so clearly even a politician could understand it:

"Look at all the engineers China is graduating. If China marries its massive labor force to technology, things will be very bleak for this country. In industry after industry, wages are starting to get cut back, fringe benefits are getting cut back—look at the poor airline industry—we're in danger of exporting our standard of living and importing our unemployment . . . You can't have much of an economy if people are just flipping hamburgers, trading stocks, and suing each other . . . Are our grandchildren going to dive for coins from cruise ships in the East River?"¹⁴

We need to put pressure on our politicians to stop off-

14

Wilbur Ross (2004), Quoted by Daniel Gross in The Bottom Feeder King, <http://nymag.com/nymetro/news/bizfinance/columns/moneyandmind/102>

shoring and incentivize the rebuilding of American industry. Anyone who thinks this country can have a long-term future when everything we buy is made somewhere else is suffering from delusions. I think Trump genuinely wanted to accomplish this, but was stymied by people to whom short term profit was more important than the long-term well-being of the country.

So our public policy priorities have to be holding the line on immigration of both the legal AND illegal varieties while bringing pressure to bear for legislation that will stop offshoring so we can re-build our own national manufacturing base. Although their “diversity” position is repugnant, the Economic Policy Institute is a good resource for battling offshoring, as well as the American Engineering Association. So check out the initiatives of these organizations to stop offshoring.

9.8 Increasing Effective Income

Along with dealing with taxation and expenses, we also need to figure out ways to raise our family income, keep it more secure, and reform workplaces so their scheduling and requirements are more conducive to raising children. Going back again to freelancing, for those able to do so, it can offer a good solution to many of these. Likewise, in the wake of the Covid pandemic, many occupations are allowing “work from home” options that are far more friendly to having kids.

On the subject of income, I need to make an important distinction. As I pointed out earlier, income doesn’t translate into political influence. The only two things that trans-

9 Solutions

late into political influence are wealth and time. Time is had by a married couple spending less time, in aggregate, making other people rich; and wealth is had by increasing the gap between income and expenses so that more of that income is retained to become wealth. We have already covered the expense side of that equation, so the other end is increasing income.

The first thing we need to do in order to raise our income is decrease the educational deficiency of our young men who are avoiding college in record numbers. This problem was well-described earlier. We also have to, whenever possible, keep our young people away from colleges that are filling their minds with pernicious victim mentalities and distrust, WITHOUT harming their educational achievement. Both our men AND our women who are so-inclined need to be educated to the highest levels they can attain while avoiding, as far as possible, the fascistic indoctrination and thought control prevalent in public schools and colleges today, as well as student loan debt. Higher educational attainments usually provide not just greater employability and higher salary, but increased leverage to demand family-friendly accommodations along with greater job security.

The European American Nation has produced a comprehensive home-school curriculum that can either be used in place of public schools or as a supplement to make sure our kids are reaching their goals. We have already completed the elementary school portion of the curriculum, which you can download free from www.europeanamericansunited.org/homeschool

There are now many ways for a young man or woman to attain a college degree without ever having to sit in a classroom in front of a raving Marxist nut who will give

9.8 *Increasing Effective Income*

him an undeservedly low grade for daring to think independently. For example, for accredited degrees online in business, health studies or computer science, it is hard to beat the University of the People at \$100 per class. Excelsior College, Charter Oak State College and Thomas Edison State College allow you to take competency exams and consolidate college credit from numerous sources to obtain regionally accredited degrees. Due to online proctoring, you can now get college credit eligible classes at very low cost from [saylor.org](https://www.saylor.org/), and take a wide variety of classes, again eligible for college credit, for \$199 a month from [study.com](https://www.study.com/). [Modernstates.org](https://www.modernstates.org/) allows you to take classes in a number of subjects and will then issue you a credit voucher so you can take the CLEP exams for those classes for free. This is just scratching the surface, but I hope it has given you a starting place to think outside the box on college.

Speaking of thinking outside the box, there are a number of computer credentials that are more valuable than most college degrees, although they will require dedicated study to obtain. Examples include the various Cisco network certifications, AWS cloud certifications, security and penetration testing certifications and so forth. Even further outside the box, becoming an apprentice electrician or electrical lineman can be an extremely high paying gig in the long run.

But along with increasing our educational attainment, as I have talked about in greater detail in some previous podcasts, we need to start turning our homes into something economically productive rather than just very expensive hotels. In accounting terms, we want them to become profit centers rather than cost centers – and that means starting

9 *Solutions*

a home business even if only part-time.

You may recall that I recommended earlier that, if one working spouse was actually costing the family money in order to work outside the home, that spouse be brought home. That doesn't mean that whatever spouse comes home should just stare at the walls and dust the end tables. Obviously, in-person child-rearing is a top priority, as well as gardening, food preservation, home schooling and other tasks that reduce expenses and form the character of our children. But, just as our ancestors worked at home while raising their kids, WE can do that as well. So whatever spouse is at home needs to start a home business. Start thinking now about what you can do with your skills that can create value for which others are willing to pay.

We also need to start investing in the ownership of the means of production. As I mentioned earlier, income does not equate to influence and power. Rather, ownership of the means of production is wealth, influence and power. Of course, if you turn your home into a profit center, you are already halfway there. You can also, with some training, start a nice stock portfolio with very little money these days.

And, as discussed in our Statement of Ethics, whenever we are in a position to do so, we need to provide opportunities to our own people on the basis of their merits so we can create the proverbial "rising tide that lifts all boats." So if you are a hiring manager, you need to keep this in mind when making hiring decisions.

Unfortunately, for the foreseeable future, most of our people will be employees rather than owners; and as already discussed, the workplace is overall rather hostile to child-rearing efforts and in some cases actively discourages the

9.9 Women's Responsibility to Repudiate Feminism

practice.

But not all workplaces are like that. Seek employment with firms who advertise family-friendly policies whenever possible. Family-friendly policies don't apply to just one sex.

Another approach we all need to take is to make sure our qualifications are the best they can be. We need to utilize educational benefits whenever possible, acquire certifications in any fields where they are relevant and so forth. By doing this, we maximize our value to employers and thereby augment our bargaining position when it comes time to ask for flexible hours and other family-friendly accommodations.

If you happen to be a member of a union, you can ask your union representatives to ask for family-friendly policies during the next round of contract negotiations.

A final method worth considering in this regard is starting your own company, possibly in cooperation with other parents who seek the same flexibility. My sister, wanting to stay home with her kids, landed a gig teaching martial arts as an independent contractor at the local community college in the evenings and at a senior center every-other weekend. She made more money for her family working just 15 hours a week than she had previously made when working 40 hours for someone else.

9.9 Women's Responsibility to Repudiate Feminism

Probably the most complicated issue we need to address is radical feminism, because it affects everything from ele-

9 *Solutions*

mentary school education through divorce rates. Because most of the victories of radical feminism have been legislative, the opportunities to combat it in our personal lives are limited. Single men probably can have the greatest impact in this regard by screening potential mates for anti-male, victim-status or hyper-materialistic attitudes; and actively rejecting such women by telling them that you will be seeking a mate who doesn't hate men or see them simply as a wallet or fashion accessory.

Women can help as well by finding ways to draw distinctions between reasonable women who simply seek fair-treatment, and women who use such issues as cover for more pernicious agendas. Publicly expressing scorn for flimsy harassment claims, or for women who have obtained restraining orders fraudulently can discourage others from taking those paths. The handful of nasty and deceptive women out there who misuse our legal system to destroy innocent men have effectively generated a marriage and reproductive strike by men, and this will continue so long as decent women refuse to speak up loudly against them and socially isolate them.

There are also an increasing number of women whose prospects for personal fulfillment through relationships have been seriously damaged by feminism. This takes many forms, ranging from the woman who has difficulty getting a man to agree to have children because of his unspoken fears, to a second wife who has to deal with endless psychological warfare played through the court system against her new husband. Wives are being damaged by husbands being falsely accused of sexual harassment, and women in general have seen more and more men become sufficiently distrustful that

9.9 *Women's Responsibility to Repudiate Feminism*

forming a productive romantic relationship is nearly impossible, or it may take years for the man to build up a sufficient comfort level – years while the biological clock is ticking.

A lot of these women – decent, intelligent, trustworthy and hard-working women who deserve a fulfilling relationship with a good man – have had enough; and they are starting to fight back and reclaim feminism from the Marxists and return fairness to marriage. They have formed organizations that I'll be referencing in a moment, and you can join your efforts to theirs.

As I mentioned earlier most of the successes of radical feminism have come in legislatures and in courts, mostly the former. Thus, feminism must be fought through initiatives at that level, but also through media exposure and education to garner the necessary public support for those initiatives.

Women like Wendy McElroy of IFeminists, Dianna Thompson of The American Coalition for Fathers and Children, Kathleen Parker and Christina Hoff-Summers are pushing hard for the return of fairness to our divorce laws, both in writing and in practice. If you are a woman concerned about radical feminism and its negative consequences for our people, then you need to contact organizations like The American Coalition for Fathers and Children, and look at the positive legislation that they are advancing, and add your voice to theirs in contacting your state legislators.

If you are a man, you can also check out these organizations, but in addition, you should check out The National Father's Resource Center and their links to other helpful organizations.

For men and women alike, you should go on line right

now and sign the Joint Parenting Petition to let your representatives know that fairness in divorce laws is important to you.

But, now, a word of caution. Be careful while surfing – and read carefully. While the organizations I have specifically named are mainstream and honorable, there are a number of organizations out there whose true agenda is to replace the unfair status quo with an equally unfair destruction of the natural rights of women. This cannot and will not work because, as I stated earlier, for white people to be free, ALL of our people must be free. Avoid them as they do much more harm than good to the ultimate cause of creating conditions amenable to more white children.

9.10 It's Up to You

We've covered a lot of ground in this book at whirlwind speed. Our people have reached negative population growth to such an extent that we are in danger of extinction in a mere blink of the historical eye. I have covered the major causative factors, as well as practical solutions you can implement in your private life and public policy advocacies.

There are practical things, then, that anyone can undertake with minimal risk. Many of these things are racially neutral so even the most timid of readers has no excuse for failing to act. So instead of whining and crying and lamenting our low birth rates, I want to encourage you to stand up straight, undertake a posture worthy of our forebears, roll up your shirtsleeves and get to work. Don't sit around waiting for someone else to act. YOU must act. Today.

10 Afterward

I hope you've enjoyed this book, and that, within it's pages, you've gained an understanding of the big picture, the forces arrayed against our families, and how you can use this knowledge to make considered choices to both influence others, and maximize your own familial well-being and freedom. This is far from an exhaustive treatment, because there are a lot of things I left out, such as the impact of prostitution on our families, the cultural force fisting of degenerate lifestyles and more. But I believe this book has covered enough to allow you and your family to take back some power, and use it in a way that will help us have more kids.

As mentioned in the forward, this book and all the research that went into it (which you can tell from all the footnotes in some sections was pretty extensive!) is part of a mission of European Americans United. I want to take this opportunity to tell you a bit about this organization.

We were founded in 2007 out of a desire to move pro-white advocacy into a new and hopefully wiser and more effective realm. It's not that past efforts were necessarily wrong, but they simply did not work. The past efforts were almost universally modeled on the civil rights movement of the 1960s, completely misunderstanding that the movement had been underwritten by the very status quo it was purporting itself to oppose. I have written about this in various articles on

10 Afterward

our news site at www.wvwnews.net. The methods that work for advancing left wing causes will NOT advance right wing causes, because they are quite peculiar to the left. Taking the same techniques and slapping our name on them won't work.

In 2007 we started with a largely European New Right influence (think of Benoist, Norman Lowell, and others) and as a standard dues-paying organization. Over time we have learned, and changed more toward a model such that we are now a stateless nation that has registered on the Bitnation block chain, and asked for diplomatic recognition as such. As a nation, there are no dues, and membership is for life. Instead of concentrating on what has traditionally been seen as activism, which we know has not worked, we instead focus our efforts on infrastructure. Examples include suicide intervention, homeschool curricula, our current project to create our own college (where members actually get paid) and the like. Our end goal is to have a complete self-sustaining parallel society with our own institutions that can exist and thrive even in the face of a dying West. As people having a near monopoly on competence in an emerging idiocracy, we expect to be the people to whom others will naturally turn for leadership. This is a model that has actually worked numerous times, and we think is worth pursuing.

As a nation, we permit our members to also be part of other pro-white efforts and orgs if they are so inclined. We don't see it as mutually exclusive. In fact, we even contribute to other orgs, such as the White Art Collective. Though we would obviously like members to contribute to our national efforts, merely by adopting our Statement of Ethics, they will serve as avatars who will help to inspire

others and improve conditions. All members of our nation explicitly adopt our ethics, and that is because we have seen that a lot of our peril comes not just from without, but within in the form of moral weakness. By consciously adopting and adhering to a higher moral purpose, our members stand as the natural aristocracy of our people. Thus, our members all have aristocratic ranks that start at Knight and progress upward from there based on their meritorious service to our national efforts.

Our nation is ruled by a co-regency of anywhere from one to five regents. Right now there are two, but it is our goal to first augment that number and ultimately even replace ourselves as members advance up the ranks, because this is an effort that will likely last a couple of generations. Unlike other members, our regents are specifically prohibited from financially benefiting from the organization, and since we don't charge dues, that means that our regents have to work for a living and can't devote full time to micromanaging people and ordering people around. This means we expect our members to be self-managing on their own projects. We will provide general direction, infrastructure and approval, but beyond that we expect members to take initiative.

So this makes us a rather elite project, and there's nothing wrong with that. We don't recruit from the general public and in general invite certain people to join rather than casting a wide net. If you feel you are someone we should invite, let us know via the contact form at eau-nation.org.

You don't have to explicitly join us to help. Having read this book, it should be obvious the things that are within your power, which, in reality, is an awful lot. The world is dividing in many ways, but there is a reason why slavery

10 Afterward

was an institution for so long. Are you a slave who only moves when prodded? Or are you going to be the master, at least of yourself? If you've made it this far, the answer is the latter, and we are proud of you for that.