



# SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

## A BATTLEAXE TO BULLSHIT

Aidan Maclear

### About

There aren't many reactionaries out there, but it seems like almost every one has his own blog. Rather than add to the growing library of scholarly analysis under the banner of neoreaction, I'm aiming to shoot a different angle. I'm young, I'm busy, and I gave up on an academic career years ago. Imagine us in a shady basement dive, a few drinks in, casually talking shit about politics and life. A lot of my posts will be quick commentary on more meticulous blogs.

This is not a "gentle introduction" to reaction. There are plenty of people who can convert a young impressionable intellectual to the dark side. I have nothing but respect for their necessary and useful task.

The point of this project is to totally deprogram leftist thinking out of the right-wing brain. I could have easily called this blog 'The Medieval Mindset'. Don't read this unless you've already taken a good healthy course of red pills. It'll burn on the way down, but sobriety is a scary drug to be on when you've been a drunk for years.

If I'm vulgar or crude, it's because you can't treat the Kali Yuga like an honorable opponent. You go for the guts. And you need a loud alarm clock to wake someone from an opium dream.

One more thing. Read the comments. If I'm ranting about my right-wing extremist items in a pub and a professor happens to walk by and take issue with something I said, or asks for clarification, I'm going to respond to him in a professorial tone. Often with useful elaborations or insights on the original post.

## Contents

Stationary Bandits	2	Patriarchy Masterpost	46
Leftist Hypocrisy and Power	3	Where Hence, Art?	51
Correcting Thots	4	Nationalism	54
The Center	5	Monogamy is not Socialism	56
A Few Minor Reforms	6	Game Advice	56
Mother Government and Father Government	8	Abortion Rhetoric for Normies	58
Love is Bullshit, Arranged Marriage is Good	9	Rape and Sexual Relations	61
Primogeniture	10	Test of Your Game: Human Zoology Edition	64
Disowning the Greeks	11	Book Review: C.A. Bond's <i>Nemesis</i>	69
The Spiritual Physiognomy of African Man	14	Rectification of Names: "Gays"	75
The Centralization Trap	17	Meet Your Future Wife With This One Easy Trick	77
Socialism and Capitalism	20	Mental Illness	82
Sexual Status, for Autistic Libertarians	21	Test of Your Game: Answer Key	83
Bullying Works	22	The Best Reason to Suppress the Gay	86
First Snow	24	Chronicle of King Donald I	87
A Counterpoint to PA	25	Proles, Carpetbaggers, and Reaction	91
Epitaph for an Intrepid Cuck	26	Why I Post Less	92
Why We Have no Wars	27	The Absolute State of Healthcare	94
Crime	28	No Cops	98
Without Comment	30	Final Notes on the WQ	100
We Are Not Rome...	33	John Smith, Autists, BAP and Vae Victis	102
Two Feminisms	34	Blaq Violence and Aidan's Guide to da Streetz	104
Culture Meet Axe: Harry Potter	37	Ideas Never Rule	107
Culture Meet Axe: Game of Thrones	40	Fall of the Empire	109
Sexual Manorialism...?	43	The Last Election	112
Whores and Actors	44	We Lost. Now What?	113
PUA is Unnatural	45		

## Stationary Bandits

September 16th, 2018

[Jim Donald](#) characterizes monarchy (and government in general) as 'stationary banditry'. Stationary bandits are preferable to mobile bandits because they behave predictably and have low enough time preference to not kill the goose that lays the golden egg. It's in the stationary bandit's best interest for the society he controls to be rich and powerful so that he may profit in turn. It's clearly a more realistic way of thinking than gnosticism, idealism, immanentizing the eschaton, what have you. In a sense, it's early Moldbug monarchism, one step removed from libertarianism in recognizing that there is always a state, and one more step is taken to deduce which kind of state is best for a fallen, sinful humanity.

Like I said, not totally wrong, and you can do much worse in terms of political philosophy. But I dispute the claim that the King is a mere stationary bandit, because historical feudal kings do not act the way we'd expect stationary bandits to act. Take the enclosure movement in England. Early 1500's, England's main export was wool. By far the most profitable thing you could do with your land was to kick the peasants off their farms and use it as a sheep pasture. In which case you only need one shepherd per flock of sheep, and a lot of farmers lose their livelihoods.

At the time, a number of defunct or impoverished noble titles were being purchased by wealthy commoners who had made their money in trade or banking, both relatively new as extremely profitable enterprises. These 'new money' nobles wanted to kick the peasants off the land, raise sheep, and sell wool. They couldn't take the land of smallholding yeomen, but they did have a legal right to do so on the 'commons', the lord's land that peasants would share in the farming of. Almost as soon as the practice of 'enclosing the commons' began, King Henry VIII and the House of Lords told the new money that they couldn't kick the peasants off of the land, the new money obeyed, and enclosures didn't become a problem for 30 years.

In other words, the merchant class, on obtaining noble estates, began behaving exactly the way that you would expect stationary bandits to act, maximizing profit at the expense of their subjects, and the long-established nobility sided with tradition and the ancient rhythms of feudal life and put a stop to the practice. 30 years on, when Henry dies, his short-lived son's foolish regent gives the new nobles a go-ahead on enclosures. Instantly, unemployment and inflation that, while perfectly routine in a modern depression, made the English of the time believe that the Apocalypse had literally come upon them. England, previously, had practically full employment and the 'valiant beggar' was nearly unheard of. Now, there are hordes of able-bodied young men who don't have jobs roaming England and committing crimes.

Another example, same King. Henry VIII became concerned that the men of England were wasting their time with effeminate games like bowling, and not training in the longbow skills that made England a military force to be reckoned with. So he decreed that every town should set up an archery range at its own expense, set price controls on longbows so that every man could afford one, and told his people to git gud. Stationary bandits do not arm their populace. Feudal Japan and Imperial China acted like stationary bandits, and they disarmed their subjects. USG acts like a stationary bandit, and it is attempting to disarm its subjects. Imperial Russia acted more like a stationary bandit, and it disarmed its subjects, and displayed hostility to subjects like the Cossacks who refused to disarm. Henry's England went to personal expense in order to train and arm its commoners.

The Mafia didn't give out tommy guns to storeowners who were under its 'protection'. But it did give out tommy guns. To who? Its lower ranking members. Well, duh. But hang on a second.

Stationary bandit theory works... if we take feudal society writ large as one bandit clan, commoners and all. So now there's no dichotomy between the bandits and their victims. We just have differing ranks of status inside a gigantic mafia. Like any military organization, there are senior officers and there are grunts, but the reciprocal familial loyalty goes both ways. Not anymore, but it did. Everyone outside the clan and within the nation was either assimilated or destroyed in the warfare that birthed the feudal aristocracy.

Now hold up. That's actually a pretty big discovery. Makes things a lot clearer too, which is what this blog is all about. I don't know about everyone, but this seems like the best possible government to me. You get the benefits of hierarchy and monarchy, and the communal reciprocal loyalty that romantic nationalism is all about. We even avoid the demotism that taints fascism. And we're better off than the Greco-Roman and Chinese empires because we maintain the Freehold and a healthy level of individual agency that gets around the centralization brick wall that France ran headlong into. (more on that later). It's not a thousand-year-empire level of stable perhaps, but what government is? This arrangement certainly lasted a millenium.

We also have the Church, which necessarily dirties its hands a bit by working with bandits, but performs the necessary Altar job of keeping our bandit clan moral and sacralizing the obligations and duties that contribute to its internal stability. This is necessarily the weakest link because people can always try to out-holy the church. Which is why the Throne burns people for heresy and the Freehold lynches people who start treating them like they aren't part of the stationary bandit clan. Talk about checks and balances! America aint got nothin' on this.

So now we see two straightforward but difficult paths for a reactionary to tread. We can internally take over our current stationary bandit clan, restore membership to the people who deserve it, and kill or exile the ones who don't. Or we can form our own bandit clan that promises more rewards for loyalty than our current one does, and we destroy the current stationary bandits in a moment of weakness. Then we incorporate or exile the people it rules over. The hierarchy of the clan maps very neatly even onto Moldbug's CEO-king and sovcorp. And the ideal neo-feudal society may have no formal government whatsoever, like a secret society in which members only have contact, in terms of taking and giving orders, to the people directly above and below them. But again, that's something for another day.

## **Leftist Hypocrisy and Power**

September 17th, 2018

Just reminding everybody that the Left has nothing to do with principles, and you cannot defeat it by attacking its purported moral principles as hypocrisy.

Power knows no hypocrisy. Claims of hypocrisy only work when they are used by power against the weak and principled. Because if you're weak, the only thing backing up your claim to power is said principles.

Claiming your powerful enemy is a hypocrite is simply a claim that they are powerful- because otherwise they could not get away with hypocrisy.

While the forces of darkness steadily advance their power, people like Ben Shapiro make a lot of money snarking off from the sidelines about their lack of principles. It sells well because it makes a lot of gangly college Republicans feel smug and superior for an hour or two. It changes nothing and has the potential to change nothing.

Unless you have actual power. In that case, you have to (literally) hang your opposition with their own rope. For example, if Trump prosecutes Clinton and the Podestas for colluding with the Russians. I have no idea whether or not he will. But once you break in their rope, you need to quickly and quietly substitute it for your own.

## Correcting Thots

September 19th, 2018

I've begun to think that if you can't correct a fallen woman, you can't restore a fallen civilization. No, I'm not cucking hard like an evangelical white knight who tells whores that the magic of Jesus will restore their virginities. I'm not talking about convincing a roadworn slut to rediscover her femininity and become a sweet caring wife and mother. Yeah, there is a tiny minority of reactionary women in the sphere who 'come around' but they're not ever to be trusted with leadership. Their role is to be as pretty, fashionable, and publically happy as possible to tempt young and impressionable women into tradness because women do not generally change themselves unless there is an existing social group ready to adopt them.

Women like breaking taboos. That doesn't mean that they will be drawn like flies to edgy reactionary politics. It's actually very convenient for them to pretend that they're breaking taboos by supporting ph@ggotry and refugees, because these things are high-status within the mainstream. They get to have their cake and eat it too- the sexual thrill of breaking taboos (and girls always feel this thrill in a sexual way) along with the comfort of submission to high-status mainstream bioleninism.

Patrolling thots is the right idea, because thots not-so-secretly want to be patrolled. Patrolling thots over the internet is the wrong way to go about it because the thing women love the most is submission to a high status man and the thing they hate the most is coercion by a low status man. Take the genuine and unfiltered online hatred of 'incels' spewn forth by wounded roasties. Over the 'net, every faceless anon is an incel. That's the most ego-saving assumption, and thus it's the one women are going to jump to. The only male opinions that matter to girls are the ones of the (charitably) 20% of men that they would fuck.

When you want an animal to go somewhere, you give it a whack, but you need to give it an exit. You can herd cattle into even an abbatoir with a hickory switch, but if you whip it into a corner, you'll get attacked. Thot patrol is not carrot and stick, nor is it telling thots that they are completely irredeemable. And it can only be done in person, by legitimately alpha and otherwise high-status men. Note that when I say THOTS, 99% of modern women qualify. I'm not talking about targeting prostitutes or crack whores for redemption. This blog is written from a medieval mindset. I'm talking about girls most moderns probably wouldn't call sluts, but your ancestors would.

Correcting thots is about increasing the pool of eligible wives and mothers for the Right. We are not restoring their purity. We need to turn 'everybody's thot' into 'my thot'. That's called domination. You can make a woman give herself to you completely, body and soul. If she's a virgin, it doesn't take much work because people are designed to fall head over heels for their first. But if there were plenty of virgins out there for the taking I wouldn't even be on this topic. (Well there are, but I advise against grooming sixteen-year-olds for legal reasons. If you're a *stone-cold playa*... Let's just say I warned you).

In process, you're not going to go and whip out that war bride Genghis Khan viking shit on the first date. Getting laid is about hinting at your dominance, but as they say, little dogs bark the

loudest. If you have to talk a big game, you don't have it. I know many innocuous men who treat their girlfriends with a strong pimp hand in private. Girls do care about discretion, especially the ones who want to signal the 'strong woman' shit. Her acting like your tradwife in public is going to be the *very last stage*. It's how you know you've really got her because in terms of social status, a woman acting like a real woman in public, and not a whore, ***is the equivalent of getting her to walk down the street in bondage gear, or diapers, or some weird fetish outfit***. I can't stress that enough. Dominance of your woman proceeds from the sexual. Consciously, she only wants to be dominated sexually. Most of em do admit that to themselves. But unconsciously, she will feel the bliss and peace of true femininity when your sexual dominance of her extends to other areas of her life.

To be perfectly honest, there's a thrill to 'riding the tiger' and wrestling the personification of modernity into submission. And not every man can handle Evola's proverbial beast. Not in the slightest. But civilization is not saved by unremarkable, timid men. If you can tame the thot, you can save the West. That's the training program. And first, become a man who can tame the thot. Because you're not convincing a ho to become a housewife. The [heartiste](#) archives are littered with the ruined lives of cuckolded beta males who thought they were up to the challenge. When I say that you're using the extremity of masculinity to reawaken the femininity of the modern woman, I'm not talking about 'manning up' and being a good provider or a responsible father. The personality of the modern woman is like a shell of faux-masculinity built around the *vesse/* that constitutes the shape of the female soul. You were given a *tool* with which to shatter it. Stuff for another post. An X-rated one. Maybe I'll only give it out by email request.

## The Center

September 21st, 2018

I've been agonizing for years over the elusive 'center' from which power flows. It's been like wandering through a maze. Where is the spring, the source of the river? Culture is downstream of power, but from where flows power? It's sex. Period. Sex is to civilization what gasoline is to modernity. Gasoline should not be forsworn, because it is a useful tool *when controlled*. When sex is channeled and harnessed properly, civilization reaches great heights. Gasoline is not a substance that should be given liberty unless you are trying to destroy an enemy, in which case you coat them in napalm. While staying, like a jewish porn mogul keeps his daughters, far upwind. Sex was jealously guarded, but once leftists figured out the secret, and managed to attack it, leftism accelerated. Henry VIII failed because his cock stopped working. Arthur fell because it was Lancelot, not he, who was fucking the Queen. In the early Arthurian myths, when the Fisher King became impotent his land itself became infertile. This isn't some pagan voodoo shit. It's an accurate metaphor; the health of a society relies on male virility and elite male fertility.

In fact, you can read early leftism, from Calvin through Robespierre, as an attempt to break through enough layers of traditional obligations to reach this throbbing organ at the center of society. Maybe they were only tearing at them because they were there, visible and ready to the hand. But they reached it eventually. Restoration begins at the center and slowly reforms the traditional obligations that exist for its defense. This is, in case you haven't realized yet, a bit of an addendum to the ['Correcting Thots'](#) post, in which I elucidate the absolute necessity of starting the Restoration from the personal sexual dominance of your woman.

Jim Donald says that to have civilization you need to hit women with a stick and keep them in line. He's right, but how do you go from Current Year, where women are hitting men with sticks to keep them in line, to a civilization where men can keep women in line? He offers no answer

on how to do so other than to first take power, and then unilaterally roll back the culture via royal decree. I don't see a reactionary coup d'état happening anytime soon because I don't see any reactionaries who are willing and able to do so. Of course, if they were they wouldn't be public about it. But they would probably reach out to us (in absolute secret) because they will need loyal statesmen post-putsch. Which they haven't done.

The answer is to dominate a single woman on your own terms and make her unconditionally obedient. There's a lot of talk about building institutions among the Right, but institutions are ***built to protect the good***. And for that reason only. First you have to have something worth protecting, and it has to be a real, tangible thing. Building institutions to protect ideals is incredibly dangerous- holiness spirals and all that. We must rebuild and restore from the absolute ground up, because everything traditional has been destroyed. This absolute center is male-female relations. Every institution in traditional society is edifice, a beautiful cathedral built to guard this sacred relic. Take a woman, make her yours, fill her with your seed, and create a tiny bubble that is your family; a little medieval fief hedged 'round with spears.

Once you have such a woman, and have kids, you begin a community of like-minded men. You don't have to live in a commune in the woods somewhere. In fact, this is counterproductive. Your community, thanks to the beautiful convenience of the Internet, can be a network. When you have a network of men who have proven their ability to ride the tiger and sustain a traditional family in the midst of the tempest of modernity, you have a nascent elite. (Members should be intensively vetted) Your kids socialize, are educated (at least in all matters of real consequence) and will marry within the network. The network will infiltrate, for lack of a better word, influential institutions in society. It will do so naturally, as the followers of Gnon, especially when they protect each other, will devour those who reject Him.

Leftism will not be destroyed in the full bloom of its might. It will be destroyed in a moment of weakness. This is necessarily true. The inevitable victor, patient and poised to attack the American Empire when it falters, is China. To attempt to seize power any earlier on our part is to fail. Leftism is weakening, and we know this because China is colonizing Africa and East Europe is telling the EU to go fuck itself. But the time is not yet ripe. The moment when the West stumbles, finally worn out by the illness that afflicted it, is the time when a number of men, seemingly unrelated, will rise to their feet and restrung the Bow of Ulysses. And from their midst will stride forth a King.

## **A Few Minor Reforms**

September 26th, 2018

I don't, like Moldbug eventually admitted, foresee the West being restored under any banner but the Cross. With that in mind, the good old RCC needs a few updates to be able to successfully do battle with modernity. I can hear our Catholic reactionaries getting the old stake and tinder ready as I type this, but you can put it back down. I'm not suggesting a radical change in doctrine. All the church needs is a few tweaks to its hierarchy and a bit of a shift in focus to stuff that's already in Christianity but is more relevant today.

For example, the Devil. In medieval times, the Devil was a bit of a comic figure, a little green man who represented the evils of pagan times, and the caprices of the old gods, that still nibbled at society. He was a nuisance, Old Hob, a far cry from the Satan who tempted Christ with temporal kingship. The reason for this is that society at the time still had the Devil pretty well chained up. The evil he managed to do was truthfully a petty nuisance, so the Church of the time was accurate in portraying him that way. But as Carlyle said, there's scarcely a fetter on

Beelzebub now, and he's a lot scarier when unchained. Most Christians today will take it as a metaphor, but Evil is real, and the Devil as a real force at work in society is something the Church needs to focus on.

Which leads into the Church Militant. This is pretty uncontroversial among Catholic reactionaries, but it bears repeating. The Church was a lot more militant back when there was fighting to be done and civilization to be hacked out of Satanic anarchy. The Saxons portrayed Christ as a warrior, his sacrifice the act of a hero who walks bravely into a battle of certain death. You should read *Dream of the Rood*. (I'll still be cooler than you because I can read it in Old Anglo-Saxon and there's a bit lost in translation) [The Iron Legion](#) went a bit into this syncretism between barbarian warrior spirit and Christianity, and it's a real shame that they stopped posting. I hope the guy who ran it didn't get murked, but if he did I hope he died fighting. And read up on the Harrowing of Hell while you're at it. Yeah, the Church doesn't talk about it too much nowadays, but while Jesus was lying dead in the cave, his spirit was down in hell *fucking the devil's shit up*. He probably ripped the Hellmouth right open and broke its jaw. But anyway, the Church needs to emphasize the real blood-and-guts battle against worldly evil. We're not Protestants, we need to do some good works to get into Heaven. And if you're a rough motherfucker, you need to slap a cross on your Kevlar vest and take the fight to Satan personally. If you're a real Christian, you know what happens to the tree that bears no good fruit. Be the lumberjack.

Another thing that medieval society had more or less under wraps was female evil. So it didn't signal too much against it even when people in the Victorian era started saying, essentially, that women could do no evil. And now we have feminism and female evil is stalking the West like a sexually-frustrated Whore of Babylon. (In fact, women are potentially more evil than men because civilization can withstand a degree of male evil, but not female evil.) Plenty of examples from history and the bible, but the Church needs to refocus on the fact that women are more than capable of evil, and need to control their evil impulses like the rest of us. Failing that, they get a proverbial (but actually literal) stick across the buttocks. And if they're really unrepentant, a really big stick. With plenty of kindling. The new Church needs to be a totally cuck-free zone. White knights kill Saracens, not lick the unwashed muffs of entitled feminists.

I remember some guy at Thermidor claiming that allowing the clergy to marry isn't the solution to priests molesting little boys. It's not, at least by itself, but the whole 'chastity as heroic sacrifice of faith' needs to go. The Church once allowed priests to marry, and it can do so again. It needs to step to the fore in these times and set the example of fertility, among other things. Together with this, there needs to be a new monastic order to soak up the degenerates. Which was a function of the Church in times past, as much as we don't want to think about it. It assumed the necessary but unspoken duty of allowing those who would not or could not live the life of a normal secular person to contribute to society. The pathologically sex-averse of both sexes, omega males who could not marry, and those with other odd compulsions or mental disorders could find solace and purpose in a monastery or nunnery.

We need to be a bit more explicit about that. Now we can have *Monks Penitent*. (and nuns of course) In other words, people who can't help themselves from doing bad things. Most likely, people will be more or less forced into being a monk penitent to avoid capital punishment. Or parents could commit unsavory children to the order. These monks cannot rise in the church hierarchy and are strictly supervised. Maybe they won't even be allowed to publicly engage with normal people for charity. People who cannot live good lives on their own but aren't evil enough for the gallows can be incorporated into this order to do something useful. Drug addicts, blatant homosexuals, latent pedophiles, women who fuck their dogs, etc. It would be a social stigma,

but also a feel-good sign that people are being redeemed. In medieval times, people were sent to monasteries for fucking up all the time. Gwynevere became a nun because she fucked Lancelot. We need to bring the practice back, and it needs to be more explicit so that the degenerates who are essentially wards of the church do not ever rise to real power and influence, even if only over other monks. This latter fact is correcting a historical design flaw; monasteries even in the 1500's were nests of pederasty and adultery because the Church did not distinguish between monks who were there to get away from normal society and ones who were there out of true faith and service to God.

When I think of anything else there will be a Part II.

## Mother Government and Father Government

October 2nd, 2018

When I was a kid, my parents explained our two party system as being like two parents. The GOP was the strict father who wanted you to be self-sufficient and the Dems were the nurturing mother who looked after the unfortunate. I bought into that when I was a kid, and rhetorically it kind of soured me on socialism, welfare, etc. Who wants to have mommy take care of him forever? (Women vote lib because they want to *be* the mommy).

The thing is, "mommy government" is totally evil. And we don't have male and female styles of governance today, we have two competing mommy governments. It's 'single mother' government. And single moms are bad. Real bad. The #1 predictor of childhood delinquency isn't poverty or race; it's whether the kid has a father or not. The Dems, and by extension communists and socialists, are the overbearing mother who overprotects her kids. And in doing so destroys them. The GOP is the ghetto single mother that leaves her kid alone while she goes around slutting it up with whatever high status bastard flashes a wad of cash. Who sometimes comes home and beats her kids.

All democracy ends in single mother government, and all single mother government is evil. (Fascism is like having a very butch lesbian as your mother.) True paternal government is monarchy. Filmer goes into this in [Patriarcha](#). If you want to really educate yourself, read the old masters and not the blog of a young reactionary who has better things to do than wax poetic. But government by father is qualitatively different from any kind of maternal government. Mommy cares about your thoughts and feelings. Daddy doesn't. Your soul is your own, and his rules are designed to develop your agency and let you live the best life you are capable of. Not coddle you, promise you the world, and tell you that you're a victim.

If you were raised by a good father, you know what I'm talking about. Maybe he was strict, maybe he was aloof, but when the rubber hit the road you knew that he loved you and had your back. And his love was the love that wanted you to be your own man and felt fulfilled when you achieved your independence. Early republicans used rhetoric implying that the European commons had 'grown up' and was ready for self-government. Which turned out to be a massive lie, or if you want to be charitable, misguided optimism. If I had to bet, Locke's ghost is buying Filmer's drinks every night. Now, this is a massive oversimplification but if you want the scholarly stuff you can and should crack open Filmer, and Carlyle, and Froude. Any parent and any government can be abusive, but single motherhood is categorically abusive while only a personally evil father is abusive.

## Love is Bullshit, Arranged Marriage is Good

October 2nd, 2018

Your distant ancestors did not have a word for romantic love. They did not believe in a transcendent emotion felt between men and women that existed as a more pure form of sexual desire. The introduction of such an idea into our culture is completely foreign and likely results from a mistranslation of the Greek *EROS*, which means lust, and a misinterpretation of Plato. Unfortunately the idea took root as a method of expressing *eros* in a Church-friendly way. "I'm not like those barbarians who just want to fuck you! I just want to write you poetry and bask in your beauty!" Ugh. Malory skewered this almost as soon as it was introduced. Your wiser predecessors knew better. The Victorians, to their eternal shame, brought the idea back.

"Bringing romantic love back to marriage" makes about as much sense as bringing buggery back to marriage. It's not supposed to be a prerequisite whatsoever. What we call romantic love today is actually a juncture between *eros* and loyalty. Loyalty is a judgement our genes make as to which woman is a worthy investment of time and risk. This plus *eros* pair-bonds a man to a woman; if we did not feel loyalty we would be like rabbits, see women as walking sperm toilets and not bother to devote our resources to ensuring that she carries to term and that the child is raised to maximize its status and odds of survival. This protect instinct is what makes you feel all fuzzy inside when you think of your woman. And this, plus *eros*, is all you need to feel for your woman to make a marriage work.

The likelihood of pair bonding wanes as sexual options wax. We're designed to bond the strongest to our first partner because for most of human history, there were few potential partners available. Enduring relationships are only assured by first partnership. That happens around the age of sixteen, when you're a dumb fucking kid who is going to make some dumb fucking choices. Is it any surprise that parents and the community stepped in to make these choices on the behalf of their children? That's the only rational way around it. The fact is, most arranged marriages are very happy. As a man, you remember being 16 years old. Think how fucking horny you felt around women, hell, just the intensity of your affection was greater- and this in a desensitized age of porn and high school girls in miniskirts. Now imagine being sixteen in 1300. You mostly saw girls at a distance, they were covered up, maybe you would share a word or two and relish your young lust. And then your wedding! Holy shit! You, as a modern, have no idea how intense the first sight and touch of a girl was back then, and how powerfully it would bond you to her.

The other side of the coin is, it's exactly the same for women. Modern women are similarly desensitized. From the age of 14 they are constantly receiving open and tacit advances from men, both their own ages and older. Women are attracted primarily to male power and charisma (which is latent status). Today, they are constantly bombarded by male displays of status and charisma, but in 1300, provided they were not nobility of the court, they were not. That first touch from a husband, his first dominant word, her first bath in the intensity of his lust; again, a modern woman simply can't imagine it.

Don't believe me? I've had the opportunity to observe Amish girls 'in the wild'. They are completely unpretentious and unjaded, their interactions with men modest and cheerful. And they look forward to their marriages with giggling anticipation. The eldest one, who was engaged, was the envy and admiration of her younger friends. She, herself, was relieved that she managed to find a husband. She was getting old after all; almost twenty. If I had known then what I do now, I would have converted immediately. You really have no idea how happy women are under the patriarchy until you've met Amish girls. And they work hard. Really hard. Does it

crush their femininity? Not a chance. The Victorians were retards. A farm girl singing a song while she prances ankle deep through horse manure with her dress hiked a few inches up manages to be more feminine than a thousand of our dolled up sluts put together. What a fucking joke. Yeah, they don't shave their legs and they smell like the farm. If you've fucked five dozen women it will put you off. If she's your first and you've been working all day alongside her, you won't even notice.

So what does a modern man do now? You're kind of fucked. Traditional virgins are pretty thin on the ground. If you're real young, like high school age, wife up your high school sweetheart if you're anything less than supremely alpha. Putting a bun in the oven first will help convince her. "Extended childhood" is dead. The future belongs to men who decide what they want out of life at a very young age and then take it. Your father won't help you become a man. (That's what I'm for, kid.) If you're older, you're more screwed. You might have to settle for a woman who's less than pure. Look at her past relationships. A girl who's been piped out every night in a couple of long-term relationships is far better than a girl who gets drilled by a different man every month. But I've already written about this in [Correcting Thots](#).

If you're lower status, and I don't mean money and power but your sociosexuality, don't settle for 30-y/o used up skanks looking to settle down. Mostly because even if you bite the bullet for the sake of future generations, she will do her worst to fuck your kids up. Pick younger undersocialized girls who are on the nerdy side. They're rare but there are more of them than trad virgins. Must be something in the water. They'll bond hard to you, they're easy to mate-guard, and most of them have fiery sex drives underneath the shyness. And then make sure to raise your kids right.

\*Edited for clarity. Love is real, between family, between comrades, and between you and God. Romantic love has always been used as an excuse for adultery and as a weapon used to attack the prohibitions on illicit sex.

## Primogeniture

October 4th, 2018

The traditional award of prime inheritance rights to the firstborn son strikes most moderns as arbitrary and unnecessary. Like most traditions of medieval times, of course, there was very good reason for it. Actually, there were a few:

The first and prime reason has to do with political stability. In this case the firstborn is an arbitrary choice, but an arbitrary choice must be made because the major political weakness in monarchy is succession. If the King dies suddenly without naming an heir, you need a go-to choice. There is never any question as to which son was born first. It is impossible to falsify by ambitious lords and scheming ministers. And if you make succession the King's choice, you have a bunch of Princes and Lords who live their entire lives thinking that they have a shot. Which is a recipe for civil war and discord. Ruthless competition among shareholders in the same company, and even worse, in your BoD, will not lead to a good outcome. Whereas if your firstborn is first in line, your later kids grow up under the impression that they don't have a shot. You can raise him to have the demeanor necessary to a King, and your later children to have the qualities of loyalty and obedience necessary to princes of the blood.

The second reason is genetic: your kids are healthier the younger that you have 'em. Traditional peoples certainly noticed, if only unconsciously, that older parents result in birth defects and other problems. Thus a value of purity was attributed to the firstborn.

The third is fairly simple. If your wife was a virgin on her wedding night (verifiable), your first kid was very, very likely to be your actual genetic offspring. Whereas after years of marriage there is a greater risk of adultery. And adultery was a sin that European nobles often engaged in.

The fourth is specific to medieval religion, but the practice of primogeniture gave God a say in who ended up King. Not that He would necessarily use it, but it was a gesture by Man to respect the wishes of God, whereas arbitrary choice of succession is an act of free-will, which He will generally not intercede in. (Henry VIII, by the way, was a second son. His older brother? Prince *Arthur*, who died young. Feels like too potent a symbol, with Europe on the brink of a turning-point, for it not to mean something. Like C.S. Lewis and the abortion of Christ's second coming, England may have been deprived the return of its true King.)

The fact that I am even analyzing this is a sign that our Culture is moribund. Our ancestors understood without thought: the value of Primogeniture, which in a word contains the practical PoliSci, the sexual, the eugenic, and the religious, was simply self-apparent to those who carried on the tradition, and wrapped up in the aesthetically potent symbol of the Firstborn. And so I dissect its corpse as evidence that it was once alive, and good. Because its enemies tell us that they killed it for a good reason.

I dissect it not because I want to Frankenstein it back to life, but because we must raise something, not a LARP, not a zombie, but real and organic, that bears the same internal principles. In fact, this is an area where modern technology corrects the weak points, few though they are, in medieval social technology. (This is a phrase I'm loath to use, because it was not designed and manufactured dispassionately but grew organically out of necessity. Most modern people cannot understand it if I do not phrase it this way.) For example, genetic degeneration through elite inbreeding is easily corrected by modern science. And we have unbreakable encryption that allows a monarch to name his successor without the danger of falsification by an usurper, not to mention genetic therapy to ensure you bear a fit, healthy son and medicine that is sure to preserve that health into adulthood. Just look at how long the Rothschilds can keep themselves alive when cost is no obstacle.

## Disowning the Greeks

October 10th, 2018

I feel like this is an entirely quixotic mission, but it's something that ought to be put out there nonetheless: The ancient Greeks and Romans are not part of Western culture. Homer is no more a part of the Western canon than the Bhagavad Gita or the Tao Te Ching. When I see something like Identity Evropa and their posters covered with Greek sculpture, it makes me cringe internally.

The Greek culture was the culture of the body, and their society was the society of the present, the tangible, the material, and the sensuous. The Western culture is the culture of the intangible, the distant, the esoteric, of moral law and expansionary force. As an example, when Plato introduced idealism to the Greek, he did so using a telling metaphor; the ideal was not an essence, or an abstract, but a perfect body that existed in a parallel world. His idea of liberation was liberation to a more vivid sensuousness, a more 'real' materialism- from the Cave to the world of light. The Greeks imagined the world after death to be universally a drear misery, for saint and sinner alike- it was life, the *carpe diem*, that was of real significance. Look at the way they depicted the soul- as a butterfly. An *insect* which flew from the mouth after the death of the body, the only important part of man!

Greek art is popular because it is shallow. The statuary of Lysippos has no hidden depth, it suggests no higher meaning than the perfection of material form and proportion. In perfect mimesis of life, in undying stone, was where Greek spirituality exhausted itself. Working in stone does not represent care for the future; rather, to the Greek it symbolized the eternal present.

The Renaissance was merely an adoption of outward form rather than the revival of real "Greek" art. Consider *La Pieta*, and realize that this one sculpture contains more emotion, signifies a deeper world of meaning, than the entire history of Greek and Roman sculpture combined. The Greek sculpture had no individuality, no suggestion of internal depth and personality. It wore a mask, even when it was meant to designate a specific god or personage, a mask that was drawn from a mere handful of stock character types. Even the portraiture-in-stone that developed through Hellenistic into Roman times, even when it strove for mimesis of the actual person, contained no hint of the internality of the man depicted.

And realize that the high arts of Europe bore almost no relation to those of Classical times; of orchestral music compared to the near-nonexistent and to our ear absurdly primitive Greek music, of oil-painting to the wall-fresco, of the opera to the masked, robotically-intoned Greek theater. And the mere single generation of "Renaissance" sculpture actually produced is a historical footnote compared to the likes of a Bach or Beethoven. The architecture that the Renaissance thought it was borrowing from classical times was actually the architecture of the Muslim kingdoms, which they in turn had borrowed and modified from the Romans. Oops!

In other cases, the European attachment to the Classical was detrimental to the expression of the Western world-feeling. Aside from a scattered few geniuses like Shakespeare who chose or were chosen to work in the form, it was a long time before theater liberated itself from Greek pretensions and became the opera. It should be considered a blessing that the Greek arts of painting and music were lost to the medieval European, unlike their work in stone and writing, because the full actualization of Western art comes indeed in these media and not those which were trammled in by classical conventions. The great epic poetry of the West as well was written in verse, whether lyric or alliterative, that was entirely alien to that which the Romans and Greeks utilized. In any case, the utility of Classical influence on Western art was in the best case an incidental choice of form or subject matter that had no effect on the inner spirit of the work, and in the worst a restrictive form which stifled Western tendencies. Never do we see a case in which Classical influence improves a Western art form.

The pediment of the Ionic temple sat with a heavy finality upon its columns. The Parthenon is a beautiful building. But it is worldly and self-contained in its perfect proportions. Its interior is merely an afterthought; the main element of the classical temple is the entablature and its pediment, a single mass exalted, a body raised above the earth by columns. Compare to the Gothic cathedral, with its spires and vaulted arches: it aspires toward heaven, appears to strain against the limitations of gravity, to break free from the earth. Its stained-glass windows dissolve the boundary between interior and exterior; they suggest, to the worshiper inside, an infinite expanse of light. It becomes self-evident that the creators of these two architectures had *entirely different spiritual physiognomies*.

Nowhere is this difference more apparent than in our attitudes toward the Divine. The Greek felt the presence of his gods most keenly in the heart of his city, among the bustle of people and in sight of that god's altar. Western man feels his God as infinity: infinite force and infinite energy, and as such feels his presence in places that suggest this infinity: on barren mountaintops, windswept moors and under the expanse of a heaven-reaching canopy of trees. And it was this feeling that he sought to inspire when he built his churches. Our monks and holy men would

withdraw from the social world, so as to be alone and thus together with God. The Greek was never alone. Even in his theater, even in a moment of solemn reflection by the protagonist, he was attended to by the anonymous public body of the chorus. Achilles' solitude was aberrant, and I suspect a great deal of the material that became Homer was left over from Mycenae, spun and edited to make it palatable to the Greek ear.

Don't get me started on Homer. Achilles may well have been the first Western hero, but the Iliad is a *repudiation* of Achilles. Greeks didn't name their kids after him back then, and they don't do it now. Odysseus meets Achilles' ghost in the Odyssey, and Achilles laments that he chose death and glory over a comfortable life of little renown. This is a passage that has given scholars an endless amount of headache, when Achilles claims that he would rather be the meanest slave alive than king over all the dead. It seems to contradict the entire Iliad, but it only does so when we read Achilles as a hero and not as an unworthy man who is not meant to be emulated. And we only read Achilles as a hero because of the makeup of our souls and our particular world-feeling, which are in fact inherently opposed to the Greek way of seeing the world.

The Greeks did not believe in the free will and had no conception of the man as playing an active role in destiny. Odysseus is buffeted about from island to island. He is not an intrepid explorer, not a hero projecting his indomitable will across space, but a toy of fate, an insect clinging to a leaf that the gods have seen fit to blow hither and thither at their pleasure. Another fact which perplexes scholars is that Odysseus took many years to cross the tiny Mediterranean sea in order to reach his homeland. But again, they impose a Western perspective which illustrates the vast spiritual distance between us. To the Greeks, the Mediterranean was a terrifyingly huge expanse of ocean, an intolerably hostile environment which dissolved the microcosm of the polis and its environs. And Odysseus, though a clever problem-solver, was not clever enough to set a course for Ithaca and stay it. He in fact possessed very little will in the matter; a far cry from a Columbus or a Magellan- or even the Mycenaeans, who colonized even the Atlantic coast of Spain, far earlier and far more distant than the Greeks ever dared sail.

The Greek colony was not a projection of the mother city's political power, but a form of cellular mitosis in which an entirely new autonomous city was founded. In their colonization, the Greeks followed literally in the footsteps of the Phoenicians, and oftentimes founded their colonies within visible distance of an already extant Phoenician colony. In each and every case, the tendency of the Greek soul seems to shrink from the distant and the unknown. The Greek city-state's territory comprised only the land from which the city's acropolis could be seen, and anything distant from that was a hostile wilderness, the domain of Chaos. Whereas in the West, a state is the projection of a King's rule, all the land under which his laws and his sovereign force can be applied. But to the Greek, *Delphi* was a definite, temporally defined *body*, a single *thing*. And the society of men that lived therein was simply a "body made up of bodies".

The Greeks had no special concern for history or the future. No Greek ever thought to excavate Troy, which was exactly where Homer said it was, nor did they pay any attention to the ruins of Mycenae and its imposing fortress, which loomed over Delphi but bore no historic significance to its population. Rather, they simply dismissed it as impossible for man to have constructed, lending its architecture the moniker 'cyclopean', despite the man who became known as Agamemnon resting there! Thucydides was an exception; he himself was exiled and likely murdered, and we don't see his like again until the West rose. And even his fairly meticulous history was only of the very recent past. After the sack and ruin of Athens by the Persians, the Athenians took their destroyed art and heaped it, along with the rubble of houses and other stones, pell-mell into a wall around the city. The Romans literally invented their pre-republic

history out of thin air. All that needed to be known was the myth of the legendary founder, which itself occurred in an indeterminate past. Virgil's Aeneid was, rather than a definitive canon, simply an interpretation of a myth that every Roman had heard in a slightly different way. And we can contrast the Greco-Roman attitude towards history with that of the Egyptians and Chinese, both of whom were keeping exhaustively detailed annals before the Greeks had even learned to write.

Now, this is not to say that there are no lessons we can learn from the Greeks, but they are lessons that must be treated as if coming from an alien people and culture, the same way a reactionary can gain insight by reading Confucius. Their materialism led to a meticulous observation of rites and rituals, and they were not shy in considering certain behaviors as pathological to the body social. But on the other hand, they were just as meticulous in observing the rites of foreign gods, who they truly believed to be real entities in the lands of their worship. And only public behavior fell under the scrutiny of Greek moral law. The idea that one could be inwardly sinful, or even have 'evil intent' would be considered absurd. The Greek culture and the products of its political thinking and philosophy should not be swallowed hook, line, and sinker as part of the Western tradition.

## **The Spiritual Physiognomy of African Man**

October 18th, 2018

This is a Spenglerian critique, and as such I'll be operating with Spengler's practice of "spiritual physiognomy". Physiognomy simply means "knowing from the physical", and was a branch of science (once popular, long "discredited", and thus most likely true), which asserted that one can predict a person's inner characteristics from their physical appearance. Physiognomy of the spirit is the practice of using the products of the soul; i.e. art, literature, philosophy, architecture, in order to determine the characteristics of a racial soul or cultural world-feeling. To Spengler, this "cultural soul" was the prime phenomenon of history to be studied, and his focus was on well-developed peoples. He didn't spare too much mental energy on primitive peoples, and for the purposes of his philosophy, there was no need to.

It's been a good hundred years since *Decline of the West* was published, and certain 'primitive peoples' have made a good stab at culture in the following century. So I think his methods and assumptions can be applied to the African, despite his not having had a fully-developed civilization. To Spengler, every Culture has a prime symbol that acts as the means with which it interprets its universe. As a truncated example, the prime symbol of the West would be *infinite space*, and correspondingly, the *force vector*. And as a result, the idea of the *inner world*, *free will*, and *moral agency*. In art, *contrapuntal music*, the *gothic spire*, the *character drama*, and *perspective-based painting*. In science, *non-Euclidian geometry*, *calculus*, the *function*, the *steam engine*, *aviation*, etc. It also has late-stage degenerate forms that more or less describe one part or another of the body of leftism.

I'll just throw the main premise out here first: the prime symbol of the African soul is the *demonic possession*.

Don't believe me? The now-classic meme of "he's a good boy, he dindu nuffin" falls very differently on African ears than our Western. The African sees nothing false about a confessed criminal not having committed the crime in the moral realm, because he believes that impulsive passions are *external to the individual*. To us, the bestial, vicious animal nature is a part of ourselves to be constrained and mastered, and the failure to do so represents a personal fault. The African deals with the problem of human animality by placing it above the *human self*. Both

excessive genius and impulsive violence are believed to be the work of *spirits* which, sometimes randomly, sometimes not, come to possess a person and then leave them. The African considers it a monstrous unfairness and hypocrisy that a man can be a 'good boy' for sixteen years of life, commit one horrible crime, and then be executed or imprisoned for the rest of his life. Only a consistent pattern of demonic possession, or the intent to infuse evil spirits into one's own body, can mark an African as evil in the eyes of the fellow African. He considers it perfectly normal that a good person will be seized by bouts of uncontrollable violence or lust, and should not face consequences for acting on them. Even Africans like Martin Luther King or Jimi Hendrix, sacralized by our culture, are prone to this. Both were men seized by violent passions, kept absolutely private and nearly erased from history.

Because of this, African politics and rhetoric universally center on removing pernicious influences from the environment. The fault is never with the moral agency of the persons so afflicted, but always on demonic entities such as "the legacy of colonialism", "institutional racism", etc. Sometimes, the evil influence comes from a physical fetish that exercises a form of black magic. The problem of violence would be solved by getting the drugs and guns out of the ghetto. Or by moving Africans to the magic dirt that projects a good juju onto him. The human himself, to the African, is considered in his uninfluenced form to be a contented head of cattle without agency. The African is always tempted towards millennialism and utopianism; such a condition, in his mind, is reached when evil spirits and fetishes are exorcised entirely and humanity reverts to a peaceful state.

We see this state in many older Africans. To our eyes, the youthful passions and impulsiveness cool with age, creating the serene and pleasant Negro present in the romantic culture of the American South. (Not unrealistically- they did and do exist) To the African eye, this represents a closing-off from the spirit world, with the benefit on the one hand of being protected from evil spirits, and the detriment on the other of being unable to access the positive spirits of manic inspiration. Other older Africans become quite insane; the modern citygoer will recognize the detrimental form of this in the homeless, who often babble to themselves in languages real or imaginary, or accost passersby with inane and nonsensical questions. The positive form of this is in the shaman, preacher or artist; the manically inspired. Ben Carson, for example, who is apparently a uniquely talented surgeon despite being barely coherent when he speaks.

As a result, African culture centers around emulation of great figures, and seeks to inspire spirits to possess the body. The Hero-African is possessed of the ability to channel powerful spirits at his own discretion; a genius who can access powerful talents on demand. Thus African art revolves around the spontaneous performance. The freestyle rap battle, improvisational jazz, the sermon of the Baptist preacher; all these seek to demonstrate the individual's prowess in summoning a genius that transcends the African's everyday abilities. And all his music and art seeks to induce suggestibility to this possession.

The point of music, to the African, is to transfer the abilities and emotions of the artist into oneself. The artist, channeling a powerful spirit, becomes a spirit, his audience the vessel. Rhythmic, unlike melodic or symphonic music, seeks to stifle the thought and the free imagination. It drowns out and interrupts thought, leaving the listener suggestible, resonating with his animal instincts. Similarly, the abruptness and disunity of improvisational music disrupts a coherent thought-picture and forces the experience of music down to the limbic. And as a result, African music always seeks to effect a change in the body, whether to gird one for battle, to loosen sexual inhibitions, or even to relax and return the body to a state of placidity.

We can observe the way simile and metaphor are deployed in rap; no Western poet would say “I am Achilles” or “I am Zeus”, but this construction is ubiquitous in rap, as the African seeks the influence of powerful beings and heroes by invoking them. This is the origin of the ghetto custom of making t-shirts with a murdered loved one’s face on them, of their obsession with designer brands and named football jerseys, and of their tendency to adorn themselves with gold ornaments and jewels when they can afford to do so. All of them represent the desire to channel the powers of a beneficial or desirable “other”.

Note that belief in actual demonic possession is still persistent among African Christians and Muslims, some of them going to brutal lengths to “exorcise” their children or neighbors. But every African feels this certitude in their souls, even if expressing it in the midst of Western civilization is low-status. The introduction of monotheism to the African did not enlighten him or change his modes of thought; rather, it coalesced all good spirits into “God” and all evil into the “Devil”. Or “Halal” and “Haram”. One simply need witness black Baptist mass to get a sense of what I mean.

The centrality of *possession* to the African is a negation of human agency as the European understands it, an attempt to animalize (that is to say simplify) the nature of man and to place his complexities of extreme good and extreme evil, of extreme talent and crippling disability, into the ownership of a mysterious spirit world that is felt intuitively and never wholly comprehended. He considers himself inwardly always the moved and never the mover, the horse and not the rider. His inner humanity is without form and identity, a man of clay to be shaped by a mystical other. The aggressively bombastic individualism that we see in a Kanye or other rap mogul, or famous athlete, occurs only in the West, in an aping of the apparent spirit of its success, often with significant White admixture in the individual himself. If you begin to listen for this self-denial of agency in African culture, should you have the stomach for it, you will hear it everywhere.

To the African, the white man is himself a demonic entity, or is collectively under the influence of a demonic entity. His very consistency and seeming immunity to wild swings of emotion and inspiration is inhuman. The will-to-power that he possesses in his endeavors is a will possessed, in the African cosmos, only by spirits, by demons. Only the demon has a consistent will; a consistent mischievousness or violence, or a constant love or benevolence, that alights on and departs from humanity on a whim. Thus the European will always and unfailingly be regarded with suspicion and hostility by the African, just as the honest European sees in the African an unpredictable and inconsistent animal. (It is a shame, of course, that the European has the tendency to try and *tame* animals.)

What kind of civilization could eventually blossom and take root in this spiritual ground, I cannot even begin to imagine. The safest guess would be nothing. It goes without saying that the African soul is wholly incompatible with European law, society, and culture. Only centuries of evolution could alter this fundamental nature of the African. Excepting, of course, the rare “Uncle Tom” who, like the Hon. Clarence Thomas, sees in White culture a source of good juju to be channeled and emulated rather than as a source of evil voodoo that oppresses and violates. And even the exceptionally smart African probably regards the mathematical formula, or the scientific process, for example, as a cargo-cultish magical ritual that produces a desired result upon successful emulation.

## The Centralization Trap

October 23rd, 2018

Or why you need aristocracy. Kings in the 17th century got the idea, generally, that they could stabilize their rule by cutting out the feudal nobility and consolidating their power. This represented a kind of 'pure' monarchy that kings had occasionally aspired to, and which was discussed in medieval political theory as the ideal state of government, from Dante through Hobbes. We call this Absolutism. Some people will call the 17th century the "Age of Absolutism", something you've probably heard before. Moldbug uses "pure" absolutism as a thought experiment, by giving a King a magic wand that lets his political will instantly be done. It's not quite that simple in real life, because you can't be everywhere at all times with an instant-kill button that lets you enforce your will. Power needs people, if you want to exercise it further than you can shoot a gun.

Here's our case study. Louis XIV. Louis really didn't like his nobility. In fact, when he was young, he had to fight a civil war against them. Unruly nobles stirring up trouble and fighting the King were fairly common. The liberties granted to the nobility, to hold and rule their land, were a legal grey area. There's ultimately a good reason for this, but we'll get to it. But Louis XIV, at any rate, thought that France would be richer and more peaceful if he could personally govern it. The problem, of course, is that Louis is one dude and France is a big place. He can't practically run France by himself. In fact, it's impossible. That's kind of what the aristocracy is for in the first place. But your nobles aren't a bunch of bureaucrats who faithfully carry out orders. They're a collection of warlords with big balls who practically shit will-to-power. That's how they and their ancestors got their titles in the first place. (And also why they make effective rulers)

But XIV didn't like giving them the freedom that they needed to govern their lands, because sometimes they would get uppity or offended, and rebel against the Crown. He couldn't do it all himself though, so he decided to do it through proxy. He created a massive civil service of bureaucrats. Who couldn't tell the feudal nobility what to do, but who were invested with the actual powers of government. I.e. they had the powers of the courts, legislation, and law enforcement. As far as they were carrying out the King's will in an official capacity, they were invested with the King's authority. These civil servants were all commoners, despite being educated (in fact, XIV could only do this *because* of mass education of commoners). He also "reformed" the army to take it out of noble control and bring the appointment (and firing!) of officers under his direct command.

Now, the nobles would probably be pretty pissed about all of this. And it's not like Louis came out and told them "Hey guys, I'm taking away all of your power. Suck my Sun-cock." He did it behind the scenes. And his nobility did just lose a civil war. It's not like they were in a position to complain. XIV also did something really smart. He invited everyone important and powerful to Versailles, to live at court where he could keep an eye on them. The nobles probably thought they could get back in his good graces by coming along. But in reality, XIV kept them all distracted with the sublime hedonism that only the Baroque could provide. These nobles, and especially their sons, became more concerned about who was in royal favor at the moment, who was dressed on the cutting edge of fashion, whose taste in music and food was the best, who was fucking who in secret, and so on. It absorbed and deflected their status-seeking tendencies.

I don't really fault the Sun King for what happened. Politically, he was treading into uncharted waters. What he was doing made sense both to the pre-Enlightenment monarchist and the Enlightenment itself. It's only the hindsight of jaded reactionaries that can see his disastrous

mistake. Which is assuming that since he gave these commoners power, and that they were nothing without his support, that they would be totally loyal to him. It was actually a mild form of [bioleninism](#). But the people he appointed weren't total underclass, the type of people who couldn't feed themselves. They were the sons of successful merchants and artisans, solidly middle-class. And Europe's middle classes are a smart, cunning bunch of guys.

See the problem yet? Louis couldn't rule France on his own, which also means that he can't supervise all of his bureaucrats either. He can't tell if his civil servants in Calais or Marseilles are actually carrying out his orders, unless he hires more bureaucrats. Whose loyalty isn't any more guaranteed. His bureaucrats realize that they're effectively operating independently with near-unlimited political power. And a bureaucrat becomes more important the more problems he solves. So eventually, he begins finding problems that aren't there, or even making them out of nothing. A lord doesn't get richer and more important the more he meddles with his people's lives. In fact, it's a lot of work for one dude. So he's going to be pretty hands-off unless he absolutely has to do something. Which is pretty much the way government should be unless you're at war.

Louis' bureaucrats ruled pretty effectively for a good thirty years. XIV himself was under the mistaken belief that ancient loyalties and the ideal of the King would keep his civil service in line. And it worked that way for a generation, but not too much longer. Eventually the bureaucrats realized that they were effectively in charge. Collectively at least. So what did they do? They used a crisis as an excuse to whip up an angry mob, capture the King, (now Louis XVI) and set up an English-style parliament. Nothing effectively changed at first; all they did was formalize the political reality that had existed for 30 years. I always wondered, when I read [Carlyle's French Revolution](#), where all these initial revolutionary characters came from in a feudal society. They seemed to spring into existence, hundreds of experienced legislators and administrators. Turns out that they were already working for the government.

See what happened? Louis XIV wanted to consolidate his power, so he made his aristocracy into figureheads. Which in turn made him, the King himself, into a figurehead! So we can surmise that, somehow, the King's effective power is intrinsically tied to his noble class. More on this later.

Now about this crisis. The bread shortage. Calling this, alone, the cause of the French Revolution, is stupid. Or it has an *agenda* behind it. Let's debunk it in one sentence: Famine was an occurrence inherent to Malthusian society, and had happened cyclically for hundreds of years, but suddenly *now* it's the King's fault? Just when a new elite class, thirsty for power, is on the scene? Give me a break. Again, no peasant revolutions in the past 1000 years due to famine. Peasants overbreed when a realm is rich and successful, but food production doesn't rise concomitant to population because this surplus population starts to move into cities. And if they're not making enough money to import food from other kingdoms, people will start to starve. One can even see this as a good thing, in Darwinian terms, but that's a whole 'nother can of worms.

England managed to avoid this because its surplus population went out to settle the Empire. France's colonies were, by and large, not settlement colonies. Think how many Frenchmen lived in the Louisiana purchase compared to the American colonies. Hardly fucking any. A bunch of fur trappers, mostly, a few traders in New Orleans, and a few Cajuns who went out into the swamps. I couldn't say why history turned out this way, but England staved off famine through colonialism while France did not. Most of France's revolutionary civil servants, at first, were Anglophiles. They attributed the success of England's Empire to England's constitutional

parliamentary monarchy (I attribute the lack of civil war in England's Whig constitutional monarchy to the success of its Empire).

(I'll head off a likely objection and say that it wasn't Descartes and Rousseau and Voltaire either. Enlightenment philosophy, like Protestantism, only became popular because there was *already a market* for its ideals: wealthy educated commoners who were salty about not having noble titles and thought that they knew better than Church and King.)

These people, as in all revolutions, took over with the best of intentions. They wanted their Lockean Enlightenment constitutional monarchy, perfectly moderate in its whiggishness, sensible in its electoral franchisement, and humane towards its peasantry. Just like the Russian Revolution. And just like the Russian, 130 years later, the moderate faction got outflanked by the Left, as it always does. Lafayette and Mirabeau were good, but misguided men. They were destroyed by demons in human skin like Robespierre. Louis XVI was a pussy of a dude, and he would've been more or less content to be a figurehead. Which is why he lost his head, and why France took a blow it has *never recovered from*.

But the purity spiral is something we understand quite well. What is less orthodox is the need for an aristocracy. The King relies on them, and they rely on the king. Like I've said before, feudal society is [one big bandit clan](#). The nobility are first and foremost military officers. The experience they get in war helps them govern in peacetime, and their duties and obligations as peacetime leaders help make them an effective military force. It's not uncommon for the King and the nobles to fight, or the nobles to fight each other. But this bond of personal military loyalty is the basic unit of Western society. There's no trying to circumvent it, as we just proved. I'm a reactionary because I don't believe in perfect government, or perfect society. This tension between King and Lord is perfectly acceptable compared to the alternative. And that's why the alienation of the King's sovereignty is a legal grey area. (It wasn't designed that way, but it ended up working out pretty well)

If the Lord is just a bureaucrat, he needs to meddle in people's business to make it look like he's doing a good job so that the King doesn't end up firing him. And if his position is replaceable, well, maybe he's incentivized to overthrow the King and create an egalitarian parliament of bureaucrats that ends up fucking everyone over. But the Lord can't have total rights over his land, total alienation of sovereignty from the King, because then he has no reason to obey the King. He's just a King now. And when you scale sovereignty down to the totally local, your state is prone to being invaded by any asshole with an army. And then that asshole makes you a noble, if you don't die fighting, and calls himself a king. Which is pretty much how feudal monarchy was invented in the first place. After Rome fell, you had a bunch of minor kings with tiny kingdoms. And then some dick, whose tiny kingdom was a little bit bigger, would invade you and tell you that if you took your men and fought for him, you'd be big and important once he was finished invading everything he could. And maybe your kids might have the chance to marry his down the road, and you get your genes into the royal bloodline.

And since he was just a dude, he didn't really bother to stick his nose into your territory once you were a Duke. As long as you kept the peace, protected the Church, and all that, you were pretty much in charge. And all the guys who fought for you were promised pretty much the same thing you were by the King, and they get some land and some legal independence and now you have freeholders. Everything I said about monarchy and aristocracy scales down to the aristocracy and its freeholders. If you don't give your responsible, trustworthy men some independence, you end up with a class of unaccountable bureaucrats that effectively wields all of your power. And will end up killing you and an appreciable percentage of your population.

## Socialism and Capitalism

November 4th, 2018

There is no fundamental difference between a state that owns a corporation and a corporation that owns the state. In the absence of a state institution that has absolute authority, people with money will end up buying the state. In an ancap paradise, with functionally no government, one corporation or a partnership of corporations will eventually usurp the function of the state. Absent 'regulation' you get massive monopolies, because free competition is only a step on the way to the endstate of capitalism. Success has a snowball effect. If you manage to get bigger than your competitors, you can use your leverage to suppress competition, and it's in your best interest to do so. It's also in your best interest to gain control of the regulatory apparatus of a modern democracy and use it to suppress competition that you can't simply buy out. Big corporations love regulation. They're already big, and can afford an army of lawyers to cut through a massive cobweb of red tape. It's a small cost compared to the risk of being outcompeted by a startup with a better product. But startups can't cut through the red tape as easily, and incur growth-inhibitive costs by doing so.

Simply put, the endstate of capitalism is a massive business entity that suppresses innovation and competition through state mechanisms and a massive bureaucratic apparatus. It doesn't matter if the restaurants are called "McDonalds" or "Soviet Restaurant #3184". You will still end up living in a cheap, ugly brutalist building. You will work for an entity that is either the state itself or a close partner of the state. Wait, under socialism the peasants get welfare, right? But Amazon would love, absolutely love, to pay its workers in housing vouchers and food stamps rather than cold hard cash, if there was no welfare. It would love to have them all live next to the warehouse. We saw this in the late 19th century with the rise of the company town and company store. Both unfettered capitalism and socialism destroy the freehold and the vocation.

The only difference between socialism and the end state of ancap is the motive of its leaders. Socialism is run by the priests of utilitarianism who seek to maximize human pleasure while the capitalist runs his state to maximize profit. But once the capitalist has a universal monopoly, his best interest shifts to maintaining its monopoly rather than maximizing profit. And a corporation in this state is already a moribund institution. The benefits of capitalism are the benefits of competition. Free competition is a brief, fleeting stage of anarcho-capitalism. The Randian Hero-CEO is soon replaced by the Brezhnev-CEO who is concerned with minimizing cost and risk in a monopoly, and socialism and capitalism converge in form and function. Today, we have a system where both coexist in a hellish fashion. The socialist state subsidizes the underclass so the capitalist class can get filthy rich, which is then allowed some influence in the state as long as they don't run afoul of the Cathedral, which turns out to not really hate the capitalists very much despite their Marxist roots, because it turns out that capital is an extraordinary tool for stamping out heresy.

The spirit of our civilization is expansionary. It needs a purpose. It does not sit in tranquility like Edo Japan unless it is rotting. We are like a shark; move or die. Both socialism and capitalism are death. R&D is expensive; it's of no benefit to the monopolist to innovate. No carriage-maker with a monopoly will invent the car. Perhaps an extraordinarily powerful state can enforce free competition, which was the point of Teddy's anti-trust laws, but it didn't really work out that way, did it? The state apparatus that enforces this halcyon condition of free competition is necessarily going to be massive and intrusive, and ends up becoming its own form of socialism. When

competition occurs, somebody wins. The trick is keeping the inevitable monopoly far away from the state apparatus.

The question of capitalism is not a question of 'regulation', or of state interventionism. The capitalist class is, to the King, a contractor hired by the King to make use of the physical and human capital that is the King's property. The contractor is a capable man of considerable expertise, but his contracted use of the King's estate does not and must not give him legal interest in said property. If I discover a rare earth mineral beneath my land, I may hire a miner to come dig it up. I will likely give him the right to sell this mineral to his profit, as long as I get a rightful cut. If this miner comes back and tells me that now he owns my land, or if he tries to cut me out of the profits, or if he harasses me in an attempt to get me to sell the land, I am entitled to take him out into my woods and shoot him in the back of the neck, and so it is with the King and the Capitalist.

## Sexual Status, for Autistic Libertarians

November 11th, 2018

I've seen a few libertarians around the 'sphere question the existence of 'sexual status' or even the 'sexual market', so it's time to set the record straight on that. I don't quite understand your pathological aversion to the unquantifiable, but luckily for you I can speak your uncouth language. Just as the 'market value' of diversity-free safety and social trust is reflected in the housing market, we have hard data on the sexual market because sex is a commodity that people buy and sell.

Now, I'm sure you're still with me when I say that every exchange of goods and services for money is a 'fair exchange'. I.e. the money provided accurately reflects the value of the service provided at that point in time. If something is worth more one week than another, well, that's just how markets work. Supply and demand. So, let's take a look at what sex sells for. If you go out to a shady neighborhood at night to find a street whore, you're looking at a few hundred bucks to get your rocks off with an older, moderately attractive slut. Which varies depending on how drug-addicted, young, and attractive said street meat is.

A few years back, I remember a scandal where some politician, Spitzer I think his name was, was caught paying for high-end prostitutes. A high-end escort is a young, feminine, and beautiful whore. Spending the night with one of those bitches will set you back \$20,000 to 50,000. So we can see that whorishness being a constant, the value multiplier for youth and beauty is a whopping 100x. Still with me? We can go deeper (heh). Occasionally, young beautiful women who are virgins [will sell their virginity](#). You can already tell what price that commands on the market. I even recall a story about an Arab prince paying \$6,000,000 for an Instagram model's virginity. (That's supply and demand at work, of course, because white girls are scarce and in demand in brown countries.)

You should still be with me. My model might be a bit rough, but markets are markets. They don't lie. The market value of a beautiful young virgin, as opposed to a beautiful young whore, is 50-100x greater. Compared to an old used-up whore, the market value of a young, beautiful virgin is 10,000x greater, or 1,000,000% of the value of an old slut.

Here's where it gets tricky. You already knew that there's a 'real' market where people trade sex for hard, liquid cash. Now how do we derive another 'sexual market', where people voluntarily have sex with each other, from this? Well, we've already established that a beautiful young virgin has an asset worth 2.5-5 million dollars that she carries around with her everywhere. Even

if she's a young beautiful slut, her sex is worth 20-50,000. Everywhere she goes, she encounters men who see her and are as tempted by her beauty as they would be tempted by a suitcase full of benjamins.

Under this metric, it would seem insane that beautiful young women would give up their sex for anything less than the equivalent of a shitload of money. But if you've gotten out of your libertarian-cave recently and tasted the fresh air, you can't help but notice that they do it a lot. For free, to rich suitboys, and broke bikers, and smelly DJs with heroin habits. And those girls feel like they're getting a *fair deal*, because they'll do it again and again. As a libertarian, you have to conclude that they're making a rational economic choice. What those men are giving her in exchange isn't good dick, which is almost worthless on the market, but something else. Something unquantifiable.

What men who fuck beautiful young girls have in common is that they are all top dog within their respective social milieux, or they project so much dominance that women get the impression that he is top dog of something, or will be in the future. Being owned by a top dog male, or even just the feeling of it for a night, is even more valuable to women than the suitcases of cash they occasionally sell their pussies for. Even more valuable, because far more of them choose to be piped out by a dominant male for free than choose to get poked by beta male peckers for suitcases of cash.

This quality in men that women trade their incredibly valuable sex for can be called 'sexual capital', but it refers to the quality that we tend to call 'sexual status' 'round these parts. I know my model is accurate because when men learn about my history slaying virgin puss, and fucking beautiful young sluts, they treat me with a respect about equivalent to the respect I see multimillionaires with successful businesses get. And from women, even more respect than men treated me with. Thus you will see dirty bikers and broke musicians swagger around like millionaires. They've accrued millions of dollars worth of sexual capital and have the envy of very rich men, like Elon Musk and his [>tfw no gf](#). Needless to say, you're not going to care very much about getting filthy rich when you're a sexual millionaire. A modest living will do you just fine.

Finally, I've seen some morbidly autistic libertarians call traditionalist sexual mores "sexual communism", as if society was more or less giving out wives to undeserving men, and the current, deregulated sexual market was a bastion of truth and beauty. First of all, it's not a subsidy or a gift if duties and obligations are attached to it. It's a contract. Even if traditional society was some 'bureau of marriage', handing out wives to every man (which it was not, and should not become), the concomitant responsibilities of upholding the King's law, defending the Church, and fighting on the state's behalf during war, would make this arrangement not a subsidy but a contract of employment. Secondly, you still had to find your own wife. Enforced virginity increases the supply of virgins, and thus lowers the market price so that marriageable young women are not monopolized by a tiny male elite. If this happens, 80% or more of men have no stake in the future and nothing to lose. You either get tribalism, on display in a ghetto near you, where over a third of men die from interpersonal violence, or you get Islam, where the harem-masters send out their surplus males to foreign lands to pillage and rape. Take away patriarchy and you have no hope of achieving anything resembling libertarian society.

## **Bullying Works**

November 14th, 2018

I have a pair of contrasting anecdotes for you, both taken from acquaintances of mine. I'll call them Dexter and Chad. Both of them suffer from Asperger's syndrome, and I watched both of them grow up from childhood to young adulthood.

Dexter was a little runt of a kid, and he grew up skinny, short, and ugly in the face. High IQ, but you wouldn't know it because he rarely spoke and when he did, it was in short sentences. But he would always ace his math tests, which people thought was strange since all he would do was sit on his ass playing videogames all day and never study. His mother was strict, and his dad, the epitome of kulak-class American, gave him a hard time too despite his rough fatherly affection. His older brothers were more social and active, and they'd always be roughing him up, and teasing him, and dragging him out to fight with sticks and ride ATVs in the woods, and all the normal shit a rural American boy does.

What happened was that he learned to fire back when someone insulted him or tried to give him shit. And because he learned not to give a fuck, he made friends at school. When he got to college, he asked me for dating advice. I told him not to treat her like a princess, and that she didn't want to date a chump and she'd try to get him to act like one, so don't fall for it. Since then, he's gotten in decent shape and never been without a girlfriend. He leveraged his sperg math IQ through grad school into a cushy, well-paying job and is dating a girl way more attractive than anyone would expect. If you talked to Dexter, you'd assume he was incel. He looks and dresses geekier than Dylan Roof did. He's still quiet and antisocial. But his upbringing gave him a mental toughness and inner peace that allowed him to maximize his naturally low status.

Now on to Chad. Chad also grew up in a rural area, is also a sperg, but he and Dexter couldn't be any more different. He was the only child of a loveless marriage between a cunt tankrrl feminist and a liberal bugman. He grew up coddled and insulated. His parents never said no to anything he wanted to do, and never held him to any expectations. I don't think he'd ever taken a punch or ever heard a mean word against him until middle school. And he imbibed leftist ideology at his mother's tit. He grew up plagued with insecurities, and thus talked loudly and incessantly to fill the intolerable silence of his life. In high school, embittered by his low status, he embarked on a massive self-improvement program that focused around the gym. It ended up making him look like Conan the Barbarian, and he managed to make himself a bit more likable to others.

But here's the thing. He's still incel, and not for lack of trying. He's a big jacked dude, over 6 feet tall, good facial phyzz too. If you saw him walking down the street with a dimebag on his arm, you probably wouldn't look twice. He asks girls out, and gets dates, but never closes the deal. Partially because of his white knight RESPEC WAHMEN mentality, partially because he's deeply insecure. But he is insecure because he never went through the requisite hardships that cultivate inner toughness. His leftist victim mentality meshes with this self-defeating inability to take action. Despite him looking visually high-status, he is practically unemployed and a virgin at 22. And I've seen this dude in action. He's not exactly hitting on the cream of the crop.

That's why bullying works. Life itself is low-level stress and conflict. When kids fight, they learn to fight back. Absent, of course, the supervision of catladies who punish the victim for defending himself, the bullied often become friends with the bully. I was lucky to escape the catladies because when I was bullied in elementary school, I fought back and then gave a proverbial middle finger, as far as an 8-year-old could, to the school administration, but I was too young to face any real consequences. And the reputation as someone not to be fucked with lasted years.

## First Snow

November 19th, 2018

We had our first snowstorm here a few days ago. Unseasonably early. A good portent. There is nothing quite as beautiful as the snow, whether first-falling or on a clear night following. During the storm, everything distant is subsumed in a white haze. All sound is muffled; a dead quiet and a dead loneliness. And at night, when the snow has settled on the pines, and on the gables of homes, it reflects the moonlight and the starlight, and the lights that man makes. A snowy night is never dark, even in the wilderness. The noisy black forest of summer becomes a silent place of silver light and steely-blue shadows. Beautiful, peaceful, and hostile. One feels alone, and painfully aware that without your coat, without a warm home awaiting you at the end of the road, you would be dead in the space of hours. Because the winter is death. Tolkien did not like it:

*...and stones crack in the winter night,  
when pools are black and trees are bare,  
'tis evil in the wild to fare.*

He intentionally starts the quest of the Ring in the dead of winter and ends it in spring. In his cosmogony, "immoderate colds" are a corruption wrought by the Satan-figure Melkor. Joyce uses the snow as a symbol of death, of forgetting and numb oblivion. They are not entirely wrong. But the time has come to be reconciled in our hearts with Old Man Winter. He does not love us, nor will he ever. But he has made us *strong*.

Tropical man has no thought but for today. Northern man must look through winter to spring, through death to rebirth. Our northern race was not forged in fire alone, but in *ice*. For Jack Frost is a moralist. Children haphazardly begotten out of wedlock, he will take. The isolated man, the consummate individual 'lonely and desolate as the wild ass' he will smite mercilessly. The family that does not save of their harvest, that fights itself and does not cooperate, he will ruin. The fool who cannot plan ahead he will starve. Only the hearth and the store-room keep him at bay. Only stone laid with assiduous care to stone will keep his bitter breath from your home.

I said he has no love for us, but that's not exactly right. His love for us is harsh and merciless. Only through staving him off have we evolved. From whence industry? From wool, and from coal! The steam-engine, to mine coal, and the factory to spin wool. All of our strivings have their root in this: to preserve ourselves from winter, warm and safe around the hearth-fire. For we meet Death in late October each year, and though we cannot defeat him in the last, through our children we gain a small measure of eternity.

It's no coincidence that winter is when we, as Europeans celebrate our holidays of family, from Thanksgiving through the birth of Christ. It is a time of contemplation and rest, for the making of art and planning the year ahead.

When the cold really starts to bite deep, and trees freeze to the sap, tropical humans and sand people vacate the public eye. They only go around out of necessity, heads bowed, subdued and reserved compared to their summertime exuberance. For they are under the hand of brutal Death, an inevitable death that leaves them feeling naked and insignificant. Hardly will you ever see them playing at snowball fights, or building snowmen, or sledding. For the cold reminds them of what they do not have, and it reminds us of what we do.

We know that the sun is entering a period of inactivity, and that this solar minimum will bring deeper and colder winters on the Earth. I want to believe reports of a coming ice age, but that seems overexaggerated. Nonetheless I welcome the coming frosts. They stand as a harbinger for the cleansing of our people and our lands.

Of course, what is the cold void of outer space but the greatest winter of them all? I fear and envy the humanity that evolves under its merciless hand.

Of old, a certain tradition was practiced in the North. When an aged man became weak, and his continued life began to burden his family, who cared for him, he would go out "hunting" in the woods in the dead of winter, never to be seen again.

*"O King Winter, long have I defied you to see my children grow healthy and strong! But you have won, and so I come home to thee, at last, at last!"*

## A Counterpoint to PA

November 27th, 2018

The esteemed PA, over Thanksgiving, [made the point on his blog](#) that a balance between a realistic appraisal of woman's nature and natural male romanticism is the healthiest attitude to have as a man. He criticizes Jim (not mentioning him by name, but we all know it is Jim) for dwelling excessively on the cold biomechanics of male-female interaction, calling it

*"...repellent, like trying to live our one life with eyes compulsively fixed on the movement of a myriad insect legs in the grass"*

He also makes the point that because men are so good at compartmentalizing, they can hold both a hard-nosed biomechanical understanding towards women and a romanticized attitude towards, in this case, his wife, as he fondly recalls the nostalgic early years of their marriage. I agree, in a way. Men are natural romantics, which is precisely why I, and bloggers like me, will hammer home the "soulless biomechanics". Rather than compartmentalize female hypergamy away from romanticism about women, I actually see them as two sides of the same coin: admire the rose's beauty, put it to your nose and drink deep, but take care of the thorns! The spiritual nature of women has a dark side.

Like I said, I will talk more about the dark side because it is the least understood and the hardest to accept. It's a matter of good rhetoric. If I promote a healthy balance, say 50/50 for the sake of discussion, the ravings of this lone madman will be absorbed into a reader's 95/5 understanding of women and average out to an unhealthy balance. Because no matter what I or Jim say, men will always insist that "this one is different"; the romanticism will creep in. So I will promote the 5/95 understanding, or even a 0/100, because it exerts a stronger pull and makes the reader settle closer to the truth. Basic Overton window.

I have my own anecdote over Thanksgiving, talking to a young man having a few woman problems. He had been “talking to this girl” for a while but hadn’t been able to “make anything happen”. His words. This guy was conversant in red pill topics. He expresses disdain for ‘social justice warriors’, and asked advice on whether or not she was ‘shit testing’ him. But his behavior was totally out of step with what was logically going through his brain. He couldn’t help himself- even though he understood what she was doing, he couldn’t break out of his romanticized programming on how to treat a woman.

My advice to him was along the lines of: “You live in the middle of nowhere. You’re easily the best man within 20 miles, and she knows it too. But every minute that goes by without you making a move, her respect for you goes down.” But it was half-hearted advice because without something happening to truly draw the veil from his eyes, he will act this way around women until his member stops working.

One must be fully disillusioned before he can allow romanticism to creep back in. I was lucky in that regard, or maybe it was because I spent more time in and around women in my younger days. I recall sophomore year in high school, when I was working in the computer lab with headphones on. On, but not listening to music. So I happened to overhear a conversation between a girl I had a crush on, who was sitting next to me, and her friend. These fifteen year old girls were talking about last weekend’s sex party, and more specifically arguing about which of my classmates gave better dick. I asked them jokingly why I wasn’t invited, which game-wise is kind of cringy. (If I could do it again I would’ve said something like “make sure you send two invitations next time, mine must’ve gotten lost in the mail”.) But somewhere inside of me, a little squire in a white cape began to waste away, and a fat bearded biker who only answers to “Daddy” started to rev his engines in the distance.

This anecdote wasn’t enough by itself, but I’ve had a pretty eventful life. The better I got with women, the weaker that little white knight became. I don’t think many men who play it by the book and respect women ever dare plumb the sexual depravity that the weaker sex is capable of. Or if they do, they’re too polite to talk about it. I’m not. Once you get there, and it begins to spiritually disgust you as it did me, the romanticism creeps back in with tender, cautious steps. PA, with all due respect, has the luxury of a little romanticism. He has had a long and fruitful marriage. I forget who it was, but I read a comment on the ‘sphere somewhere that was like

“Make sure your woman understands that she won’t get your full love and respect until your firstborn’s head comes wailing out of her cervix”

That about hits the nail on the head. (I think it was a comment on Heartiste’s blog) By all accounts, PA’s wife has more than proven herself. But he is kind of like a boomer who, having made his wealth when the getting was good, deigns to advise millenials on how to succeed. So Jim, and I, and many others, will continue to look at the insect legs scuttling in the grass, because that insect is carrying a plague, and we are researchers trying to devise a *cure*.

## **Epitaph for an Intrepid Cuck**

November 28th, 2018

I rarely do, or will, comment on current events. But this week, we got to enjoy the sight of the left [celebrating the lynching of a racial minority](#) by an extremist group of separatist traditionalists. No need to moan about hypocrisy, they have the power and you don’t.

I'm a bit pissed off about something else though. To be honest, I have very little sympathy for Mr. John Chau. I don't know where he resides in America, but I guarantee that within a mile of his home, maybe within a thousand feet of his front door, there is a young man in deep crisis or a young woman on the brink of becoming a whore. Young people who are not Christians, or maybe they are bad Christians, whose lives would be bettered by a bit of old strong religion. Who would find some meaning and purpose; the joy of a family maybe, or the peace and humility of worship.

But evangelizing the troubled youth that assuredly exist in his community is not glamorous. It wouldn't get him on the news. It might even get him scorned and attacked for a lack of sufficient progressivism, were he to evangelize his local community. The money he spent on a plane ticket to the literal other end of the earth, so he could take bible-thumping selfies with a bunch of ungrateful primitives, could have paid the trade school tuition for a young Christian man contemplating suicide in the face of a hopeless future, could have sent a young heroin addict to the oil sands to get clean.

He does not 'love his neighbor' in any sense of the phrase. His trip to the other end of the earth is a display of contempt of his neighbors, or sheer stupid folly, if he thinks that they have already found God, and do not need His help.

These evangelists should be put on notice. *Your communities are watching.* Make no mistake, the young men and women of America are struggling: physically, morally, and spiritually. When they see men like Chau, men like you, turn your backs on them for virtue-signalling trips to ungrateful and savage lands? They turn away from you, and away from your Church, and away from God. Why shouldn't they? Your charity is meant to demonstrate the mercy of your Lord. What you are telling them is: "No room for thee in Christ. You are below the heathens of the jungle in the eyes of the Lord".

The tribals he attempted to evangelize, so isolated for so long that they likely do not even share our species in the eye of honest science, are smarter than he is. They understand what neighborliness means; maintaining the integrity of their group at any cost.

Matthew 15:26

*But he answered and said, It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs.*

## **Why We Have no Wars**

December 7th, 2018

Contrary to Fukuyama's Whig triumphalism and the assertion that mankind finally settled on liberal democracy and contractual international capitalism as the harbingers of a peaceful "universal brotherhood of man", war has not ceased at all but taken on a different character and form. I think Fukuyama later walked back his assertions, but that was because of the oh-so-terrifying populism of maybe 20% of Europeans peacefully objecting to their invasion and replacement.

The reason we have no 20th century style war between technologically advanced nation states is simply due to the fact that defensive war is more effective than offensive war. The world realized this when it realized that devastating air power alone was not enough and you need boots on the ground to capture territory. This is because human dominance/submission behavior does not activate unless there's a physical presence to acknowledge as dominant.

Massive firebombings of civilians as seen during WWII only serve to galvanize a population and make them more eager to go overseas and kick some ass.

Once you put boots on the ground though, they're a massive target for absurdly sophisticated computer-guided ballistic missiles and artillery that would put 'ol Werner's V2s to shame. It might seem counterintuitive that offensive weapons contribute to the strength of defense but the vice versa is also true. Offensive tactics were superior during WWII due to the simple fact of tank armor. Explosives weren't powerful enough to destroy a column of tanks before they got into your defensive lines, so your best bet was just to tell the tanks to charge and send in an army walking behind to mop up the rout. That's called blitzkrieg, and it's what every army in WWII did. It's why Hitler expanded so easily and then why his seemingly invincible armies crumbled once he overextended himself and his enemies pushed him back.

Nowadays, the opposite is true. The M1 Abrams is an incredible piece of technology, and pretty much an invincible piece of cavalry against goatfuckers with RPG-7s, but it's not going to hold up against a modern airstrike. You put those things in a line, you're just saving the enemy money on bombs.

Just imagine China trying to send a fleet to invade the continental US. It's an absurd thought; all those big expensive aircraft carriers would get blown out of the water before they even made it to Hawaii. We make a lot of noise about missile defense, ostensibly to protect against nuclear ICBMs, but it's really so that we can put boots on the ground without being counterattacked. The technology is not there yet. The field test data is very unimpressive. Hitting a 17,000mph projectile with another missile is possible under perfect conditions, when you know its trajectory and speed, but a computer-guided enemy missile that's constantly changing course and even varying its speed? Using radar-shielding stealth tech? Even a 90% success rate only means that the enemy needs to spend more money and use more missiles to hit its target. Naturally, we can't send a fleet to China for the exact same reason. During the Gulf War, we managed to literally bomb Saddam back to the stone age in a month, but only because he could not meaningfully contest the air. Recall that his mere handful of primitive SCUDs had us terrified.

So when you see Russia bragging about all the new advanced weaponry it's building, that's a defensive posture. When you see a country bragging about missile defense, that's an offensive posture. Russia saying that it has incredible ballistic missiles that get around anti-missile defenses, is saying "come close to me and I'll rain hellfire on you". When America says it's developing invincible anti-air defenses, it's saying "I'm coming to get you, you bitch, and you can't stop me". Because great missiles are useless without boots on the ground, and great missile defense lets you put boots on the ground. Like a Mexican standoff where one party starts putting on Kevlar. The top brass in both countries is of course well aware of this, even if it's not something you tell the public. And why America's installations of "anti missile defense systems" within spitting distance of the Russian border has them on edge.

Which is why all of our wars are proxy wars: 4GW. They would fight enemy modern nations with 20th century total war if they could. Of course, if you were in a Mexican standoff, and you had Kevlar on under your clothes, you wouldn't tell anybody about it. But I think the fact that we aren't engaging in total war is evidence that we don't have secret defensive technology yet. Once we do, that's evidence that we have it, and we will invade some country and mysteriously suffer no losses without the public even knowing about it.

## **Crime**

December 14th, 2018

Why do idle hands do the devil's work? The simple truth is that it's fun. Crime is fun. Being able to fuck someone over and get away with it is a blast. If you've never, for example, beaten a man senseless for hitting on your girl, let me tell you: It feels incredible.\* The evil ape part of our brains tells us that it is high status, and raises our status, which in the state of nature is completely true. In modern society it is also true, because the benefits of crime outweigh the risks. Criminals get laid. Criminals have more kids than non-criminals, even controlling for class and race. Criminals are high-status within their milieu. Criminals get richer than their abilities would allow for. Other men fear and respect you. It makes your balls infinitely heavier and makes you walk with a swagger in your step.

Conservatives have spilled endless pages of ink telling us why crime is bad, every word of it true, so I'm not going to repeat it. Crime is bad. If society is a clan of stationary bandits, then once the bandits start preying on their clansmen society falls apart.

So crime is bad, always, but crime is sometimes good for the people who commit it. The obvious solution is to make crime bad for the people who commit it, the stick, while offering a carrot for being lawful. In medieval times, a working prole had a virgin wife, a bunch of kids, and a decent amount of agency in how he worked. He had a community of likeminded men in his class who reaffirmed his place in a world of sacred relations, and a Church which did the same. That's more than enough status and security to disincentivize you to commit crime, and it's not a subsidy either. You had duties and obligations to fulfill, and fulfilling your obligations makes you feel like more of a man. A lumpenprole in that society is not committing crime because he doesn't need to break up the monotonous angst of being a welfare slave with spurts of fun and status. His monkey brain realizes that an exciting mugging or an assault-and-battery on the guy down the street who screwed him over, no matter how much of a badass it might make him feel, isn't worth throwing away his life, his wife, and his standing in the community.

Our society today guarantees men none of that for 'playing by the rules'. For a man of modest abilities, playing by the rules gets you nothing. You slave away at a pointless job with no ultimate reward and no agency. Your church tells you that you're shit and deserve to become obsolete.

But the anarcho-tyranny of the state makes it easy to get away with crime. The guy who's selling meth is at least fucking chicks and has a nice car. This transcends race, by the way, but obviously it's worse for more impulsive peoples. We're not currently in a position to restore the sacred relations that characterized ancient society, but we can stop crime with just the stick, and we should. A wound must be disinfected before you sew it back up and bandage it.

The way we solve crime is by attacking the status of criminals. Five years in jail boosts a criminal's status. Fifty lashes in the public square, making a self-styled hard man cry like a bitch and beg for mercy, tanks a criminal's status. Same thing for being put in the stocks and having people throw rotten food at you. Social shaming works, which is why our ancestors did it. Shaming the family of criminals and decreasing their status works, which is why our ancestors did it. It makes damn sure you don't raise your brats to be crooks.

We don't have a public square anymore, or close-knit communities that make ostracism effective, but we do have Youtube. Every PD should have a youtube account where public lashings and the like are broadcast to millions of people. And you also go after the associates of criminals. If you're the girlfriend of a gang member, or even one of his bitches, you get public lashes for aiding and abetting. And then the vast majority of women will stay far away from

gangsters. When gangsters aren't getting pussy, and all of their friends can go on Youtube and watch them crying and begging while getting whipped, people will stop being gangsters.

Not only that, but public beatings make forgiveness easier. When a man gets out of prison, you assume he's even more of a hard motherfucker than he was when he went in. But when a man's been publicly broken and humbled, it's easier to give him a second chance.

And that's before we even get to the noose. Public hangings, and leaving the body to rot in the town square; talk about mortal salience stimuli! When you're viscerally reminded of the death penalty every day, you're not going to do *shit*. And people didn't, which is why mobile bandits lived far away from decent people in the wilderness rather than in the hearts of our greatest cities.

*\*According to third party sources. The proprietor of this blog has never committed any sort of crime whatsoever and encourages his readers to follow whatever local laws exist, unless they involve the state forcing you to chop your son's junk off.*

## Without Comment

December 14th, 2018

Spengler:

"A deep transformation sets in first with agriculture- for that is something *artificial*, with which hunter and shepherd have no touch. He who digs and ploughs is seeking not to plunder but to *alter* Nature. To plant implies, not to take something, but to produce something. *But with this man himself becomes plant*- namely as peasant. He roots in the earth that he tends, the soul of Man discovers a soul in the countryside, and a new earthboundness of being, a new feeling, pronounces itself. Hostile Nature becomes the friend; earth becomes *Mother* Earth. Between sowing and begetting, harvest and death, the child and the grain, a profound affinity is set up. A new devoutness addresses itself in chthonian cults to the fruitful earth that grows up along with man...

The peasant's dwelling is the great symbol of settledness. It is itself plant, thrusts its roots deep into its "own" soil. It is *property* in the most sacred sense of the word. The kindly spirits of hearth and door, floor and chamber- Vesta, Janus, Lares, and Penates- are as firmly fixed in it as the man himself...

...In all countries of all late Cultures, the great parties, the revolutions, the Caesarisms, the democracies, the parliaments, are the form in which the spirit of the capital tells the country[side] what it is expected to desire and, if called upon, to die for. The Classical Forum, the Western Press, are, essentially, intellectual engines of a ruling City. The sentiment and public-opinion (so far as it can be said to exist) of the country is prescribed and guided by the print and speech of the City...

...The City is intellect. The Megalopolis is "free" intellect. It is in resistance to the "feudal" powers of blood and tradition that the burgherdom or bourgeoisie, the intellectual class, begins to be conscious of its own separate existence. It upsets thrones and limits old rights in the name of reason and above all in the name of "the People", which henceforward exclusively means the people of the city. Democracy is the political form in which the townsman's outlook upon the world is demanded of the peasantry also. The urbane intellect reforms the great religion of the springtime and sets up by the side of the old religion of noble and priest, the new religion of the

Tiers Etat, liberal science. The city assumes the lead and control of economic history in replacing the primitive values of the land, which are for ever inseparable from the life and thought of the rustic, by the absolute idea of money as distinct from goods...

...Presently there arrived an epoch when the development of the city had reached such a point of power that it no longer had to defend itself against country and chivalry, but on the contrary had become a despotism against which the land and its basic orders of society were fighting a hopeless defensive battle- in the spiritual domain against nationalism [**i.e. the Revolutions of the 1800's**], in the political against democracy, in the economic against money...

...But this is the reason, too, for the want of solidity, which eventually leads to losing its power and its meaning, so that at the last, as in Diocletian's time, it disappears from the thought of the closing civilization, and the primary values of the soil return anew to take its place.

...All art, all religion, all science, become slowly intellectualized, alien to the land, incomprehensible to the peasant of the soil. The immemorially old roots of Being are dried up in the stone-masses of its cities. And the free intellect- fateful word!- appears like a flame, mounts splendid into the air, and pitiably dies."

Kevin Williamson, "Conservative":

"If you spend time in hardscrabble, white upstate New York, or eastern Kentucky, or my own native West Texas, and you take an honest look at the welfare dependency, the drug and alcohol addiction, the family anarchy—which is to say, the whelping of human children with all the respect and wisdom of a stray dog—you will come to an awful realization. It wasn't Beijing. It wasn't even Washington, as bad as Washington can be. It wasn't immigrants from Mexico...

...The truth about these dysfunctional, downscale communities is that they deserve to die. Economically, they are negative assets. Morally, they are indefensible. The white American under-class is in thrall to a vicious, selfish culture whose main products are misery and used heroin needles. Donald Trump's speeches make them feel good. So does OxyContin. If you want to live, get out of Garbutt"

*La Sale Famine de Valfunde:*

*Europe t'es vieille t'es épuisée et t'es castrée*

*Ta maladie Europe c'est l'intellectuel.*

*Où sont passés tes berserkers et tes as très*

*Prompts à percer la rate de ces blattes en duel ?*

*Quand verra-t-on les jours heureux les jeux bandants ?*

*Des lancés à la catapulte d'étudiants dans*

*Des marres de pisse, de batraciens et d'excréments ?*

*Qu'ils étudient le sexe avec les animaux rampants...*

*Au Colysée les emmerdants racleurs de glotte*

*Les phraseurs de la \*\*\*\*\* ultra trop rigolote*  
*Coupons leurs sales horribles têtes de pécores*  
*Et faisons-nous des masques avec leurs visages morts...*  
*Tombes de bombes*  
*Dans les mégapoles:*  
*Nos pires chiens sortent de l'ombre*  
*Dynamiter la capitale*  
*Afin que croulent*  
*Vos tours de verre et de fer,*  
*Afin qu'elles roulent*  
*Dans un vacarme d'Enfer*  
*Sur leurs bâtisseurs même.*  
*Et vos troupeaux, et vos icônes,*  
*Et vos marchands ceints de couronnes,*  
*Qu'avec ils coulent*  
*Comme de la crème*  
*Donner à bouffer aux égouts !*  
*Qu'ils nous offrent le gai ragoût*  
*De leur molle putréfaction...*  
*A coup de batte on guérira*  
*La technocrate.*  
*Au golden boy on percera*  
*La rate.*  
*Au sommet nous rétablirons*  
*L'Aristocrate.*  
*La République nous lui fendrons*

*La chatte.*

## **We Are Not Rome...**

December 19th, 2018

We are Carthage.

Why do I draw this comparison? Getting right to the point, just because a cultural practice is authentically your own people's does not mean it isn't evil, degenerate, and foolish.

Leftism, liberal modernity, crypto-Calvinist Progressivism, resurgent Gnosticism, teh J00s, call it what you will, is a demon summoned of our own volition. Spengler did not choose the moniker "Faustian" for no reason. No other people than a White Christian Europe could have come up with leftism. We live in a theocracy, the theocracy of the sole surviving Christian tradition that has any real power. Every other Christian denomination, those that, ew, still believe in God and Jesus, play handmaid to it.

Some people do not want to believe that a White Christian Europe could collectively behave in a way harmful to itself of its own will, that the maladies which infect our society result from plague vectors of foreign transmission.

But we look back and we see Carthage. Carthage was very great. So great, the idea that a tiny republic of warlike barbarians called Rome would actually be able to crush its military might and eradicate it, would have been considered laughable. And Carthage was not only incomparably great and powerful, it was wholly Carthaginian, practicing its own homegrown traditions and adhering to its own culture.

Just one little problem. Their elites sacrificed their sons to Moloch. Which is really, really stupid and evil. The evil is obvious. The stupid, because you want successful people to have more kids. Trickle-down eugenics. Carthage could not have outcompeted its neighbors and rose to power doing this, just like it's laughable to imagine a Europe with modern leftist morals ever getting out of its druidic barbarian beginnings. It developed after Carthage's success, the same way our stupid dysgenic leftist religious practices developed after the height of Europe's culture.

A purity spiral. "I love Moloch more than you! I love Moloch *so much*, I'm going to give him my firstborn son." Right into the oven he goes. This shit only makes you high status when priests exercise kingly power and not priestly power. Again, stupid evil and dysgenic. But even very smart and competent people will do stupid, evil, and suicidal things to please power and signal their holiness. That sin, by the way, is called Pride and there's the reason why it's #1.

And so Gnon furrowed his slimy brow and stared darkly at Carthage. How many men of Hannibal's quality were fed to the brazen bull as infants? Were it only three or four, or even one, Rome might have fallen and Carthage stood for centuries more.

The Carthaginians had at least the decency to chuck a few kids into the fire and get it over with. Make no mistake, we are far, far more degenerate than Carthage and getting worse. Sending every promising son of the West to college, which is really priesthood training in disguise, is one

thing. Sending every elite daughter to college is temple prostitution by any other name. Temple prostitutes do not marry or have happy families. Some temple prostitutes graduate into the priesthood, i.e. the media-education-NGO complex, most are dumped back into the civilian world ruined and unmarriageable. Either way, high IQ young women need to have babies and turning all of them into ritual prostitutes is suicide.

Don't believe me? What do temple prostitutes do with the kids that inevitably resulted from their duties? Ritualized abortion, of course, which is another sacred cow of our society. Or they raise the resulting spawn to be temple prostitutes themselves. What do the daughters of single mothers grow up to be today? Yeah, you know the answer.

It is also encouraged and ritualized by the ruling theocracy for our young men to castrate themselves. The priesthood today is trying to escalate matters, trying to make the ritual buggery of our young sons into a sanctified religious practice.

In the eyes of Gnon, killing your kids and not having any are the exact same action, with the same evolutionary outcome. To Gnon, our civilization practices human sacrifice on an industrial scale. In the case of abortion it is actual blood sacrifice, in the case of making young men into eunuchs and young women into whores, it is soft human sacrifice. Soft in the eyes of its participants, who are living in a priest-made garden of earthly delights, but not soft in the eyes of Gnon. When the conspiracy theorist panics about hidden child sacrifice cults run by Hillary Clinton and the Rothschilds, he is projecting. Because he knows deep down that it is he who has sacrificed his children for his wealth and his license and his worldly pleasures.

We are not like Rome, we are like Carthage. Rome's imperialism and ours have parallels. But it is the dilemma that our priesthood has brought on us that will prove our end. One day, probably not too far in the future, our priests will succeed at mobilizing our entire society for war against some Rome. In all likelihood it will not be an emergent nation of actual people but a quixotic windmill. A war on Hate, or Poverty, or Global Warming. And in this war we will find that we are far weaker than we imagined, and the last few of our valiant men will burn the final dregs of vigor left in our people, and vanish forever, and those who come disgusted after us will plow salt into the land on which we spilled our children's blood.

## **Two Feminisms**

December 29th, 2018

I haven't updated over Christmas, partly because I was off visiting family and couldn't be arsed, and partly because my usual piss-and-vinegar posting is a tad sacrilegious. I also got a Twitter, which shouldn't be hard for you to find, for low-effort shitposting and throwing peanuts at people more popular and influential than I. Anyway...

All of the public debate (and much of even the dissident right debate) in the West today, as far as it concerns women, is not a debate between a feminist and an antifeminist worldview, it is a debate between two competing feminist worldviews.

I say two, and not one, because if there was only one feminist ideology, its controlled opposition would be both laughably ineffectual and further right than it, whereas today the more extreme feminism has not yet permeated the entire public consciousness, and is not yet written policy in each and every case, though it has captured certain institutions. The fact that one feminism controls some institutions while the other controls different institutions is evidence of a real ongoing battle within the Left, and I consider these as two different feminisms rather than one

Feminism because they have different memetic evolutionary lines and fundamentally opposing assumptions at their centers.

The two have not been named, so I will give them names. They are Whig Feminism and Sacral Feminism. The central premise of Whig Feminism is that women are the equals of men. The central premise of Sacral Feminism is that women are not only the moral superiors of men, but that women are categorically incapable of evil.

Now, this last assertion is stupid, and saying it out loud makes it laughable, so Sacral feminists will engage in rhetoric that claims the premise of Whig feminism, while acting and writing literature in ways where the mask slips and their actual beliefs are evidenced.

For the details of how Sacral feminism evolved, read [Dalrock](#). Sacral feminism came out of Christian theology to eventually permeate the entirety of Western culture. Originally, the actual effects of Sacral feminism appeared conservative, and indeed modern conservatives still stick to primitive Sacral feminism. Sacral feminism in its earliest stage is the Victorian view of women and what leftist academics have termed “the cult of domesticity”. In it, women were believed to be inherently spiritually pure, that if a woman did something evil, harmful, or immoral, she had been corrupted or induced by a man into doing it. The result is that women were to be isolated from the world of men, as “angels of the household” and spiritual/moral guides to their husbands and families. Dalrock gives a very good account of the details of this belief, and it had a hold from at least the early 1800’s, because Queen Caroline was given the benefit of the doubt for her adultery and George IV could not have her confined and whipped but had to settle for writing letters begging her to act more properly.

Naturally, it’s very hard to explain why a spiritually pure being must remain subservient to a fallen, evil being, so the superficial “woman’s sphere is the home” material of the ideology fell away as its spiritual core “women are inherently good” asserted itself in ever more drastic ways. You can read early feminist “utopian” literature of this bent, in which nations run by women have no wars, no crime, are always clean, etc. This version of feminism actually suffered serious defeats in the early 20th century in Soviet Russia and Anglo countries at the hands of Whig Feminism, and was resurrected by the Frankfurt school in a more radical form to subvert the dominant Whig Feminism. In its less leftist forms, which survive today, you can see Evangelical Southern Christians say of their wives “she’s the boss”, even when they believe that women are less suited to the world of male work. In its most radical form, it reverses from “women have no inherent evil in them” to “everything a woman does is categorically good”. One can see this attitude everywhere in modern culture.

Whig Feminism, on the other hand, is the feminism of the French Revolution, of Rosie the Riveter, of Ayn Rand, etc. Its principal basis is in Locke, in the *tabula rasa*, and its victories were the victories of the suffrage movement, of Soviet female liberation, and the reigning feeling through the 50’s in Anglo nations and the 90’s (and partially to today) in Russia, that legal equality was sufficient and that after that, women ruled their own choices. More rightist (i.e. less leftist) Whig feminisms will acknowledge biological differences between the sexes, and one can see this in moderate Whig feminist Christina Hoff Sommers’ rebuke of radical feminism and Sacral feminism. This type sees, not a literal physical equality between men and women, but a spiritual equality between them. In other words, that women have the same rights as men, that they should not be coerced into marriage, have decisions made for them, etc- even if women do not end up being as successful as men, as wealthy, as influential. This is the J Peterson position on women, the gamergate position on women, and too common among “rightists”. But I’ll get to that.

In Whig feminism's more radical state, it believes in actual "hard" equality between the sexes, just as political Whigs morphed from believing in spiritual equality transcending class to believing that this spiritual equality necessitated physical, economic, and social equality. This, of course, is a purity spiral that, like communism, is being implemented today and will unleash more and worse horrors if allowed to continue. Today, Whig feminism is the written law of the land, and Sacral feminism is the unwritten law of the culture, which is attempting to change the laws of the land. The Sacral feminist rules the kangaroo courts of the University, where presumption of guilt is the rule for men, where an intoxicated man and a sober woman can have sex in a woman's room that she invited the man into, and the man is found guilty of rape despite continuing to have sex with the girl on multiple occasions afterward.

Whereas in the real courts, where Whig feminism rules and sex is only legitimate when bound by a verbal contract, such a claim is usually thrown out because of the presumption of innocence. Which makes Sacral feminists furious, because a dirty sinful man gets off and a woman who can tell no lie is disbelieved. Whig feminism in culture is Princess Leia, who needs to be saved but is a sassy little thing who doesn't need protection. Sacral feminism is that old dyke general in *The Last Jedi* whose gross stupidity caused her soldiers to mutiny, and is treated as a martyr by the film because "evil men soldiers no trust woman leader". Whig feminism is Brienne of Tarth. Sacral feminism is Daenerys Targaryen. But Sacral and Whig feminism are actually in conflict today, because Sheryl Sandberg will say that we need more women in big business, and get shrieked at by Sacral feminists who insist that business is inherently male and sinful, and without a trace of irony recommend that we return to polyamorous gardening communes.

The only two beliefs that are high-status in the West today are radical Sacral feminism and radical Whig feminism, but the less-radical versions of these are tolerated and employed as rhetorical weapons and strawmen by the radicals. I.e. "We're just for equality. You care about equality, right?" and "I believe women". But radical Sacral feminism has managed to actually rewrite the law in Sweden, and feminism is mostly Sacral in the media-academia-NGO complex. These places represent the actual power center of the West, so in 20 years get ready for your kids to go to school learning about the inherent superiority of women as an explicit and not just implicit part of the curriculum. In terms of the pagan communes run by lesbian occultists, I wouldn't hold my breath. Without old patriarchal institutions as eunuch slave soldiers, the Cathedral is far less effective at projecting power. If radical feminists actually managed to abolish the army, the cops, and dissolved large corporations, all of my right-wing buddies and I would be out the door with our rifles before you could blink, and we'd be sitting on piles of war brides that'd put Genghis Khan to shame by the end of the month. 'Cause Moldbuggian passivism doesn't apply when the Cathedral can't actually enforce the Brown Scare. Then it's just plain anarchy.

But I digress.

In 1840, you had Whig feminists asking for the vote, and admission to college, and the right to own businesses, and you had Sacral feminists telling them that all of these were fallen-world male things that would sully woman's natural purity and goodness. Now, in 2018, you have Sacral feminists lobbying for the destruction of all fallen-world male institutions of business and politics and the powers of pater familias over men, and Whig feminists telling them that they should be content with 51% representation in all of these institutions and economic equality, when both of them aren't busy uniting against the fake opposition of "The Patriarchy", which has been a toothless beta cuck since George IV, probably a fag, wrote his wife a letter begging her

to stop fucking the ministers of his Cabinet instead of having her beheaded or at least sent down to the Thames to be ducked.

I will be very clear in that every permutation of feminism is the enemy. Old Sacral feminism is the enemy. Once it was believed that unwed mothers giving birth in alleys is the fault of evil men, and not because said unwed mother is a silly little slut, people subsidized these unwed mothers and the number of unwed mothers giving birth in the rain exploded. In Old Whig feminism, you get TS Eliot and young married women sitting in bars circa 1919 chatting about the abortions they were keeping secret from their husbands.

There is no better way of weeding out entryists than by stating that women should be subject to their fathers' approval in marriage decisions, that the 19th should be repealed, that women are generally incapable of leadership, that despite women having comparable IQ to men, their exercise of it is hampered by contextual and emotional logic, that women are very prone to sexual immorality as an inherent feature of their biology, that even a very intelligent and well-spoken woman with kids is still at heart a goofy little slut who fantasizes about being raped and likes to get slapped and choked in the sack.

Some will complain that this drives women away from "the movement", but wanting them to participate is itself a part of Whig feminism. Women bet on the strong horse and rationalize the Why later. If the Patriarchy wins, a hundred million feminists will suddenly and inexplicably rediscover their love and respect for it, just like they love and respect Islam today. If you want a wife today, before we've won, and you should, your task is to make a woman care more about your approval than Harvard's. A tall order, but it can be done. And if you can't do that, do you think you'll stand a chance against Harvard itself?

## **Culture Meet Axe: Harry Potter**

January 1st, 2019

Welcome to a new series. Don't worry, we're not going to be totally shifting focus here. I'm just going to have some fun making steak out of a few liberal sacred cows, and dusting off some legitimately reactionary hidden gems. This post is definitely the former.

Man, where to start with Harry Potter? The series is a titan, it made Rowling richer than the Queen of England. If I wanted to flex my legitimist muscles, we might as well put a crown on the woman and declare her Regina of the Liberal World Order. It's not a very well written series of novels, as many have pointed out, but that's almost required for widespread popularity today. Rowling's prose is decidedly amateur, and moreso in the earlier books. Despite this, I have to give her props for characterization. Her characters are not quite one-dimensional, but neither are they complex, lending them a vividness and life appropriate for a children's novel, though less so for a "serious" work. Her worldbuilding and scene-setting, too, is shallow but vivid, and at least holds the reader's attention. It's not like the series has nothing going for it, and Rowling to a certain extent realizes her limitations as a writer. Every book but the last adheres to the same formula of "boarding school slice-of-life with an underlying mystery to solve". The formula works, the author clearly has an interest in detective fiction, and her mysteries lend some intrigue to the teenage school-drama, most of it petty, that forms the meat and potatoes of these books. When Rowling departs from this formula in the last novel, her pacing suffers a terrible blow, with long tedious stretches of nothing interspersed with brief bouts of climactic action. Part of this is the fact that she left too much unresolved going into the final installment, and then made matters worse by introducing a whole new plot to be wrapped up entirely in the confines of the final book.

Again, Rowling is a limited intellect and a competent storyteller. She would be right at home telling bedtime stories to children, in fact she would probably be one of the best at it. But this talent only transfers halfway into authoring a novel. What I really want to talk about here is the series' status as the new Leftist Bible. Pretty much every liberal millennial alive sees the world through the lens of Harry Potter, and that's what makes taking a knife to it so fun. And also why I'll be donning the black mask of a Death Eater to countersignal. You see, the villains of the franchise are a group of wizard-nationalists led by a one-dimensional psychopathic villain named Voldemort who loves nothing better than killing for fun. His followers, the Death Eaters, are a secret conspiracy of crypto-reactionaries who infiltrate the wizarding government, making it progressively more dystopian, in order to maintain the purity of wizard blood against miscegenating with the nonmagical, which they believe will cause the extinction of magical peoples, and eventually to install a wizard elite ruling the world of the Muggles; those who can't use magic.

Why aren't we rooting for these guys again? Well, Rowling, in order to keep the purity of the good v evil narrative intact, kind of shits the bed on characterizing her villains. Any reactionary, in fact, anyone with even a bit of common sense, is going to be left disappointed with how badly Rowling handles this. For one, the Death Eaters, without exception, are possessed by a singular and universal hatred of Muggles, and delight in torturing and killing them without a shred of remorse. Ludicrous. Hate is not the opposite of love; hate is an emotion we feel toward that which threatens what we love. And Muggles do not threaten wizards in the least; in fact, the magic of wizards in the series is so powerful and reality-bending that ordinary people cannot hope to do them violence, or even come close to the pocket dimensions in which they live and work. In other words, wizards have absolutely no reason to hate Muggles, because in the real world, hate is always reciprocal to perceived and actual threats.

Rowling also goes to great lengths to detach the motive of anti-miscegenation from the reality of her world. In her world, when a wizard and a Muggle breed, the children are without exception magical, and more or less equal in powers to the magical parent. Sometimes, two non-magical people can produce a magical child, who is also without exception as powerful as any pure-blooded wizard. The author can't even help but virtue-signal by having some of the "Muggle-born" wizards in her story be more powerful and competent than pure-blooded wizards. See the problem here? Rowling has built a world in which it is impossible for wizards to diminish their powers through outbreeding and become extinct, and then motivates her villains with prejudice against an impossible occurrence.

But all this is very intentional. Rowling builds a cast of villains who stand in as strawmen, meant to evoke the liberal bogeyman of hidden white supremacists infiltrating the government, and roots their motivations in what are, within the world, entirely irrational concerns. She is of course trying to tell us that the real life elitists and racists have concerns utterly detached from reality, that they are motivated by the simple sadistic desire to murder and enslave others. The fact that their motives are so ridiculous in the novel makes for very effective brainwashing of young children, though hopefully a rational adult will raise his eyebrows.

The far, far more interesting motive is the one of wizard imperialism; that wizards should rule muggles, order their lives, prevent the chaos and war that plagues nonmagical society and is totally absent from magical society. If this was actually the main motivation of the villains, you could have an interesting story; wizard imperialists versus wizard isolationists, *noblesse oblige* versus allowing the weak to fail, the role of the state and the intellectual class in society, etc. These are things that reactionaries struggle with and debate today. Naturally, this is the motive

that Rowling completely glosses over, and only hints at, and that the villains only use as propaganda to cloak their sadism and sociopathy. Yawn.

What I find interesting in this whole thing is that while Rowling uses the language and codes of racism and antiracism to describe this conflict, the underlying essence of it is in fact a Marxist rather than an antiracist animus. The wizards are not really written as a master race; they are written as an aristocracy, an intellectual and priestly elite. Most of the Death Eaters are “old money” English families, jealous of their wealth and status against a “new-money” common-born wizard. And Rowling, propelled from wife-of-the-state single mother welfare slave into the ranks of the very rich by the success of her first novel, is certainly motivated by this *ressentiment*. The muggle-born represent a “natural nobility” that has been invited into the upper classes meritocratically through the public schooling process. In other words, Rowling is not arguing for equality, she is arguing for the replacement of a reactionary elite by a new, caring, socialist elite, one which, in her unicorns-and-flowers politics, is *laissez-faire* and more or less isolates itself from the Muggles.

Amusingly, she has the wizarding government, as infiltrated by the reactionary Death Eaters, become more and more dystopian and bureaucratic, more meddlesome in private life, and characterized by surveillance, censorship, and mistrust of the fellow citizen. I hope my readers are laughing along, because what Rowling is actually disgusted with in her heart is British Socialism, though she cannot understand the beast that she hates, and cloaks it in the garb of atavistic reactionary villains. When in reality, it is the priestly elite of rabid humanitarians that always and unerringly produces these horrors. But of course, in the author’s silly female head, Love Wins, so the enemy can be nothing but hateful and irrational.

That silly female brain of Rowling’s, however, produces something pretty interesting, which is that it can’t help but be honest about female sexuality. At least as far as a YA novel can be. We have the classic tropes of the underdeveloped, nerdy Hermione being torn between dumb but cavalier alpha Ron and brooding dark hero Harry, at least as the characters grow out of childhood. And Rowling herself was surprised that elitist bully Draco Malfoy ended up being so popular with female fans, though this is of course fake surprise along the lines of “I didn’t balance out his dominance with enough low-status whining”. Rowling’s love of brooding heroes, charming rogues, and unapologetic bullies shines through pretty well.

The thing to note here, of course, is that Harry, the protagonist, is *actually a female hero* in the way his sexual introspection and romantic life plays out. In other words, Rowling lacks the power of imagination to put herself in male shoes and try to understand male sexuality. No sixteen-year-old boy is ever “confused” about his attraction to a girl, but Harry is. When Harry, as the sixteen year old captain of a winning sports team, stands there dumbfounded and surprised as his sassy, outgoing love interest grabs him and kisses him in the middle of a victory party, Rowling is actually doing damage to her impressionable young male readers. In real life, Harry, a chad jock at the highest status he’s ever been, would grab the girl he liked and kiss her, and she would like it, and he would carry her off to a private room as soon as no one was looking. That’s normal human sexuality.

Rowling tells us that men should act like women, and passively wait around for the girls they like to decide to act like high status men and jump their bones. This makes men frustrated and angry, because if you want a woman to actually jump your bones, you have to sexually tease and torment her until she can’t stand it, which is quite the opposite of a fifteen-year-old man brooding because he can’t understand the feeling of sexual jealousy, which Harry does. If you read Harry as a female protagonist in a romance novel, however, you get great insights into

female sexuality. Harry doesn't notice girls until they pay attention in some small way towards him. But not too much, because he is turned off by Ginny's thirsty little girl crush until Ginny becomes more aloof and starts fucking other men. He is disgusted when Cho Chang breaks down crying on their date, because a girl would be disgusted in the same way by a man doing it, because Rowling is disgusted by it. Whereas when a man sees a girl display this vulnerability, the protect instinct starts to fire up. Harry is a cuck, because he doesn't start getting really interested in a girl until he becomes jealous of said girl fucking another man. But this is in game terms called preselection, and it's how female sexuality works. Hermione, on the other hand, is Harry's friendzoned beta orbiter.

Of course, after it turned out that Draco Malfoy made girls across the world hump their coffee tables in excitement, Rowling is very careful to code her villains so that women will not find them sexy, because women usually find male villains who act domineering sexy. So Voldemort is thin, weak-looking, and physically disfigured, and speaks with a high voice, his second in command is a crazy woman who wants to fuck him, Lucius Malfoy's thin veneer of upper-class aloofness is revealed very early on to only be a veneer, and every other Death Eater is more or less a faceless, bumbling minion.

Seriously guys. If you don't want to take my word on what women like, women will tell you themselves. Just go read anything written by one that has romance in it.

I'll use my last few words here to point out that Rowling is not a very good leftist by the standards of 2018. She, of course, believes in love and forgiveness and a vaguely anarchist leftism, so Dolores Umbridge is written as a villain. But living in the world that Rowling supported when she called Trump "worse than Voldemort" is more or less just like having Umbridge as a teacher. In other words, J.K. Rowling is old hat, obsolete. Where is the next great leftist YA series that enthusiastically supports censorship, ritual self-humiliation, and a civilian corps of informants dedicated to rooting out thoughtcrime?

## **Culture Meet Axe: Game of Thrones**

January 7th, 2019

Turns out that kultur-posting is a lot of fun, so I have one more for you.

This isn't about the TV show, though the same criticisms mostly apply.

Fair warning, I do enjoy these books to an extent, because I'm pretty good at pinching my nose and consuming some leftist culture from time to time. If you're the kind of guy who gets a bit nauseated by the Victorians' Whig bullshit, you kinda have to if you want to read anything. Like eating an oyster; tilt your head back, slurp it down, try not to focus on the texture.

So I think it's a legitimate shame that Martin bit off more than he was capable of chewing since I'm a sucker for political intrigue and swordfighting both. And he managed it for a while, but his multiple-perspective approach absolutely damned his pacing as he moved past the third book. The simple fact that he needs certain characters to be aligned in space and time for plot points of actual significance to occur means that he wastes a truly staggering number of words on absolutely nothing, on characters sitting in place and doing nothing, or pursuing dead-end plot points simply meant to eat up time while another character does something of actual significance. This becomes the case more and more as the series drags on and reading becomes a legitimate chore.

For example, Tyrion spends an entire book on a boat going to visit Daenerys, because the two of them can't meet until Daenerys' story in Mereen is finished, until she's rooted out the slaver conspiracy, and that plot had to drag on for two whole books because she couldn't return to Westeros too early, because the war of succession was still going on, and the war of succession needed Stannis to be defeated and go North to the Wall, so that Jon Snow could be revived from the dead via his sorceress, and needed Balon Greyjoy killed so Euron could take over and try to steal Daenerys' dragons, needed Robb Stark killed so that the North fell into the hands of usurpers, so that Bran had to flee north of the Wall, needed Renly killed so that the Tyrells could ally with the Lannisters...

Any author who could pull this off would be a goddamn genius. Martin is not one. It's often lamented among fans of the series that Martin writes too slowly, that he takes forever and an age to finish a damn novel, and that this problem has gotten worse over time. The cause is of course that he has written himself into corners with multiple plot lines going nowhere, and is not competent enough to unstick the plot in a believable way. Managing the intersection of multiple, intricately complex plots in a way that still produces an enjoyable piece of fiction is probably beyond the abilities of most authors. Most do not try, but Martin had the hubris to think he could do it. The hilarity of it is evidenced by the fact that the TV show, once it caught up to the novels, had to continue because it was too profitable to do otherwise. So the showrunners, consulting with Martin, took a sword to 75% of the story's subplots, including several that, in the books, were hinted to have real significance to the overall story. Euron? Thrown away. The Young Dragon, and Dorne? Cut. Jaime and Brienne's quest? Gone. Immediately, the show, always a bit of a slow burner, took on a blisteringly fast pace and covered what I'm sure will be many, many novels worth of content; if the morbidly fat author manages to outrace heart disease, that is.

Martin's worldview is tied intimately to his own real-life status in the male hierarchy. Which is very low. Martin does not understand honor and loyalty because he was always the geek and the loser, on the outside looking in. It seems that he grew up before normal male socialization behavior, in which high status boys bully low status ones until they fight back and are then accepted into the group, was made illegal. Which means that he was one of the very rare omega males who was too cowardly or damaged to participate in male social activity. I know this, because any man who has friends immediately and intuitively realizes the value inherent to being true to one's word and backing your friends up in a fight. Yet in the world of *A Song of Ice and Fire*, the most ruthless come out on top, betrayal is as common as breathing, and the few characters who abide by codes of honor are brutally punished for it.

This is exemplified in the character of Eddard Stark, the seeming protagonist of the first novel. He's a dutiful Lord, loyal to his King, who he served with in war, called from his remote border-realm to replace the King's main advisor and investigate his suspicious death. The first novel ends with him being betrayed by a conspirator and sentenced to death for treason. His son makes a similar mistake and gets betrayed and murdered in a similar way. From then on, the smartest and most cunning conspirator wins, and betraying one's allies is the de facto state of politics. A good reactionary should see the problem here: If everyone is defecting, a small alliance that is actually loyal to each other is *highly adaptive*. A loyal and honorable force cuts through an uneasy alliance of defectors like a hot knife through butter. Indeed, this is how feudalism began in Europe, how tiny Rome took over the Italian peninsula, and so on. Martin is categorically incapable of seeing the value in a cohesive group of honorable men; honor evolved for a good reason! The reason being that it defeats weak anarchy like an adult slapping around a child.

Honestly, this worldview is simply depressing. And wrong. Martin sees defection as an optimal Darwinian strategy; betray early and often. In reality, loyalty beats defection in the long run, which is why we have civilization in the first place and not a collection of nomadic tribes with 31% murder rates. This unrealism rears its ugly head in other places too. Such as the absurd devastation inflicted by the warring claimants to the throne on the civilian population. You don't put your tax base to the sword for no reason. You don't burn the fields that feed your troops. You don't rape the sisters of the men you'll be recruiting into your army come the next campaign. Historically, Europeans did not do these things when they fought each other for non-religious reasons.

Thus, the characters in the novel behave unrealistically, in a way that will make the actual student of history cringe. In a sense, Martin's world helps to uphold leftism, with the underlying assumption that we need some tolerant matriarchal utopia of peace and love to stop us from acting like assholes and betraying each other at every turn for power and wealth. Again, Martin's world is influenced by his inner world. Martin is filled with misanthropy and rage due to his status as an outsider, an Other looking eternally in at society. His own exclusion from it, in his own mind, is evidence that the same forces that excluded him are constantly simmering beneath the interactions of normal people, ready to flare up in acts of violence and betrayal.

Similarly, Martin's attitude towards sex is characteristic of the incel, of the antifa orbiting grody leftist chicks with dreadlocks. To him, alien from the sexual world, all sex is considered equal. In a world of Free Love, he hopes, a little bit of pussy will get thrown his way; Rampant buggery, adultery, and pathological fetishes are a small price to pay for liberating sex from the greedy grip of high-status men. One can see these sad, wistful fantasies hinted at when the plot alludes to lands and customs outside the Europe-derived lands in which most of the plot takes place. Much has been made of the "rape" in his novels, but I don't really care. Half of it is actual rape, i.e. a military phenomenon, and the other half is "rape" like a romance novel has "rape". I can't actually be sure which sex is meant to be positive and which is supposed to be neutral or negative, so I'm not going to comment on it.

Despite all this, though, Martin is very good at characterization. The unrealism in the way characters act is mostly two things; a misunderstanding of history and a misunderstanding of sexual dynamics. Otherwise, they tend toward vivacity and dynamism, another telltale sign of a screenwriter who needs to flesh out a character with relatively few words. As an omega male, Martin has clearly studied character from afar. He's very interested in what makes a charismatic man charismatic, in what makes people tick, and so on. Not surprisingly though, his best characters are all the low-status men; the dwarves (midgets, not the fantasy race) and bastards and eunuchs, and before he gives a high-status man any character development, he will usually humble him and decrease his status. He writes every alpha male as a caricature; amoral and ruthless or dutiful and straightforward. But some of them are fun characters nonetheless. Euron Greyjoy is, at least in the books, a total fucking badass. The show had to ruin his character so we wouldn't like this villain too much.

I'll also take a moment for his writing style. It's capable and workmanlike, but uninspiring. I like a fantasy author to have a little fun with his prose. It's impossible to actually replicate period language, but a skilled writer will use archaic diction and some complex turns of syntax to add a bit of flavor to the setting without getting too cheesy. But Martin's prose is the prose of an experienced though untalented writer. He gets the point across, but there's very little genius present. And it detracts from his setting and world-building. Martin cannot convey the awe of a 700-foot wall of ice built as a bulwark against a threat from the North. Similarly, he cannot convey the majesty of a castle, the wistful nostalgia of one's ruin, the cozy homeliness of a

peasant village, or the mystery of magic and religious experience. When Daenerys burns herself alive on her husband's funeral pyre, and emerges from the ashes alive and unscathed, Martin's authorial tone is as dispassionate as it is when he describes the layout of the streets of King's Landing.

Now, I can't be too hard on Martin on one point. Portraying humanity in terms of naked mechanisms of power and self-interest is a small rebellion against the ruling Left consensus. If you find yourself too deep within Leftist culture, this series will actually seem refreshing. So it was when I first read it years ago, well before the TV series was made. But revisiting it, after making a conscious attempt to stay away from pop culture and re-rooting myself in older and truer literatures, its underlying worldview becomes trite and depressing. Nonetheless, the reason for the TV show's success lies in this. For the normie, mired in a stressful and suffocating culture of lies, Martin's brutal, amoral Machiavellian world is a blissful liberation tinged with a bit of guilt.

Another advantage of reading a novel written by an omega male is that they don't really buy into some of the blue pill shit about women, and thus he often writes more interesting female characters than the Cathedral generally allows. So plenty of his female characters are insane, depraved, or power hungry and treasonous. But very rarely do they commit sexual evil, and when they do, seldom is judgement passed on it in the same way as for male sexual evil. Martin cannot help his setting, broadly late-medieval circa the War of the Roses, so a Queen cuckolding her husband is indeed considered high treason by the law. But despite the Queen cuckolding her husband leading to a brutal civil war, Martin does not seem to think of it as especially evil. Even though the legitimate historical reason is right in front of his face and used as a plot point. *"Oh if only the king and his brothers didn't give a shit that the heirs were illegitimate!"*

However, as the novels drag on, Martin tries harder and harder to signal that he is on the Right Side of History. Daenerys was a good character when she was in love with the brutal Mongol warlord she was married off to, but that book was written in the 90's. Once she became the benevolent "liberator of slaves" matriarch, her chapters are vomit inducing, as she makes dumb choice after dumb choice, maintains the loyalty of her followers, and somehow escapes from the consequences of her stupid decisions. And this in a series that kills off main characters frequently and with relish. For all Martin's edginess, he lacks the stomach to actually go against the Cathedral, and thus his novels contain very little that would cause his nihilist modern readers any real moral discomfort, or would even make them think in any substantive way.

## **Sexual Manorialism...?**

January 10th, 2019

A few years back, a far more degenerate and roguish Aidan MacLear than the one who stands at this pulpit of modern heresies had a certain girl in the place of (dis)honor at the head of his rotating harem of casual fuckbuddies. She was not the prettiest of girls, nor the most pleasant company, nor the most sexually voracious. And yet she exercised a curious pull over my black heart and my member both.

What was it about her? I had no idea, for the longest time. She was cute enough, she had a lithe and sexy though not flawless body, and we had fun together when we weren't in the sack, though we were far from a perfect match. And yet we not only felt a warm kinship toward each other, but shared a volcanic sexual chemistry together that surpassed all but a handful of girls

on my side, and on hers, every partner she had ever had. Both of these were rather inexplicable given who and what she was, and who and what I was.

Oh, but I found out eventually. I knew already that her ancestry and mine called the same country home. Eventually I bothered to ask her where in the country. To my surprise, it was within 20 miles of the ancient seat of my own family. So I looked up her family name. As it turns out, her family, of old, were vassals and sworn swords of my more noble and important clan, living on our lands and fighting by our side in war. (We were eventually stripped of most of our holdings for siding with the Cavaliers and fighting Cromwell). I used to joke that I owned her, and I'd be summoning her father and brothers to fight for me when I overthrew the state.

Anyway, this girl, should we have been born 500 years prior on the windswept highlands, or had feudalism persisted to this day, would, in all likelihood, have been a serious candidate for my marriage if not my wife! And we shared a strange bond and affinity that seemed to surpass a sober hindsight assessment of how much we ought to like each other, in just the same way that we love our brothers and cousins who may be unlike us in temperament or personality.

Coincidence? My friend, I do not believe in coincidences anymore. I do believe in genetics. The Westermarck Effect evolved to prevent close incest, but otherwise we are meant to suss out genetic similarities in our potential mates and couple with those who were like unto ourselves. When mixing races, it is not the qualities of intelligence and so on that suffer most but the spiritual weltanschauung that is diluted. I now believe this to be the case, to a lesser extent, for marriages across the lines of European subgroups, and all the way down to the most local level.

Perhaps we have become well and truly alienated, and it is impossible for us to understand the bliss of living in a community where everyone was kin, where the odd bond of affinity I shared with this girl was the rule and not the exception, for every kind of relationship from the husband and wife to the Lord and his servants. Marriages were happier, the sex was better (even if it wasn't mentioned in polite company), and every time you spoke to another, that sense of loyalty and fraternity was reaffirmed. Genetic similarity may have been a lube that greased the wheels of every institution, from the freehold to the great halls of State.

Of course, I speculate. One person is not a sample size of any worth. But I have good instincts, and from experience, I always did have better sexual chemistry with lovers of the same national ancestry, and got along better with them too. My sample size is large enough for that observation at least. It's not too far fetched to think that it scales down to the local level...

I believe that every man should make pilgrimage to stand upon the ancestral soil from which he sprung, to breathe the air and immerse himself in the environment that shaped his genes over the long years.

And, though an absurdly tall order, to find a wife whose ancestors hail from the same patch of ground as yours.

## **Whores and Actors**

January 29th, 2019

Every good whore is an actor, and every actor is a whore.

It isn't that actors lie by performing a character, and thus become offensive in the eyes of God, (which was the basis of most early Puritan criticism of theater) but that acting is a species of

prostitution. One's spiritual and emotional energies are a precious and private thing. In women, these energies are shallow and inexhaustible. For men, these energies are an intense but limited resource. A female artist can produce an endless amount of trivial nonsense, perhaps refined in form but ultimately meaningless. A male artist often only has a few works of profundity and greatness in him, and then he is exhausted.

Thus it is degenerate to summon these emotions only to piss them away into a crowd. Women cry easily and often, for good reasons and bad ones alike. When a man who is not a pussy (i.e. womanly) cries, you know he has been wounded by a deep grief. To summon one's emotions and throw them into the public for a sum of money or the validation of one's ego is akin to prostitution, and actual prostitution always dogs the heels of the theater and the troupe of actors.

Both historically and anecdotally, actresses are sluts and whores almost to a woman. The act of giving herself to the audience for fame and wealth unleashes her darker nature and primes her for a life spent on her back below a procession of different men. The danger of this was so evident to our ancestors that women were barred from appearing on stage. It was felt even more keenly by the Greeks, who made the theater and play a venue of solemn religious celebration, actors cloaked and masked; and even then, a religious ceremony in honor of the god of drunkenness, harlotry, and wild abandon.

The actor is also inherently and categorically a rootless being. In older days, the theater would literally migrate around the countryside, wearing out its welcome and the novelty of its plays, and then moving on. Only the large city can support a stationary theater; in this case, it is the audience as rootless migrant. The theater and the actor may stay in place, but the people he meets are always new and strange.

This is not to say that the art of theater has no place in our culture. I'm not a Puritan, I will point to their burning of theaters as evidence that they Didn't Get It. Our forebears had the right of it when they made it a profession low and mean in status. The men of the stage are invariably buggers, or else hollow, damaged, womanish. Theater is entertaining, high art has come out of it, and broken, unmanly men need a place as well, but that place is low. The idolization of this trade is a principal marker of our degeneracy. The foul nature of Hollywood is a feature of the profession, not a bug. One should look upon the actor as a jester in motley, a silly, unserious man with bells tinkling on his hat, not as a demigod. That is his place, that is his nature, that is his inner worth as a man.

The number of writers who have produced written plays of serious literary merit in English can be counted on a single hand, and it would be charitable to use all of my fingers. Film experienced a brief golden age of serious artistry and withered faster than any other medium. And even then, my opinion is that film's role as artistic medium is in the retelling of simple, timeless epics, with very little 'acting' involved. But that is the topic of another post.

## **PUA is Unnatural**

February 7th, 2019

A man walks into a bar. There, he sees an unmarried woman, unchaperoned by another man, though she might be accompanied by other young unmarried women. He likes what he sees, so he saunters up to make her acquaintance and talk her into the sack, trading witty banter over the rim of a cocktail. In the immortal words of Bronze Age Pervert, *YOU ARE GHEY!*

The above situation has only been a social reality for less than a hundred years. Women did not socialize with strangers for 9,000,000 years of evolutionary history. In recent human evolution within society, women did not socialize with strangers unaccompanied by men of her ingroup. Thus female sexuality could not possibly have evolved to recognize alpha males without heavy social cues. Those social cues are the respect of other men and the lust of other women.

In other words, women do not exercise sexual selection. It can be construed to look that way, when two strangers meet and a woman is expected to determine a man's status based on limited information, but this process is above her evolutionary pay grade. In PUA, the seducer is counted as having a high rate of success if he beds a mere 1/10th of the women he approaches, and for most practitioners of the dark arts, the rate is far lower. To me, this always felt like trying to fit a round peg in a square hole, because there is a far more successful means of bedding women.

So what does normal human sexuality look like? Well, when you're the alpha male of a social group that includes men and women, the women are *de facto* your sexual property. Once you are recognized as the alpha, there is no courtship involved in bedding the girls that orbit your circle of friends. In the immortal words of Trump, you just start kissing them, grab 'em by the pussy, and have your way with them. The success rate of this strategy is closer to 90% for groups where you are clearly the alpha male. And this even applies for girls who are new to the group. It's shocking how quickly you can go from "Nice to meetcha" in the middle of a circle of stone sober friends to pulping a girl's cervix like an orange in a storage closet. My record is 15 minutes.

But there's one small problem here. You're not an alpha if you don't have a circle of peons to do you homage. If you're piping out every hot girl in your circle of friends, the truth will get out, because womenicker jealously. And the men in your group will either rebel against you (if they don't fear your capacity for violence or the law) or leave for pinker pastures where the pussy is not monopolized. And then you're an alpha over a henhouse of jealous, bitter girls. Who will also leave when the men abandon you, except for (probably) your main bitch.

So what's an alpha male to do? He enjoys his position because he has loyal friends who support him, but they won't be loyal for long if he doesn't give a little back. But he is *Cyninga*, the canny-man, the cunning-man, the King. The giver of rings, full innuendo intended. He takes the hottest girl for himself, openly, and maybe a casual mistress or two. Then he plays matchmaker, encouraging his loyal lieutenants to take girls of their own. The social proof he gives them makes them appear worthier to their mates, and he agrees tacitly to not swing his dick around and do things that'll make the lesser women unfaithful. In fact, he'll shame and ostracize the girls in his group for sleeping around, encouraging them to pair up and stay paired up. His beta males know what side their bread is buttered on; most of them are thrilled to have a girl in the first place, since without their alpha's magnanimous nature, they'd be shit out of luck. And they'd fight fiercely to keep those girls.

If this social group is fighting to stay alive against others, you now have a massive competitive advantage. Polygamous tribal societies have murder rates of 30%. If you're not the alpha, you fight and die to try and get there. Still works that way in the urban ghetto. And that's instability. A cohesive war band of loyal men will slaughter a tribe of infighting polygamists like sheep.

See what happens? I just derived monogamy from a 'free' sexual market. The first King was a giver of hymens. That is the basis of civilization. That is the basis of sovereignty. When Power in what was once Christendom abdicated this fundamental duty of the sovereign in enforcing

monogamy, it ended its civilization in a single stroke. We are no longer a civilization because our men are no longer loyal to a giver of rings. Morally, we are tribal primitives, living in fear and awe of the shamans of leftism and their military enforcers.

## **Patriarchy Masterpost**

February 14th, 2019

I am tired of hearing people say that they want the patriarchy back, and then when someone proposes policy which is part of patriarchy, crucial to patriarchy, they start to sound a lot like progressives, claiming that certain social technologies are barbaric, medieval, outdated, that we've moved forward since then.

Generally, these are the kinds of people who laud Poland and Hungary's tax cuts for families with children, as if the collective self-euthanasia of Christendom could be tidily circumscribed with a few bureaucratic incentives.

The problem is female liberation, and the solution is female coercion. Women want to be owned by someone or something. By this I do not mean rational, conscious desire. You will find the rare woman who is honest with herself on this, but in a woman, honest self-reflection is almost a mental illness, and accompanies other, real mental illnesses. Rather, women are biologically compelled to find owners, because without an owner, she and her bastard child would die in the rain on the veldt. So women wander around and misbehave, causing weak men to stay away and strong men to give her a hard slap and some strong dick to stop her annoying misbehavior. Women enjoy both the misbehaving, and getting put in their places for it.

This is commonly known as a shit test. Allowing the misbehavior is failing the test, giving her a slap and a dick sandwich is passing the test. (If you are her father, the slap is enough)

If women are left feral and unowned, they will go through their lives shit testing everyone and everything in an attempt to find an owner. The men who pass these tests are commonly referred to as "evil" by civilized society. Bikers, gangsters, drug dealers, streetfighters, slippery amoral rogues, etc. Some of them will be upstanding civic-minded alpha males like Donald Trump, many more of them will be like El Chapo and worse.

This process of shit testing and looking for an owner begins as soon as a girl can walk. If the Right wants to prevent pedophilia, prevent its little daughters from getting fucked by old men, it needs to keep its daughters on a leash rather than live in constant suspicion of other men. If men are too suspicious of each other, male cooperation and thus society fails. Rape and pedophilia hysteriae are Leftist tools that attempt to destroy society, by making men attack each other instead of rival (cooperate/compete) each other.

Men will fuck sheep and horses if they're horny, (I'm sure *you* would never, dear reader, but if you put men around ewes and mares, ewes and mares will end up getting fucked) and men will fuck little girls too. Almost nobody will fuck animals or little girls if they have real, adult women; an epidemic of pedophilia is the result of sexual liberation, of men who cannot otherwise get laid and have no chance of marrying.

If you don't want your cattle rustled, you lock em in a barn. Fucking the beasts of the field is weird and gross and degenerate, and fucking little girls is weird and gross and degenerate, but it'll happen if you leave em unattended. If you kill every man who ever chubbed out at a cattle breeding, you'll never be able to hire a cowboy, and if you let your daughters roam around

unattended in tights and miniskirts and then attack every man who leers at them, you don't have a society anymore.

As a man, it's your instinct and in your interest to protect your daughters, but you're protecting them from their own stupid, self-destructive biology. If you "protect" your daughters by giving them freedom and attacking male sexuality, they're going to find owners in the few urban barbarians who retain that sexuality, like an old family friend of mine, an ex-Marine who sells industrial quantities of pot, deadlifts 500lbs, and makes his girlfriends wear collars and eat out of dog bowls.

If your worldview involves "making men better" or "making women better", you are a Gnostic and an enemy; anti-human and anti-reality. Man does not have the powers of God and cannot actuate Paradise-on-Earth. And Man as an entity cannot be made moral. He can only be forced to obey moral law, and hopefully, as an individual, come to see the necessity of it with time. But that is not possible for everybody. I have come to have a deep respect for Leibniz.

But I digress. So women go through their lives looking for owners, and they will find them. But the owners women end up with are not the ones we as men need them to end up with for society to work. The dude who invented the bow and arrow would not have mated without enforced monogamy. He had caveman autism and probably wasn't very strong or tough. In tribal polygamy, he would have spent his life trying to make himself strong and mean enough to steal a woman for himself, and probably failed. I explicated this in [my last post](#). Enforced monogamy came first. Once it was invented, Mr. Caveman Autist could stop spending his free time trying to get a woman, and start spending it on his geeky toying around with sticks and sinews and obsidian.

And one fateful day, he tied feathers to the tiny little spear he'd been trying to throw with his bow, and it flew far and straight. He told the chief: "We can hunt better now, we will never hunger again, never lose another man to the jaws of the tigers". The chief laughed.

"You have always been soft", he answered. "Now we will kill the tribe of one hundred that lives in the green valley, and take their rich lands and their women". And so they did. The caveman-autist, who would have had zero children before, stole two more wives and had ten kids. More important than just the invention, his smart genes got passed down. And we started getting smarter, more capable, inventing technologies at a faster and faster rate. Those who practice patriarchy live in harmony with GNON. For those who do not, life is short, nasty, brutal, sexless, childless.

Patriarchy entails making sure women are owned by a man or institution of men from birth to menopause. More specifically, it means her sexual activity is proscribed by an individual man, with such proscription backed by the laws of society. Most traditionalists take this to mean that sex alone needs to be controlled, that as long as a woman's sex is under the sway of moral law, she can be allowed full agency on other matters, like choice of marriage partner, working outside the home, going out unsupervised to socialize, etc.

If you let women choose their marriage partners, and do not force them to marry, they will all go off and make themselves available to alpha males. The 90% of women who are not pretty and well-bred enough to be chosen, will choose to not marry rather than marry a beta. They will sit and read romance novels until they become old maids, hoping some alpha widower will finally come along and choose them. Once their fathers kick them out of the house, they will become wenches or prostitutes, and there is not a whole lot of difference.

If a woman works outside the home, even if she is married, chances are that she sees her male boss as more of an alpha male than her husband, considers herself the *de facto* sexual property of her boss, and will probably try to pass her boss' kids off as her husband's. Traditionally, women are not supposed to sit around reading chicklit either. Women are meant to work and be kept busy or go slowly insane; a woman's traditional place is in her husband's business, as his employee as well as his wife. This ensures the proper sexual dynamic; she should end the workday with her panties soaked from being ordered around by her husband all day, and then babies are made. Women are detail-oriented and good multitaskers, a berry-picker mindset, which makes them great at busywork and terrible at leadership.

If the media had a huge, unprecedented influence on female sexuality, as many of our purple-pilled national socialists and Whig republicans like to claim, no man today would ever get laid, since our women would be constantly chasing after rockstars and movie stars, and they would be race mixing and miscegenating far more than they actually do. In reality, the alpha who is present has far more sway over women than the alpha who exists in the media. Of course what is socially acceptable and encouraged has sway over female desires and expectations, but this is minor compared to the social cues that govern female sexuality in the day-to-day present. The media also, by the way, encourages men to spend lavish gifts on women, women are expected to only put out for men who engage in Hallmark romance and conspicuous consumption, but men who get laid today are ones who defy the media-approved methods of romance.

In other words, media will never make me attracted to disgusting fat women, and it will never make women attracted to sappy romantic betas who defer to them. The media may amplify the signal of dominant high-status men, but it will never change what women consider high status, will not change their behavior of making themselves available and vulnerable to high status men.

If left alone, women will find owners and mate in a dysgenic and dyscivic fashion, so it falls to men to choose owners for women, to choose the men most valuable to society to own the best-bred, most beautiful, and most fertile women. Female consent does not play into this, not generally, but then again, female consent does not map very well onto human mating behavior no matter what you do. Our mating behavior is very similar to other mammal mating behavior, has existed in its present form long before human language. Like other mammals, our mating behavior consists of a few acts of female resistance, and then total female submission to mating. Today we call those acts of token resistance "shit tests"; in the scientific literature they are "fitness tests". Real female resistance to mating is obvious and recognizable, it is the reaction a woman would give if a naked hobo jumped out of an alley with a rusted knife in one hand and his erect cock in the other.

If you do not believe me, just play a sex game with your woman in which you pretend to rape her, and she tries to struggle and resist you with all of her might. You will find that it is impossible to consummate the act with a squirming, struggling woman, just as it is impossible for a dog to mount a bitch who isn't in heat, who is fighting and running away. In bondage and rough sex fetishism, even the most hardcore variants where the woman wants to pretend to be raped as realistically as possible, she has to intentionally switch to feebler, ineffective resistance in order to get penetrated and get her rocks off.

There are many cases of unconsensual sex that a woman later feels good about, and does not consider to be rape under the modern definition, and many cases of consensual sex, or the consensual lack of sex, that a woman later feels bad about and thus considers to be rape,

because in the former example a shit test was passed, and in the latter, a shit test was failed. Normal human sexuality, and female fantasy, resemble marriage-by-abduction, where a high-status male sweeps a woman off her feet and spirits her away to an isolated location despite her feeble protests. If you have ever had sex according to contractual verbal agreement, you will realize that it feels odd, unnatural, and unromantic, like hiring a prostitute, and she will likewise get feelbads from it.

Frat parties have been memed as dens of rape since the 80's, and yet they are full of nubile young feminists loosening their inhibitions to this day. Many men are very angry about Muslim rape gangs in Europe, but women are not very angry about them and continue to find reasons to be around gangs of horny sand people. Any definition of rape based on the female point-of-view is legally and logically unsound, and results in all men becoming rapists, because rape is redefined as all sexualized interaction, from eye contact to coitus, that makes women feel bad at any point in time. Instead we have to use a definition of rape from premodern times; Rape is sex that the girl's father and brothers feel bad about. It is a military phenomenon, terrible in the eyes of the conquered society's males but passe, even fun, in the eyes of the conquered society's women. To the Aztec man, Cortez was a rapist. To the Aztec woman, Cortez was an immaculate conquering sex god.

Now, no moral system, no religion, and no male ownership has total power over the horniness of teenagers, so it's often the case that unmarried young men and women find a way around Daddy's watchful eye to fuck each other. Rather than unilaterally declare this rape and hang a lot of potentially good and useful men, and send a lot of fertile young women to nunneries and whorehouses, the beautiful institution of shotgun marriage was invented. ("halberd marriage" is a lot less catchy) Now, Jesus cares about marriage coming first, but GNON doesn't, as long as your first partner is also your last. Based on England's great church records, it was fairly common in the 1500's for the bride to be showing a pregnancy at her wedding. Shotgun marriage is pretty great. The girl's father might not have thought you were alpha enough to marry his daughter, but you can always prove him wrong by seducing her, reintroducing the ancient and beautiful social technology of marriage-by-abduction.

Male ownership of women needs to be backed by religion. In the event that the husband is beta, the religion, if aligned with male interests, supplements his ownership, takes some of the alpha male duties off the shoulders of the beta husband, becomes the wife's owner in her own mind. It is oft remarked by great minds that women are more outwardly religious, and this is true. The Church becomes part-owner of the wife. It has demands of her, and she likes being ordered around and made to do things that impose on her. Have kids, don't deny your husband pussy, cover your hair in public, don't be alone with other men. Leftism, as religion, fulfills this role of Daddy today. Get tattoos, pierce your body, take drugs, sleep around, get fat, eat pussy, get abortions, all things that crater female sexual status in the eyes of prospective husbands. Women like being dommed by a religion. Leftism doesn't fail shit tests. If a girl shit tested the Church, she got burned at the stake. If she shit tests Leftism, she gets howled at and ostracized by polite society, which is almost as bad as getting burned alive for a woman.

It also needs to be backed by the sovereign, which entails allowing the principle of the freehold, that every man is an alpha on his own property, and the guest is temporarily lower status be he King or Lord. If a man is prevented from being a king under his own roof, if some bureaucrat or priest invades the sanctity of his home to try and make him more moral, he will lose the ability to control his women, his wife will cuck him and his daughters will become whores. If a rich man needs shelter in the home of a peasant, the rich man follows the peasant's rule and does him deference and homage, because this is necessary for patriarchy to continue. This right of the

freehold is given to the commoner in exchange for loyalty, military service, and upholding the Church's morals. (A "right" is not inherent and god-given. A right is a contract, a form of property that is held in exchange for another intangible.)

Marriage is a contract, a trade of intangibles. A man must love and cherish his wife. That means think of her as a part of his family rather than as a brood mare, and protect her (You can't be forced to feel romantic love; love is a familial emotion, and a conscious act of judgement). A woman must honor and obey her husband, which means exactly what it sounds like. If you want women to want to marry, just like Amish girls want to marry, you need to give a wife higher status than an unmarried virgin, and far higher status than a whore. Women will not want to marry unless whores and unwed mothers have no legal and social protections, thus unmarried women who do not live with their fathers need to be left to die in a gutter in the rain, and if you do, women will not be whores, and will marry, will act virtuously.

In the end, there is no female liberation, just like there's no political liberation. Female liberation will end in women finding masters who are far, far worse. Like a nation, there is a lot of ruin in a woman.

## Where Hence, Art?

February 19th, 2019

We have many good reactionary theories of politics, but we need to start thinking about art in a slightly more sophisticated way than "old equals good". It is true, old does equal good and you will find many eternal truths of staggering beauty in ancient works of art. However it is equally true that while beauty may be objective and timeless, the particular spirit that resulted in ancient works of art and literature is particular to a specific time, place, and stage of cultural development. *Beowulf* and the *Iliad* are two very different epic poems. *Beowulf* is a Christian tale about the struggle against esoteric evil and entropy, wherein a civilization rises and falls in the course of the hero's lifetime. It is a tale about the necessity of spiritual salvation to escape the cyclical and mechanical nature of pagan fatalism. The *Iliad* is about male honor, the barbaric versus the civilized, the cruel whims of the gods and the social structures implemented by man to combat reckless emotion. (The funeral games of Patroklos are some of, if not the most, important chapters)

Homer could not have produced *Beowulf* and its own anonymous author could not have produced the *Iliad*. In just the same manner, we, today, cannot replicate ancient art. I could write a poem imitating Milton, but I will never achieve the equal of *Paradise Lost* by copying Milton. Whereas Eliot's *The Waste Land* is at least an equal accomplishment to *Paradise Lost*, and a natural successor to it in the Western literary canon, though in a style and form proper to post-WWI Europe and not to Milton's milieu.

Milton was living in a morally and religiously pure world that had begun to slip into evil and rebellion, and thus he portrays the fall of Man, original sin, and the war between the republic of Hell and the kingdom of Heaven. Eliot was living in a wholly evil and fallen world, and thus his epic poem portrays the internal search for spiritual truth and redemption.

Oswald Spengler, who you should [just go fucking read already](#), proposes that the entirety of a Culture and all of its technological, philosophical, political, and artistic output centers around a single symbol that defines the relation between Man and the World, and between Man and Truth. He has convinced me on that front and offers a staggering quantity and quality of evidence so I will not guide you through his arguments for him. You should never swallow him

hook line and sinker, but this central thesis of his is rock-solid. To Spengler, the central premise of the West is *infinity*, with two components: *infinite space* and *directional energy*. So in Milton, we have a sin that lasts for eternity, of infinite depth and breadth that extends itself eternally into time, until it is countered by an opposing act of *infinite salvation*. In Milton we see a Culture which still has perfect confidence in its central idea. In Eliot we see a Culture that is beginning to die, that has lost its certitude and directional energy. The “narrative” of *The Waste Land* both is and describes the spiritual poverty of his time. No longer do we have a single truth that extends eternally; rather the narrator wanders from piece to piece of lost culture, attempting to stitch together atomized fragments into a singular whole, for Eliot feels the deep necessity of a singular truth.

It was this inversion, described, decried, and in part perpetrated by modernism, from external infinity to internal infinity that marks a turning point in the cultural life-cycle of the West. Victorian Romanticism was September nostalgia, senescent reminiscence. Modernism is Alzheimers, and a brutal deathbed attempt at repentance and self-honesty. Postmodernism really does not exist as a separate movement *per se*. It is simply Modernism without the learning, intellectual and philosophical fantasy without an honest attempt at truth.

So the West is dying, but it is dying of old age rather than murder, or illness, or parasitism. Of course, sicknesses and injuries that the body would have healed easily when healthy and young now take a grievous toll and hasten its demise. And there are plenty of parasites waiting to feast on its corpse. The role of an Augustus, in the darkest and most black-pilled assessment, is merely to fight off some of the sicknesses that afflict an aged body, to prolong life in old age through a comfortable senescence empty of accomplishment.

The white pill behind the black, of course, is that new cultures succeed the old, even using the same racial stock and in the same locale. We may, we *must*, have a new West, as different from and yet similar to the old as the Holy Roman Empire was from the actual Roman Empire.

It is not for us to try and force the new Culture into being, or decide its nature and central symbology; there is no act, no pretense more emblematic of “dying civilization” than the attempt to mechanically and intellectually force a new Culture, a new Art, a new Weltanschauung, into existence. It would be the height of Gnosticism, the deadliest and most horrible sin of our race, to attempt to do so. The attempt to force a new world-historical feeling into being has been tried before by our people. Socialism, Communism, Fascism, Revolution; demonic bloodbaths all, titanic orgies of senseless horror over which Satan laughs and strokes his erect cock.

And yet we cannot turn the clock back. We can only go forward. Forward does not mean progress. It means inevitable death and most likely perdition. I am friends with no necromancers, who can resurrect Aryan charioteer-conquerors, or the beautiful and fragile Greek *polis*, the Saxon war-band, the Viking berserk, raging against the dying of paganism, the Crusader-kings, the great Baroque of the imperial-absolutist palace cultures. The good of these things cannot be excised with scissors; a little of this, some of that, graft them together, wait for lightning to strike and bring your undead monstrosity to life. Cultures are not assembled like robots. They are born, and grow, like children. Read old books. Apprehend the eternal truths of your forefathers and let them sit pregnantly in your mind, let them inspire your soul, their failings and evils too. Maybe you, even you, will birth a new Culture. The Son of the West.

Only a fool seeks for the fountain of youth when he should be having children. Perhaps the next culture has already been born, or it sits somewhere embryonic, obscure, ignored, colossus-potential within it. If it does, we should seek it out. But beware. To you, my over-civilized reader,

it will seem frightfully crass and barbaric. A Mongol to the Han, a Pict to the Roman. Born in mud and blood it will grow, in time, into high art and supreme accomplishments. It will colonize Mars and extend its rule beyond the reach of our sun's gravity. It will have its own central symbol, its own mortal sin that will eventually fester within it and bring it down. You are not a part of this Culture, not yet and maybe not ever.

I am asking you to pledge your allegiance to something that has not been born. Something your children may see only the faintest stirrings of, which in a hundred years may not have yet come into its full might and glory.

And a fledgling culture can often be smothered in the cradle by its dying parent. The West in its old age has become exceedingly cruel and malicious. The Cathedral, Harvard, Leftism, call it what you will. From here on out I will simply call it the Enemy, *delenda est*. Call me an accelerationist if you will. I am not. I do not want to floor the throttle on collapse until our parachute is strapped on and double checked. Once it is, put a brick on the gas and bail.

But this is beside the point. I am here to talk about art. Western art has played itself out. It can only imitate the past, and a healthy and vital culture does not imitate the past, even when it thinks it is doing so. The Renaissance thought it was imitating the past, but it was not. Romanticism thought it was imitating the past, but it was not. Otherwise, "contemporary" or "postmodern" literature is all pure garbage. In fragmented, atomized, stream-of-consciousness style it accurately portrays our contemporary world, but not a word of it is great art because it is founded on the Enemy and thus founded on lies.

Postmodern literature could be truly great art, but it gets pwned by the Enemy when it assumes that culture and reality have become more nuanced and complicated over time. In fact the complexity of the modern world is all incidental rather than material, and in fact our culture has become a great deal simpler than it used to be. Below all the noise and showmanship, the Enemy is a two-horned demon: Power and Appetite, concealed beneath the cleanest and most appealing humanitarian Gnosticism possible.

Our art has only one great task before it: denuding the Beast. You think you've seen nihilism? You think *we're* the embodiment of nihilism, dear naive reader? When this is accomplished, and the Western Canon is truly closed shut, and European Man loses faith in even the lie, even Gnosticism...

Then we will enter the *Kali Yuga* in truth. And I'm kind of excited for it, tbh fam, but then again lust and wrath are my two great sins and enduring temptations. The horrors that will be perpetrated when the Right wins the culture war (yes, there are many Christian believers among the right but even those who think they are trying to convert heretics are in actuality and effect trying to make them disbelieve the Enemy. This is not a bad thing, it is world-history taking its course. Sincere belief will come later) will not be the horrors of trying to manufacture a better world, oh no. They will be the blind death throes of the West, the greatest and most powerful human civilization in history raging against the dying of the light. I will leave the political actions to be taken against this fact to another post.

Back to art. How to denude the Enemy? It is garbed in lies, so you use the Truth. Its cloak of lies is well-adapted to deflect the eternal and spiritual truths. But it is not equipped to bear scrutiny on its own nature. It will not be destroyed with hymns to Christ but with weapons of ugly, brutal honesty that reveal its own ugliness and brutality. [Delicious Tacos](#) is of the Enemy, but he is honest. He wounds the tiger he rides. The novels he writes contribute to the closing of the

Western Canon; an ugly honest art for an ugly lying time. For those spiritually and artistically inclined, Tacos can do what a thousand vicious Twitter trolls, each effective in their own way and on different types of men, fail at: making those who are the body of the Enemy stop believing.

In related news, I have a based and redpilled friend who will soon be throwing his hat into the ring and publishing. Keep an eye out.

## Nationalism

March 3rd, 2019

Like Whiggery, nationalism is now considered a right-wing ideology though it spent a great deal of its history in opposition to established tradition and social order.

We must rectify some names before we begin. Much of what is now called nationalism is in fact agrarian populism, summed up in the wonderful name of the French political party "[Chasse, Peche, Nature, et Tradicions](#)". In America, you could call it Guns, God, Property, Peace. The values of a farmer and freeholder, with or without a local lord. It actually is a right-wing ideology and always has been. It doesn't have a King right now, but it never minded one and is more or less a continuation of the eternal feudal values of blood and soil. It is an unlikely bedfellow for romantic nationalism, for the latter murdered the former.

The former, of course, believes in actual blood and actual soil. Local blood and local soil. The latter, romantic nationalism, believes in metaphorical blood and metaphorical soil, that a disparate group of disparate cultures speaking relatively similar languages constitutes a singular unitary identity if you extrapolate to a Platonic ideal that they all reflect in common, an ideal which must then be immanentized through mass education and propaganda, after which this ideal, the "Will of the X People" must be allowed to rule through mass democracy.

Historically, the idea that "France" was a singular unitary identity that took precedence over local identities was absurd. A man of Calais or Marseilles only became a Frenchman under his King's banners in opposition to the armies of Germany or Spain, etc. We know this because when a noble chanced to rebel against his King, his people followed him and didn't murder him in the name of the King.

The concept of "France" is too large for a man to follow in a definite and coherent fashion. These national identities forged in the fevered minds of revolutionaries are in reality the identities and fashions of the metropolis, codified by a priestly class of civil servants. Why? They were Enlightenment Humanists, first seeking to crush the local feudal and secure their power, and next to extend that power over a reluctant countryside.

Nationalism is an ideology of rootless city transients attempting to impose a fake identity on the localist agrarian countryside, and it is the means by which the City and the mass society crushed the ancient and the feudal.

Now, nationalists are right about a few things. All the different kinds of Frenchmen have a lot in common, more in common than different, and a Somalian can never be a Frenchman. But the problem is not arcane semantic argument over what constitutes a coherent people, the problem

is scaling loyalties. The bigger and further away the loyalty, the weaker and more diffuse. A man can be loyal to a faraway King, but he usually doesn't even care who exactly wears the crown, and the King is one dude. Asking a man to be loyal to the concept of "France" is insane.

It is against nature, as a man's loyalties do not scale effectively to massive quantities and distances. A man's loyalties are first and foremost to his family, and this is the most powerfully felt and viciously defended loyalty. Then men are loyal to their locality, which entails the actual community that a man is actually in contact with, as well as its local sovereign. The King is the most distant and abstract possible loyalty. My Boss' Boss. My Lord's Lord. Pretty simple, but it has to be, because chances are you've never seen your King.

Rome was strong when Rome was a legitimate local identity that fiercely believed in its own supremacy, to the extent that Roman-ness did not extend to those born out of sight of the city. This Rome smashed the Etruscan Kings and Carthage in turn; and then Greece and Egypt to boot. Rome was weak when Rome was a vague idea applied to anybody in the Empire who spoke Latin and believed in the Emperor. This Rome got its throat cut by the Germans and the rest of it got cleaned up by the Arabs.

In other words, nationalism helped cause the problem it now complains about. By destroying hierarchically stacked loyalties arranged as *family, locality, king*, with God to mediate Man's relationship *with each and every one of these entities*, man fell necessarily into pledging an uncertain, distant, and uncaring loyalty to vague and meaningless (to him) entities such as *nation, race, party*, which he would not naturally care about. Thus he became a slave of mass agitation and propaganda, his mind malleable and changeable, since there was no longer anything solid before his own eyes on which to stake his vital male loyalties. Nation, Race, and Party are all entities which have definite meaning only in the minds of priests, thus classical romantic nationalism ensures rule by priests, is a tool for ensuring priestly power, because even when a warrior is ostensibly at the head of a nationalist state, the priests retain the power of names, the power to define the criteria of membership in *nation-race-party*.

Thus it comes as very little surprise that *nation-race-party* dissolved into the even more abstract and meaningless *Global Nation, Human Race, Harvard Uniparty*, as the latter allows more bioleninist organization and disruption than the former, though the desire to settle Somalis in Minnesota in the name of Humanity is the same spirit that drove Garibaldi and Mussolini to reject the Roman, Venetian, and Sicilian in the name of Italy.

That being said, the local identities that now exist are only allowed to exist in their most neutered and harmless forms, since Harvard is wearing their corpses as skin suits and there is now nothing within them worthy of hanging a real *blut und boden* sentiment on. It is impossible to use their corpses to rebel against Harvard. The phrase "white race", so meaningless to a Bavarian peasant who had never met a Jew and thus had to be indoctrinated against their depredations in public school, takes on a new meaning when you're in constant contact with the black, brown, and yellow. So today, I consider nationalists on my side, especially because they no longer talk about a National Will that requires endless change, reeducation, and revolution but are instead angry about the depredations suffered by actual men, families and towns at the hands of my Enemy.

If the Restoration looks like Charlemagne, every nationalist who shoots Left will be on my side, and once the carnage is over and the lands of the West are divvied up among our most prominent warriors, those nationalists will settle down and live next to their friends and families, and keep all the old loyalties forged in war, the most capable among them will be ennobled, and

a new local culture will arise organically. Every proud racist whose first concern is the White Race will start caring about the fate of his family and his community above all, and this is how it should be.

If the Restoration looks like Augustus, and I unluckily find myself in the position of Imperator, and I unplug all mass media as foul and unnecessary propaganda, and a nationalist pops up to tell me that I don't care enough about the popular will, that I need to act like a True American when I rule, as defined by him and his priests, and he tries to teach every kid in the country what being a True American means, I will bundle him into a helicopter and have him dropped into the ocean, and this is how it should be.

(Before you ask, Fascism is priests LARPing as warriors. Stalin was a warrior LARPing as a priest. Small wonder he and Hitler hated each other's guts. If Stalin had thrown Marxism in the trash, crowned himself Tzar and had himself covered in holy oils and incense by the Orthodox Church he'd only have to have killed half as many of his own people, he would have done it honestly in civil war instead of grotesquely in famine, and Hitler would have worshiped the man, with the result that we'd all be speaking Russian. Putin is a warrior who rules like a warrior, with an intentionally thin facade of being a Harvard-approved priest, which means Russia has a bright future ahead of it.)

## **Monogamy is not Socialism**

March 7th, 2019

This short post was transplanted from my comment at Jim's blog and deserves its own airing. I alluded to monogamy not being socialism in a previous post but this is where I explain it.

Monogamy is more like capitalism than socialism, a transaction rather than the assignment of goods by command. Pussy for military service if you are a nominalist.

I usually write like I am a nominalist because it tends to ensure substantial debate rather than specious debate about the nature of truth, but in my opinion this transaction is a bit easier to intuit as a covenant of two intangibles. As the supreme alpha male of the land, the sovereign trades some of his authority over women to the common man to ensure that he can enforce chastity in his daughters and obedience in his wife. In return, the common man gives his sovereign loyalty in war and obedience in peace.

This is not redistribution by command, this is a mutually beneficial trade of things which properly belong to each party and are more valuable when traded. The King could bang every woman in his territory, but then he would be king over a henhouse of bickering bitches and disloyal cucks. His supreme alphaness is more valuable when traded for loyalty. A common man could live far from society and use his violence only for himself, give his obedience only to himself, but then he is fighting a constant war against nature and other men. So his violence and his obedience are more valuable when traded for security, peace, and marriage.

This covenant leaves a man enough violence and agency to run his household and defend his property while leaving the King enough alphaness to marry the highest-status woman according to male society and fuck the prettiest mistress according to nature.

If a government tried to enact actual pussy socialism by ticking off boxes to assign wives to husbands, it would probably be as disastrous as socialism of goods and no one has been stupid enough to try it.

## Game Advice

April 10th, 2019

This could be a massive post full of anecdotes with everything I know and have learned, but I've realized over the years that game really boils down to three simple things, and everything else is nerdy min-maxing.

1. Pass her shit tests
2. Don't show weakness
3. Dominate other men

These three things require that you have confidence, but not all men with confidence do these things, and in fact these three things are exactly what the blue pill wants you most vehemently *not* to do. It wants you to take shit from women, share your deepest weaknesses with them, and restrain your toxic masculinity. And thus it ensures that you won't get laid, won't have normal relations with women, are unable to form a family. It really doesn't matter how well you dress, how handsome you are, or buff, or charming, or tall, or rich, or funny, or charismatic. You can tick all of those boxes and do terribly with women, and I know men who do, because all of those things are 10% of courtship and the trinity of game as described above is 90%.

For 1, well, you should already know what a shit test is and how to pass it. In the words of the pimp, women give you shit to find out if you are the shit. So don't take her shit, unless passing the shit test entails doing something illegal or screwing over your bros. I'm not risking my neck or my friends for a ho. Some people have misconceptions that good girls won't shit test you and bad girls will. All girls will shit test you. "Good girls" just do it less frequently, less cuntily, and are satisfied of your status for longer once you pass them. Bad girls will give you constant, escalating shit tests throughout your relationship out of the hypergamous insecurity that you're not man enough, and since these shit tests will inevitably escalate to the point where beating and rape are required to pass them, these girls will only end up sticking with really mean motherfuckers. And you can tell that these are shit tests because the girl herself will never make a criminal complaint on her "abusive" man despite how brutal his pimp hand, (up to and including the murder of her children from a previous man, news stories that are inexplicably common) though witnesses might, so I cannot recommend doing what is needed to handle this type of woman. I've dated a few girls like this and always bowed out before I did something to incriminate myself.

For 2, you should never share your insecurities and weaknesses with your woman. That sounds fucking harsh, but this kind of emotional support is just not what women are for. Your woman will kiss the wounds of your bravery but not of your cowardice. If I crash my literbike while illegally streetracing and get disfigured, or get gutted in a knife fight in a dingy bar, (not to imply that the proprietor of this blog has ever done anything illegal) my woman will stay and nurse me back to health. If I get mugged, and surrender to the robber in front of my woman, she will cuckold me with someone very much like the mugger and expect me to raise his kids as my own. If you're stressed out or worried about something, and want to share your feelings, that's what your bros and your family are for. If you don't have any, I guess there's always more anime to cheer you up. Or make art. Women love a "tortured soul" through a plausibly deniable layer of separation. I know guys who can't help themselves on this point, they think that true love involves a woman nursing a man's insecurities, and as a result they get burned over and over. Sometimes girls I was sleeping with would ask me why I never talk about my feelings and my problems with them, and I give them a transparently fake answer like "I don't have feelings", which joke answer completely placates her after token protest because deep down, it's the

answer she wants to hear. I know a man who tells women that men have three emotions: hungry, happy, and horny, and if he's not happy, he needs one of the other two taken care of, you know what to do darling.

For 3, this also includes the negative that you don't act submissive to other men in front of her. But in your male hierarchy, you're just statistically unlikely to be on top, so what do? Well, society used to solve this problem through guest laws, that every man was king under his own roof, so his wife would see him as dominant more often than not. If, hypothetically, I'm in a biker gang, and I'm not top dog in the gang, my biker bros give me respect as a host and follow my rules when they come over to my place and meet my woman, and everything we do that requires I follow another man's orders happens far away from my woman's eyes. But we don't have many male societies with unspoken rules like this, so if you're trying to attract a woman, the easiest way involves dominating other men in front of her during courtship. This is why Mystery could get laid despite being a goofy nerd; he was very good at AMOGing other men in nightclubs and making them look like idiots, and in fact he intentionally dressed in a way to get verbal sparring from other men and shit tests from women and then outperform them. If you're de facto the AMOG, [getting laid is very easy](#), but you won't always be in this scenario and will thus have to AMOG other men, or at the very worst act and imply that you can easily dominate other men.

Is it hard to really internalize this stuff? Sure. But this is all the advice you need. If you want to get better with women, practice these three instead of openers or jokes or anything like that. My online identity isn't predicated on teaching you how to get laid, so I can give you the superconcentrated dose and wash my hands of it rather than drip feed you little techniques and optimizations to keep the blog going. So this is the first and last lesson from me on how to deal with women.

P.S., since it's on topic

Some loser on Reddit a while back couldn't quite square the circle of my advocating hardcore patriarchy and monogamy while simultaneously talking about crushing girls' cervixes like ripe fruit. Well, you can't ruin a whore by fucking her. She's already spoiled for marriage. Her 50th or 200th cock makes her no dirtier, just like your daily shit not making a half-full cesspit any fouler. Whores have been around forever. We have way, way too many of them now and most of them fuck for free. (Right now we have ninety whores serving ten men, when the natural order is that 10 whores serve 90 men) God has always said no to piping out whores, and you shouldn't get on God's bad side, but all things considered, an unmarried young man frequenting a whorehouse is not an unforgivable sin and we've historically never seen it that way. So if you're a religious young man, do what God wants you to do and avoid whores. I have nothing but respect for a man who abides by his vows.

The only moral line I'll draw for all my readers is not to seduce virgins and then dump them. If you, after despoiling a sweet innocent girl, feel bad in the morning about leaving her, that's how you know you should wife her up. Get her pregnant and entrap her into marriage. It's an ironic role reversal, yeah, but we live in Clown World. Honk Honk doll, you're pregnant and we're getting married.

## **Abortion Rhetoric for Normies**

May 16th, 2019

To use on normies that is. Not the single liberal women, you're not going to convince them, but you can trigger them and convince the onlooker. The pro-abortion crowd doesn't have a leg to

stand on as far as logic goes; every argument they use is squid ink to disguise an infanticidal instinct which is incompatible with male civilization. And it's not hard to make them blow their cover.

I usually wouldn't bother with a post like this, but Twitter has been nothing but abortion talk for a solid week now and I'm taking pleasure in how destroyed the Left is feeling at the moment. So here's a better set of weapons to trigger them more.

"A fetus is not a person". That's what you'll usually hear. But extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. The claim that a baby in utero is not a person is an extraordinary claim. Every expecting mother will call it "my baby". If she has a miscarriage, the normal human reaction is "my baby died", not "oh, my body expelled some nonhuman fetal tissue, better grab a rag and clean this up". Most normal human beings consider killing a pregnant mother a double homicide. Most of them consider beating a pregnant woman to induce a miscarriage a murder. The law prosecutes both crimes as such.

In other words, tell them that the burden of proof is on them. They have to prove it's not a person. The interpretation of a child in utero as "not a person" is contrary to common sense morality and the way we treat pregnant women in everyday life. Demand their criteria for personhood. They'll usually say something like this:

"Science says that a fetus is not a person". Science describes the properties of a fetus. Science cannot determine the personhood of anybody. Personhood is a moral issue. If science says that a fetus is not alive, neither is a person in a coma. Science also tells us that the fetus is extremely likely to become a living human being if unmolested. Is it okay to kill someone in a coma who is extremely likely to regain consciousness?

"It's not conscious". Neither am I while I'm asleep, but that doesn't make it ok to kill me. As soon as I regain my consciousness, I'm going to want to live, and that's a perfectly reasonable moral assumption that makes it evil to kill sleeping people and people in comas. Same for babies. It's extremely likely to gain consciousness soon, and once it does, it's going to want to live.

"It can't feel pain, it doesn't know it's being killed". Again, neither does someone in a coma. Someone in a coma who has almost no chance of recovery is a different moral dilemma. The baby is nontrivially likely to gain consciousness and awareness of its surroundings if you don't kill it.

"It's not fully developed". Neither is a baby after it's born, neither is a 5-year old, neither is a 12-year old. At what point is development enough to consider it a human being? Why do you mark a specific point as a transition between human and not human? A retard with a 50 IQ is not fully developed, does not have the full faculties of a normal human; can it be killed at will?

"Birth is when it becomes a person because before that it's dependent on its mother to live". It's also dependent on its mother to live after it's born, until the age of four or five when its labor could be worth the cost of feeding it. You don't gain the power of life or death over someone just because they're dependent on you, at least not in normie morality. Before birth, can't live without you, after birth, can't live without you. No moral difference.\*

"Your sperm has human DNA in it, why isn't jacking off murder?" My cum isn't going to become a human being by itself. An embryo implanted in your uterine lining will.

“I can do what I want with my body. The fetus is part of my body” No. A Siamese twin is also connected to your body. It’s murder to kill your Siamese twin.

“The baby is inhabiting my body without my consent. I didn’t choose to have it in me, I therefore have the right to get rid of it” Babies are the result of sex the same way death is a result of stabbing. Yes, you can try to stab someone in a way which will not kill them, but if they die anyway despite your precautions, you’re still morally responsible for killing them. You chose to do something that often results in the creation of a human being that cannot live without you, you bear the moral consequences of that act.

“I can kill a trespasser in my house, I can kill an unwanted baby in my womb” Even in a state with great castle doctrine, if I open my front door and put a sign out front that says “open house”, I’ll still be guilty of murder if I shoot everyone who walks in.

“You’re restricting a woman’s right to choose...” Nobody has the right to choose to commit murder. If a baby is a person, it’s murder. Why is a baby not a person?

“Why do I have to be forced to carry to term and give birth if I don’t want to?” As a man, I’m legally forced to care for a child I didn’t choose to have for eighteen full years. You can’t do nine months?

“Making abortion illegal will result in a lot of child neglect” It’s not the state’s job to stop you from being a bad parent outside of extreme abuse. It is the state’s job to punish you for committing murder. If it was a binary choice between being abused and murdered, most people would rather be abused than murdered.

“Making abortion illegal just makes abortions more dangerous. They’re still going to happen” Wrong. How many abortions happen in Taliban-controlled territory? Yeah, exactly. And if you’re so desperate to murder your child that you kill yourself in the process, good riddance dumbass.

“If you’re pro life you should be XYZ position”. I’m not pro-life, I’m anti-murder.

“You should do XYZ to prevent abortion instead of banning it” Policy that prevents murder from happening is a good thing. Doesn’t mean you can legalize murder.

“What about in the case of rape” That is a tiny percentage of abortions. The baby is innocent of the rape. If you get raped, the hospital will give you a morning-after pill if you ask for one. (Don’t say this part to normies, but most women are actually going to want to keep the rape baby. They know it’s strong seed, no matter how they choose to rationalize it. Notice it’s always pro-abortion men who hammer on the “rape exception”, not the women)

“What about incest” If it was rape, see the above. But really bitch, you want to fuck your brother and then be allowed to commit murder on top of it?

“What if the mother’s life is threatened by the pregnancy” Also very rare. This is a moral dilemma. Some mothers, when presented with this choice, save the baby rather than themselves. It’s a dilemma precisely because both of them are people. But sure, you can have this one.

I also have to take a minute to hammer on the moral weakness of “conservatives” who shy away from prosecuting the woman who gets an abortion. Prosecuting the doctor for murder and

giving the mother a light penalty is hypocrisy that lends ammo to the pro-abortionists. If abortion is murder, the mother who gets an abortion is a murderer. If you hire a hitman to kill someone, both you and the hitman get prosecuted for murder. “Pro-lifers”, losers that they are, like to pretend that women are gaslit or pressured into abortion. No way. Women want to kill their kids. “Post-partum depression” almost always results in ideation of infanticide, and without the father or another male around, many women go through with it, like a female animal eating her cubs. Infanticide and hypergamy go hand in hand. So yes, the leftists are right, anti-abortion is the Patriarchy. But without the Patriarchy, women will kill their kids a lot, both before and after birth, and not really be too bothered about it.

\*The only logically consistent argument for abortion is in fact this; that the parents have the right of life or death over their children because the children depend on them to live. The vast majority of cultures in history, from China to the Greeks, to the Romans, to the Aztecs and the Inca, Pagan Europe, Carthage, etc. take this stance on infanticide. Naturally, this is up to the father and not the mother. But it also requires allowing infanticide up until the age of four or five, when the child can walk away on its own two legs and become a slave or a servant for someone else, thus no longer totally dependent. Not allowing infanticide is almost exclusively a Christian Europe thing, and it still happened quite a bit anyway. Infanticide isn't totally against GNON's will, when you're a stern Spartan patriarch throwing cripples and retards and bastard children into the river. (This is one of the few points on which GNON and God disagree) But today, as practiced, it is contrary to GNON's will and serves the purposes of DROM (demons real or metaphorical) so I'm against it.

## **Rape and Sexual Regulation**

July 24th, 2019

I've been doing some research into the way rape was regarded historically. Initially I was only looking at the way rape was legally defined, but then realized that I was entirely missing the point. Say that a historian, five hundred years from now, looked merely at our legal codes to determine our attitude towards rape. If they were to do so, they would have to conclude that our attitudes towards sex and rape had not changed whatsoever in the past 150 years or so, entirely missing feminism and anti-male legal attitudes. Rape is still on the books as “forced penetration” in the US, and probably will be for the foreseeable future. But “forced” was reinterpreted as “lacking consent”, and “consent” is currently being reinterpreted as “female's positive feelings about the sex act at any given point in time”, with consent being revocable post-hoc after many years pass.

I looked a little deeper, and noticed that the adjudication of rape and sexual morality is always disconnected, often very drastically, from the legal, “on-the-books” definition of rape. For example, Roman law regarding sex and rape remained, on the books, almost exactly the same until Christianization. I can't find case studies on how rape was actually prosecuted in Rome, but considering the progression of feminism and female liberation in Rome through this period, must have been prosecuted drastically differently from the days of paterfamilias, despite both elopement and seduction of marriageable women still being considered rape by the law. Eventually, I realized that “rape”, regardless of its legal definitions and the notion of consent, has always and everywhere been prosecuted as “illegitimate sex” according to sacral regulations on sex and not legal ones, which are usually present as a matter of mere formality, vague enough to allow prosecutors and defendants considerable discretion as to how they rule in a case.

What sex is legitimate or not depends on who is in charge. In western Europe, rape law has almost always been on the books as “forced sex”, and it’s been on the books since Roman times that marriage required parental consent, but in Renaissance England, half of women were visibly pregnant at their own weddings, implying shotgun marriage, that sex had happened without her father’s consent. At the same time, prosecutions for rape were much rarer despite the fact that both the daughter and her father could have gotten out of the shotgun marriage with a rape accusation. Since saint Augustine, the Church has held that chastity as a spiritual quality is unharmed by rape, which you can see in practice in the canonization of rape victims as saints. This theoretically incentivizes women who sleep around and get caught to make false accusations of rape. But again, it never really worked out that way in actual history because it is always the legitimacy of sex (and shotgun marriage proves that fornication ending in marriage was considered legitimate) that bears on the question of rape.

And it’s not like “real, no kidding rape” wasn’t prosecuted at all; “forced sex” was a capital offense for almost all of our history, but the main use of “rape” has always been as a war crime and we see far more prosecutions for rape among the military even in the Middle Ages. Actual rape prosecutions seem to have been reserved for men who were already criminals or itinerants who made themselves scarce after the sex. Again, the consideration of whether any given sex is rape or not is always based on the context of the sex, thus always based on a concept of legitimacy that is above and beyond the written law. Other tribe fucking your women? It’s rape. Yup, even though conquered French kittens were willingly hopping into the sack with Nazi officers.

I didn’t write the rules, man. You already know that it’s near-impossible to define consent as it relates to sex, but it’s also almost impossible, historically, for cultures to even *write laws* capable of dealing with the legitimacy of sex in an honest manner; it’s not that sex is never regulated, because it is, but that even reasonable and ostensibly reactionary laws regulating sexual activity do not map very well onto the way things play out in practice. I’m not saying that they *couldn’t*, just that we need to be very careful when we decide what is tradition and what is not. We have Anglo-Saxon laws permitting bride capture (as long as you compensate the woman’s owner later) but others granting women the right to divorce, and very incomplete records regarding what was actually going on and in what social classes.

I did a little more thinking, and I realized that human mating is best regarded as a zoological phenomenon that systemic legal definition does not bear on, and that every reactionary, i.e. reality based, i.e. red-pilled view of sex and sexuality regards it and thus regulates it as such, regardless of the legal world that sits above it. This means in practice that we have to let certain processes play themselves out. We can’t pretend that women are pure and naturally chaste and treat them as such, cannot treat heroic virtue and self-control as the norm and attempt to inculcate it in the masses. Women are absurdly horny and manage to find ways to be owned by a man despite the harshest patriarchy. Shotgun marriages are not just for forcing the man to stay, they’re also for keeping the daughter from becoming a worse slut, to keep her from using Joey to get access to Chad. In other words, the legal aspect of sexual regulation needs to formalize the natural bond of ownership created by cock-in-pussy sex. We’re not saying “tie sex to marriage”. It’s more accurate to say that “sex is marriage”. From this truth we derive the notions of the common-law wife and the “natural marriage”. We are defining its limits rather than its essence.

If sex is ownership, always and everywhere, “sexual liberation” as a descriptor of modernity misses the full picture. If NRx is right in us always having a religion, it is also true that we always have regulation of sex. “Sexual liberation” as defined by the Left is regulation of sex according

to Leftist norms. Those norms have not always been the same. The hippie “free love” is not in fact free; the hippie orgy in which women have sex with disgusting and low-status men most closely resembles the extremes of BDSM, where a male dom makes his slave have sex with low-status strangers she feels revulsion to as a form of humiliation. Enforcing “free love” the way hippies envisioned it in fact requires extreme male power. But female power has since taken over the Left, so new leftist sexual norms have become the extreme of female sexual power, the new sacral regulation of sex has become a gigantic shit test which only the most sadistic criminal men can pass.

Essentially, every act of sex that occurs today can be defined as rape and every sexual advance is a crime. Does that scare you? You just failed the shit test. The man who’s willing to discipline his wife will never need to, and the man who fears no sexual assault allegation will never get one. That’s female power in action. Weeds out the low-status. I can actually think of another historical example. Viking society was another land ruled by female power. Scandis were always cucks, they were just better at swinging axes in the good ol’ days. Viking society attributed shocking and laughable spiritual powers to women, believing that math, science, and writing were female magic and that men were unfit to engage in them. The Viking man who feared no witch was the one getting laid back home; most Viking men were incels who had to go raid abroad to capture women, and most Viking colonies in the New World failed because they brought their infertile wives along with them, not realizing that it was a steady trade of nubile blonde slave girls that kept their fertility in Scandinavia from collapsing. When the Vikings settled in Normandy and started to hang with the Franks, they realized how cool patriarchy was and finally took hold of the coveted British Isles. I’ll leave what this implies about our future to your imagination.

But I digress. “Sexual liberation” is also not an accurate descriptor of sex in the state of nature. Sex in the state of nature looks like Jeffery Epstein, with a handful of high-status men holding gigantic harems of fertile, nubile women. But Epsteins are rarer in the Cathedral than out of it, since if you are in with the Enemy, the Enemy’s gigantic shit test sexual norms are more heavily enforced, (the women you’re fucking won’t complain but backbiting fat women and incels will) and if you’re getting cozy with the Cathedral, you’re probably blue-pilled and unlikely to acquire a harem of women anyway. There are probably a few thousand Epsteins out there, but most of them are unemployed drug dealers with body counts who invite high school girls to their parties. Sex in the state of nature creates a relationship of ownership, and sacral norms creep back in, in the same way I’ve described in a previous post, in the same way that true anarchy creates an instant and powerful demand for cohesion and loyalty.

If you doubt that sex is a zoological phenomenon and best not interpreted or regulated as an act of human will or cognition, again, take a look at history. In Renaissance England, shotgun marriages accounted for at least half of marriages at the time, which means that even under strict patriarchy it’s very hard to keep your daughters off the cock. Patriarchy certainly failed to convince women to be chaste. In this case, the sacral understanding of sex was in line with its zoological nature, that women were apt to find a chance to be alone with a man and get pregnant, and best marry them off because the ownership bond was created and now supersedes the father’s authority. This sacral understanding of the zoological nature of sex took precedence over the legal definitions of what constitutes licit or illicit sex, because the legal definition theoretically gave fathers the power to put the deflowerers of their daughters to death.

As I wrote in “PUA is Unnatural”, I now consider pickup and game to be merely purple-pilled, because as time went on I realized that there was a significant disconnect between the systematized logic of the pickup artist and my lived experience. The PUA will tell you that

women need to feel comfortable with you before they fuck you, that there is a seven-hour rule, when I've fucked women, attractive women, stone-cold sober within fifteen minutes of being introduced to them, and this is not because I spat transcendently good game but because the stars aligned and the ancient human mating dance of dominance, danger, and proof-of-status played itself out in a short period of time. Roosh tells you in Bang that girls who call themselves lesbians still want to fuck men, which is true, but that they need to be gently and subtly seduced over a long period of time, which is, uh, not true. A pickup artist will imply that women don't just jump your bones, but occasionally they do. (This will only happen if you have the balls to jump her bones but just choose not to. If you're too cowardly to jump a woman's bones, you should *not* rely on this) Now, it's not that game and pickup artistry will not get you laid, because it will. It's that by mechanistically trying to game the system, they miss the forest for the trees. They're looking at the biology and not the zoology, forgetting the fact that the most effective way to get laid, to make women devoted to you, is still just to kill a man and spend fifteen years in prison. Not that I recommend it.

We can mock women all we want for saying "it just happened", but this is closer to the red pill than you know. Sex as zoological phenomenon means that the logical mind has very little relation to human mating behavior, which evolved before speech and before the bicameral mind and has not changed all that much in the meantime. Monogamy can and should be enforced; the animality of sex is beyond human control or even methodical definition. A man and a woman find some privacy and it just happens; as I said, some of my most effective womanizing was the result of just turning my brain off and dancing the ancient dance of love.

## **Test of Your Game: Human Zoology Edition**

August 1st, 2019

In line with my previous post, here's a fun one that should offer a little insight into what I mean when I say that sex between people is a zoological phenomenon. Every one of these is a real scenario from my life where I bent, broke, or did something that had no relation to the laws of the dark art of pickup and still banged. I'll also say that not all of them happened the same night; these moments are the decisive ones. This is Game 401; there aren't any super lame or beta answers to these, every one of them pushes the encounter toward sex in some way, and they all assume that you know how to talk to girls and get them attracted to you. It's about closing the deal. And all of these -might- work: I want you to pick the one that will work the best, or at least worked for me. If you're a good volcel boy, still very useful knowledge. Get her desperate to have you in her, and then and the last minute, drop the megaton shit test: "I'm sorry, I can't go any further, I'm saving myself for marriage".

1) Imagine that you're a very young man, still first year of college or the summer after highschool, and you're not exactly bad with women, not an incel, not a virgin, but you know nothing of the dark arts, have swallowed the blue pill, so your true potential is held back. An attractive female friend who you had considered out-of-your-league invites you over to her house at night to hang out. You're thinking "damn, she was into me after all, I'm getting some tonight". But when you get there, she's treating you like an asexual platonic friend, seemingly oblivious to the fact that the two of you are all alone in her house. You don't feel any sexual tension from her end, i.e. she hasn't shit tested you at all, and there's no flirting going on, but nonetheless you push the thought of her tight curvy little ass out of your mind and have a fun time hanging out, drinking a little liquor, and watching movies. Later, you realize that the night is winding down without any progress, and if you want to fuck her, you need to do something soon. She's sitting on the couch next to you, close enough that you smell her intoxicating scent, but not touching you. What do you do?

(a): You blew it for tonight. You know enough about girls to know that you need to heat up their attraction gradually; she's interested a bit at the very least, but it's too late to ramp up your vibe as a sexual creature and start the attraction ball rolling. You acted too beta. It's time to retreat and regroup, and come back at her with the best game you have next time.

(b): It's not too late to get the ball rolling. You don't have too much time, but since she's interested a bit, start getting flirty, running the half-game you have, and see if she bites. Sometimes sex happens in the blink of an eye, and if not, she'll be warmed up for next time

(c): Since she's hot, it's her style to play it a bit coy and not give unambiguous signals that she's interested. Her inviting you over alone was enough. Salvage the situation by making an unambiguous but relatively gentle come-on. If she gives you shit about waiting so long, play it off like you just then noticed her as a sexual creature.

(d): You're an idiot for not realizing that she wanted to fuck you when she first invited you over. You have to redeem your former asexual behavior by coming on very strong. Grab her and kiss her, and go from there.

2) You're in a bar after work with a few coworkers. It's a mixed group, guys and girls. You've been flirting off and on at work with one of the girls present, but haven't wanted to commit to anything unambiguous like a date since money comes before pussy and you don't like to shit where you eat. But a random hookup shouldn't rock the boat too badly and you see your chance; you don't get to go out with these people very often. You're neither in a position of authority at work but nor are you low on the totem pole; in fact, your male coworkers are all pretty alpha and it's a lively workplace with lots of jokes and banter going on. Your bros know what's up with you and this chick so they don't butt in: despite sitting at a table with a bunch of people you have a little privacy to game her and it's going pretty well. You've moved on to a deeper rapport and you think she's hooked, and that the only question left is logistics. You get up to use the bathroom, and once you've pissed, you come back and this chick is now standing at the bar engaged in conversation with another man, who looks a bit nerdy; less handsome than you, less fit, in a striped polo shirt and chinos. Your gut roils a bit; you can tell that this is a shit test that will determine your getting laid or not. What do you do?

(a): You pass the shit test by ignoring it. Walk right past her, back to your table, and start talking with your bros. Once she realizes that you don't give a fuck at all, she'll come back and you can pick up where you left off.

(b): This shit test is because she feels insecure about your dominance over other men. Join her conversation with the guy she's talking to and 'mog him until he bows out of the interaction or gets quiet, at which point you can walk away with your girl.

(c): You pass the shit test by flirting with another girl within earshot. Strike up a conversation with any one of the hot chicks in the bar to flip the jealousy script she's trying to create back onto her, and she'll lose her feigned interest in her patsy and find her way back to you

(d): This is an absurdly rude, even nuclear shit test regarding your dominance over men that demands a drastic response. You can't give her a spanking in public, but you can pick a fight with the guy she's talking to, either making him dick-tuck and retreat or you lay him out on the ground and tell the girl that running from the cops is fun and she's coming with you.

3) You're in college, hanging out with a group of friends that includes a cute lesbian. There are plenty of girls in the world, so you're usually not going to try and fuck a lesbian, but the way the night plays out, you end up by yourself with her in public. Despite her claims that she's not interested in men at all, you know the deal with dykes and you can feel a bit of sexual tension, as if she's interested and doesn't know what to do. This is something you've sensed from her before. You invite her on a motorcycle ride. Instantly the sexual tension ramps up and her eyes sparkle. "Okay but just as friends alright? I'm not into you like that." Or something along those lines. So you take her on a ride; it's night and the streets are empty so you speed around town and campus and end up in front of your dorm. You have to help her out of her helmet; she doesn't know how to undo the straps. When you pull it off her head, you feel an absurd sexual vibe. From experience you know when a girl is eager to get fucked, and she's giving off all the signs. Normally, you would kiss her right there. But you hesitate just a moment, thinking maybe you should do things differently for a lesbian...

(a) No hesitation. A girl is a girl, she wants dick, and the moment is right. Kiss her right there in public while she's hot and bothered, before the moment fades and her logical brain reminds her of her identity, and then take her back to your room for hot raunchy sex

(b) She is into you, will fuck you eventually, but needs to struggle with her self-professed identity before she'll accept the cock. You should continue to hang out with her and make sure that you create plenty of moments of sexual tension like this in the future, until you broach the subject of "trying things with a man".

(c) She is into you, will fuck you soon, but needs a little bit of time to process her feelings. Game is always a good idea, so take her to the bar a couple of doors down and game her up like any other girl.

(d) She will fuck you now, she just needs an excuse. Invite her to your room on a flimsy pretext and make a strong come-on there.

4) You invite a few friends over to your place for drinks, games, and movies. However, the weather is shit, freezing rain on a February night, so everybody cancels except for a cute acquaintance among your mutual friends who you've had your eye on, flirted a bit with once or twice, but never the chance to seduce. She shows up to your place dripping wet and cold. You offer her a change of clothes and she declines, but she takes your offer of a towel to dry herself off. She seems slightly surprised that she's the only one who showed up. The two of you are hanging out for maybe five or ten minutes when she pulls out her phone and starts texting. She tells you that her best friend is going through some serious emotional shit, and asks you if she can have her friend come over to your place to hang out with the both of you and take her mind off things. You can smell a shit test, but you acquiesce to this socially reasonable request since you're wondering if her friend is cute or not. Her friend is indeed cute, though you would prefer Girl A if you were in front of em in a brothel with a fistful of hundreds. The friend, Girl B, accepts your offer of dry clothes and you give her some oversized pajamas. You can't quite tell if her claim that Girl B was having problems is true or not, but Girl B is a little bit friendlier and more receptive to you as you hang out, and she did take your clothes without a second thought. What do you do, knowing you prefer Girl A?

(a) Girl A didn't know she was going to be alone with you, so she invited B over to feel more safe since she wasn't sold on your cock yet. You can tell she's into you because she didn't make up an excuse to leave when she realized that she was going to be alone with you, but

instead had an excuse that bought her time with you. Go through the night without making major moves and invite A out on another day for a proper seduction.

(b) Switch to gaming Girl B. She's been more receptive to you and Girl A inviting her over when she realized that you'd be alone with her is proof that she's not into you like that yet and it'd be an uphill battle. In fact, the fact that she did this might mean she thinks B is a good match for you and seducing her has A's blessing so you won't get girl-cockblocked.

(c) Threesome! Inviting another friend over is weird, and it means that they're both kinky sluts who are thinking about sharing a man and have probably done this before. Run your best threesome game and roll both these chicks.

(d) Game Girl A throughout the night like nothing happened, try to get B on your side as a friend. B having problems and needing to come over was true, and a fluke of fate and you should proceed as if A is totally into you.

5) You meet two girls at a party and invite both of them back to your room. Neither is especially exciting, though both still attractive, but you can smell the potential for a threesome. The two of them are best friends and the vibe overall has been fun and flirty, though you can sense that there's a bit of a jealousy dynamic going on under the surface; neither girl is sure which one you're going to take, and they both seem to want you, something which you've been playing up to your advantage. Girl A is more extroverted and has a taste for sassy banter; Girl B is a bit cuter, but a little more reserved. Of the two, Girl A seems like the safer bet in terms of closing the deal. The excuse you used to get them back to your place has been fulfilled; the three of you are hanging out and talking. Keeping in mind that you want a threesome but would fuck either of these girls, how do you proceed from here?

(a) Anti-slut defense is too strong, neither of these girls will do anything with her best friend right in front of her, and if you try to kick one out while keeping the other there, you blew it: the one you try to kick out will cockblock you out of jealousy and the one you want to stay will be afraid her friend will judge her as a whore. Nothing's happening tonight, you should let them leave together and then reach out separately another day since each of them is clearly interested.

(b) These girls knew the deal when you invited them back to your room, but they think that just one of them is going to be fucking you. There's no point blowing up a sure deal. Play up the comfort with the girl you don't like, ramp up the game with the one you do, and then whisper to the one you intend to fuck that you like her and you want to hang out, just the both of you, but you think her friend is a bit worried about her safety. Then slip away to the bathroom and let the girls work it out the way girls do, so that one will have a convenient excuse to leave while the other sticks around a while longer.

(c) You go for the threesome by heating up both girls at the same time. Anti-slut defense is strong, so you have to get them into the depravity together by introducing a sexual topic into the conversation and letting them talk to each other about it so that no one is left behind on the race towards slutting it up. You close by getting them to kiss each other, or do a three-way kiss

(d) You go for the threesome by ramping up the game with Girl B, since she's a bit more reserved, and then putting the moves on her in front of A. Since A is already sold on you, you can bring her into the fun in just a bit.

(e) Same as above, but you should go for A, who is a sure deal. The sight of you two making out will turn B on and put her over the fence, either for a threesome or to make herself scarce so you can fuck A.

6) You blew a first date with a girl you wanted to fuck, a coworker. You had her alone, your game was tight, the mood was right, but when you went in to close the deal, she icily shut you down. Despite this, she continues to be friendly and flirty with you when you see her in person, hangs out with you when other coworkers are around, but when you get her alone, all you get is the ice queen routine. Because of this, you filed her under “depraved cocktease” and went on with your life. A few weeks later your coworkers throw a party, and the both of you are there. After a few drinks, you think she might be worth another shot. You game her up a little bit as the party goes on, but avoid giving her your full attention. She starts talking to another guy. You’re feeling a bit mischievous, so the next time you walk past her, you take an ice cube out of your drink and drop it down the back of her shirt. You walk to a chair and sit down. A few seconds later, she walks over to you and slowly pours her drink out over your head. What do you do?

(a) You raised the stakes with your rude ice cube prank, and she escalated to a higher level of assholery. The only thing to do from here is to escalate even further, and further means some gentle violence. Slap her across the face like James Bond would, or bend her over and give her a spanking.

(b) You don’t need to go as far as above; you just need to match her hand. Throw your own drink at her and keep things fun from there. You’ll both have a good laugh over it and you can game from there and close the deal.

(c) You don’t need to even go as far as that; show her how few fucks you give by blowing off her rudeness with some asshole game. You got her attention, now your game is all you need.

(d) This is a trick question: she was never interested in you, and this is the one that doesn’t end in sex. She emasculated you in front of your friends and coworkers, so you need to get damn mad and chew her out to save face.

7) You’re on a first date with a professional model and it’s going well. You’re bringing tight game, she’s responding well, and the two of you end up in a secluded public place with nobody else around; trees and bushes and sweet darkness. You’ve established a deeper connection on top of the attraction; a little making out, a little getting to know one another. It’s been a very smooth seduction so far: a couple of shit tests passed, a brilliant disqualification routine that you improvised on the fly that had her fighting for your approval back. You’re in the home stretch. There’s a lull in the conversation, and you’ve locked eyes with her, so you grab her and kiss her, and she reciprocates passionately. You bite her neck, and she’s moaning a little and breathing heavy. You slide your hand up her thigh, under her skirt. She grabs your arm: “Whoa there tiger”. Last minute shit test! Your weapon is painfully hard and you’re so horny you can hardly think straight. What now?

(a) It doesn’t mean anything; girls at the extreme of female attractiveness and character just don’t fuck in public on the first date. Everything was going well, she was into you and more than willing to get physical, so you should deescalate, bide your time, and get laid on Date 2.

(b) It’s not that much of a shit test, just normal LMR, so deescalate for now. On the principle of “two steps forward, one step back” go back to normal kissing, and try again in a little bit. She

likes you, she wants you, she just doesn't want to feel like a slut, so a little token resistance is just part of the process.

(c) She likes you, she wants to fuck, but just not in public. Pass the shit test verbally, stop making out with her, and invite her back to your place.

(d) This is a very rude shit test, and your asshole game needs to be very strong to pass it. Throwing in the patronizing "Whoa there tiger" is a test of your dominance above and beyond normal LMR; come right back at her with a shockingly assholish statement and show of dominance. Very hot girls don't fuck less than extremely dominant men; she gives every man this kind of shit, even if she likes them.

(e) The "shit test" was so patronizing because it wasn't one: she didn't ever see you as a sexual creature and was just humoring your efforts to seduce her. Your cock isn't getting anywhere near her pussy without RAYP: in other words, this was a trick question.

I will be posting the answer key in a week or so. Until then, I want everyone to get in my combox with their answers and I'll deconstruct some of them in next week's post, and give you your grades.

## **Book Review: C.A. Bond's *Nemesis***

August 17th, 2019

I was going to put out the answer key to my last post this week, but Imperium Press saw fit to give me a review copy of C.A. Bond's yet-unreleased work "Nemesis", and it turned out I had quite a lot to say on it (4500 words? holy shit). You may know Bond as Reactionary Future, a bit of a contentious figure from my knowledge, but most of the internecine conflicts in reaction are fake and gay and I really couldn't care less about them. We will need rigid doctrinal conformity when we constitute an official priesthood. For now, a bit of diversity of thought and some healthy disagreements on a few things makes our school (I guess I'm a neoreactionary) more attractive to prospective patrons.

Anyway, *Nemesis* is a serious academic work of history. It's not full of white-hot invective, and it's not even designed to sneakily radicalize you against modernity like Moldbug. If you're not used to reading dry academia-level texts, it might turn you off, but in that case you're probably not the target audience anyway. It's actually surprisingly normie-friendly, at least within academia. The biases of the author are let slip only a handful of times; it is generally written in a very even-handed objective tone. I suspect that this book is meant to find its way into the hands of living historians, political scientists, and other members of the elite. Not to turn them into reactionaries overnight, but to get them asking some interesting questions, and perhaps to get them to dig into the milieu that produced the work. Moldbug's success in conversion was in his rhetoric and not his dialectic; it's very sly rhetoric, but it's in there for sure, and all the more effective on big brain nerd types for being subtle. This book, in comparison, is pure dialectic. Well, almost:

"To recap, the Brown v. Board 1954 case was brought to court with elite funding of legal costs, elite organisation to find plaintiffs, as well as "science" produced by the elite with elite funding, and it was then determined by the court that the opinions of the elite (of which the court were members) were in fact "scientifically" grounded and correct."

It's also thankfully brief; Bond's analysis doesn't need a 600-page tract and despite plenty of historical examples it's dense and everything serves a purpose, a departure from political science and history writings that are packed with superfluous filler. In terms of actual subject matter, it's almost exclusively a commentary on Jouvenel. "High-Low versus Middle" is the simplified version of Jouvenelian conflict. The more nuanced one is that power centers- and here we mean both political i.e. coercive, and cultural i.e. status-granting centers, which are often the same but not always, are engaged in constant conflict with their own subsidiaries, said entities being institutions whether formal or informal that aid the power center in its exercise of government. Power centers, whether out of fear of being deposed, or sheer simian lust for power (Bond mostly spares us from speculation on the *why*), always attempt to accrue more power to themselves from their subsidiaries. Because the very low-status have little power to take, centralizing authority must take from its own lesser allies, which are sometimes not very lesser at all. To do this, Power must ally itself with other elements of the hierarchy, most often by promising those lower on the rung greater goods and status than those between it and the Power. Sometimes, as with Church and King, we have two rival Powers which are each very strong in their own rights, and a great deal of the book is devoted to both explaining the Jouvenelian model and giving plenty of historical examples.

For example, in 1250 Europe the King's power was fairly limited. He was war-leader, diplomat, judge of last resort, but not legislator; nor did he have a private army or income independent of his own estates. By 1750, the King is far, far more powerful and this is seen as an excellent development by pretty much everyone thinking and writing. So how did the old Kings accrue all this power to themselves? Bond goes into it, step-by-step almost. But he reserves a judgement call on which is better. I won't. Topheavy things tend to fall down when you shake 'em a bit. I've already gone into detail on [why absolutism is bad](#) and you can read the full version there. Seems to work for the Chinese, but then again so does eating bugs and soy.

But in short, in 1250, the shoes of the King were big enough to do the King's job, but small enough for one man to fill. The actual occupant of these shoes tended to change a lot; Kings got stabbed in the back, and deposed in war, and so on, but the social fabric remained more or less the same throughout the entire medieval period with no negative innovations. The crown was unstable, but the trunk and the roots? Rock fucking solid. Real hard to read Chaucer and get the picture of an unstable, unnatural social order seething with tensions. In 1750, the shoes of the King (Louis XIV to be precise\*) were enormous, since he was now responsible for legislation, education, maintenance of his standing army, and government of every individual province in his realm. He took all of the power possible unto himself, and found that he was an unfitting Atlas to hold up the whole of his country. So he shares the load, not with his fierce and potentially rebellious warlord nobles, but with a class of common-born civil servants he appoints himself, who he thinks in his hubris will be loyal to him. Cause Leninism, they'd be nothing without him, right? No surprise that the army of bureaucrats he hired to enact his power realize that they don't need the King anymore to enact their Enlightenment Gnostic Utopianism. Louis XIV kicked the centralization snowball down the hill and his grandson was crushed under it, other monarchs were wise enough at least to dodge out of its way and merely become irrelevant to the levers of power.

Later on, he applies the Jouvenelian model not just to distant history, but to very recent history. He has to get through a great deal of talk about ethics, epistemology, and so forth, which I'll get back to myself, but the most layman-friendly portion of the work is closer to the end, when he runs through, Moldbug-style, a ton of recent historical developments exposing "liberal democracy" as perhaps the most insidious totalitarian system in history. This section is meticulously sourced for those who would want to debate him, but also where his rare rhetorical

killshots come in. For the normie who's been following along, I imagine it'd be pretty disillusioning. He brings up the Soros Open Society foundation, quotes liberally from their own minutes on their creation and manipulation of Black Lives Matter, and then dismisses the "silly right-wing conspiracy theory": Because it's not a conspiracy, dear reader! No shadowy cabal! All of the NGOs are like this. Your *entire government* works like this. This is Organic Locally-Sourced American Communism, stripped bare naked.

Much of the book is focused on a refutation of individualism using the framework of Alasdair MacIntyre, which is very welcome. The observation that centralizing power always frames its appeal to its client class as increasing its freedom is certainly interesting; this dynamic is explicated very well by Spandrell's bioleninism, which was originally just Leninism; patronage of classes who would have no or little status without your institutional support. When you tell a lower-status person that you will increase their liberty and equality, what they hear is that they are going to knock over a big apple cart and be able to snatch up a lot of free shit. Of course, individualism and totalitarian authority go hand in hand, as it is simply not possible for most client peoples of lower status to be able to practice individualism without the patronage of the powerful.

However, the alternative to individualism is not made explicit by Bond, though he hints at it. Perhaps it would make the book obscenely normie-repellent, so I will do it instead. This is a matter of finding a proper frame, one where natural order is opposed to the unnatural raising of some people's status and the unnatural suppression of others'. His section on the historical usage of Divine Right as justifying absolutism during the closing days of the Renaissance (see James I) is instructive in this regard. He notes that the use of the phrase "Divine Right" implies that authority is unnatural and especially granted by God to increase the liberties of subject peoples and bring them closer to the divine. The claim to legitimacy by a Divine Right absolutist monarch is "men are naturally born free with XYZ rights, but / in particular need ABC powers in order to assure this". Of course, this is also the justification of every democratic power since. (I will note that this suggests the rebirth of the Gnostic heresy that forms the spiritual basis of Leftism; "natural rights" are not very natural after all, and require a titanically coercive distortion of reality in order to actualize) In other words, all of our political thought since the 1550's has proceeded from the assumption of the sovereign individual who then chooses to engage with society: social contract theory.

So I will propose an alternative frame based on natural law that does not presuppose individualism. I meant to bring up this concept long ago on my blog but never had a fitting chance. Basically, I want to be able to say that hierarchies are totally natural and good, that structural inequality *is* the state of nature and the will of God, and it's foolish, evil, and destructive to countervene this natural order that you do not exist as an individual without. Almost everybody has forgotten about it, but in opposition to the social contract theory and individualism, I (re)introduce the Great Chain of Being. This is a medieval concept that fell out of use right around the accession of James I, and if you read this book, that's not a coincidence. Basically, the entirety of creation is imagined as a vast physical and spiritual hierarchy, from rocks to bacteria up to animals, humans, and God at the top. Your soul can be saved, yes, and shoot up to the top of the chain to hang with God, but He did not make you equal on this Earth, oh no. The human social hierarchy is as much a part of the chain as a wolf eating a deer and the deer grazing on leaves. Sounds unfair? Live with it. That meatbag you call your body ain't so important in the long run.

Similar to the idea of "you can't fight GNON", trying to upset the natural order has disastrous unintended consequences because everything is connected. The Great Chain of Being is why

storms rage and horses go mad when Macbeth murders his king, why in Arthurian myth the land becomes waste and infertile when the king is impotent and sinful, and so forth. We don't need to go so far as to say that the rocks and trees will tremble when you upset the natural order of human society, but it's not super off the mark either. When communists overthrow the natural order, guess what? Famine and civil war stalk the earth. You really do end up with a blasted wasteland. When Louis disempowers his aristocrats, the King loses his head, and the people starve. When the state removes the father's authority over his family, sons disobey their parents, men act like women, and wives rebel against their husbands. As a spiritual heuristic, the GCoB works, and if you go into the power mechanisms behind it, also checks out. We can thus avoid social contract theory and the notion of individualism through teleological natural law in this manner. Though I will say that the fallacy of the social contract only applies to the individual's relation to society at large. What is the Saxon's king's ring-gift but a kind of willful contract creating a state? I will use the word *covenant* to refer to entirely legitimate promises or contracts between men or institutions of men, so that we can differentiate between this function and the "social contract" that acts as the basis of modernist political theory.

If this sounds like Divine Right rehashed, let me explain the difference. The "divine right" absolutism that Bond rails against as being centered on social contract theory has its driving telos focused downwards. God gives the King power to "ensure the rights of Man". This unilateral telos is used precisely as Bond describes in a socially destructive Jouvencian power game. With a GCoB understanding of the purpose of society, the telos of a peasant is different from the telos of a lord and the telos of the King; and when I say this, I speak not of individual people but of the social roles themselves, classes which take on the status of an entity in the sense of Theseus' ship; it does not matter particularly *who* fills the shoes of the King that makes his role legitimate, nor do the individuals constituting the agricultural, merchant, warrior, or artisanal roles. This is tied to the concept of the "sacred vocation" which is both anti-individualist and anti-collectivist. The vocation shapes the individual and "makes" him to a far greater degree than the individual can influence the vocation; even in mastery and transcendence of a vocation, the individual can merely update the tradition for those following him. Thus the telos of every separate class entity is multidirectional, featuring both an upward purpose toward God and a massive web of particularistic and diverse obligations and rights (not in the humanistic sense but as the reverse of an obligation; something due to you) that extend in every direction in society. As a personal aside, this makes a society incredibly interesting, culturally rich, and aesthetic, but this is slightly besides the point.

I am not entirely a fan of Bond's chapter on economics and corporations: Bond's total rejection of social contract theory, which is entirely solid in the case of *status hierarchies* and participation in society, breaks down a little bit when it comes to the economic realm. His total rejection of the private/public duality (to him, everything is public) prevents him from understanding that rational or semirational covenants do rule a lot of human interaction that doesn't directly bear on the social order. He is correct when he says that the state is not a creation of the private world, not a result of the spontaneous and rational decisions of individuals as modernity would claim. But I do not entirely reject the public/private duality. If anything, the causality is reversed and it is the private world which exists and has its form as a result of the existence and character of the state. Primitive man does not have a private realm whatsoever; it is clear that the private is contingent on the security and peace provided by Power, but that does not mean that Power should be interfering with the private realm. When Power tries to micromanage the private realm, to stick its nose behind every closed door, you get serious and disastrous effects. Again, though, he doesn't go quite that far.

It seems that Bond loves his dichotomies; it's hard for him to not think in black-and-white. He is correct that a corporation, or, more generally, any institution, requires the formal approval or at least the apathy of Power in order to be treated as a distinct entity. But this does not mean that there is no such thing as private life, as he seems to imply, nor does it mean that corporations are *necessarily* an arm of the State. He comes very close to alignment with the Jimian position, which I've been feeling more affinity towards, that capital does not rule, and cannot rule. Which does not preclude capital as attack dog for a priestly or militant ruling class. However, it comes off to me as slightly disingenuous to lump the university system and the medieval guild into the same category as the charter corporation and the modern publicly traded corporation. In the sense that they are all bodies (hence the name, corpus) of individuals constituting an entity with some of the powers and rights of personhood, fine. But in ignoring the class divisions, not in a Marxist sense but in the sense that some of these entities exercise a priestly role and some a merchant purpose, you get poor logic such as reasoning that because NGOs and Universities exercise political power, and NGOs and Universities are corporations, that all corporations are subsidiaries of political power. The difference is that an NGO can rule, a University can rule, but Goldman-Sachs cannot rule. Goldman-Sachs does not force the government to do anything; rather, Goldman-Sachs was forced by the government to make risky unprofitable loans to dumb minorities who stood no chance of paying them back.

He dips into generative anthropology, which is necessary to attempt to refute social contract theory, since where did Power centers come from if not originally by the consensual clustering of individuals? However, his concept of the "magical origins of power" is flawed. He entertains the idea that primitive man is ruled by spiritual forces external to even the most powerful, and thus by those who interpret the will of the spirits. But how is that different exactly than what we have now? Every society has an external in its hierarchy higher than the King, High Priest, etc. This is not exclusive to primitive peoples and does not represent a radically different social order. Priest rule lies in interpreting the will of this external power and warrior rule is to rule as its avatar (hero rule). And power is downstream of culture which is downstream of power. This has always been true: the sacrificial center of primitive Man is not appropriated by tribal chiefs but originally created by them. Man has a religious instinct, but without leadership to codify man's relation to the divine, it does not express itself in a coherent manner. I'm actually somewhat surprised that he breaks from Jouvenelian analysis for the very origins; if all ideas follow from Power to serve a political function, how was it that primitive tribes of Man had "sacrificial centers" that were later appropriated by authorities?

Bond does not address the WQ and female emancipation other than to point out that feminism is bioleninism, that women are clients used by the centralizing structure to expand its power. Well duh, this is a work on political structure and not social issues. But I have come to believe that a sex war is being constantly fought just as the Jouvenelian conflict is constantly in motion. The feminism of Rome did not follow a standard Jouvenelian model in which theoretically oppressed women were the clients; even at its height, only a few property-owning women could participate. They weren't a vote bank, nor was their "freedom and equality" an excuse to increase centralizing power, as both the Augustan and Christian reforms concerning women rolled back their liberties as a Jouvenelian play for the status of fathers and husbands.

The sex war, in fact, resembles a reverse Jouvenelianism in which the female as symbol is the patron and lower-status men her clients. (feminism is not alpha males freeing up women to fuck; female liberation has very little to offer Genghis Khan or similar men) Bear with me here. Women cannot physically coerce men, thus must gain male allies to enforce female power on male society. This mechanism operates through superstition, by attributing sacred powers to women and then enlisting men to either gain the benefits of these sacred powers or avoid

magical punishment. Women as angelic symbols of purity and virtue in the Victorian era led to opening the door for greater liberties for women, in which case we got a lot of sluts, a lot more prostitutes, and a lot of bastard children being dumped on the doorsteps of Victorian orphanages, said orphanages never being a necessity a generation before.

Indeed we see plenty of past societies playing the game of Jouvenel without touching on women at all as a potential client base, or even by promising the subjection of women to lower-status men who had trouble keeping them in line. It seems to me that the struggle between male power and female power is orthogonal to the Jouvenelian structure and just as likely to cause ruin to a civilization if left unchecked. Men are constantly tempted to attribute sacred powers to women; at first a special class of priestesses or witches, and if left unchecked, women at large, which ruins fertility and undermines male cooperation and male religion, founded as it is on the divine order supplied by the Logos.

As a last aside, Bond's followers already know why the nominal-Right cuckservative in US today is ineffective, but the normie who happens to pick up his book does not. I would favor an expansion of the section that describes the conservative "resistance" to centralization, with a more detailed argument as to why and how the controlled opposition of the Republican party is ineffectual and token.

Bond also goes into great detail explaining how the elite does not know that it is an elite; that the Cathedral itself is unaware that it is acting as a government and accelerating the centralizing force of states. I will add that the blissful unawareness of the Cathedral that it is engaging in cynical patronage and HLvM politics is an adaptive phenomenon. The government that does not know that it is a government is far harder to attack, and the sincere feeling of the de-facto ruler that he is actually and truly oppressed, that he is the underdog, causes him to take faster and more severe action against his phantom opponents than the one who knows he is in charge. Thus we get the holiness spiral, as the true-believing radical outmaneuvers the cynical Machiavellian.

I do not know if Bond has read Spengler or not, but Spengler preceded Jouvenel in laying bare the historical centralization processes that seem to occur in every great civilization. Spengler sees them as a natural historical phenomenon, something which captures Bond's interest if only indirectly, for he at one point is slightly puzzled at how neither the philosopher nor the man using him seems to be aware that they are enacting the Jouvenelian dynamic. They seem to do so as a matter of destiny; and Spengler sees this in terms of actual Destiny. The City, not as entity but as physical and cultural center of power, is constantly hungry for blood and for minds. It sucks in the generative life-force of the countryside and transfigures it into the finished products of the "Become": art, philosophy, theology, architecture, etc. In the same vein, it undermines the peasant *sangre-et-terre* values and modes of life that are manifest in both the peasant and the landed noble: barter is replaced by first coinage and then abstract finance, the peasant is replaced by the worker, the elite cavalry by the standing infantry, the aristocracy and its lower officers by centralized bureaucracy.

Culturally and politically, the end of this centralization is in fact the end of culture and of political power; summon to mind the terrible and chilling image of the man who could only be described as a primitive living in the ruins of Rome after the Fall; one of every five cave-houses occupied, cyclopean ruins that he has no conception of how to build or repair. It is hard to consider this fact and not view the history of a civilization as the acting-out of an inescapable destiny; it is not that the will of man has no influence, but that the will of Man is of a certain nature and quality which drives these developments. Just as a living being has a *will-to-life*, and we can describe

its actions as such irrespective of its level of sentience, Death is also built into it on a genetic level.

I alluded to an anti-Jouvenelian structure in the GCoB section of this essay, which has turned out far longer than I planned, but it is also true that Jouvenelian power games defeated this system. (I will assert that it lasted far longer against them than most, that a Jouvenelian spiral into oriental despotism or female-power tribalism seems to be the prevailing norm) Moreover, the physical conditions of medieval society are quite different from today, so a new social order that embodies harmony with the GCoB, in a “multidirectional tapestry of duties, rights, and obligations” will look quite different from feudalism and manorialism, but the basic essences of these class entities will remain more or less the same because men and the roles men can fill remain more or less the same. This type of society forms out of the sheer necessity of brutal anarchic warfare, conditions in which defection is not adaptive to survival

in either a political or reproductive sense. We saw the beginnings of this in Rhodesia, though that good nation could not resist when it fell under the Enemy’s Sauronic eye and its full military might.

Thus the most pertinent split on the Right in my eyes (and I mean of course the actual Right) is the conflict over whether we ride the Jouvenelian tiger to enact a centralized Caesarist or Augustan Restoration, or if the only Restoration possible resembles the Carolingian, that only after collapse and decay will some barbarian aspire to the glories of the past and plant the seeds for surpassing it. I waver on this myself. If Jouvenelian, we need a patron. Caesarism is coming to the West, as the last stage before a primitive collapse, and we will need to make ourselves visible and amenable to Caesar, so that we may get more than a dictator who merely arrests the decline for a while. I see no reason why we should not do this even if we see the necessity of collapse; a real Restoration, even if a longshot, would be vastly preferable to genocidal civil war and a potentially long Dark Age.

However, I would keep Rhodesia in the back of my mind. The West’s nukes likely don’t work anymore; Navy ships staffed by brown janissaries can hardly be sailed in a straight line without crashing into something. In a world where the Cathedral’s military arm is weak and degenerate, which will not take more than a generation of decline from today, it’d only take a few hundred Rightists and a boat to knock over some brown tropical shithole and plant the seeds for future glories. This should be considered a bitter victory; it would mean most of our people, most of the West, will be killed and likely eaten in the fashion of Haiti.

Anyway, do I recommend you getting this book when it comes out? Hell yeah. I might have some pet disagreements with Bond but this is still a very important book; just look at all the thought and interpretation it just inspired in me. Put it on your bookshelf, lend it to your friends, let your sons read it when they’re old and smart enough.

P.S. I’m getting F\*cebook as a referrer now. I don’t know which of you guys has the meteoric balls to be linking me on there but dude, not sure that’s wise. We should all be presenting plausibly deniable social normality if not exceptionality.

P.P.S. MMB, thanks for reaching out to me. Your email address doesn’t work or I would have responded in kind. Sadly I live too far away from you to forge a friendship, and you live too far from any of my boys I could put you in touch with. Also I didn’t find my faith in a Church but in the depths of depravity. Not that you shouldn’t go to church, and you definitely should not

debase yourself to realize the existence of the Devil; your future kids will have faith even if you never do.

\*To clarify, Louis XIV was the king who instituted the reforms, though the actual king in 1750 was XV and the one who got guillotined was XVI

## **Rectification of Names: "Gays"**

September 4th, 2019

Frame is important. We need a reactionary frame on issues and not a modernist one. Don't take too much issue with my use of "modernist" by the way. Duh, I like technological modernity. But in art, Modernism stood for the dismantling of tradition and the atomization of perspective, which you cannot really personally escape as a worldview, having been born and raised here. Political modernity means much the same as artistic. Reaction is attempting to dismantle the premises of political modernity, and the spiritual and aesthetic task is at least as important. But we're all modernists now. Using the word is an acknowledgement that the Enemy won, and that there's no substantive dissent against it in terms of essential worldview.

A core tenant and central fetish of our anti-culture and its religion is *identity*. I want to be substantially clear on the philosophical underpinnings of this, because it seems at first counterintuitive that a worldview based on atomic individuality is linked at its core with the notion of the sacred identity. But allow me to explain. Without an external sacred reference point that allows Man to define his role in the world, we must adhere to new and strange gods instead. What has replaced the original Christian sacred origin has been the sacred human will, reason, intellect, and so forth. The creation of sacred categories of identity (to say that a certain behavior, trait, etc, grants legitimacy and constitutes an identity) operates with no logical rigor. Of course, one motivation for why some things constitute membership in an identity and some do not is often sheer naked power, but this power is always framed as necessary for the benefit and liberty of the individual and his rights.

And yet the naked power argument falls apart a little bit. To give an example, the "Asexual" component of the LGBT+++ identity bloc. We will ask the question: What is it about a supposed lack of sexual attraction that constitutes an identity and not preference in hairstyle or clothes? With reference to the "political power" theory of motivated identity, what political "right", what power exactly is the "asexual" seeking? The male homo, of course, wants his massive orgy, freedom from judgement (which is always the power to punish those who do not clap loudly enough) and easy access to little boys for raping. Now, the only plausible motivation for the "asexual" to band together as an identity group is resentment against the normal and the desire to harm them. But those who lack sexual attraction can easily blend into normal society and there are no tangible benefits to their seeking power as a group.

But as I've demonstrated, there's no external or rational way to establish identity. The philosophical core of modernity's obsession with identity is the individual's act of will; the conscious choice that a material trait of the self be elevated to sacred status. From the purely nihilistic perspective, "sexual preference" is of no more significance than my preference for brunettes over blondes. But again, Man must worship something, and lacking the external and eternal reference point, a new sacred role or category is created through the holy exercise of self-identification. This is why I am not attracted to Nietzscheanism; what is this act but an act of supreme overman will? Erecting a new god from the self to worship? Thus we see how atomized modernity and the seemingly collectivist "identity" are one and the same.

This act of individual will is then filtered through the constructed identity to aggrandize the individual's status and establish the legitimacy of their will as a fact beyond repute; as something that they *just are*. Thus to criminalize an *identity* just doesn't compute with people today. Even the most ardent right-winger will pause when criminalizing homosexuality comes up in a non-ironic sense. Make it a crime to *be gay*? It shouldn't be a crime to *be black*, even a hardcore racist doesn't think so. But you've already fallen into the Left's frame by thinking this way. F\*ggotry isn't an identity. It's not something you are, it's something you *do*. To even refer to a "gay" or a "homosexual" is to grant it legitimacy as a subgroup, as an identity. I don't believe it is, and it certainly doesn't deserve that kind of status.

In other words, gays don't exist. "A gay" should come off to a person as a ridiculous statement. Assigning perverse behavior an identity, even for the purposes of criminalizing and persecuting it, ingroups the perverse and creates a bloc of opposition, if only in secret. When you use "the gays" as an identity category, young men with the perverse desire to fuck and be fucked by other men think "there are people like me out there, my perversion *means something* about me". When you prosecute it as a perverse behavior like any other that should be outlawed, it stays in the closet and we don't notice it exists.

When we say that homosexuality undermines male cooperation, that's hard for modern man to viscerally understand, because undermined male cooperation is the default state that he's lived and breathed in since the day he was born. If you say that men can't really be friends if one of them wants to fuck the others in the ass, that makes a lot more sense. The homosexual identity has nothing to do with it. F\*ggotry is an act, a specific crime against nature, and it needs to be referred to as such.

We need to rectify names, and thus we need a name that captures the fundamental absurdity and wrongness of the homosexual act, lowers its status, and makes people comfortable with rejecting and criminalizing it. Given the status that even clinical diagnosis of mental illness has attained among the left as an identity-group, I don't even want clinical-sounding names or to classify it as a mental illness. "F\*g" immediately jumps to mind, it still has power as an insult, but gays call each other fags the way blacks say nigga, and again, it's something you *are*. Let's keep fag to use on generally weak and pathetic men and keep looking.

Sodomite is another, and I've seen an attempt among right-wing Christians to reclaim sodomite, but I'm not a huge fan. It doesn't have that visceral, universal meaning. As far as identity goes, it sounds like you're made a citizen of Sodom by fucking another man in the ass... which is not a place you want to be a citizen of, but it ingroups gays. We don't want fags to have solidarity as an ingroup, because they're not a group. We need a word that makes them into isolated, lone perverts again.

The thing is, we have a dusty but perfectly suitable word for what we need to suppress, which plays into the proper frame. Buggery. Bugger. It at once evokes the near-comical grotesquery and low-status of the act while simultaneously avoids the pitfall of ingrouping or assigning an identity. Outlaw buggery. Then buggery, if it happens much at all, happens deep in the closet and buggers don't act publicly like buggers tend to do. This is not merely for post-Restoration either; your rhetoric and dialectic should proceed as though "gay" is not a subgroup or identity. Jim has a great post on why buggery is bad, and I don't need to repeat it, and his comments have a good deal of speculation on where it comes from, something I also don't want to go too deeply into.

I will also remark on the tendency of buggers to nearly all want to rape little boys, and while we can use the term pederast in dialogue among ourselves, this term is too dry and academic to make for effective rhetoric. We need to call it like it is, and point out the advocates of boyrage and the political agenda of buggers as being centered around boyrage. Based on the historically rapid rise and spread of boyrage in any society that tolerates it, it's pretty obvious that buggery is like a disease and should be quarantined like a disease.

## Meet Your Future Wife With This One Easy Trick

September 13th, 2019

This is going to be my last substantive post on game, dating, women, etc. I've said what needs to be said on the topic and screening girls for marriage is a good endpiece to the subject. Aside from the answer key, which I still haven't gotten around to because it bores me to write it up along with explanations, I am capping off my discourse on the WQ, though perhaps the zoology of human sexual dynamics will need some more attention down the line.

Also, I lied. Clickbait titles are fun but there's actually a lot here.

I left my gf of three years a few months ago. We'd agreed we'd revisit the marriage and kids question once she graduated. (college, you can calm down Mr. Hansen) Which meant no, and I knew it meant no, but I do have a bit of a soft side, and I was really fond of her. So she graduated, and surprise, still no.\* So I slipped back into my old habits. Ran through four girls in the following month. Which means I hit 50, I think. I stopped keeping count a long time ago cause it felt phaggy. But the last time, God himself tried to cockblock me. I didn't take the hint, because I'm a horny shit and this chick was *really* hot, and fucked her anyway, and then He in His infinite wisdom took his revenge. Which didn't cause any permanent damage, so in the end, I'm grateful He saw fit to personally interfere. Cause He usually doesn't. But I'm taking it as a sign that He has plans for me, and they don't involve womanizing.

So in the spirit of turning over a new leaf, some tips for screening out the sloots. Cause dating in modern times is like being a gold miner in California in 1848. Plenty of girls around, but they're pretty much all whores. If you're a good boy volcel, you might not be able to tell the difference between a girl you can handle and a really soiled one. So the first rule of thumb. Don't date a woman your grandmother would call a whore. If you're not sure, err on the side of "no". Or have her meet your oldest living female relative. Old people really don't give a fuck, your grandma will make her opinion known. "Never trust a woman with a flat chest" were my grandma's words of wisdom, and for purely selfish reasons I choose to follow her advice.

Ideally you are going to want a virgin, but virgins are hard to come by. I do not trust a "religious" girl to be totally or even acceptably chaste these days unless I know her father and he vouches for her good behavior. I have popped six virgins, and none of them were good Christian girls raised in trad households, but I know several "good Christian girls" who think Sunday morning forgiveness is an excuse for Saturday night rodeo.

Remember when Roosh was gushing over Mennonite girls? I knew a Mennonite girl in college. As soon as she was away from her father's watchful eye she ditched her long modest dress cut from a single cloth, bought dirt-cheap Walmart clothes with her scanty pocket money, and started slutting it up. She never wore makeup and had bad skin from eating all the processed cafeteria crap instead of local grown. Her tacky lack of fashion sense was kind of endearing. Innocent, hell yeah, but still a whore.

There are no good girls. God took so long to send us his Son because in all that time He could not find a sinless girl to be His mother. There are no good girls. Even if I entertain the idea that there are modest angelic trad unicorns out there of impeccable moral purity... ye missed the boat, lad. Those girls, if they existed, all loyally married their high school sweethearts. But I also don't want to imply that girls are all the same, because some are more marriageable than others.

Because marriage as practiced since at least the Early Bronze Age is illegal, and as Jim says, if your marriage is symmetrical and equal it is a gay marriage, your marriage will need to be covertly ancient in its dynamics. Inexperienced girls are easier to impose your will on and more likely to fall deeply and madly in love with you, and once her romantic love wears off, familial love of being one flesh takes its place and the habit of honoring and obeying you will be solidified.

Sex is a zoological phenomenon and the relations between man and woman are also a zoological phenomenon, pre-conscious and pre-verbal. Men evolved language to better cooperate with other men, and their daughters inherited this capacity and learned that they could use it to obfuscate their bad behavior, manipulate men, and compete with other women. A good relationship involves subtle, nonverbal communication as if you and your mate were apes that had no language. You do not show neediness, do not hover around her; you call her to you or you invade her space alternatively. This is subtle and intuitive and very hard to put into words. For example, a woman you own will want to please you and do things to make herself useful to you, and you should approve of and appreciate these things as if you are entitled to them without appearing grateful... this is a very fine line and it is something you need to feel out for yourself, but many things in relationships are like this.

I am immensely sexually entitled. I have seduced virgins before and I can do it again, and will make it permanent this time. The trouble is finding them. I have a keen radar for inexperienced girls because I have a keen radar for sluts, and I can tell the difference very quickly. At least as far as white girls go. Asian girls are very, very good at faking inexperience when they are really sluts, but I don't like Asian girls very much anyway, and want kids who look like me, so no big loss. So I apply my radar, in the adult world, in the big city, and no surprise, no virgins at all. While in college there were quite a few of them.

Well, let me step back a bit. The most important part of this post is teaching you my radar so you can pick out sluts from inexperienced girls. The "thousand-cock stare" is well attested by the PUA community [I'm leaving this typo in because it's too funny to fix]. It is not just a minor or occasional feature of sluts but an ironclad natural law. All sluts have dead eyes and all women with dead eyes, eyes that don't smile when she smiles, are sluts. And even better, this is a spectrum based on how many different men have used her as a self-warming flashlight. A girl who has only slept with one man, even if he piped her out every night for five years straight, will not have the dead eyes and dead soul of a girl who had twelve short flings. This correlates directly to notch count, not number of copulations. Perhaps it is related to microchimerism, DNA from multiple different men being much worse for her than being microchimerized by any quantity of one man's sperm, perhaps not. I had a three-year relationship with a virgin, and when I left her, her eyes had much the same life to them as at the beginning.

Anyway, I pay a great deal of attention to the life in a woman's eyes as a direct indicator of her sexual history and state of her soul, but you might not, since most women today are sluts, and slut eyes will look like normal eyes to you. Thankfully, I love girls who exude an aura of inexperienced untapped sexual frustration, commonly referred to as femininity, they all have

eyes that shine with a feminine *joie-de-vivre*, and when I seduce these girls, I find that they are literal hymen-intact virgins or have only had sex once or twice and obviously have no idea what to do. Genuine *joie-de-vivre* and eyes full of life are the first and most reliable signs that a girl is worth marrying, and I implore you to start noticing this. In most normal girls, this is happy and bubbly, in nerdy awkward girls this is shy and vulnerable, but either way, you will see their eyes sparkle when you tease them. So consider yourself lucky; I've sinned so you don't have to, and acquired a knowledge that very, very few are privy to.

Dead slut eyes is a little bit different from "crazy eyes" (woman are medicate NOT allow). Crazy eyes are when the eyes of a woman, goes for men too, express a radically different emotion than the rest of her face. Easier to see in photographs. Literally cover the bottom half of a person's face in a picture and you will be able to read the emotions in their eyes, which as the windows to the soul reflect what they are actually feeling at the moment. Oftentimes you will see fear, anger or hatred in a person who is otherwise smiling, and this revelation is often quite disgusting. Many sluts are also crazy, but some virgins are crazy, and thus have both the spark of youthful life and nutjob eyes that betray inner torment. Needless to say, stay away from crazy-eyed women, unless it is a type of crazy you are used to handling. Because all women are insane by male standards, find a type of crazy that you don't mind mastering.

For example, manic girls piss me off to no end and I hate dealing with them, but depressive girls I find quite easy to deal with, as I can just be a pillar of silent strength she can cling to, most often literally, and if she goes off somewhere alone to cry, more blessed time to myself.

If you are in your twenties, aim for late teens and early twenties, and if you are in your thirties or later, aim for women in their late twenties. If you are in your teens, not yet of legal age, aim for the youngest fertile girls you are legally able to date. Unless you are above 50, don't be looking to marry women over 30. Unless your game is immaculate, will not be scoring early twenties or late teens if you're above 30, will probably have to settle for lightly-used goods. If you have to settle for lightly-used goods past 25, make sure she has a history of long relationships and not a history of "being single". Women lie about this, so trust the eye test.

One trick is to marry down in attractiveness. Personally, the prospect of a hot wife doesn't excite me all that much; since I've slept with models and heiresses and nymphomaniac demon-possessed sluts, any woman I marry will be less exciting in bed than the best I've had, since I'm definitely not marrying a model, stripper, or succubus incarnate, though if I could get away with handcuffing the latter to a tether that ran between my bedroom and my kitchen and throwing away the key I would certainly consider it. Yeah, it was *that* good, Lord preserve me. But anyway, if you marry down enough, your wife will still get hit on, but she will generally not get hit on by men more alpha than you, and that makes all the difference.

There is always a man higher-status than you in female eyes, and always the risk of infidelity, but if you manage your milieu, you mitigate that risk. If you put me in a room with other bikers, chances are I'm not the chaddest biker in the room, but put me in a room full of nerds, (and I do kind of belong there too, given some of my hobbies) I am always the chaddest nerd in the room. You could put me in a comic convention with 20,000 attendees and I would still be the chaddest nerd there, and the girls I got laid with meeting through nerd hobbies were always hotter than the girls I got laid with doing chad hobbies, and slightly hotter than the strangers I picked up in bars and on the street.

So I am angling for a wife who keeps nerdy social circles and has nerdy hobbies, because I have good claim to be one of the highest-status men on earth (the way women see status)

among nerds. I am a natural, a bona-fide asshole with a heart of gold. Trouble is, I am only a natural with girls in my general IQ range, like anyone is, and I'm far enough right on the bell curve that the number of women in my IQ bracket is near-zero. When I meet these girls, I don't need to think about game; I talk to them and come on to them and they fall into my bed, which would make my marriage very easy and drama-free if I manage to find a decent one, but I'm not betting on it. I need to think about game and consciously perform it with the vast majority of girls out there, but no biggie, since I'm used to it.

I don't believe in meeting girls in bars anymore. Bars are an awful place for pickup unless you know the bartender, tip him well, and have him treat you as high status. In a bar, the bartender is the alpha male, and women want to fuck him because other men are looking at him and clamoring for his attention. Bars are an okay place for a first date, because you can get a table, carefully selecting one where she cannot see a crowd of people fighting for the bartender's attention, and go up to get drinks yourself, so that she cannot see you acting low-status for the bartender. I personally prefer cheap, exciting first dates in which we do something somewhat physical and active so I can test her for submissiveness and compliance. An old standby of mine is drinking on the beach at night and swimming, usually skinny-dipping, in the black water. It's never failed me in getting laid, and now that I'm volcel, can get very close to fucking her before I drop the "sex is for marriage" bomb. And you should make her want what she can't have. There's a big difference between a man who can't fuck and a man who won't fuck.

Even now that I am screening girls for marriage, I prefer to affect an attitude of cavalier playboy nonjudgementalism, because it is very effective at getting a girl to open up about her sexual history and be relatively honest with you, though nowadays it will also make me screen her right out if too slutty, to the point of leaving an establishment through the back door during a "bathroom break". I do not need a virgin wife, because once a girl with one or two ex-boyfriends gets a taste of me, the ex becomes a sexless worm in her eyes. But you may need one if you are less experienced yourself, because it's likely you will need her mad and powerful first love as a crutch until you learn how to handle her.

So where do virgins hang out? Virgins aren't innately purer, they are just as horny, they just haven't been gotten to by a sufficiently alpha male yet. So how do you be the first? Well, most of the virgins I knew tended to hang around low-status men, and I mean in female eyes of course. I really need a word for male status through the eyes of women, and a different word for male status in the male hierarchy. Conflating the two causes much error, stemming from the purple pill and causing the purple pill in turn. But I digress. Most of the verified virgins I knew were nerdy girls, raised in nerdy families. Smart girls with Stacy hobbies all got popped in eighth grade by the high school lacrosse team; this isn't about smarts, it's about subculture. Gamers, sci-fi conventions, actual LARP, DnD, MTG... you're more likely to find a virgin frequenting venues of nerdy hobbies than you are in a church. Yes, we live in a world of bitter irony.

Of course there are virgins in church, too, but if the church is cucked, the girls get fucked. Even if the church is trad, the girls may go bad. Remember the Mennonite I told you about. I don't even remember her name, but keep her in mind. You have a very short window between religious girls leaving their fathers' houses and them getting popped. Girls who live at home do not fuck as often, no matter their age, so if your church has marriageable young women who attend with their families, make friends with the patriarch, as an equal without treating him as higher status, and he will likely be wanting to marry off his daughter, and you may end up with the opportunity to court her. But if the father is a white knight, I feel no reservations about being a sneaky fucker, and it is much more exciting for the daughter to be eloping with a man her father disapproves of.

I will also caution you that many girls who remain virgin for longer than the usual age these days often experience some kind of sexual dysfunction, either claiming to be “lesbians”, or “asexual”, or “genderfluid”, or some such nonsense. This is caused by the fact that Chad never came on to them, and plenty of low-status men did, so they associated a Pavlovian disgust with men and male sexuality, and began to favor their inherent attraction to females, which all girls have. But they act like normal girls, they respond to game like normal girls, and they fuck like normal girls, and oftentimes they forget about all the identity nonsense once shackled up with Chad. Of course, the very crazy ones are usually especially ugly or unpleasant, so only pursue this type of girl if it has the whiff of a shit test and not of real insanity.

I have found that I can get girls in my bed far faster than the PUA consensus feels is reasonable, so I have a feeling you can get a girl into a serious relationship and marriage far faster than anyone thinks is possible. Pre-rational and pre-verbal. I think I may marry very impulsively. But this is not an easy thing to test out. I do carry a ring with me everywhere. A cheap one, but it has sentimental value. If I do end up putting this ring on the finger of a girl I barely know, wed and bred in the space of a week, my readers will certainly hear about it. Of course we will have the marriage blessed in a church, and celebrated with a big party, but the sacrament of marriage was given to the husband, not the Church. Adam’s marriage to Eve was sacramental, created by God perhaps, but Adam’s sons had valid marriages before there were priests, therefore the sacrament of marriage was given to all men to perform. And of course the dynamics of your marriage will need to be quietly and secretly ancient, but I am quite whitepilled about this. Maybe not easy, but nowhere close to impossible.

\*I know what you’re thinking. I was planning on intentionally accidentally impregnating her but she got the jump on me and had a copper rod inserted into her uterus to kill my sperm. Clever girl, she knew me too well. Not wanting kids was probably a shit test, and if I married her she would have come around to it eventually, but I’m not going to wait or take that chance. I want eight kids, and I am going to have eight kids. Sadly, cannot abduct her, cannot coerce her into marriage like the good old days, legally not allowed to pass the shit test the way she needs me to pass it, so I must dump them instead.

## **Mental Illness**

October 23rd, 2019

The vast majority of mental illnesses are fake. First we should rectify our names. I define mental illness as profound disconnection from reality. For example, say you feel depressed. If your wife just died, well, that’s not mental illness. You have a very good reason, in actual reality, to feel crushed. If you feel depressed, have no motivation to get out of bed, or feel like there’s no point to your existence, and your life actually does suck, again, that’s not mental illness. That’s an actual response to reality. We have hordes of young men today suffering from anxiety and depression because men are maligned and hated, their prospects for ever having kids get slimmer by the day, they are denied membership in a male hierarchy, deracinated, decultured, devoid of a sense of community, and denied the support of God in their maleness whether they follow the progressive religion or the old Christian.

Mental illness occurs in animals when their natural environment is denied to them. Zookeepers learned early on that if you put a monkey alone in a concrete box with bars, it will go insane and start behaving in disturbing ways. A monkey is a relatively intelligent social animal that needs other monkeys around, and needs a stimulating environment with problems to solve. The processor is still working properly. The input sucks, so the output is also garbage.

Actual mental illness is comparatively very rare. When the input is good, and the output sucks, then and only then you can assume the brain has broken down, only then can you diagnose with insanity. Very rarely, men with seemingly great lives “struggle with depression” and end up killing themselves. These fringe cases are of course held up as poster children by the Left and by “psychiatry” at large; big hard-to-understand problems need lots of funding and status after all. Being unaccountable, these institutions are also incentivized to make the problem worse, to diagnose as large a population as possible with mental illness to maximize their power, but that is a bit besides the point.

It is also arrogant and counterproductive to assume that when the brain is actually physically broken, we can fix it. The culture of mental health medication basically boils down to “there’s nothing actually wrong with you, except your life sucks, so take these drugs and dope yourself up so you don’t feel bad about it”. Naturally, when people who weren’t very crazy to begin with go off these drugs, they go into withdrawal similar to heroin withdrawal, and start doing some really crazy shit. “See? We told you you needed those meds”. The solution for true insanity is still the same as it has always been, which is to cloister the mad in an asylum if low-functioning, and if high-functioning, deal with the eccentricities.

Basically, the vast majority of mental illness is the result of the frustration of the human telos in all of the bizarre cultish practices of liberal modernity. I’ve had some people tell me that I shouldn’t want a 22-year-old virgin, that if she’s still unpoped at that age there’s something seriously wrong with her. Yeah, kind of. But most mental illness in women is also the result of a failure of telos. Most young women these days claim to be suffering from depression, anxiety, dissociation, and sure, they probably are. When they’re alone, probably going nuts. Girls living alone, or feral, do some really messed up stuff that kind of reminds me of a monkey in a cage eating its own vomit. Her telos is to have a man and a few kids already. That’s what her brain is designed around. I don’t pay much heed anymore to a woman claiming to be mentally ill, because when I’m around, when we’re in a relationship, all those pathologies vanish like the morning mist, not a sign of depression or anxiety or whatever. When female friends of mine tell me that they’re pervasively depressed, I have started to tell them something like: “Well, your brain evolved around the fact of nature that you’d have a husband and a few kids by now. You can fight nature if you want, but your brain needs that very specific kind of love to work right.” Not, I think, that it’ll do them much good. They probably need to hear it from other women.

Anyway, this is a Joker review. Joker wasn’t actually all that crazy, aside from the pathological laughter and a delusion or two. He acted in a fairly reasonable though atavistic way, honor-killing people who mocked or mistreated him. Without the clown-themes and the bits of actual insanity, you’d have a movie about some nerd with a shitty life who finally snaps and takes revenge. Maybe he’d dress up as a barbarian instead of a clown.

## **Test of Your Game: Answer Key**

October 24th, 2019

1. D/C
2. B
3. D
4. A
5. C
6. A
7. D

Yeah, this took a long time. My bad. Now I can start replying to commenters on the first post. Didn't want to spoil the answers.

1:C/D

D is what I would do today, though I would have done it much earlier, but you get credit for C as well. A and B are both weak moves. Having you come over when she's alone is as close as it gets to her jumping your bones; the rest is up to you. A complete lack of flirting will happen when sex is very far away, but also when it is very, very close. Most men have to screw up their courage to kiss a girl, even I did for a long time, but that should never come across. If you are alone with a girl and feel like kissing her, just do it as soon as you get the urge. I was more inexperienced, my choice was C and it worked for me. I put my arm around her waist and pulled her in, she said "Wait, you want to hook up with me?" or something like that. I said "Yeah" and let the silence hang. No shrinking away, no backpedaling. A moment later, a flustered "Okay" and it was on.

2:B

This is one of those questions where every answer could be reasonable from a PUA perspective. If it was a girl you just met, C would be the best move, and for a girl you were already sleeping with, I'd probably go with A. But if you're onto the stage of building a connection, C and A would both be steps backwards. I realized that she was insecure about my dominance over other men, because my coworkers were a pretty cool bunch of guys and I spent most of the evening talking to her; she didn't really know where I stood with guys at large. My first instinct was to fight, cause I'm a bit of a testy fellow, especially with a few in me, but I realized that she was actually throwing me a bit of a softball as far as shit tests go. She didn't start flirting with my friends, or enter the orbit of the biggest, meanest guy in the bar, so I could tell she liked me. Slinking back to your table would show a huge lack of balls in her eyes, even though it's most men's natural instinct, and D would be an overreaction, as she's not your woman yet and her talking to a random dude is still socially normal. So I went with B. I can't remember what exactly I said, but I walked up and introduced myself and mugged him with some slightly condescending compliments mixed in with getting him to talk about himself in the most boring manner possible. After a couple of minutes I switched to talking to the girl, and he eventually just walked away. I closed her with my old "Hey, I'm popping out for a smoke, come keep me company".

3:D

This question hinges around her public identity as a lesbian. B and C are both out. You can tell she's horny right now and either option will just give her time to rationalize her otherwise normal attraction away. Gaming a girl who is already wet and willing is counterproductive. Maybe, eventually, it'd work, but why put obstacles in your path? A would be the move on any other girl, as most commenters pointed out, but I figured at the time that a self-professed lesbian wouldn't want to risk being seen kissing a guy in public, and there were a few people around. Probably still would've worked, so you get credit for A too. But the power of flimsy excuses is very strong. Some girls need a little secrecy. So I was like "I'm kinda hungry, wanna grab some food?"

"Yeah, sure"

"Cool, let's stop by my room to drop this gear and we'll head to [24/7 place down the block]"

She could have said “I’ll wait out here”, or “I’ll meet you there”, but she came up with me, and I was kissing her as soon as my door snicked shut, and we went to bed hungry.

4:A

This is the rare case where waiting until another night is the right move. When she found herself alone with me, she immediately rectified that situation by inviting her friend over, but instead of just dipping out she did it in a way that got her more time with me. It’s not C, because in BluePillIOS that girls’ brains run on, emotional problems are not a good pretext for a threesome; it would’ve been a different excuse. B isn’t a bad option, but Girl A was signifying that she liked you by having an excuse to hang around you. Yet I wouldn’t put the moves on strong with her friend right there. Cockblocks with best friends are real and I like my privacy. So I went through the night like normal, enjoying the status of getting to host, and invited Girl A over alone on a different night. She came over, and it all went down without a hitch.

5:C

Cockblocks are real, as I’ve said, and I like to avoid any chance of them. This type of scenario is not a common one, so I didn’t have much experience to fall back on. B is likely to work and similar has worked in the past for me. Girls are quite frank with each other about sex and manage to get laid despite roommate and friend issues with the guys they’re banging; cockblocks are more often the spontaneous blowing-up of jealousy. If you let them talk it out, that’s counterintuitively the way to go. But I wanted to go for the glory, so C it was. Threesomes are a real option. If one of the girls didn’t want to come home with me at the party, neither would have ended up coming. But because they both like me, jealousy cockblocks are a real issue. If everyone is on the same sexual page, there’s nothing to cockblock. I said to girl B: “So you were raised Mennonite right? I heard they’re pretty strict, how did you manage to sneak out and meet boys?”

She laughed. “I really couldn’t lol. But there was one time at this dance...”

And then to girl A: “Hmm, you seem like your parents were pretty liberal. You probably didn’t have to sneak at all”

“Ha, I was such an awkward kid in high school. They probably would’ve been happy if I got to bring a boy home”

And so on. Girl A, being a bit drunk and a bit rude, opened one of my drawers, I don’t really know why, and discovered a, well, certain item that identified me as a bit of a rogue. It was a good moment so I snatched it out of her hand and kissed her, and then pulled her shocked friend up from my armchair to kiss her too...

6:A

I actually had Heartiste (RIP) publish this whole story before this blog existed and I was commenting under a different name. If it sounds familiar, I’m not stealing, that was me. This turned out to be one of those girls at the extreme right tail of female sexuality who exclusively sleep with men who rough ’em up. (Turns out she didn’t get laid very often) Any answer to this that backtracks from physical to verbal is weak. I’m not going to verbally game a girl who just physically disrespected me like that. B is the second best answer if you kiss her right after throwing your drink on her. But I was struck by a sublime moment of clarity. “Normal game”

already didn't work on her; she was disappointed that I wasn't 100% brutal warlord. It makes sense, she was from the Balkans, born not too long after the war. So I slapped her right across the cheek, not even expecting to get laid, just intending to keep my balls nice and heavy. I think the key to this was how coldly and calmly I did it. Getting too flustered by a girl's shit=beta. To my friends' great surprise, and not very much to mine, she jumped my bones right there and kissed me in front of everyone. I threw her over my shoulder and carried her off to the nearest bed while my friends went wild, mostly laughing.

7:D

This is actually a very rude test, not normal LMR, so not B. If she wasn't into you at all, you never would've gotten her anywhere secluded, she would've resisted the makeout. So we can exclude E. Every single time I start something with a girl in public, (and many of them are willing to go all the way in public) but she has hangups about public sex in particular, she'll say some variant of "not out here", which in girl language means "please take me inside and lock the door". But she didn't. So not C. If A, the test wouldn't have been so rude. A girl who wants you, but has serious rules against fucking on the first date, is always apologetic about it. Really hot dimepieces only put out for big mean jerks, and I might be only 95% of the way there, so I have to push myself over the edge a little bit. (I liked one commentor's suggestion of growling like a tiger and going right back at it. I think that qualifies as D.) But it's time to be a huge asshole! Best I could muster with half my blood in my hog, absolutely deadpan:

"Mm. Patronizing. I think you need a spanking."

"What? No"

"Sounds like something a girl who needs a spanking would say"

I hiked up her skirt and slapped her ass. She squealed, and dodged away from my second slap, and we ended up doing a little dance with my hand holding her skirt where I tried to spank her and she tried to twist out of the way, giggling and squealing like a little girl. I pulled her down onto the grass and kissed her again. No rudeness this time.

Alright, bonus question. One of these girls was of very good character and ended up being a great long-term girlfriend. Bonus points if you can guess who.

Also, I consider getting even a few of these right a good score. Many of these are ambiguous, multiple options could have worked, and I mostly acted on sheer impulse and rationalized later. Moreover, I try to minimize cockblocks wherever possible, even when other options are likely to work. I have had a girl literally jump my bones, and then thirty seconds later, her friend appeared out of nowhere, physically pulled the girl off of me, and dragged her off. Sadly, not socially normal to give her a spanking in the middle of a party.

## **The Best Reason to Suppress the Gay**

November 11th, 2019

Jim has a [good post](#) with dozens of reasons to suppress the gay. None of them on their own are wholly convincing. We know that suppressing the gay is Chesterton's fence; it is done for a good reason. We might not know the reason, but we know that every healthy society suppresses the gay and that sick and dying cultures tolerate and even liberate it.

I think I found the answer, out of the mouth of the gay itself. Read this Twitter [thread](#). It is necessary for understanding this post. What this thing (claiming to be a female lesbian but possibly a straight male freak in lipstick) is describing with such revulsion is healthy human sexuality. A “goddess” adoring a rough man with an implied penchant for violence. It feels a truly visceral demonic hatred for this natural arrangement and expresses its desire to undermine it. The jealousy is obviously partly sexual, partly driven by a hatred of normality that the thing will never be able to partake in, but it is something I cannot really put into words; you have to experience this seething hatred for yourself. It’s like being bathed in radiation.

Gays hate normal sexuality and seek to undermine it. This is not a society-wide occurrence as has been interpreted. If so, gays, like market-dominant minorities, could be allowed to do their thing in their gay ghettos. Excluded from the halls of cultural power and influence but not actively persecuted. This is not just a society-wide phenomenon, it is a personal one. Your girl’s gay friends will attempt to poison and undermine your relations with her. *Here is a snake! You cannot safely take it with you or leave it behind. To slay it would be just...*

Generally, gays are unsuccessful at poisoning straight relationships. That is my experience. But I am an outlier. I cannot give advice on how to make a girl stick around because it comes so naturally to me that I am incapable of verbalizing it. In hindsight, every gay friend of my women hated my guts and tried to undermine me, and it did not make a difference. For the average man, though? I am not so sure it is always unsuccessful. And I am unwilling to be magnanimous. Just as the white knight commits a violence-worthy aggression against you when he tries to “protect” your girl from you, so too does the homo commit a despicable act of violence against you when it tries to undermine your relationship.

It did not seem like a big deal at the time, but in hindsight it is a very big deal and I do not want to brush it off with “probably won’t work anyway”. I cannot punish such an aggression, because we are not more alpha than the FBI, but under patriarchy, can and absolutely should. Imagine a Bronze Age pastoralist. He ducks under the flap of his tent after a “business trip”, tunic stained with dried blood, built like a shit brickhouse without an ounce of body fat.

“Honey, I’m home. Good strong slaves this raid. Our lands will prosper.”

“Uh, hi husband, Queeriel was just telling me how I could totally do better, and like, find a husband who didn’t treat me like breeding stock. He said we were, like, toxic.”

“Oh yeah?” he snarls through his uncombed sternum-length beard. “We’ll see about that.”

He walks out of his tent, over to Queeriel’s “group-fertility-maximizing gay shaman” hut and buries a bronze ax to the hilt in the twink’s eye socket.

This scenario, played out thousands of times across culture, is part of the foundations of civilization. When you have tribal sexual chaos, the “free sexual market”, gay aggression seems small or nonexistent. It is lost in the shuffle of hypergamy and constant mate competition. When trying to establish sexual order, trying to build and maintain patriarchy, gay aggression against you and your woman is nakedly obvious and obscene. As soon as the thing I linked brought it up, instantly recognized this pattern in my own history. I did not care in the past, because I was not looking to secure a wife and kids, but any attempt to destroy the time, energy, and resources I put into starting a family and ensuring my paternity, no matter how ineffectual it proves to be, is worthy of blood retribution. The gossip, the slander, and the backbiter are absolutely despised through Scripture for this reason.

Do we really need to punish the gay gossip who tries to pull your girl away with a tall building?



## Chronicle of King Donald I

November 26th, 2019

It is easier to think about Trump and his presidency through the lens of ancient politics rather than filter it through the illusion of modern democratic politics. Hence this post.

If one has the haze and illusion of democratic politics clouding his vision, it looks like Trump is not getting much done. Almost counterintuitively, it is the democratic understanding of the US federal government to say that the President has power. He was elected to wield certain powers, endowed with them by the people. One who works from this frame assumes presidential power when he says that Trump is not getting much done. If the President had the actual powers he has on paper? Then Trump is not an effectual president.

But democracy does not exist. It is easier to consider American politics through a medieval or ancient lens. The presidency is a vestigial and ceremonial monarchy. The Parliament our Congress also has theoretical powers. In actuality, we are ruled by our priesthood. This priesthood has thoroughly infiltrated both the Parliament and the "Presidency". The kitararchy is not infiltrated but a legitimate and actual branch of the priesthood. It is the representative of the Church.

Trump inherited a presidency that was tiny and weak. A mere ceremonial monarch. The "executive branch", however, has become a purely priestly apparatus. The President appears to be exercising power when he is in harmony with the priesthood. Obama was not an exceptionally powerful president who bent the executive branch to his will. Rather, he was an avatar of those who already worked for the Executive.

Being ruled by the priestly class doesn't sound so bad. At least until you realize that our priesthood, simply as I can put it, worships Satan. And Trump is fighting against it and trying to diminish its power. His task is about as difficult as the Queen of England trying to exercise political power. From that perspective, he's doing a great job. If we imagine Trump as a ceremonial monarch trying to become an actual monarch, his actions make a lot more sense.

Let us envision the Kingdom of America as it exists today. We have a rotating King, who is mostly chief diplomat and war-leader. He also has the bully pulpit and oversees matters of domestic security. Around the King has grown up a bureaucratic apparatus typical of the absolutist state. It is staffed by members of the priesthood, and every command given by the King, save those directly to the military, are filtered through several levels of priest before they are put into action. This is especially true of the diplomatic and domestic security apparati. But take a look. What's that? Even the King's speechwriters have degrees from seminary school. And a requirement of promotion in the military is to have an advanced degree from seminary

school. Curious. Before a guy in a helmet fires a gun, the King's order passes through several ranks of priests. We'll get back to this.

We have a bicameral Parliament that writes legislation for the King to approve or reject. Supposedly, the Parliament most directly represents the "People". The people always elect priests though. Isn't that funny? Every member of the Parliament just so happened to go to seminary school. And everyone in Parliament tends to take the advice of bodies of actually-ordained priests that we call NGOs. In the spirit of priestly charity and poverty, they are usually nonprofit organizations.

Finally, we have High Courts that serve, officially, as the Church's direct representatives in government. Technically, the King gets to hire new priests when one dies or resigns, with the approval of Parliament. It causes a great deal of unrest when a priest thus chosen is either excessively holy or openly heretical, choosing instead to follow the Old Religion that still believes in Christ. Mostly, secretly radical priests tend to be appointed, as the Court openly values neutrality. Priests suspected of heresy need to have publicly impeccable records to make it through. Priests who are obviously holy and dogmatic [need not even be literate](#). The priesthood is generally holy and dogmatic, and shrieks like banshees over the fact that the High Court may be less holy than the priesthood at large.

\*\*\*\*\*

So onto this field, a new ceremonial monarch steps, one who has promised to curtail the worst excesses of the priesthood. He has even committed open heresy! The priesthood is united in their opposition to him, almost categorically. Only dissident priests, and merchants who have bought up some priestly power, dare voice their support. His alliance is a patchwork one, but he managed to secure the support of most of the unordained common folk, who still practice the Old Religion half in secret. The wealthiest and most successful merchants, knowing where Power is, support the Church. But many smaller merchants are unhappy with priestly interference in their business, and most warriors, frighteningly enough, are enthusiastic in their support for the crass and headstrong Donald I. It is official dogma, of course, for the Church to consider the provinces of the Empire to be holier than its heartland, and this belief has proven unsurprisingly unpopular among the unenlightened heartlanders.

As soon as Donald I was coronated, a Grand Inquisition was opened against him. For the Church to open an Inquisition against the King is a very rare thing. To actually convict the monarch of treasonous heresy is almost never done. Nonetheless, the Church hopes to use this Inquisition to remove the King's closest allies and prevent him from carrying out his agenda. The King's advisers and favored aristocrats enjoy no such traditional immunity from conviction, and it seems likely they will betray him rather than face the Inquisitor's lash.

King Donald I immediately began to withdraw the Empire's legions from their Holy Jihad in the desert lands, and pledged to only use the great Legions in defense of the Empire. The truculent heretics of the desert had proven themselves resilient in the face of the Empire's superior force, and the costly Jihad had become unpopular in the eyes of all but the holiest priests.

Shortly into the reign of Donald I, a crisis arose in the land of Syria, in which prophets professing the Holy Faith of the American Empire incited a civil war against its legitimate monarch. The Church was unanimous in declaring a righteous Jihad against Syria's King, the scholarly and methodical "Lion of Damascus" Bashar Al-Assad. Al-Assad cannily entered into alliance with the heretical Russian Empire, employing its considerable military might to fight against the rebellion

in his lands. It was clear to all that the rebellion in heretical Syria had been instigated by the Church, though the Church, finding actual American dogma rather rare in Syria, was forced to employ Wahhabi zealots in the rebellion, a fact which when revealed, consternated followers of the Old Religion and the New alike.

Here we see the wisdom of King Donald show itself for the first time. He could not dare, in the face of the Church's enthusiasm for Jihad, portray the Empire as militarily weak, and Wahhabi zealots indeed posed a present threat to the Empire. Thus he entered into secret diplomacy with the Russian Tzar and the Syrian King as he sent a small detachment of Holy Crusaders to Syria. As per this agreement, his Crusaders made a show of force against empty military bases in supposed retaliation for Assad's heresies, while the "ISIS" zealots were, in cooperation with the Tzar, methodically forced out of Syria and eventually eradicated. The outcome satisfied all parties involved, and the people rejoiced when King Donald's crusaders returned home with the ISIS leader's head upon a pike, for it was a moment of pure victory in an Empire that had almost forgotten the meaning of the word. The Church decried the fact that Assad remained on his throne, and lamented the lost opportunity of Jihad against heretical Russia, but had lost its capacity to incite further war.

However, on certain fronts King Donald has not yet managed to wrest power from the Church. He is faced with a critical shortage of competent aristocrats desirous to enact his will, and those he trusts with power have often been revealed as traitors and agents of the Cathedral. He cannot openly acknowledge the dissident priests and heretics, (those who call for the dissolution of the monasteries and removal of favored status for provincials) among his most loyal supporters, nor can he appoint them without the Inquisition falling upon his head. All he does, for the moment, must plausibly be in the name of the Church's doctrines, for many of his supporters are firm believers in its righteousness while reviling what they consider to be recent errors.

Not trusting to priests, he instead relies upon prominent members of the warrior and merchant classes to renegotiate unfavorable trade agreements with the provinces and other Empires, seeking to move the manufacture of goods and production of energy back to the heartlands of the Empire as a reward for his common supporters. In this, he has been successful, for the Empire is now a net exporter of energy, as mining booms and manufacturing trickles back in. He has also employed certain strict measures against provincials seeking employment in the heart of the Empire, both in the sponsored preferential hiring of provincials and in the mass movement of such, technically illegal but long endorsed by the Church, across the Empire's southern border with Aztlan. Though heretical, both policies enjoy wild popular support among the unordained while causing the merchants who support him some discomfort.

Though the Church has forbidden King Donald from erecting his promised border wall, construction has begun nonetheless, under the pretext of "fortifying existing barriers". The work has been slow, as it was only recently revealed that the administrator he appointed to oversee it had in fact been in the pay of the Church. Within just the past week, King Donald appointed the controversial minister Jared Kushner, his son-in-law, to oversee the remaining construction. While Kushner has long been suspected by those loyal to our King to be an agent of the Church, our King shows wisdom in this appointment. One can only imagine the temptation that must exist to betray the King; Kushner, should he do so, would likely be canonized overnight. Yet because the Church's official position holds that the border wall is a heretical offense against sacred provincial dignity, the completion of this task would forever alienate him from the Church's favor. If the suspicions among our King's loyalists are correct, and Kushner sabotages the task for the Church, our King has easy pretext to rid himself of a snake, which he could not

otherwise do. As always, our King sets up confrontations that are, in the common parlance, win-win, or Catch-22's for his enemies.

Our King has also taken action to circumvent priestly control of our legions, foreseeing future military conflict within the Empire. He has sided with the common warrior against the Church's officer class in legal disputes, knowing that should the religious tensions in the Empire come to a head, he will need the direct support of the Legions against the Church. He has also used his capacity for public speech to discredit and embarrass the most prominent members of the Empire's domestic security forces, knowing that the Church has deployed them against him in the Inquisition. On all sides, he appears to be bracing for a great conflict.

And yet he does not display a lack of wisdom in his manner of provoking this conflict. While appearing brash and impulsive, he encourages his enemies to underestimate him. He dangled before the Church the tempting bait of his apparently illegal dealings with the puppet-state of Ukraine, knowing full well that an inquiry into these matters would reveal many crimes the Church committed in establishing and maintaining this province. Before many more years turn, it is likely that he will have sufficient pretext to order arrests of many prominent Church members. Most likely, this will come on the heels of his reelection and the great legitimacy it lends his cause. Reelection is likely, as the Church struggles to find a plausible replacement to promote among the field of senile old men, hedonistic degenerates, and half-insane holy women it has cultivated. Should one walk into a tavern, nigh every man who works with his hands will raise them in a toast to our King, and raise their voices in blasphemy of the Church's most recent and holiest strictures.

The Inquisition has since mounted in fervor against King Donald, and this chronicler fears that the Church, of late becoming holier and holier in its innovation of doctrine, has lost all reason as it calls openly for the mass sacrifice of the unborn, the buggery of young boys, and the forced creation of eunuchs to join the priestly ranks. King Donald is heading towards a confrontation which will see either his victory, or his burning at the stake. Make no mistake, the Inquisition will then turn its zeal against all who supported our King. We may only pray that he realizes the gravity of the situation and acts appropriately.

## **Proles, Carpetbaggers, and Reaction**

December 26th, 2019

The slick cityboy carpetbagger goes to the small town and tells the working men there that he is going to improve their lives, make them better, make them richer, they just have to do this that and the other thing that ends up enriching the carpetbagger and ruining the proles. The slick communist intellectual brings his carpetbag to the small town and tells the farmers that he is there to improve their lot, that he is one of them, that all they have to do is kill the kulak who is oppressing them and the worker's paradise will be actualized. Then the commie official ends up running the farm from Moscow, running it terribly, and millions of people starve to death.

The reactionary speaks to small town workers (through the internet of course, he doesn't actually *go* into a flyover state) and tells him how moral and noble they are, he speaks of his own *noblesse oblige*, how he wants to help them and uplift them and make them better men...

Don't do it guys. Don't fall into the trap. The results will be the same as above. Reaction may have good intentions towards the lower classes. So did Pol Pot. The only thing that can be done for proles is to leave them alone. Just ask them. Prole political expression boils down to "leave me alone". "Don't tread on me" is the single most effective meme libertarianism has ever

produced. But the libertarian is stupid, because the nerd libertarian from the city tells the prole that the cops and the local church are oppressing him, but proles like the cops and like the army and like their church. This does not compute in the libertarian system, and thus libertarians never win elections.

The prole does not think that the cops and the church are treading on him, because they are not treading on him, except to the extent that they have to impose the official religion of Washington, to the extent that the cops have to reluctantly knock on the door with a fat evil State U social worker in tow to investigate a “home environment” complaint made at the kid’s school. Proles like to cheer on their country, and like to put on uniforms and fight for their country. When the government invites in a bunch of Guatemalans who are obviously taking jobs and committing crimes, that is not leaving the proles alone. It is quite the opposite, and the libertarian does not understand that.

If you actually believe that proles are hardy, manly people who can take care of their own, leave them alone, and they will take care of themselves. The prole-elite alliance, the high-low alliance, is very simple. The elite tells the prole quite truthfully that there are people who want to kill him and take his stuff and tell him how he should raise his kids, far away and organized such that a farmer with a gun cannot defend against it, and that the army and the cops will take care of it. Which is why proles like the cops and the army and eagerly participate in them, and why they hate gangs and bureaucracy.

Current underclass degeneracy is the result of attempts to uplift the proles. Underclass men are heroin addicts and underclass women slutty because of EBT cards, because of social workers, because a prole man cannot give his son a whuppin’ for being a little delinquent and can’t keep his daughter locked up when she wants to go to Mike-the-29-year-old-unemployed-drug-dealer’s party without the cops knocking on his door. Prole men smoke weed and play call of duty all night after work because they don’t have wives and can’t imagine that they have good chances of getting them anytime soon. Revealed preference shows that prole fathers will whup their misbehaving sons and lock up their misbehaving daughters, and if you left proles alone to act the way they act when left alone, the underclass degeneracy problem is solved in less than a generation.

Telling coal miners that you are going to teach them to code is carpetbagging, telling them that you’re going to sign a trade deal and a tax law that lets the mine owner make a profit on mining and selling coal, and put everyone back to work, is proper elite-prole relations. Trump gets it, and libertarians don’t. Drug-testing every prole, or distributing narcan, is carpetbagging. Liquidating the cartels is not.

Every good government, everywhere and everywhen, practices good government when it is looking up, when it is absorbed with threats to its security and stability, when it is focused on defeating enemies, and not looking downward in an attempt to meddle in the lives of common folk, no matter its intentions for doing so. It is not a matter of ideology, it is a matter of practical governance. When the nobility genuinely does not give a shit about the peasants, the peasants tend to do pretty well. The problem is when the state falls prey to the priestly systematizing instinct of “let me fix you”, the idea that human welfare can be improved via central planning, which plagued and brought down even otherwise reactionary states.

## **Why I Post Less**

February 19th, 2020

This blog (I hate the word) is named what it is for a reason. I began it to take a whack at all those who try to reason out of our problems from a modernist frame. "Setting the Record Straight"

I have been posting less not because I have run out of things to say, but because I am starting to believe in the futility of words. "Right Wing" leaves a sour taste on my tongue. So does "reactionary", "NRX" and so on. The "right wing" is *de nome* cuckservative; not only does it inherently presuppose the existence of a "left" against which it struggles, the word itself conjures up images of the French parliament, of a political arena in which order and chaos both are given a "fair hearing", includes *politics* in its very name. I do not believe in *politics*. The less politics a person, nation, or class engages in, the better.

"Reactionary" is a similar word, though more accurate. We really are just "reacting" to what those who have power are doing. This is inherently a submissive position. A "reactionary" king is an impossibility; he may "react" to his enemies, but the moment they are crushed and peace achieved, there is no more "reaction". I do not feel like "reacting" anymore. I intend to *do* something.

No, this is not fedposting. I am simply growing bored with *theory*, with writing and debating and convincing. If I've actually unshackled, actualized an atavistic mindset that goes soul-deep, not going to sit around and fucking blog very much. Philosophy is gay. That being said, I'm going to complete a system of teleology at some point. I'm priest class deep down, because it bugs me that no one's done it yet. Well-reasoned, academic, no hint of my cavalier vulgarity, etc. Probably under a pseudo; I have a reputation to uphold. The end conclusion is common sense. Teleology is common sense. The nerd needs his five dollar words as a balm for the fact that he should agree with the jock. (We've debated the utility of the words nerd and jock. A nerd is a man who relies on his intellect for status. That is a useful category.)

Technology will not save us. The futurist who confidently predicts artificial intelligence, transhumanism, and the singularity is even more a LARPer than the luddite survivalist and primitivist. I drunkposted something to this effect on Twitter. Collapse and dark age happen routinely, but Man has never built anything more complex than his own brain. If this is a categorical impossibility, the technogeek's fantasy and entire worldview collapses. Mine applies not only to the tribesman in his yurt, but the citizen in the agora, the warlord in his motte, the president on his podium, and even to the captain of a space colony extracting raw materials from the asteroid belt.

Roosh has [swallowed the blue pill](#). I left some absurdly inflammatory comments on his site under a pseudo and was promptly b&. The synthesis between the divine and the red pill is not "Game doesn't work on good girls". You have guys like yours truly to set you straight. I can talk about the WQ with hard blue collar men. I can't with anyone who's been to college. Every functional marriage is quietly and secretly medieval. Deep roots are not reached by the frost.

Jordan Peterson has gone off his fucking rocker, publicly this time, though we with eyes saw it coming. You want self-help advice? Unprogram modernity from your brain. That's what we're all about here. Unsupervised women are feral animals that need taming. Cute and dangerous. I hope you're up to the task of breaking a horse or training a dog. Other men are your friends, your subordinates, or your bosses. If not, they're enemies. You live under the yoke of an insane cult that wants you dead and your sons raped in the ass. If you're here reading me you probably spend too much time thinking. Stop doing that shit. Don't clean your damn room more than you have to, or any woman's work really. Be as much of a barbarian as you can get away with. Get

her pregnant. Don't be a slave to leisure, but do manly shit that makes you feel alive. Become worthy.

Become Worthy. What does that mean? Well. Do you feel worthy? Worthy for what, exactly? There it is. "For what?" There is no solid answer for you, but the path to that What is paved with blood and glory.

Moldbug's latest writings make his limitations clear. A diagnostician rather than a doctor. He represents the end of history, the right-wing counterpart of Fukuyama, an eternal stasis akin to post-Confucian China in which the ebb and flow of culture and power carry as much significance as the wars of chimpanzees under the canopy of some hellish forest in the black armpit of the world. Perhaps that is true of all human history, and I am romantically and irrationally ascribing to things a meaning that does not exist. But history is not made by men who dismiss this meaning. In fact history is lost by those who feel that way. The degeneracy of late Rome, like China with its mandarins, was an antifragile system that weathered all internal attempts at change. Until rough men who were filled with a child's joy at the daily rising of the sun put the brittle "systems" of intellect and philosophy to the sword.

Born too late to participate in the unselfcritical building of the West, born too early (probably) to brain its shambling corpse. Does this sound like a blackpill? Nonsense. God does not play dice with the universe. The laws of nature are a constant. Spit in GNON's eye and the fate of Gomorrah will look gentle. The status quo will not continue. "Reaction's" proposed methods of political change are about as realistic as attempting to reform the Roman Senate from within in an age when Caesar stands on the banks of the Rubicon. We will get Caesar if we are lucky. Are you Caesar? I'm sure not. Become worthy, to be of use to him. Yet my betting money is on collapse. Rome defied GNON gently and subtly compared to today. For the first time, a generation is now being born directly into the sewer, [into a world where mere reality is as fleeting a dream](#) as God was to Eliot in his Waste Land. Soon this generation, explicated in its entirety by the above anecdote, will come into power... and your children will be among them as wolves among sheep.

Yes, my reader, you're a LARPer, a phag, a nerd, [a spiritual slave retreating from the world into a half-imagined nostalgia for a never-was](#), a giant walking cope over the fact that you couldn't hack it in this world as a billionaire, an artist, a playboy, a master. And yet a curious thing happens in nature. A pig, escaped from captivity... well, its children's teeth will start to grow. Its fat bare skin, bred over centuries into a walking bacon factory, will grow bristle, hard and black. A feral pig's grandchildren... are *boars*. Pig, the sun will rise one day and gleam off your grandchildren's *tusks*, ready to gore.

## The Absolute State of Healthcare

April 4th, 2020

Where do I even start with this one? How about this: 75% of medical costs in the US are spent on people in their last year of life. And I don't have to tell you, but that's an astronomical sum of money. Now, it's your damn money, and your business if you want to spend it on buying grandma another three months of undignified misery hooked up to a tube and shitting the bed. I'm not about to make the argument for socialist death panels here, I just want you to rethink the frame of modern medicine a bit.

What's undeniable is that the costs have ballooned exponentially, probably by several orders of magnitude, and the benefits... well, they haven't caught up, nowhere close. There are a lot of

diseases that we don't die from anymore, true. But that's all antibiotics and vaccines, which are cheap, and the result of some genius inventing them once. Easy to manufacture after that, and I don't think I want to give the credit for one guy's discovery to the entire profession of doctors. We'll get back to it. Good medicine and good healthcare are two different things, and you shouldn't conflate them.

I'm really talking about acute malfunctions of the human body and how to deal with them. Cancer, heart disease, strokes, general organ failure, and the chronic illnesses that lead up to them. To speak of "curing" heart disease, the biggest "killer" by far, is absolutely ridiculous, and there's no evidence that we've gotten any better at it. Similarly with cancer. Cancer is not "curable"; it is rather evidence that it is already too late. Cancer is an immune system problem. Your cells malfunction all the time, every day, and your immune system wipes them out when they do. When your immune system falls asleep on the job is when you get cancer, barring cases like exposure to extreme mutagenic factors like high doses of gamma radiation that just overwhelm your immune response.

Guess what. When you get old, your immune system gets naturally weaker, just like your organs get worn out and fail to regenerate, just like your DNA degrades once your telomeres are all used up. Eventually there is no substantial difference between a true "death of old age" and a death from some secondary cause that only got you because you were old and weak. Healthcare, for the first time in history, has gotten just good enough to buy you a little more time when you're basically a walking corpse. And this has made people *go fucking nuts*. In the old days, there wasn't really anything we could do. Death would swoop down and enfold you in her gentle wings and that was it. People die. It's sad. Getting bled and leeches and buying powdered tiger dick was kind of a last resort. Medicine didn't promise or deliver very much when someone was in bad shape. That hasn't really changed, but we can save a few more people, and more importantly, we believe that we can save more people even when it's not actually true. We can buy them a few more months with surgery and IV drips and respirators, but it's not a good few months, and that's generally all we're doing.

It's totally possible that medicine doesn't save substantially more lives today than it did a hundred years ago, excepting the vaccines and antibiotics I mentioned. A lot more people see doctors now, and for much less cause than they used to, and they go to the hospital more often now too. So the total proportion of people dying in the hospital versus those making it out is lower. And again, we're pretty good at saving people who get stabbed and mangled in accidents and stuff like that. Surgeons can stitch you back up and let your body's healing capacity do its job, and give you a healthy dose of antibiotics and disinfectants to stop local infections. And that's mostly antibiotics. Even in ancient times they knew where all the parts were supposed to go and had needles and thread. Hell, the Romans were even performing abortions, which were just as grisly back then as they are today. Sharp metal implements, meet cervix. Same shit, different millennium.

Obviously, there is great quality care out there. The Rothschilds all live to 95 and go through new organs like pairs of shoes. The ability to "democratize" that level of care is... questionable at best. The deciding factor in the extremely rich getting multiple major organ transplants and surviving is probably not technology; their doctors don't have secret space magic. Better, yeah, but it's not an order of magnitude better to the point it lets you go through five hearts harvested from the kids of Chinese dissidents. Rather, it's the quality of the doctors themselves. If you have a swimming pool full of cash, you can afford to hire one of a handful, and I mean a literal handful, of inspired supergenius doctors who can buy you quite a lot of time when death is

otherwise certain. You're not getting the care Ginsburg gets because human talent is not something that can be distributed.

Similarly, much of the failure of our healthcare system is the result of human talent. Or rather, the lack of it. This is an inherent feature that cannot be overcome; there are millions of people who could be saved by a prodigal genius, but there are very few prodigal genius doctors and a lot of midwits. The average doctor operates on a simple if/then algorithm; his schooling is the rote memorization of facts and procedures. The process is fundamentally no different than that of an auto mechanic's job, except a doctor needs a higher IQ to remember all that stuff, because the human body is a lot more complex than a car. Because of that, I don't really mind the fact that they get paid more and have higher status. What I do mind is the doctor's holiness, the fact that they have obtained an outsized priestlike status when in fact their role is at the top of the artisan caste alongside engineers and architects.

Most people who were going to get better given basic or no care get better and most people who were going to die, die. Barring the development of certain drugs, which were invented by supergeniuses and easily manufactured via procedure, I don't think medical care in general has gotten a whole lot better. The last time I was actually bedridden with an illness was six years ago. I knew exactly what was wrong with me, because I'd gotten it before but not as bad. I needed antibiotics, because bacterial infection, and I was feeling close enough to death that I wanted their help rather than just fight it off myself. But I had to go see a doctor and get tested, and have him tell me that I needed antibiotics, rather than just walk into a store and buy some. I knew what specific illness I had, and the doctor was skeptical, because he'd never seen a case that bad, but I asked for a certain test and he gave to me, and sure enough I was right. That only worked because it was a private clinic run by some crazy Chinese dude who didn't care all that much, and just gave me the test I asked for. I've heard others have it much worse: "no, I don't think your symptoms match even though you catch this every couple of years so I'm not going to test you for this, instead I'm going to run a bunch of other tests and prescribe you something totally useless". Yes, the doctor can even fuck up the routine administration of routine drugs. Unlike the local kids on the block, I wouldn't trust one to feed my pet while I'm away. I'm also glad I didn't walk into a hospital, because then they would have wasted even more of my time and money. Even in this case, where a good and useful medicine exists, the doctor has to impose himself unnecessarily in the process. People say we have a shortage of doctors, but we actually have an overabundance of doctors, making so much work for themselves that it appears there is a shortage.

When every headache and sore throat and bee sting needs to be looked at by a doctor, there are never going to be enough doctors. The medical establishment has become a religion unto itself, based on nothing more than the fact that sometimes they can extend the life of the ill and slated-for-death by another few months. It looks like death rates have gone down, but only because more people are being treated than ever, and because the definition of "natural causes" is totally bullshit. An old person dying from infectious disease *is a natural cause*. Old people die. The vast majority of the time, our medical establishment doesn't even buy them another year.

Ultimately, the cost of medical care is unnaturally high because the *demand is unnaturally high*. Insurance implies risk. You get flood insurance, car insurance, life insurance, what have you, to protect yourself against black swan events. Insurance simply does not work if the risk is 100%. It's just not insurance anymore, and I don't think we have a word for what it becomes. With "health insurance", the risk is 100%. Everyone gets sick. Using health insurance to cover visits to the doctor and the rubber-stamping of common but overly-regulated medicines is like using

flood insurance to buy a new rug whenever you spill a cup of coffee. It fucks with the market. The price of flood insurance would go through the roof, and people who install carpets would jack up their prices because hey, the insurance company is paying for it. It's simply not a market anymore. And then people start lobbying the government to do away with flood insurance sellers and nationalize carpetmakers because nobody can afford a new carpet on their own dime anymore. Sounds fucking absurd, because it is, but that's the situation we're in. Of course you have an absurd copay and simple medicines cost a ridiculous amount of money, because you don't really have "insurance". It's just something pretending to be insurance, a semi-socialist cost-sharing program where the healthy keep the sick afloat by buying insurance and not using it.

So why is the demand unnaturally high? One factor is regulatory capture, which is why medical tourism (and its reverse) exists. I went over this one already, but it's the reason I semi-legally import my contact lenses from a foreign country rather than pay an eye doctor to tell me the same thing every year. Doctors have made a lot of unnecessary work for themselves, and have basically written it into law that you have to go through a doctor to get any kind of care or medicine. There is no reason why both the test and the drug shouldn't be available over-the-counter. This would make them affordable as well. Slashing both the duties of doctors and the number of them would make their role more clear. A good diagnostician is an intuitive, much like a detective, and good surgeons... Well look at Ben Carson. The dude is barely verbal, barely literate. Good doctors aren't supergenius "experts" of superb IQ, good doctors are wise and canny. Guess what, med school doesn't test for intuitive abilities. Big shock.

The second thing is the outsized holiness of doctors, the "medical faith" that inspires mass hypochondria. Got an ache? Better see a doctor. The lower-middle to upper-middle classes are, from my personal experience, caught up in hospital-worship. They spend middle age constantly on the move from chiropractors to dentists to ophthalmologists to oncologists to whatever the fuck urinary specialists are called and so on. Medical care is expensive, so this is a status-signalling thing, but the fact that medicine is a little better at buying time for the walking dead than it used to be has inspired a sincere and blind faith in the abilities of doctors, something I've witnessed firsthand. I can judge with great accuracy when someone is healthy and when someone is about to die, but people who still have faith in the medical establishment cannot.

One thing we can say now, that we haven't been able to in the past, is that we understand the causes of illness a lot better. It's not just Apollo going out for his target practice anymore, but neither need we put excessive faith in the superior holiness and righteousness of doctors. I knew a young man who had massive chronic joint, tendon, and bone problems. The doctors were mystified, prescribing him various immuno-suppressants, anti-inflammatory drugs, proposing surgeries, etc. There was an obvious problem, that he was 75lbs overweight, but they mysteriously failed to notice, and he mysteriously failed to realize why he had these lifelong chronic conditions. I told him "you can't climb this hill because you're fucking fat dude, lose some weight", and eventually he started exercising, lost something like 40% of his bodyweight, and his inexplicable chronic health issues completely and totally disappeared for reasons that his doctors conspicuously failed to explain.

It turns out that I know better than doctors why people get sick and how to fix it, and from a very basic and intuitive understanding of the human body. Why does grandma have a blockage in her intestines? Fuck if the doctors can explain it, but, uh, have you ever seen her drink a glass of water, uncle? No? Well, shit. It was too late for grandma, by the way, but she lived a good long life. Anyway, the average person is basically too stupid and low-agency to understand why their bodies malfunction. Used to be Apollo telling Artemis "bet ya you can't hit his heart from

here”, now it’s “put your faith in doctors, if you break we’ll fix you”. Even though the hospital is basically a death sentence and I’ve never seen a surgery that wasn’t botched. There’s something sacral in the human mind about health and sickness. The Old Testament doesn’t even distinguish between physical, ritual, and moral cleanliness. They were all one and the same. Health is always a priestly concern, and when God died in the West, the “scientific” medical establishment grabbed up its priestly powers. When science got priestly power, it stopped doing science, and when medicine got priestly power, started promulgating gross errors like prescribing immuno-suppressants for someone who was simply too fat, or saying “quarantines don’t work”.

The priestly elite always decides what is high status. The story used to be “God wills it”, or miasma, or humors, all sorts of bullshit, and now it is fake medical science. Since we understand the causes of illness better than how to cure them via technology, we will need to make being healthy and fit high status, make preventing illness more high-status than attempting to fix it. The good thing, though, is that the fact we know better than doctors about preventing illness lets us aggressively define a culture of personal responsibility for health. Discrediting the medical establishment is not even coup-complete; it happens in real life every time my broscience outcompetes “doctor science”. Having to go to the doctor should be shamed as low-status. You have diabetes because you’re fucking fat. You get sick too often because you’re immunodeficient, because you stay indoors all the time. Your diet is shit because 80% carbs and no animal fats. You don’t get enough sun, dumbass. Your joints ache because you never use them. Your posture sucks because you live hunched over a desk. You have a million allergies because you spent your childhood in front of a TV instead of playing in a yard.

Again, we have a story that materially outcompetes, provides objectively better outcomes, than the official story. And it’s not even open heresy (yet) to spread it, though it is open heresy to mock the fat, the sick, and the weak. You don’t even need fascist-bodybuilder gym class either, or banning sugary foods, or any of that commie nonsense. There is a very simple frame that will come out of our public mouths: “The best cure is prevention, and prevention is not that hard. If you live your life wrong, science trying to fix you will not work that well, will be hellishly painful and inconvenient, you’ll die young anyway, and people will laugh at you”. In the meantime, being healthy and fit is always and naturally high-status, our ideas will make you more healthy and fit than the Cathedral’s ideas, and people can notice that for themselves, even when they refuse to notice something like black misbehavior. People noticing that we are right about nutrition, health, and fitness lends more power to our ideas than our ideas themselves; on their own, our ideas are mere heresies that may or may not be true, but are definitely low-status.

When I give people diet advice, someone else will always pipe up with “but muh low fat”, or some similar nonsense, and I always say “are you going to take advice from someone who looks like me, or someone who looks like him?” and it always shuts them up.

## **No Cops**

April 18th, 2020

Last time the doctors. Now the cops. File this under “Agreeing with leftists for the wrong reasons”. The cops are not a good institution with a few bad apples among them, as any normie, left or right, will tell you. The modern police force is in fact a completely illegitimate institution. Not because they oppress you or shoot blacks or anything gay like that. Rather, the police, on the whole, have usurped or been assigned a certain duty that used to be expected of the adult male patriarch.

But I'm not going to tell you just yet. History time. The pigs are pretty new. They've only been around since the 1800's. (the organized guards of huge ancient cities were more or less permanent military occupation expecting spontaneous riots i.e. military resistance) So how did we deal with crime without the cops? Well, what's a crime? And what's law for? The purpose of law is to separate an ingroup and an outgroup; men who cooperate with the group (which on a large scale is civilization) from men who defect. In ancient times, before codified law, communities were small and defection was treated on a "we know it when we see it" basis. Such was the swift justice of a tribal patriarch. "Ruler" simultaneously signifies leader, measurer, and decider. Codified law in of itself was not a bad thing. Having the rules be clear and well-defined is good for cooperation.

The problem is what happens between the crime and the judge. Judges have been around a lot longer than cops. Today, judges sit in court and hear cases all day long, five days a week, fifty days a year. At least if you live in or near a city. I was summoned to court in a tiny town once. Like, way the fuck out there. (I got off scot-free of course) What was interesting was that court met once per month, for two hours, in the local post office. That's how it used to be; in Anglo-Saxon England, judges met once per month, if not only four times per year. There was just not a lot of crime... that needed the attention of a judge at least.

Well, what happened between the crime and the judge? Like I said, law codifies defection against the ingroup. It's up to the ingroup to handle the defector. The ingroup basically means every man in good standing with the community, and handle means anything from a stern talk, up to lethal violence. When dealing with organized crime, one local official rounds up the boys, all rough armed men, to deliver justice; as it was in the American West, so it was in feudal Europe. "More than thirty thieves is an army". Large scale defection is a military matter, small scale defection is to be handled by the small-scale community.

This is more or less what is meant by "common law". The tendencies of a community in the way it handles troublemakers are recorded, tradition and history acquire a legal weight. A ghost of this remains in "judicial precedent". Do you see what the cops have taken from you yet? Do you tense up a bit when you see a cop, even if you haven't committed a crime? There is no ingroup and outgroup anymore. Have you ever jaywalked? Driven over the speed limit? No matter who you are, where you are, what you are doing, there is going to be some petty crime on the books that the cops can throw at you. Everybody is a criminal, and nobody is. We cannot define what constitutes defection against the ingroup anymore because there is no ingroup. The telos of law has been completely inverted.

That's not even the main thing. The power that the police have usurped is *the fundamental duty and responsibility of the patriarch*. That is, the use of violence to defend the family and enforce male cooperation. If a man banging his wife every night and having eight kids he knows are his is cornerstone #1 of civilization, *this is #2*. Look at how popular The Punisher is with manly blue collar dudes. Vigilantism, constrained by tradition and community precedent, is the natural and fundamental state of justice in a healthy civilization. Okay, you don't get to vote. But the inkeep who waters down his beer? The town drunk who stumbles around at noon and rants at your kids? Yeah, you can fuck 'em up. Which would you rather have?

Getting the boys together to rough up some shithead encourages and cultivates manliness in the upstanding citizen, and *confirms your status in your wife and kids' eyes*. Ordering men to do violence against someone else is very alpha, having bodyguards and private security is alpha, but when the cops show up they do what procedure tells them to do, up to and including shooting your dog. It is absurdly emasculating to call the cops if someone is prowling around

your lawn, absurdly emasculating to call the cops over the neighbor throwing a loud party, and it makes you seem like a bitch in front of your wife.

This is what things like “neighborhood watch” are about; a tough-guy LARP for the sake of their wives. I understand it, but it is a pale shadow of the real thing. Again, I cannot overstate my point; the existence of the police has destroyed the lowest level of male cooperation-in-violence that is absolutely fundamental to a healthy society and public morals. We live in a society in which a woman can make a phone call and summon coordinated military violence against an upstanding man with a good reputation, even her own husband, by saying a few magic words. That’s what priestess power looks like, dudes. That’s the fat bitch of Catalhoyuk at work.

The cops, by the way, are generally full of well-intentioned men, who joined in order to take back a little bit of this power that was stolen by the selfsame institution. Selfish, but I get it.

Again I detect behind this the centralized gnostic “ism”, the eternal bureaucrat, eunuch rule of a bloated civil service parasitically sapping all vitality from a land. It is in fact the mafia which arose in response to the Anglo police system. Wealth is always easier to obtain legally than through crime; organized crime is about warrior status, and through status, pussy and genetic immortality. Legitimate associations of men performing ancient and necessary functions of community maintenance found themselves outlaws in the cursed land they traveled to, their masculinity and purpose revoked by the blue-pajama’d civil servant. Their role as “mafia” was at home above-board, the lowest subsidiary unit in a warrior society; then the only niche it could occupy was involvement in illegal activities to retain its cohesion without emasculation.

Abolish the cops. Contrary to leftist pussies, “community policing” would result in a glorious and righteous brutality that the police have been unwilling and unable to enforce. Ask the average blue collar gun owner what he’d like to do to heroin pushers. This goes double for hood niggas. Black “community policing” would cause a level of violence that would make the Rwanda genocide look like a bum fight, because your average bn *isn’t defecting against anything by committing murder*. He’s making what is ultimately a genetically rational decision that will result in his becoming a baby daddy to ten kids. The effect of the Anglo police system is actually to inhibit the birth of an actually black male cooperative order proper to their race (which would look really brutal to us, but who cares) by overlooking spontaneous violence while cracking down on collective violence. The birth pangs of this would be both absurdly eugenic and really fun to watch from a safe distance.

Who would win, if we let decent normal men shoot it out on the streets with criminals? Whoever organizes better. That’s the test of whether you still have a society or not. Or whether you can make one from scratch. Thus spoke GNON: *Vae Victis*

(P.S. If you want to meme this kind of sentiment, abrade the cops for not brutalizing more evil people, make clear a triumphal vitalist desire to be let loose on criminals, and shame people who rely on the cops as unmanly cowards. My point is too easily misinterpretable as leftist drivel)

## Final Notes on the WQ

May 3rd, 2020

I’ve posted most of these insights in other comment sections, on twitter, or in DMs and personal correspondence, but I’m back to put a few necessary thoughts where they belong lest they be lost or go unseen.

First, I'm somewhat disheartened by the rage and bitterness that seems all too common among the red-pilled. I shouldn't have to tell you not to hate women. Getting angry at the behavior of girls demonstrates an insufficient dose of the red pill, shows that you are holding them or want to hold them to the same standards as men. One law for the lion and the lamb alike is tyranny. Women are more like kids than anything else, and getting angry at the silly and cute antics of kids is absurdly low-status. Kids can behave destructively, a danger to themselves or others, but discipline in this case is the duty of the adult responsible for them.

Yes, women are most like kids, and that's nothing against kids. Kids can even be quite smart and accomplished, take chess prodigies for example, or those famous composers writing symphonies before they turned 10. A very smart kid is still a kid. The IQ is irrelevant. The relation to reality is the most important. Women, like kids, don't live in quite the same reality as men but in a bubble of fantasy and pretense. Understanding women is like understanding kids; kids respond to fairly simple reward and discipline. Getting kids to do what you want is not that hard, even if you never quite figure out exactly what their fantasy world is made out of.

Think about how you interact with kids. I hope you're not dumb enough to take their silly pretenses and their fantasy world seriously. I also hope you're not dumb enough to autistically try to shut it down with cold logic. Interacting with kids is fun because you lightheartedly pretend to take their world seriously, and this same spirit carries over to interacting with women, who are great fun to have around.

I have seen "tradwife", totally submissive to her husband, does nothing but cook food and pump out babies, thrown around as a strawman by bitter and vengeful women. And yes, it is a strawman. It does not exist. Women are always testing your power, your fitness. And, a woman who is well-owned by a strong man is not meek and submissive. Rather, she blossoms like a flower, becoming outgoing, radiant, bubbly, internally serene and outwardly energetic. For older women with kids, generous, loving, and matronly. It is easy to believe that all women are wonderful and precious when every woman you meet is under the hand of a strong man. In ye olden times, it was men like Shakespeare, seeing the best and worst of women, who dealt with plenty of wenches and feral harlots, who dropped the real red pills. Domination is not about whips and chains and crying sex slaves. That's all LARPing. It is rather a state of deep contentment, of natural harmony, punctuated by the occasional contest of will.

A big complaint among men trying to date is that all the good girls have boyfriends. This is true, but the causality is backwards. They don't have boyfriends because they're good girls (where are they when they're single?); they're good girls, happy, sweet, and pleasant, *because they have boyfriends*, because they are blossoming under the hand of a tough motherfucker. A common type I see around is some tatted-up rough white dude in his late 20's or early thirties driving an absolute beater of a car, with his woman in tow. His girl is tatted-up, pierced, dyed hair, past her prime, but pregnant with two cute lil white kids following her. I look in this dude's eyes and see my future, but this is as it should be. It honestly fills me with hope.

Whether a girl is a good girl or not is a calculus that includes the function of the man in charge of her. You will need to make a bad girl a good girl, and any arrangement with her beyond infrequent booty calls is an improvement over her feral state living alone. People complain that the Church is not doing enough to encourage marriage, and that is because it is going about it wrong. Traditional churches are very concerned with preventing cohabitation between boyfriend and girlfriend, ignoring the fact that a girl living alone is apt to get up to much worse behavior. I take an ancient stance. If you live under the same roof and have sex, she is your wife. Churches would encourage marriage by telling men to put rings on the girls they are banging, to make the

natural marriage official. Right now, they are trying to break up natural marriages, are actively working against marriage. Telling their parishioners “you are already married, now come into church and make it official or you’re excommunicated” is a stopgap measure without strong patriarchy, but it at least has the right frame. The fact that, in medieval times, a marriage unconsummated could be easily dissolved, while once consummated could not be dissolved, proves that the consummation is the cornerstone of the marriage.

As I have said before, *true mental illness in women is very rare*. It is imperative that you understand this. The right likes to meme the absurdly high diagnosed rates of depression and anxiety in young women as evidence that our civilization is fucked. It’s not that our social conditions are driving women crazy, it is that most women feel sad and anxious because they do not have strong men leading them and properly railing them out. I have been with no end of girls who have no end of self-professed mental problems, indeed you can hardly find a young woman who does not claim some mental illness. When they are alone, they are indeed going unfathomably and wildly insane, engaging in absurd pathological behavior, like being so overwhelmed with anxiety that they piss in soda bottles rather than leave their room to use the toilet, like being possessed by the sudden and inexplicable urge to go for a midnight walk in a dangerous neighborhood, all sorts of self-harm, refusal to leave bed, “panic attacks” of all shapes and sizes, and so on, but when I am around, these mental illnesses evaporate like the morning mist under the sun, and when I stick around, they stay gone. (a woman experiencing extreme mental pathology while in a “relationship” is generally evidence that the boyfriend is a pussy)

Women go nuts when they don’t have a man; the mechanisms of female psychology are not self-sufficient but need external input from a male leader. This involves protecting her, telling her what to do (giving guidance, if you want to be gentle), and fucking her. A father can fulfill the first two roles, but women who live with their fathers for too long, stay virgins for too long, go a little bit nuts too. Single women get dogs as husband-replacements, not child replacements. The dog makes demands of her, needs to be fed and walked and given attention. Its presence is reassuring, and can actually protect her in a pinch. Yeah, some of them use their dogs to fulfill role #3, too, but this is fairly rare. I’d say about one in 200 women actually fuck dogs, and usually because they are too fat and ugly to find a human lover. There’s plenty of men providing booty calls after all.

You should take it with a grain of salt when I give advice on how to keep a woman around, because it comes naturally to me. I’ve put a lot of thought into how to bang them over the years, which is why I write about it, but once I do they tend to stick around whether I wanted them to or not. Maybe it’s because I’m a peerless lover with an insatiable libido. I find it very odd that men seem to take for granted that they do not fuck their girlfriends every day. Like, is something wrong, bruh? Eat some red meat, get some sun, and hit the gym. Your hormones are whack. I’m not giving sex classes. You can nut more than once. Figure it out, and fuck your wife until she can’t take any more.

Don’t use enemy words and don’t think in enemy terms. Orwell’s main insight was the corruption of language to corrupt thought. The corruption of language is Satanic. Like the laughable word “grooming”. Excuse me. There is a bride and a... what now? A bride and a... anyone? The people who came up with this word hated marriage and normal sexuality, and you are perpetuating their corruption by using it. If you doubt this, simply ask them to define “grooming”. And reflect, yourself, on the phrase “animal husbandry”.

If you want to think of male-female relations in terms more esoteric, the solar/lunar dichotomy of masculine and feminine is wrong. It's rather a fire/water distinction, exemplified by the sun and the sea. The sea is sterile and wild, in its depths a crushing pressure. For the land to be fertile and bear fruit, the sun, with its pure-masculine energy of *nuclear radiation*, must boil away the sea. Its waters become life-giving rain, bubbling streams and calm, sweet lakes. Water and fire are in contest: the victory of water quenches fire, but the victory of fire purifies water and allows the growth of good things. Harmony exists where water has been tamed by fire.

## **John Smith, Autists, BAP, and *Vae Victis***

May 11th, 2020

*"Engineering and manufacturing know-how should be treated with religious reverence. It is, after all, what keeps us alive."* —scientism (@mr\_scientism)

*"No. Nerds need to stay in their lane. The nuke tech is the smartest guy on the submarine, but he should not be captain."* —Aidan Maclear (@AidanMaclear)

I say stuff like [this](#). People might assume I'm anti-technology or anti-nerd. Spandrell, commenting on the same tweet I was, said that blacksmiths, despite keeping everyone alive for thousands of years, were treated as pariahs. This was certainly true in Ancient Greece; the "lame blacksmith" was a stereotype for a reason. Men who got crippled in battle and couldn't fight anymore were stuck inside using their muscles to hammer iron. Which is a lot less cool than wearing a helmet with a tall crest and stabbing people with a spear. High status citizenry was limited to those who could stand in the phalanx. When one famous playwright (Sophocles iirc) died, he had inscribed on his tomb no mention of his playwriting; simply that he had fought the Persians at Marathon. The nerdier pursuits were basically just hobbies; Plato probably spent more of his time wrestling than writing. We can call this an "extreme Chad" culture. It does hold a certain personal appeal to me.

But on the other hand, the Greeks had access to steam power... and didn't use it. They understood very well that the pressure created by boiling water could push stuff around. They used it as a toy. Lets jump ahead 1500 years to medieval England. Smiths were not pariahs in medieval England. "John Smith" is the archetypal Anglo name for a reason. Those dudes were pounding more than hot metal. All the other factors of how well they fit into society, how hot were their wives, etc, well, GNON doesn't care. Smiths had a lot of kids, and their kids had a lot of kids. And smiths were autists, at least as far as internet parlance goes. Being a good blacksmith requires the same autistic attention to detail as writing code or engineering. Just look up how chainmail got made. And then these nerds, well-paid and with large families, sold the chainmail to chads. Just how important was this? At the battle of Cerami, 136 Norman cavalry, who were themselves the most effective military unit in history up to that point, equipped with the best military technology money could buy, destroyed a Muslim force *at least thirty times their size*. The primary sources say that there were 50,000 Muslims, and while I tend to trust primary sources a bit more, that's hard for even me to believe.

And then we go farther. Once the English rediscovered steam power, all the autistic engineering minds running around immediately saw its potential. First it's a pump for a mine, then it pushes mine carts down the tracks, then you run the tracks from the mine to the town so the coal gets there faster, then you have a railroad, and hey, why not a boat? English chads, wielding weapons invented and forged meticulously to spec by English autistic blacksmiths and tinkers, conquered the world. And all this goes back hundreds of years, making sure that the autistic smith, too busy with hammering tiny identically-sized metal rods into rings to bother socializing

or chasing women, could get rich, have a loyal wife, and a big family. When we talk about trickle-down eugenics, about wanting higher elite fertility, you need the middle classes, engineers and scientists, high IQ and not a whole lot else, to be reproducing too.

Why does this matter? Well, history operates on the principle of *Vae Victis*. Before any other consideration, you have to win. Ensure the survival of your people. Paleo and Teddy K twitter is dangerously misguided. The life of a hunter-gatherer-warrior might be more noble than that of a farmer. Elite polygamy might be more eugenic. But guess what. They lost. I have a great respect for engineers and scientists. But on the other hand, mr. "scientism" and his "treat engineers with religious reverence" is equally dangerous and misguided. The "Chad" traits, the alpha male skills of *establishing and enforcing male cooperation* are infinitely more rare and valuable. Like I said, the smartest guy on a nuclear submarine is the nuclear technician, but he belongs running the reactor and not holding the red button.

Nerds can establish male cooperation in a priestly role, of course. But the skills of the engineer and the skills of the priest are two different things. Priests establish cooperation by telling stories, providing sacred reasons for cooperations. The scientist can never tell you why; mere data is useless as a guide for action without *value judgements*. Replacing religion with science and technology, using other nerds, verbal-IQ nerds to provide the story, provide the why, seems to be what "scientism" is advocating. That's, uh, what we have today bro. Unsurprisingly, the people telling the stories stole the title of science from the asocial nerds actually doing science. The actual scientists who are supposedly in charge can't stop the priests from completely taking their power. Which is why certain science is off-limits and why a lot of not-science is called science, and why our smartest autists are whacking it to anime porn in mom's basement and modding videogames instead of putting us on Mars. The only thing that can stop the priest class from holiness spiraling us into destruction is the iron fist of the warrior-jock.

## **Blaq Violence and Aidan's Guide to da Streetz**

May 31st, 2020

Blacks get extremely pissed when the cops arrest and kill them because they are used to getting away with crimes. They resist arrest because they are used to getting let off the hook. If I could estimate, based on my experience living and working in a big city, blacks get away with 90% of the crime they commit. For every black man with ten crimes on his rap sheet, he has committed a hundred, often in front of the cops, who look the other way. Contrary to the narrative, which precisely inverts reality, blacks simply do not get arrested for minor crimes. I cannot drink a beer on the street without getting hassled by the cops, while large groups of blacks can smoke pot on the doorsteps of other peoples' buildings without the popo even turning their heads as they walk by.

Black violence and criminality is not their default state. Blacks are opportunists who do what they think they can get away with. Getting away with lots of minor crime psyches them up to commit bigger crimes, most of which they also get away with, until some cop is forced by law to stop a crime occurring right under his nose, answers a call to find the suspect still at the scene making mischief, a suspect who feels invincible due to having gotten away with ten crimes for every one he is actually charged with. When we had actual white supremacy and actual brutality against misbehaving blacks, blacks did not have a reputation as wild and dangerous but a reputation as supernaturally placid and easygoing.

I am not very surprised at the riots, and even less surprised that the police were ordered to stand down. They will not be back. They will occupy a rebuilt precinct but will cease to patrol the

streets. Capital will not benefit from the riots. Like Detroit, nothing will be built over the ashes; empty lots filled with plains grasses, junkies squatting in burned-out ruins amidst piles of trash hoarded by the homeless. This is the new normal. Rome did not notice the decline of Rome, and the normie will not recognize the ethnic cleansing, ruin, and violence that will surround him. This is not new. Detroit underwent the same fate decades ago, and nobody noticed. This is merely acceleration.

Our social fabric hangs by the thread of blacks not yet realizing that they can riot anywhere, for any reason, at any time, and destroy whatever they want, with no consequences. On the flip side of the coin, military dictatorship is only [a shot away](#). (my favorite *pro-war* song) America belongs to anyone with the stones to order fully-automatic fire into a crowd. I'm not holding my breath for the cops to do it. The organization does not attract the brave and the bold.

Blacks don't yet realize that they are free to destroy, like Soufrica's blacks are free to destroy whites, because of the nature of blacks. Blacks are naturally cowardly and rarely directly oppose authority. Black violence is a dialectic, in which they encourage each other, and their victim encourages them through weakness. It is not spontaneous or random, but neither is it ideological in any way; they do indeed need to be whipped into a frenzy of chaotic violence and encouraged by the possibility that they will get away with it. The nature of modern riot policing seems designed to encourage blacks to violence. The cops stand there, shields up, defensive, occasionally harassing and annoying the rioters with various nonlethal weapons, when a single volley of lethal fire would disperse the mob.

The cops, excepting a few places, did not even do that this time. Instead they retreated, and police precincts were smashed and burned. It's not civil war time just yet, because the cops will be ordered, and will be plenty willing, to smash the "white supremacist" badman to vent the status cuckery of being ordered to stand down. During Katrina, we had a short-lived boogaloo once the feds pulled out, and hungry looters decided to go to where people owned guns. When they came back in, there were a lot of dead looters lying around with bullet wounds that they did not bother to investigate. When Katrina happens on a wide scale, when the feds pull out and do not come back, then it is time for civil war.

Let it not be forgotten that these riots represent a left-on-left conflict, on the political level, behind the scenes. When the establishment Left began their gaslighting on the riots being the work of "white supremacists", they were trying to order the rioters to stand down, knowing that the consequences for them would be extremely dire. I will get to those consequences. CNN being attacked was a symbolic moment. The Left has conjured and unleashed a demon that it has lost control over. The mainstream, older, smarter, whiter Left is a wounded animal. The young and stupid Left smells the blood in the water.

Lots of millennials I know on normie social media have been memeing about how awful 2020 has been. Honey, you haven't seen the half of it. Year on year, this decade is going to get worse. These riots have coincided with corona-chan's ushering in of a work-from-home revolution. Work-from-home has been possible for at least a decade, but companies have been reluctant to adopt it. It not only cuts into the power of HR, it also keeps the companies and workers paying taxes in areas with lots of hungry blacks. Until now. Work-from-home is here to stay. It's inertia. With the riots, there is even less reason to live and work in a city. Then, there becomes no reason for major corporations to be headquartered in cities. Corona-chan along with looter-chan will near-entirely push out the tax base that feeds the vast termite nest of africans that infests the major cities. There are federal EBT cards and federal housing projects, but with no grocery store (burned), Famine will ride on the heels of Pestilence.

Every major city will look like Detroit within the next decade, while the suburbs and rural areas flourish. I see a future of intentional communities of WFH tech bros thriving behind a bristling hedge of redneck AR-15's while the cities quite literally crumble to ruins. Men go to the cities for pussy, but women go to the cities for high-status dick. Detroit is not a hip or stylish city to live in, and neither is Baltimore. After a time lag, women will follow the men out to their new communities, the most successful of which will be too far away to dump buses of blacks from the now-ruined inner cities on, in the same way that while they forced Somali refugees on Maine, they could not dump Boston's refuse on them. This will result in a massive "flyover country" boom and population decentralization, while major urban areas become depopulated no-go-zones.

It has been a decade since America put its own astronauts into space, and Elon Musk just did it, his rocket rising as cities burned below. Is there any greater symbol than this for where we are? Decentralization will cause the Left to lose institutional power. The institutional Left does not want this, but the younger, harder Left does. They want civil war, want Haiti and Rhodesia, and as their formal power slips with the loss of the cities, they will do their best to accelerate towards civil war and political violence shielded by activist judges. Trump will win in 2020, and if decentralization continues, a Trumpist will win in 2024. Absent these Trumpists' use of extrajudicial force to seize political power, the remaining Democrat cities, run by people like AOC and Omar, all Little Africas, will engage in domestic terrorism and then hot civil war once they are desperate and angry enough to attack places where people have guns. This will happen between 2035 and 2040.

\*\*\*

Now, as far as avoiding black predation goes in your own life, well, stop treating them like white people. The longer two white guys argue, even very tough and violence-ready whites, the less likely they are to come to blows. The heated screaming match, like over road rage, vents off steam and helps preserve status. If a white guy is yelling at you, he's not killing you. When violence becomes inevitable between whites, a silence falls. When I am ready for violence, when I get in a fight, the hot emotions of anger subside and are replaced with a wintry calm. To blacks, the "cold violence" of the white man earns us the moniker of "white devil". The idea of calm and impassionate violence is inhuman to the African; to him the white man is incredibly unpredictable and unstable. Black men are guileless, either friendly and servile or rude and hostile, and one can tell a black man's mind towards you honestly and upfrontly by this dichotomy of attitude.

On the other hand, blacks need to psyche themselves and each other up for violence. This is a very primitive thing, think a tribe of africans doing their war dance before raiding another tribe's huts. They are naturally cowardly; the epithet "spook" is well-applied. Because of this, most lone blacks are not very dangerous. The exception is when a black man is muttering to himself; absent a group of peers, he is getting himself ready to commit violence. This is something I will always avoid. Blacks always test the waters before they commit a crime. Predators single out the weak. A mugger will stalk you for a while, bump into you a few times, walk in your path to see if you move out of the way, insult you under his breath... they are feeling you out, making sure that you are weak and will not defend yourself. This behavior becomes fairly noticeable if you live among blacks, but because I look fairly dangerous, and because I always carry the most dangerous weapon it is legal for me to carry, a weapon that I am trained in using to kill people, I am confident in not being victimized, a confidence that criminals pick up on.

Black violence is mostly communal; the group of “youths” ganging up on a lone victim. What gets captured on camera does not tell the full story. Before the youths attack, there is generally a long period of mutual engagement between the victim and the blacks; sometimes the white victim will attempt to Karen, to call out some antisocial misbehavior from the blacks, which turns into an argument, which gets the blacks heated up for violence. Getting into a prolonged and heated argument with a black or a group of blacks is the easiest way to ensure that they will attack you.

There are generally two ways to avoid black violence. The first is to ignore them, but this comes with a caveat. One must not show weakness; not slink away or quicken one’s pace, because this will encourage them. This works better for a lone black trying to start shit, because without his peers, and without your engagement, there is no feedback loop escalating him into heated violence. This is what I recommend most of the time. Ignore, walk away. The second is to prey on the black’s natural cowardice, by escalating right to the brink of violence before he has gotten worked up to it himself. Obviously this takes balls, but thankfully blacks generally don’t go to the cops over threats or even weapons being flashed, so it’s legally safe. When black harassment is met with immediate and serious threats of violence, they tend to back down or run away. A friend of mine, living in a bad neighborhood, had problems with his stuff being vandalized and people prowling around his yard at night. He stayed up one night to catch the guy doing it, found a black man trying to get into his car. Pulled the guy into kissing distance, said “catch you again and you’re dead, *nigger*“. From then on, his house was left totally in peace.

There’s a video of a guy with a machete who got his ass beat by the mob. Apparently he was some kind of fellow traveler on Twitter. In my experience, blacks don’t attack armed men. They called his bluff, and it must’ve been an unconvincing bluff. Don’t carry a weapon if you’re not willing to use it, and the time to use it is when the aggressor first gets within reach of your weapon. If he had given the first scumbag who got too close a nice little beauty mark, the rest of the mob would have dispersed like roaches under a light.

## Ideas Never Rule

July 23rd, 2020

Curtis Yarvin (subscribing gives me the dox heebies and I’m not giving him any shekels at the moment, but I have friends who provide) says that ape shall not rule over man and advocates for a “cozy revolution”. Logo on twitter claims that men of ideas drive history, and that men of action dance on their puppet strings. These ideas feel related in my mind. So. Two birds, one shell.

*“When men of rank sacrifice all ideas of dignity to an ambition without a distinct object, and work with low instruments and for low ends, the whole composition becomes low and base.”*

—Edmund Burke

Yarvin is sounding a lot like Burke these days. Caesar, the actual Caesar, you know the guy, killed a million Gauls and looted a staggering, mind-blowing amount of gold for the sheer thrill of conquest and to get filthy rich. The dignity of Rome’s ancient traditions demanded that Caesar come back home like a good boy to face censure and likely execution. Yet Rome was a degraded cesspit, corroded by party-politics, and Caesar, well, we still use his name to describe a guy who says “fuck that”.

Men of action rule, and are guided by externalities, not the ideals of philosophers. The philosophers who “inspired” the French Revolution did not in fact do so. Rousseau, Voltaire, and the like were merely providing the post-hoc rationalization, in the finest intellectual language, for the revolutions in England in the seventeenth century, and after their careers, served merely to validate the already-powerful civil service of the Sun-King’s absolutist government in its grab for power. Absolutism itself, rather than being ideological, was a development that arose from power struggles between Crown and Nobility, and was later justified by intellectual absolutists and divine-right theorists who arose well after absolutism had been actualized but never named.

As I said, men of action do, and thus inspire the intellectual class. The thoughts and pens of nerds dance on puppet strings when Chad flexes. The ancient dynamic of the bard eulogizing the great warrior has not substantially changed one bit. Marx’s intellectual career was spent justifying Robespierre and the French Revolution, an exact reflection of Carlyle, who spent his on Napoleon and Cromwell. The intellectual then ends his “career” being used yet again, by later fact-men as garment in which to wrap their naked power-politics.

The priest who, having power, attempts to set an idea on the throne invites disaster. Voegelin called them “gnostics”. Men of ideas do not drive history because a man, having power, must master the idea or become mastered by it. If he has mastered the idea, he becomes a Cromwell or Caesar himself. Augustus, in attempting to save the Republic, became the Republic in the flesh, annihilating the ideal. If the idea masters the man, we get the purity spiral. For an idea on a throne means an empty throne, and in its name a simian struggle to occupy the spiritual center begins. This struggle is necessarily to be halted by a man of facts, who plops his quite-human ass, that shit even comes out of, on the throne supposedly occupied by an idea, and often ends up having to kill the idea’s adherents when they object.

Lenin did not take power according to the dictat of Marx, did not take power as the representative of an organized proletariat but rather seized it from fellow elites (the wik article is brazenly tankie, with, I note, a level of prose typical of a 90IQ affirmative action college freshman), and when he attempted to install the ideas of Marx as ruler of Russia, his life and the lives of his true believers were cut short. The man who came out on top was the man who threw away the garments of his priest-LARP and emerged naked, more simian, and infinitely more effective, as the born bandit-king he was.

Yarvin is an engineer, and thinks like one. A government is not installed as a computer program is, not constructed, tested, and debugged by the wise hand of a smart and right-thinking man. Power is wrestled over, tooth and nail: the refined cabinet-politics of the Baroque, honed to as fine and precise an art as their greatest music and painting, have not altered one bit in essence from Carlyle’s megatherions grappling for supremacy in the primordial muck. Yarvin (nor Froude, for that matter) goes into much detail on what happens *after-Ulysses* strings and bends his great bow. It is undeniably *simian*. But ape shall not rule over man.

Or shall he? Charles II was restored by Parliament; by a Parliament that had General Monck’s swords resting on the backs of their necks. Not literally, but does it matter if the sword is naked or sheathed? Is one really more... apelike than the other? No matter how many velvet gloves, no matter how fine the embroidery, how rare the silk trimmings, the fist inside is still iron. The iron fist is how chimps go to war, and it is still how governments are made, reformed, and unmade. The velvet glove made the fist more effective indeed, but the value of the glove is beyond the scope of this piece. It is a fact, however, that the decorum and politesse of that era is as dead and buried as the dignity and honor of the Roman Senate in 49 B.C.

And Monck was no idealist. He was a friend of Cromwell, not a man whose head rung with “*dieu et mon droit*”. The man of ideas who wanted to reform and remake was... Barebone. I'm sure he thought, or hoped, it would be gentle. A “cozy revolution”. (And I am of course using Barebone as a proxy for his entire “elite”.) Monck was just a dude with an army who was fucking sick of it. When I talk about “men of facts” and “men of action”, this is what I mean. Monck saw the facts, and had an army. More anarchy, King Charles, or King Monck. Charles once tried to get Monck to betray Cromwell. He wouldn't do it. Now Cromwell's dead. Monck was loyal to Cromwell. Were he a man of ideas, maybe he would have tried to construct a “Cromwellism”. Since he was a warrior and a man of fact, he sided with reality.

Even Charles II had about a dozen people drawn and quartered. Nowhere close to a million, or fifty million. But he killed people who mattered. If your head is filled with notions of democracy, everyone matters to power. You have to kill a million to make a difference. If you believe in reality, you know that few rule, and you only need to kill a few. This is necessarily a difference of degree rather than kind. Is one really more apelike than another? Democide is to democracy what regicide is to monarchy. One is uglier and causes infinitely more suffering. But is the basic motive any different? Cromwell's very body was exhumed and hanged. Is this the act of an ape or a man? Did the Restoration suffer greatly for this base and puerile outburst of simian sentiment? This massive... flex?

The answer is, not a bit. Ape indeed rules over man. Monck's guards had to beat up a lot of puritans in the streets, a simple display of dominance that has remained unchanged since the tribal politics of the chimpanzee. It is time to stop worrying and learn to love the monke, for the difference is not a choice between ape and man. The choice is between the Monck-ape who understands reality and the Robespierre-ape who does not. I don't know what “caesar” is going to look like for us. The first and second Punic wars of antiquity are precisely analogous to the first and second World Wars of Western Civilization. But we are in uncharted waters, because in our culture-organism's life-cycle, Carthage won. The maritime mercantile empire ruled by an evil and insane theocracy defeated the militaristic land-empire. I do not know what Carthage's eventual Caesar would have looked like, but I do know that he would have refused to sacrifice his kids to Moloch.

## **Fall of the Empire**

December 11th, 2020

Many on our side see an analogy between our current situation and the closing days of the Roman Republic. I myself wish this was so; fighting for Caesar is far more attractive a prospect than the alternative. But there is an alternate historical analogy, which I consider even slightly more likely; that we are not in the latter days of the Roman Republic, but the Roman Empire.

And moreover, we are not Rome but Carthage. Germany (very ironically) was Rome; this land-empire with its military traditions and its two wars against the Anglo-American thalassocracy being precisely analogous to the Punic wars; America is to England what Carthage was to Phoenicia. In our case, the necessity of high technology to effectively wage war lent a vast advantage to the sea-power with uncontested control of global supply lines. Rome itself even realized the importance of contesting Carthaginian naval dominance, and in the first Punic War endured titanic losses until they could beat Carthage on the seas; Germany did not have the will, or the ability, to do so, and thus lost.

Imagine Hannibal, returning victorious from a Rome burned to the ground and scattered into the Tiber, assassinated by a cabal of Carthaginian priests, who not only proceed to institutionalize

their massive informal authority over Carthage itself, but wage a crusade to spread the worship of Moloch over all the known world, and you have a picture of what occurred in America shortly before and directly after the Second World War. Because we are not waiting for Caesar; we have had our Caesar, the difference being that, as a priest of an evil religion, he did not replace a corrupt and decadent republic with based military autocracy, but with the sinister rule of a caste of Gnostic managerialists caught in a holiness spiral.

Under Franklin Delano Roosevelt the forms of the old Republic continued, but their content had been hollowed out. The opinions of the property-holding white man, the original (though expansive) patrician class of the Old Republic, became politically irrelevant; the opinions of the priestly apparatus of educated bureaucrats and “experts” installed by Roosevelt would inescapably begin to dictate policy. Of course, FDR already crossed the Rubicon, not in running for a third and fourth term, but in attaching the unconstitutional priestly apparatus to the levers of American power.

FDR’s apparatus began to wage civil war against the original stock of the Republic, against any element which could offer resistance to its rule. Though I have my disagreements with C.A. Bond, his book *Nemesis* details exactly how this came to be. Vast quantities of barbarians were admitted within the Empire’s borders. Barbarians were granted political protections and immunity from prosecution, which predictably resulted in a massive campaign of low-level warfare that ended up forcing the Old Patricians to flee their cities. The vast financial institutions that prospered under the Late Republic were brought under the heel of the priestly class through civil rights litigation; they could no longer hire who they wanted, and every large corporation was required to have an office that functioned as an outpost of Academia, an office of commissars whose job it was to snitch on the company they supposedly worked for.

Science ground to a halt in the decades following Caesar’s ascension. To those living in 2020, a photograph of 1900 seems impossibly futuristic; sparkling clean streets on which even the most menial laborer is dressed in a suit and hat, each building new and designed with immaculate aesthetic taste. Similarly, the Romans of 450 no longer knew how to build or repair an aqueduct; the engineering traditions of the early empire were snuffed out, as everything fell subtly and slowly into disrepair. A society which in 1900 constructed hundreds of miles of underground railroads in ten years, takes [ten years to dig two miles](#) a hundred years later.

In the final decades of Rome, barbarian kings used weak emperors as puppets, using the Roman imperial form as a thin cloak for the same style of governance that served the Germanic tribes in the Black Forest. Likewise, the imperial-bureaucratic forms instituted by FDR are being themselves hollowed out by barbarians. We are not totally there yet, but Indian caste-nepotism, “BIPOC” racial revanchism, and Chinese managerialism are working their way into the theocratic power apparatus of the Left. Eventually, academia, journalism, the three-letter-agency, and the HR department, will be entirely skin-suited. Some time later, just as the barbarian kings of Rome did, the skin-suit will be cast off, the puppet disposed of, and these three main currents of barbarism will feud and war openly with each other over the ruins.

Because we are Carthage, and not Rome, these struggles have, and are, taking the form of ideological disputes rather than hot civil war. The power struggles of priests, of course, spill over eventually into hot civil war, but this is my main explanation for why, unlike Rome, we did not experience frequent and bloody civil wars over the occupancy of the throne. We have, of course, experienced multiple ideological civil wars, with last decade’s holiness overthrown by Current Year holiness.

Sounds pretty bleak. But in Rome, we can count several figures of latter days with the will and honor to attempt restoration. They failed, but it is not up to me to judge whether or not such an enterprise will always fail. Trump is one such figure, and his problem is a lack of loyalists, just as Majorian and Aurelian were betrayed. But Trump is no conquering general; Rome had, even in late times, an existing tradition of blood and honor that could produce great men. We do not have such a tradition; our priesthood has ensured the destruction of all such "aristocratic" enclaves that can breed reaction; especially in the case of the military, whose upper ranks are staffed entirely by priests loyal to the regime. Mutiny is always possible, but mutinies need leaders. The great warriors and intellectuals of our times are leading lives of pure obscurity, for our society is remarkably efficient at promoting affable mediocrities (a necessity when the claims of the priesthood are lies from head to tail) and divesting the energies of the competent into atomic and meaningless pursuits. The fat neckbeard arguing on internet forums over Star Wars canon is a frustrated theologian; the skinny geek optimizing strategies for competitive videogaming is a frustrated military officer.

Everything in our society is fake and gay, and even people showing glimmers of greatness or competence have been faggotized. And it is not as though such people are even curable, by and large. For such exacting and laser-focused men, it is necessary that they be bred and raised with a sense of civic duty, to cultivate their will-to-power and the confidence it takes to rule. That is what I meant when I spoke of a "tradition of blood and honor"; it is not necessarily even military, for the WASP elite of the American East coast had these aristocratic traditions for diplomacy and civil service, even if put to evil ends.

To find who will take power after the fall, we must look for bastions of incipient elites. The BIPOC coalition is too retarded, generally speaking, to rule anything. (BIPOC itself being a new designation meant to separate dumb and holy subhumans from competent east asians and high-caste indians) However, the BIPOCs are conspicuously holier than anybody else in the left's eschatology. If they end up in charge, we are looking at the Cambodian autogenocide or Mao's Great Leap Forward on an even greater scale, ending as Haiti ended unless stopped by a Stalin. In Haiti, by the way, and here I am speaking to the lesbian mulatta commissar reading this in horror, they killed and literally ate the mulattoes after they were through with the whites, a fact that should make you just a little bit uneasy about your future.

I consider it unlikely that the Chinese faction will come out on top. East Asians are already having their POC status revoked, hence the new "BIPOC", and they're still licking inner party boot. But supposing that the Chinese turn America into one big Toronto, life under our Judeo-HAPA mandarins will probably be materially safer and better for the Amerikaner than it is currently. On the flip side, he will be reduced to an entirely fellaheen existence as social and moral decay continues unabated. I like greatness, and this state of affairs would seem to me grotesque and intolerable.

The Indians have a decent shot, being able to hide behind the dumber and less competent members of their race. The high-caste Indian, however, is perfectly content to live on top of a festering heap of human and literal garbage; in fact, he probably feels a great unease in a society that does not look like the great slums pouring their filth into the Ganges, and will strive to recreate his homeland in his conquered land.

The castizo future is another option; the problem is a lack of castizos. Most latinos settled in the US are of low human quality; the whiter and smarter latinos back home tend to stay home, because they are in charge. However, the Cuban exile community in Florida is one to keep an eye on, for they are not only generally aligned with the values of civilization, but are an actual

elite, collectively kicked out of Cuba, and an actual community that has the potential for cohesion. Like at home, they have an imperial multiracial identity that brings along their swarthier cousins as allies and footsoldiers.

Finally we come to the Amerikaner, but the Amerikaner has no elite class; in fact, he never did. Trump is their representative, but they have no loyalists to send him, and the cultivation of an aristocracy from their ranks is his greatest necessity if he wins. In our Rome-Carthage analogy, the victory of the Amerikaner represents itself a barbarian conquest, a revolt by a janissary people, subjugated long ago, that has since fought the wars of the evil priests. (Carthage itself was notorious for using janissaries) Though it will wear the garment of FDR's Empire, it would in content be a far older form of rule, a ghost of the frontier and the West, the clannish politics of the small town (and I say that with respect) elevated to a grandiose scale.

Whoever wins- and Trump might cross the Tiber, win a civil war, and still fail to defeat the larger historical forces at play- the rule of the coastal American theocracy is swiftly coming to a close. Ricimer, whoever he may turn out to be, is waiting behind it with the puppet-strings.

## The Last Election

December 19th, 2020

(This is the designated low-effort post under which the exodus from Jimblog can discuss the events of the day until I also go dark.)

Trump has hard evidence of voter fraud on video, and the courts contemptuously dismiss his cases.

Yarvin already beat me to it, with a [piece](#) whose title is a little bit... [familiar](#), but I will say in my own words that the Supreme Court has indeed been revealed as a political nonfactor. The Supreme Court's decision on the unconstitutionality of Cuomo's worship ban is being widely ignored, and nobody will enforce it. The worship bans, ruled illegal, stand, and the court finds it has no way of actually enforcing what it decides. So much for kritarchy. The recent Supreme Court decision for Kansas, ruling that noncitizens can register to vote, will be enforced. See how this works?

Yarvin says that the ability to rig an election is indicative of the right to rule. Why didn't Trump just rig it back harder? Lol. What do you think would happen if some red suburb reported 120% voter turnout, kicked Dem observers out of the room, pulled suitcases full of loose ballots out of under a table, then ran them through the voting machines eight times in a row on videotape? The courts would be chomping at the bit to convict the GOP of fraud, evidence or no, and those decisions would be enforced. Vae Victis indeed. None of us (hopefully) really thought the system could be reformed; we were cheerleading for a coup. The media, whose vote is very strong, has voted. The DNC, whose vote is very strong, has voted. The GOP, whose vote is weak, has voted. The courts have cast their vote as well. But there is one "branch of government" which Yarvin forgets. The left rigs elections by stuffing ballot boxes, but nothing votes harder than the Mark 19 automatic grenade launcher.

Will the military vote? The officer class is of the same tribe as the Enemy. The guys who pull the triggers of our awesome and powerful weaponry are decidedly not. Trump recently cut the

higher officers out of the chain of command of the special forces. But the betrayal of those he installed in the Supreme Court blindsided him, and if I were Trump, I would be questioning the loyalties of the men I put as intermediaries between me and the triggermen.

I have no idea what is going to happen. Let us assume for the rest of the post that Trump fails to declare martial law...

The left, the Cathedral, the permanent government, now has a mandate. Not the mandate of overwhelming popular support, but the mandate of naked power. They rigged the election, locked down the country, ignored the courts, forced millions out of business for [absolutely no reason](#)... and they got away with it. The wrongdoing was blatant and obvious, and they received no consequences.

Now, the pretense of two-party politics is going to go away, and they will rule openly. If their policies prove unpopular, they can just rig the vote again. They got away with 120% turnout, why not 200% next time? Why not 91% of the popular vote for President Harris' second term? The genocides inflicted by Trump, justice now served against him, turned the hearts of millions of Americans towards leftism.

The dominant faction in the Left today is what I will name Global Managerial Bugman Communism, or GMBC for short. This is the party of the "Great Reset". Many, even on our side, mistakenly call them "neoliberal", because they want to use large corporations to advance the progressive cause instead of destroy them in the name of the progressive cause. The only difference between it and antifa is the "managerial" part.

The GMBC has no end of utopian projects to advance with its new monopoly on power. Amnesty for 70,000,000 illegal immigrants who each chain-migrate an average of three people, increasing the population of the USA by 50% in the space of a year. Zimbabwe-style land reform to increase the share of black farmers. Defund the police. The Green New Deal, which wants to tear your house down, and then rebuild it to be more energy efficient. (If it ever gets rebuilt, which is unlikely, it will be rebuilt on the same timescale with which the government fixes roads and builds bridges, fixes the Flint water supply.)

When these projects cause disaster, and we are going to get at least one of them by 2024 via executive order, that is when the left is going to start hunting for hidden right-wingers to blame for the disaster, and it will start liquidating the kulaks in earnest. Trump got 75,000,000 votes, after all; that's a lot of scapegoats. When it runs out of right-wingers, then it will start eating itself. We have Bioleninism, and that will be the time for BioStalin, a man who makes it as dangerous to be too far left as it is to be too far right.

PS: If you are going to bash Trump in the comments, you must tell us where he went wrong, and what he should have done instead.

## **We Lost. Now What?**

January 7th, 2021

I was preparing this post, anticipating that nothing would happen on January 6, that the certification of Biden would go forward with minor bluster and major cuckery. I am not going to go deeply into the events of the 6th, and my opinion on them. The short version is, I believe it was real, and a real opportunity, that Trump failed to capitalize on, and he was removed from office shortly thereafter. As I wrote [in an earlier post](#), the psychic power of violence is incredibly

powerful, even when used in an extremely limited way, and the storming of the capitol was an incredible symbolic victory that lacked elites to direct it and capitalize on it.

What is significant is that the 6th is the day that Civil War II began, which is not at all clear now, but will be clear in hindsight. Both sides got their *cassus belli*, and an excuse for martial law, but only the Establishment will use it. When I say both sides, the other side is the Amerikaner, and as has long been obvious, the GOP is its enemy.

What is significant is how soon and how hard the Establishment will crack down. Normie media, legacy and social, is full-throatedly depicting the events of yesterday as an attempted coup by Trump and an act of terrorism equivalent to 9/11. Facebook has banned all video and images from inside the capitol, preparing to tell an enormous lie. I would not be surprised if fake death counts begin emerging in the coming days.

The left now has an excuse to do what they have been longing to do for five years; a complete purge of Trump supporters. I thought that they were going to do it anyway, but this accelerates the timeline and intensity of it. The holiness spiral will escalate from “those inside the capitol should be arrested” to “those inside should be executed” (we are here), “all those who attended should be arrested”, “all those who aided and abetted their attendance should be investigated” and so on.

This will not spark meaningful resistance from the Amerikaner, for the same reason that the liquidation of the Kulaks did not spark meaningful resistance, and the Reign of Terror did not spark meaningful resistance. In both the Russian and the French Revolutions, there was an elite willing and able to fight against the Revolution, and both had hot civil wars, with armies roving around shooting at each other. The Amerikaner has no elite, so the hot civil war phase began and ended in the space of four hours. The Amerikaner had Trump and less than a handful of sympathetic men around him. Flynn and Giuliani and maybe Wood. (It is funny that Yarvin considers Trump a con. Cui Bono? What did Trump gain? It is likely he will live in exile or be murdered.)

We have a single-party state, and you do not resist a single-party state with military might. It is not possible. Yarvin is right on that one. It is time for the liquidation of the kulaks, and this post is about avoiding being liquidated, and what action is possible to resist the system. First note, it is quite likely that the left will begin eating itself alive either before or after the Amerikaner is sufficiently suppressed. The internecine power struggles of the establishment are something you should take no part in, lending neither material nor vocal support. The exception would be the Latino caudillo Caesar; probably the [only faction who would earn mine](#).

My advice, as usual, is for younger men, likely without wives and families. I presume you have some plasticity in how and where you live; not totally rooted. I begin in all cases with a total purge of your social media connected even indirectly with your identity. On the night of Jan 6, I wore my Trump shirt to the gym in a liberal neighborhood, because I was in a fighting mood and hoping to pick a fight, but that shirt will not come out again. The main thing they will be looking for is Trump support; Trump has actually drawn off fire and attention from the dissident right. In this, we are fortunate. If you're reading me, probably haven't been Q-posting. Once the Q-boomers have been taken care of, then the people in charge will have their ears open to the niche specialists who will tell them that “it really began with the alt-right”, and they will begin looking for heretics in stranger places, including both normie conservatism and more esoteric rightist thought. Don't be confused; there may be quite a swell of “populist” activism and bitching

from the GOP once they start going after mainstream conservatives, but this will accomplish nothing and you should not lend your support.

The typical solution offered by the Right, a meme and a stereotype, is to live in the woods, or at least far and humbly away from the Eye of the Enemy. It's not bad, but I caution against building a "commune" or trying to take over a certain town. Present nothing that can be considered a target. Waco and Ruby Ridge were targeted because their beliefs were publicly heretical. Plenty of dirt-poor rednecks were not Ruby-Ridged. Plenty of them will be, but maybe you can avoid notice. I do suggest avoiding farming, however. It is quite likely that land and agricultural "reform" will be on the communist agenda, and it is not the massive farms they will go after (those are already well-controlled by massive subsidies). The corona hoax is intended to crush small business, the kulaks, because massive companies are all already quasi-state entities, surviving only at the whim of HR and a steady faucet of government-subsidized loans. America is already a communist country, for the most part, and they will focus their efforts on the un-communized small businesses. After the fall of Rome, the monasteries survived because the barbarians *were also Christians* and generally didn't want to get on the wrong side of God. There was religious continuity after the fall of Empire; monasticism, the Benedict option (and I cannot help but consider that the cuckservative who named it had more in mind Benedict Arnold) will not at all work today, in the presence of an all-powerful and hostile religion.

Infiltration. Maybe you have it in mind to become Caesar. If you are disagreeable and free-thinking enough to be here, nodding along to my stream-of-consciousness vitriol that happens to pass itself off as coherent constructed writing by sheer virtue of verbal IQ, it's likely that you won't be personally capable of infiltrating the Left (and the Left is the only thing worth infiltrating). I've heard that playing Havel's Greengrocer is hard for a lot of you. If that's the case, being holier than everyone else is probably impossible. Fantasy novels are full of Machiavellian characters who manage to hide their true faces for decades, only to enact some supreme plan on their true motives. I have no reason at all to believe that this is operable in real life. A Stalin would come from Antifa, a Napoleon from the military. Neither were plotters or schemers. Both were fundamentally barbaric men, men-of-action, who intuitively knew how to capitalize on opportunities and wield power. Both were probably disgusted by the anarchy and disorder that they put a stop to. Stalin threw off the trappings of his communist priest-larp, Napoleon (to Carlyle's disdain) began to put them on as his rule continued. Neither joined up with a master plan in mind.

Furthermore, the invention of (or convergence on) bioleninism has closed off this route to power. You cannot infiltrate the Left, because the status-quo within the Left is to be the type of human refuse that cannot take or wield power. Stalin's job, for the bolsheviks, was to rob and shoot people. He was not looked at askance for being manly and having force of personality. For Antifa, if you do not suck the dick, shoot the heroin, etc, you will not get very far. The mere fact that I am healthy, confident, and suffer from no mental illnesses makes the members of leftist social circles regard me as something alien and inhuman, which was not the case as late as 2014. If you want to infiltrate- and here is a failing of something BAP has encouraged (though I have nothing against the man and his book rings more true to me with time)- you will have to LARP as a broken man or face social exclusion and the closing-off of paths to power. For public-face leftism; journalism, academia, elected office, it is enough to merely be a neurotic, squishy bugman. For behind-the-scenes leftism, need to be true garbage. Antifa mugshots are a gallery of physiognomic horrors, and Kyle Rittenhouse showed that you cannot shoot into a crowd of leftist protesters and fail to hit someone who has bugged a little boy. Can you infiltrate this, without being infiltrated yourself? Would you want to? What is there left to save, once the bioleninist race to the bottom concludes?

The third option is to flee the country, if you have the means to do so. If you are not an Amerikaner yourself, not having strong ties of blood to the land here, it may be the best option. Many recommend the Chinese hegemony as an ideal place. I will caution you, however, that there is no path to power there for an expat, and your genes will be quietly and steadily subsumed into a different civilization, your culture and values disappearing. If that doesn't bother you, go ahead. I also recommend staying away from the bloody borders of Islam, which includes all of Western Europe, but that should go without saying. Western Europe does not suffer right-wingers to exist, but you will be hiding your powerlevel regardless, and not engaging in any political activity. When the American Empire collapses, those living in Western Europe will be no better off than those on the streets of NYC.

The fourth option is to hide in plain sight, to be Havel's Greengrocer. How you do this is obvious, with some caveats. The first is to avoid the inner city, which will likely be the site of biannual riots that will grow in boldness and violence, and even if not, of growing violence and disorder, until they resemble Detroit. The second is to follow what was necessary in the Soviet Union; that the nail which sticks out gets hammered down. Not only should you avoid presenting as a rightist, you should avoid amassing wealth and status in conspicuous ways. Fortunately, they are rather incompetent; if Shaniqua at the DMV would not understand what you have as wealth: i.e. bitcoin, investments in secure assets, etc, you are probably safe. Big houses, lots of property, boats, nice cars, the things that kulaks and merchants use to demonstrate status, likely a lot less safe. It is unlikely that they will have the manpower to disentangle an arcane and esoteric network of holdings for everybody; their grabbing will become stupider, more physical, and focus on conspicuously unholy things.

I assume you want a family, and you should have a family. A family needs a house and a garden; being Havel's Greengrocer in an apartment or a townhouse will be bad for your fertility. You also need a community, and while amassing with likeminded men in a commune is very, very, unwise, today we can remain somewhat physically separated while maintaining networks through end-to-end encrypted communications. You need physical presence, and should often be visiting your friends with your family, but this should occur as the natural visitation of one friend with another rather than as meetings of some society or club. I will be homeschooling, and if this raises questions, I will talk at length about the inherent fascism of the school system, how I am teaching my kids to be more loving and inclusive, and all that disgusting pious garbage. You satisfy Shaniqua by not having much to take, and satisfy the inquisitors by being able to mindlessly recite leftist pieties, as direct-quotation as you can, since an *intelligent* recitation of leftism smells of heresy. If you want a leftist cause to donate to for goodie points, while not funding your destruction, I recommend the WWF, which gives money to black militias in Africa to commit brutalities against poachers (based). Because I am rough, wild-looking, and outdoorsy, I can quite easily LARP as a harmless leftist hippie, and if my basement is full of guns and ammo, I am deadlifting in my garage, and homeschooling involves taking my kids to the range and reading the classics, nobody has to know unless I am under direct personal surveillance. Ensuring that you breed, and that your kids are instilled with your values and will breed themselves, is worth the risk. There is no other reason to try and survive at all; if you are not trying to continue your line, you might as well pull a Brevik or join a monastery and leave your honor intact.

It is possible that cold civil war and the gradual purge of heresy escalates into hot civil war and extreme violence. I recommend that you live where you can own guns, and live in a place where people own a lot of guns. It is not likely that you and your friends will get an opportunity to overthrow the state, or carve out your own little state, but the presence of many armed men simply serves to deter the worst war crimes by boots-on-the-ground occupiers. It will be, of

course, wise to live a good distance from the types of targets that air power will attack. Look up military theory, it's not worth me going super in depth on. Strike a good balance between "South African farmer isolated" and "live right next to the stuff that people want to bomb". If you want to train to defend yourself, the most important things are going to be hiking endurance and skills with a firearm. I like strength training as a mind-corrective. It is good to be strong, has all sorts of positive benefits for your T and mood and attitude, but will not help you much in war. And a man should just be strong, period. It's a good in of itself. A final thing I should mention is adrenal desensitization, which hardly anyone talks about. Remaining calm in the face of danger is the single most useful skill a man can have when it comes to doing violence. I have successfully desensitized myself to adrenaline through years of riding motorcycles, and it has the side benefit of making it easier to remain unshaken by the adrenaline rush that comes from hitting on girls. It will also kill your worry and anxiety if you happen to be of a neurotic type. The universal trait of successful warriors is their calm; they can fight and kill calmly and coldly. Calm in the face of mortal peril allows you to access the skills that you have trained, and treat the opponent as an object, a sparring partner. Any hobby that results in extreme adrenaline rushes should be able to produce this effect, and it is absolutely necessary if you find yourself needing to survive.

Okay, so what is the long game? The end goal? Evil does not last forever. That which fights against GNON is doomed to die. The historical cycle is that civilizations such as ours lose the ability to wage war, both in cohesion and actual ability. The world is vast, and the American Empire will eventually fall apart, first at the fringes, and later at the core. The global reach of globohomo is reliant on the military. When American military might is no longer feared, people will be able to get away with shit at the fringes of the empire. Older forms of government and social organization will emerge. Governments reliant on US military aid and intervention will destabilize and collapse. Eventually, barbarians will appear to destroy the weakened Empire. Oftentimes, those barbarians appear from within, like the Sea People during the Bronze Age collapse.

We are now talking on the scale of generations. The backlash of the barbarians against the neo-Carthage that is America will be of a violence and vehemence never before seen in history; a great Nemesis that will make the Mongols and Tamurlane look like schoolyard fights. The long goal for us is to get out of the Empire, not as refugees but as conquerors. Before long now, the roving fortified brothel known as the US military will suffer a humiliating defeat, a symbolic defeat that proves to the world that the sword is broken. This will open up opportunities for imperialism on the fringes of empire. China shows little interest in such places beyond the economic. As shown by Cortez and Pizarro, by the British East India company, a relative handful of white warriors can bring a vast empire to its knees. It will be necessary for our descendants, in close contact and of a similar spirit, to be the Hengist and Horsa of the next era, to take over a shithole as mercenaries and lead an exodus. This would be so good for business, that China's hegemony would not mind. Perhaps they would even encourage and fund it. Whether our descendants in their new home will eventually participate in the centuries of orgiastic violence that accompany the Fall of America, or merely sit on the sidelines, is not for me to say. When and where is also not for me to say. Where? Wherever there is opportunity, but not too close to the borders of China or Russia. When? When the phallus of US military might goes limp. It may be ten years, it may be ten decades, but I suspect it will be closer to ten years than ten decades.