

A Radical Male Sexualist Manifesto

By Tom Grauer

Is the blood of women redder than the blood of men? Is their pain more distressful? Are their needs more urgent?

These, indeed, are the premises behind society's unequal treatment of men and women. Whereas men are constantly reminded of our sinful nature, and of our obligation to share what we've acquired with "the fairer sex," women are inundated with one, unchanging motto: *you deserve!*

Men build the institutions; women *have a right* to occupy them. Men invent the cures; women *have a right* to be treated with them. Men create the products; women *have a right* to own them. Men construct the utilities; women *have a right* to use them. And so on and so forth.

We do not ask for gratitude (to say nothing of tangible reciprocity), nor do we ever receive even a hint thereof; instead, what we receive are endless reminders that we have not given women nearly enough of this and of that - why, they deserve so much more! They have a right to everything *and then some*. Don't they?

Such tremendous equality: men have the right (which also happens to be a duty) to produce, and women have the right to consume. "Equal rights!"

This state of affairs, which has been going on since before we were naked apes in the jungle, attests to one

immutable biological condition: gynocentrism. The female *is* the species; the female must be provided for by effectively harnessing the forces of nature; men are merely the disposable instruments through which the species sustains itself - no more and no less.

Viewed through this lens, all the pieces of the inter-sexual puzzle fall into place.

Why are we constantly told horror stories about “violence against women,” when the overwhelming majority of those who suffer from violence are men? Why are we required to weep whenever a woman stubs a toe, while no word is spoken regarding the myriads of men who die atrociously in wars, in work accidents, or down in the gutter? Why do we take it for granted that women deserve representation at the uppermost echelons of society, even as the bottom of society reeks heavily of the *rotting dead bodies* of invisible men?

Because women are valued for their very existence, while men are only valued insofar as they can provide one utility or another to women; unlike men, women can never be deemed “useless.” Even, as is so often the case, when that’s precisely what they are.

To say that women parasitize on the civilization built by men, whose very flesh and blood are its brick and mortar, is to highly compliment all parasites everywhere. Parasites at least have the decency not to accuse their hosts of moral bankruptcy when the latter

fail to bleed rapidly enough for the parasites' tastes; in contrast, women never cease to find more and more "intolerable" blemishes in men's character despite having their every frivolous whim taken care of by those very men.

Such is life in our gynocentric world. Is it any wonder that suicides and other self-destructive behaviors are so disproportionately more common among men than among women?

Today, more than at any preceding era, men are collectively and individually obligated to protect, provide, and self-sacrifice; women's sole obligation, such as it is, is to collectively and individually demand more protection, more sustenance, and more self-sacrifice from men. Such "equal obligations!"

Nowhere is gynocentrism more blatant than in the field of sexuality. It is here that gynocentrism's most grotesque qualities take center stage.

Anything that might give women the slightest displeasure (in terms of their sexual self-interests) is denounced in the harshest terms and no resource shall be withheld from the crusade to extirpate said phenomenon. Anything short of *absolute comfort* won't do - and in fact, women's sense of sexual comfort can never be absolute enough! They always need *you* (the man, the chauvinist pig, the vile patriarchal oppressor)

to do more for them, lots more, and you better hurry up!

More legislation, tougher sanctions, severer punishments, greater funding, increased policing, stronger surveillance, and exactly **zero** qualms about destroying the lives of men; women's dear feelings of comfort and safety and self-esteem must not be infringed on - *or else*.

"Women have no privilege, only men do!" we are told by members of the cognitive elite; criminologists, sociologists, psychologists, phrenologists, astrologists, etc., all the quacks in town unanimously agree: men use sexuality to oppress women, and therefore, male sexuality is the enemy to be, at long last, defeated.

Should anyone deviate from this most sacred of dogmas, no oceans of tar and no mountains of feathers will suffice to punish said heretic; the accusation of "rape-apologia" (also "misogyny," "pedophilia," and whatever else) will reverberate all throughout the Milky Way Galaxy. *How dare he?!*

To cast doubt on the self-evident and unquestionable sanctity of female sexual comfort (to say nothing of actually violating it, ever so mildly and harmlessly) is "beyond the pale," we are told by gynocentric society and its self-appointed cultural gatekeepers. If a woman so much as *dreams* about you engaging in sexual impropriety as subjectively defined by herself post

factum, well sir, you are in grave trouble; you may as well volunteer for the guillotine right away and be done with it.

It goes without saying, of course, that the sexual needs of men, the actual physical conditions of men, not to mention their *presumption of innocence*, are irrelevant on a good day, and deemed brutally oppressive to women on an even better day!

Nothing justifies gynocentric policies (i.e., policies that transfer power and resources from men to women) like the hysteria over “sex crimes.” Under gynocentrism, the sexual interests of men turn into pure liabilities; it is better for a man to be asexual, to renounce his sexuality completely, lest it be used to incarcerate him under this or that pretext; alas, even that won’t avail him in case a woman simply falsely accuses him of things that have not transpired.

Every aspect of male sexuality is closely scrutinized; the smallest failure, perceived or assumed, however it may be defined, will be used against the innocent man; the vast list of victimless crimes keeps expanding, and man’s liberty -- particularly man’s sexual liberty -- is in constant retreat from the misandric, sex-hostile witch-hunt.

Behaviors that were regarded -- *throughout all of history* -- as healthy and normal now serve as solid grounds for the most vehement castigation and the most ruthless penalization; the message forcefully

conveyed by the assorted “intellectual giants” and “moral compasses” in the media, the academia, the police, and the entertainment industry is that men are essentially aberrant beings who must be kept on a tight leash. It is no exaggeration to recognize this state of affairs as an outright *war against male sexuality*. (Will it fight back?)

Consider a very common case. Policemen pose as lustful teenagers, usually pretending to be aged 13 to 15, seduce random men under their carefully-crafted false identities, arrive to take the innocent men to jail, and then triumphantly rush to announce that “predators have been caught!” The misandric media celebrates; the police are hailed as brave heroes who save the day; and the dishonest headlines often enough read: “A sting operation busted a child sex trafficking ring.”

Yes, a “child sex trafficking ring” with no child, no sex, no trafficking, and no ring. Healthy heterosexual men will endure torture in prison for no reason other than possessing normal male sexuality; that no actual harm has been caused (and no actual harm would have been caused even if these were real lustful teenagers aged 13-15 rather than fake ones) goes unsaid; another day goes by with fake heroes fighting fake crimes - yet the budgets, fat and fatter, are quite authentic indeed. Quelle surprise.

Gynocentrism is aided by another force active in human society. No analysis of male-female relations can be

complete without addressing the mentality and the mood that constitute Puritanism. The sheer zest with which normal heterosexual men are hunted down by holier-than-thou fanatics cannot be adequately explained without recourse to the increasingly common taint of character that is the Puritan outlook.

The Puritan of our times denies as many *realities of the flesh* as humanly possible, if not more-so. For the Puritan, sex is not a biological need, much less a volcanic, irresistible compulsion. Not at all. In the Puritan's diseased mind, sexuality is just a "flavor," a quaint hobby perhaps, and a very negative one at that. He is forever disgusted by what he sees.

(Curiously enough, Puritans always happen to be very well-educated about all things sexual. Someone may suggest that expunging sexuality from the world is itself a perverse fetish for the Puritan. The shoe seems to fit)

The Puritan will adamantly insist: "I am totally not an ascetic." And yet, each and every proposition suggested by the Puritan overflows with unmistakable ascetic sentiments and rests on presuppositions that only a person strongly inclined to asceticism, especially of the sexual variety, would hold.

Puritans are always on the lookout for reasons, plausible or otherwise, to call for the cessation of sexual activities by criminalizing them and loudly fulminating against them. Gynocentric norms provide ample opportunities

for the Puritan to lambaste his “moral inferiors” for their less-than-perfect (and ever diminishing) adherence to his anti-sexual pronouncements.

It is, of course, primarily men who will be subject to the Puritan’s ire; the Puritan finds it easier and more convenient to agitate against masculine sexuality specifically than against sexuality per se, thus he will often issue his invective against men and not against sex itself, cloaking his ulterior agenda under the guise of “concern for women and children.” An old trick.

The Puritan viscerally feels, deep in his bones, that people must be prevented from having sex. But “Sex is Bad” campaigns tend to be counterproductive, because most people -- including the hypocritical Puritan himself -- do enjoy sex. So the trick goes, “Sure, sex is splendid. But here are 1,000+ conditions and situations that render sex unacceptable and totally wrong. If your sexual activity (somehow) doesn’t fall within those 1,000+ conditions and situations, then congratulations, you are officially allowed to engage in that sexual activity... for now at least, hehehe.”

The Puritan will then pride himself on being “pro-sex,” because technically he is only opposed to 99.999999% of sexual activities rather than the stricter -- and *ideal*, in his view -- prohibition of 100% of sexual activities.

Thanks to rampant Puritanism, in no time was sex less *free* than nowadays, and it keeps bleeding more and

more of its freedom each passing year. The Puritan, in his unshakable fanaticism, will paint the opposite picture; he will claim that people today have greater liberties than in the past. It is the same Puritan who contends that people in the past were much more pious, and that, come the Puritan revolution, people will once again be as pious “as in the good old days.”

These are outrageous lies. The vast majority of modern “sex-crimes” were either perfectly legal, or only seldom prosecuted, in the 19th and 20th century, that is, within recent history. For instance, the modern ever-expanding definition of “rape” would have been correctly considered an absurd lunacy mere 50 years ago, not to say 150 years ago. These days, those few drops of wine your wife had drunk before you went to bed had rendered the ensuing sexual activity completely illegal, since those few drops of wine had deprived her of the ability to give “real consent.” And so on.

Of his own volition, the Puritan will never admit that perhaps the criminalization of normal male sexuality has gone overboard, because modern society is in the Puritan’s tight grip, which means that its flaws are *the flaws of Puritanism*. The Puritan is unwilling to admit, even to himself, that his worldview has miserably, spectacularly failed to make the world a better place. No; he insists that *more Puritanism* will set things right. “If only people were much more hostile to sexuality, sexual immorality would finally disappear,” he is sternly convinced. There is no reasoning with people trapped in

a frenzy of ascetic hostility to sex; relentless ridicule must be applied.

The Puritan already knows his aim (“illegalize this sexual activity!”), and works his reasoning to it backwards. He knows that legislation must be passed to make ever more sexual activities into criminal offenses; all he has to do is collect sufficiently compelling arguments in favor of criminalization. Naturally, such arguments will take the form of *anti-male* diatribes, as Puritanism -- being, after all, a human inclination -- must operate within an absolutely gynocentric environment.

Fortunately for Puritanism, and unfortunately for men and for civilization, there is yet another ideology working tirelessly to confiscate all the harmless delights (sexual and non-sexual alike) that we might have enjoyed: Feminism.

No ideology accurately encapsulates the feverish animosity against all-things-male more vividly than Feminism.

Feminists will never miss an opportunity to advocate for sharpening the imbalance in women’s favor, restricting the rights of men while expanding those of women, placing more duties on men while “liberating” women from their own duties, raising the social status of women and lowering that of men, transferring as much power and as many resources as possible from men to women; furthermore, Feminists seek to redefine

normalcy in accordance with their worldview, *and in accordance with it alone*. Needless to say, they have greatly succeeded in achieving all of those political objectives.

In every field, Feminism works to privilege women and to intensify and exacerbate gynocentric attitudes.

Feminists use Affirmative Action to promote one another, and (to no one's surprise) always demand the expansion of Affirmative Action programs. They may not create or manufacture or build or invent equally, which is really an understatement, but they surely vocally demand to be "represented" equally! After all, everyone is equal, but women are *more equal*.

They extort from the male taxpayer all the money they can lay their greedy hands on, and direct that money to causes that benefit women *at the direct expense of men*. They need special laws, special committees, special lobbies, special programs, and very special funding for those programs; pay up peacefully or be violently terrorized into submission, Mr. Taxpayer. You wouldn't want to be accused of misogyny, or of sexual harassment, now, would you?

In the name of "protecting the best interests of the child," the misandro-Feminist leeches squeeze dry the wallets of millions of men using the full force of law enforcement - and if you have no way to pay the child support, and some alimony too, then guess what? It's

jail time, baby. Divorced men find themselves homeless and starving in the cold dark gutter because a witch has the support of the state in stripping them off all their assets and income, which is apparently justified by the refrain, "Think of the children." They never logically explain what morally legitimizes such blatant seizure of men's money; apparently, it is just so "obvious" that "the interests of the child" (which happen very mysteriously to coincide with those of the woman) always trump the interests of the man. Or perhaps men *simply don't have any legitimate interests*, right, misandro-Feminist leeches?

(Since when do men have inalienable rights, anyway?)

The Feminist house of horrors has no end of unimaginably sadistic tortures for those few recalcitrant men who refuse to bow down meekly to the Feminist tyranny, or indeed, for the entire male population. No politician can slay the Feminist hydra, for its potent weapon -- false rape accusations -- is wielded against every actual or potential opponent. Feminists always seek to make it as easy as possible for any woman to accuse any man of "rape."

Did you accidentally touch the corner of the edge of a woman's hidden third nipple 68 years ago at an ambiguously-described party you couldn't even have gone to because you're only 54? Rape! Did you walk the same street as a voracious teenager, aged 15 years and 11 months and 28 days? Obvious kiddie-diddling right

there. Do you vaguely remember hearing from a distance your 17-year-old neighbor singing in the shower back in the 1960s? Duh - you possess illegal Child Pornography *right in your brain*. It's lobotomy or prison for you, mate. (Actually it's both)

Yes, the Feminist house of horrors contains an infinity of wild reasons why men are evil sexual predators who prey on poor angelic women and must be immediately stopped. Age, mental conditions, physical conditions, feelings of regret, a few drops of wine, sheer fantasy, or whatever - women are permitted to use any and every pretext they can come up with to destroy the lives of innocent men. If the women themselves won't do it, then the police or various agencies and bureaucracies of the government will intervene, will step in to put an end to a man's free living.

However, there is a plus side. Accelerated Feminism engenders the opposition to itself. There is only so much that men are willing to take before they snap. The more miserable men grow under the Feminist system, and the greater their numbers and share of the population, the faster will the demise of Feminism approach.

As Feminism rapidly switches from a semi-latent privileging of female interests to out-and-out Female Supremacy, men commence to question the very foundations of this whole rotten edifice. Our survival instinct is still healthy enough and strong enough to recognize that we're the boiling frogs; and Feminists just

can't resist the temptation to heat things up to the hottest degree all at once. Reluctantly, even politically-apathetic men grow ever more skeptical (to put it mildly) of the Feminist propaganda by the day.

We should all thank the great folks at the Gender Studies departments worldwide, who are doing the most excellent job conceivable to discredit Feminism; the zealous blue-haired crowd is a *dream-come-true* for us anti-Feminists, as they exhibit down to a T all the qualities that we've always argued characterize the Feminists. They reveal the true, uglier than all ugliness, face of Feminism, shorn of its once-maintained deceitful veneer of moral-intellectual rigor.

The Feminists have jumped the shark. A few decades ago, their bloodthirsty misandry was still plausibly deniable; not any longer. They hate men, they hate male civilization, they hate masculinity, and most of all, they hate male sexuality. Be they lesbian activists on campus, BPD-afflicted cat-ladies working at Human Resources, or androgynized parliamentarians, they are all united by their vicious animosity towards masculine, sexually-healthy, heterosexual men who possess testosterone levels that aren't abysmally low.

In their war against "objectification," "the male gaze," "catcalls," and so forth, the Feminists have lost whatever moral high grounds they might have once possessed. After all, what do *rights* such as inheriting property, owning property, and voting in the elections,

have to do with the modern Feminist hostility to everything associated with male sexuality?

Women no longer seek “liberation;” their modern political aim is official domination over male civilization. And being the civilizationally-indispensable sex, men are understandably unwilling to cede 100% of the control over the society *that they themselves built* to women, those capricious and fickle entities, the magnitude of whose parasitism makes leeches look like generous altruists in comparison.

The argument for anti-Feminism is striking both in its simplicity and in its instant appeal to logically-inclined minds:

1. Feminist movements and organizations advocate against the interests of men;
2. There are no movements and organizations that work to counter this Feminist advocacy;
3. This state of affairs is detrimental to the interests of men;
4. Therefore, it's in the interest of men to create anti-Feminist movements and organizations.

This argument can be further refined to specifically address the ardent war raging on against male sexuality:

1. Puritan-Feminist advocacy groups keep criminalizing more and more aspects of male sexuality;

2. Our gynocentric society, as could be expected, does nothing to counter this Puritan-Feminist crusade against men, against sexuality, and most of all against male sexuality;
3. This pernicious state of affairs is dangerous for men, for the civilization built and maintained by men, and for male sexuality;
4. Thus, men should launch a pro-male-sexuality movement (now also known as Male Sexualism) to reverse the situation.

This is the anti-Feminist argument in a nutshell, and combined with several factors now at play (e.g., the rise of men's movements such as MRAs, PUAs, MGTOWs, and the various Red-Pill and incel communities), it is destined to grow in popularity in the following decades; the rise of Male Sexualism is inevitable.

It is important, however, to keep in mind who the adversaries of Male Sexualism are. Broadly speaking, they can be classified according to the following four succinct categories, listed in no particular order:

1. Law enforcement agents who seek to maintain, legitimize, and expand the police-state, the surveillance-state, mass incarceration, and other dystopian, tyrannical, and illiberal elements of modern life taken straight out of Orwell's *1984*;
2. Feminist activists embedded in academia, the mainstream media, the alternative media, the entertainment industry, the NGOs, the Foundations,

sundry think tanks, and various government bureaucracies; chiefly speaking, the professors of Victim-Studies and the devout, vociferous followers of their manifold “disciplines,” such as they are;

3. Non-affiliated old and unattractive women who, driven by unadulterated envy, seek to restrict the access of men to various categories of women so as to make *themselves* more likely to be on the receiving end of men’s sexual attention; also, some non-affiliated envious men who likewise seek to criminalize the sexual relationships of other men out of nothing but spite;

4. Conservative-minded men who see it as their duty to protect “women and children” from wicked male predators; these types tend to view themselves as “gentlemen” and they self-satisfyingly pat themselves on the back for betraying male interests, particularly male sexual interests, for the sake of so-called “chivalry.”

We will presently revisit this subject in order to expound in greater length those forces, herein revealed as the coalition of Gynocentrism-Puritanism-Feminism, arrayed against us. But first, a slight digression.

What prompts so many women to initiate divorces or otherwise bring about the collapse of their own marriages? The modern female-initiated divorce epidemic is rooted in two symbiotic factors, one internal and one external to any given woman:

1. The inherent nature of women, which is solipsistic through and through, prizing one's own "happiness" above all considerations of self-sacrifice or values higher than piggish hedonism;
2. Unrelenting Feminist, Feminism-derived, and Feminism-inspired agitation which pollutes the entirety of our social atmosphere.

No sentence in the human language casts a darker shadow than "Do what makes you happy." It is in the accursed name of happiness that women renege on their marital loyalty and shatter the lives of their husbands and children; it is for their oh-so-vital "sense of comfort" that women engage in anti-marital and anti-spousal behaviors that ineluctably lead to familial dissipation; we vomit our souls out from the poisonous fruits of atomization, it being the direct consequence of the crime against humanity committed by those who sowed the nefarious seeds of Feminism.

The Feminist tyranny extracts as many resources from men as humanly possible and delivers them to the grasping hands and wolfish mouths of women, while absolving women from any and all duties to men. "Rights for women, duties for men" is the gist of the Feminist program.

This state of affairs makes marriage and family formation untenable, as women are disincentivized and discouraged from sticking with their spouse; when their "opinionated" milieu signals to them that they ought to

pursue their self-centered “happiness” by destroying their own families, that’s precisely what women -- being the herd-like, reflexive, zombified creatures that they are -- proceed to do.

Thus, women are socially engineered to prefer short-term pleasure over stability and commitment; this necessarily results in significant numbers of men, members of the less desired sex, being unable to acquire spouses or maintain them for long. **Involuntary celibacy** is Feminism’s gift to the very men who allow Feminism to thrive.

Feminism and involuntary celibacy go hand-in-hand. Men who aren’t in the top-tier of the attractiveness ladder according to female mate-selection criteria find it harder by the year to find sexual and romantic fulfillment with the picky sex; consequently, many turn to desensitizing and/or risky activities to assuage their own sexlessness. Many simply have no choice but to turn to prostitution and pornography. Such is men’s lot under Feminism - and, rest assured, Feminists would have (and, in fact, do have) whorehouse patrons and pornography consumers routinely severely penalized for desperately resorting to these sub-par solutions.

If imprisoning lonely men for glancing at forbidden, sinister pixels isn’t the very definition of “Free Love,” then what is?

To enable us to conceptualize the war against men and against male sexuality with the proper terminology, let's address the phenomenon of "kighthood" and the worldview in which it's rooted: victimology. The **Knights of Victimology** deserve their due examination and scrutiny.

A "White Knight" in internet-parlance means a person, usually a man, who spends his energies defending the female sex from anything perceived as a threat to its interests, and/or defending individual women from anything perceived as a threat to their interests *as women*. White Knights, who often self-identify as "gentlemen," give preferential treatment to women and to their interests at the expense of men and male interests, in other words, discriminate against men whenever the opportunity presents itself. Discrimination against men is the heart and the soul of White Knightism.

White Knights are driven by two related urges, both of which ultimately stem from their overactive protective-instinct: the urge to indulge women, who are perceived as the "nobler" sex; and the urge to defend women -- who are perceived as fragile and delicate -- from real or (more often) imaginary threats. It's the combined force of idealization of women, their pedestalization, and excessive and disproportionate empathy towards them, that impels White Knights into action.

White Knights are not the only type of Knights. A related term, which may be viewed as a sub-category of the White Knight, is that of the “Blue Knight.” Blue Knights are those individuals who see themselves as a voluntary police force whose purpose is to protect “children,” a deliberate misnomer for female teenagers, from so-called predation and so-called exploitation by men. Blue Knights accuse anyone who rubs their sensibilities the wrong way of being a “pedophile,” and incessantly clamor for the penalization of the male population, usually by means of the death penalty, for actions falsely described as “child abuse.”

Blue Knights believe it to be their job to guard female teenagers (“children”) from sexual contact with men, or any sexual self-expression, because these are perceived by the Blue Knight as inherently victimizing to the female teenagers, and as compromising their interests. A Blue Knight thinks, “If I don’t imprison Joe Shmoe for receiving oral sex from a schoolgirl, I will be turning a blind eye to child abuse. Never! I must ensure that Joe Shmoe will rot in prison for harming a poor, innocent child.” The Blue Knight is either unable or unwilling to recognize the realities of teenage sexuality and male sexuality, and will refer to normal sexual behavior as if it were abnormal and to common male-female dynamics as if they were aberrations.

What lies at the emotio-cognitive center of both White Knightism and Blue Knightism is the firmly-entrenched worldview of **Victimology**. Victimologists divide the

whole world into *victims* and *victimizers*, and are convinced that they must invest their time and energy into the “protection” of the *victims* from the *victimizers* by whatever means they find available. An old man is forever a *victimizer*; a young woman forever a *victim*. Anything that may suggest otherwise is ignored or shunned as “victimization-apologia.” In the Blue Knight psyche, society must intervene to protect the supposedly weaker sex from the supposedly stronger one, regardless of the actual situation on the ground.

A victimologist, holding a victimization-based moral framework, works overtime to identify and root out “power imbalances,” which in terms of male-female relations means -- *of course* -- that men must be punished and women must be championed; moreover, the victimologist insists that age-gaps always, invariably work in favor of the older person involved; and being a faux-egalitarian, the victimologist, the Blue Knight in this instance, must therefore denounce anything perceived as manifesting a “power imbalance,” which again means punishing people, primarily men, for the harmless crime of being an older person within a sexual relationship.

The victimologist seeks to equate normal male sexuality with evil and to designate it as such. Since the Knights, the White and Blue ones alike, argue that male sexuality is *inherently victimizing* to “women and children,” it is their task to create the false impression that various modern “sex-crimes” are just as victimizing, if not much more-so, as legitimately harmful crimes.

Fortunately for the Knights and lamentably for us, they have the media-academia-government complex on their side, relentlessly pumping out studies, policy-papers, and barefaced propaganda that legitimize the victimological worldview and seek newer, ever-more-draconian ways to implement it.

When the victimologist argues that a female aged 17 is victimized by male sexuality due solely to her “young age,” he is being a Blue Knight; when the victimologist argues that a female aged 18 is victimized by male sexuality due solely to her sex, he is being a White Knight. Thus we see that the two types of Knights are interchangeable, and should logically conclude that they are constituted by the very same people, which conclusion is amply confirmed by empirical observation of e.g. various forums and comments’ sections on the internet.

An all-too-common tactic employed by the Knights of Victimology is painting the entire spectrum of a certain behavior or action with the colors of its most extreme edge. For example, to garner support for tougher anti-rape legislation, a typical White Knight goal, the White Knight will present the case of several felons who ambush a woman walking alone in the dark, and armed with knives proceed to gang-rape her; the fear-mongering White Knight will then use that extreme edge case to shock people into supporting his agenda of harsher anti-rape (anti-male) measures, despite the fact

that 99.99% of the “rape” instances addressed by his proposed measures have nothing to do and nothing in common with the violent gang-rape case that the White Knight waves around and utilizes as a talking-point.

Ever-more-absurd definitions of rape include: “5 seconds rape,” “few drops of wine rape,” and “mild dementia rape.” Let’s examine these 3 absurd definitions.

5-seconds-rape refers to those instances when, mid-coitus, the woman tells her lover to stop, and it takes him approximately 5 seconds to do so. According to victimology, the woman was raped during those 5 seconds, regardless of all the other circumstances of the situation.

Few-drops-of-wine-rape refers to those instances when the woman had consumed a certain amount of alcohol, which -- according to victimology -- renders her subsequent *consent to sex* obsolete and irrelevant, which means that your romantic evening with the woman with whom you’ve been married for decades was “rape” and that you are a “rapist.” Welcome to the club!

Mild-dementia-rape refers to the Feminist demand that elderly men who had sexual relations with their equally elderly wives be charged with “rape,” because their wives happened to suffer from dementia; the desires and the needs of the wife herself need not be consulted.

The same applies to Blue Knights. They contend that lewd images of teenagers are “child pornography,” and use that misleading definition to advocate for imprisoning myriads of men, and even teenagers themselves, for “CP-related” “sex-crimes.” But to convince the public to support this lunacy, they use the extremely uncommon case of images depicting e.g. a 5-year-old child being penetrated by an older family member. (We’re not even going into the issue of sinister pixels not being identical to the *action itself*)

Even though the rape of a 5-year-old by his or her father is very much unlike the camera-prostitution of a 14-year-old teenager exploding with sex-hormones, the Blue Knights will use the former case to advocate for penalizing an infinity of men for things related to the latter case. This, they call “fighting pedophilia.” A Motte and Bailey tactic.

In the victimological moral-framework, a sex-crazed teenager who lies about her age and initiates sex with an older man is a “victim,” while the man she had passionate sex with is necessarily a “victimizer” who must spend years behind bars or even get the chair for “child abuse.”

Ironically, real victims of real abuse are forgotten about as the torch-and-pitchfork witch-hunt against bogus sex-crimes intensifies. Kids who are beaten, humiliated, and tortured shall be practically disregarded as the police is

busy chasing after random men who may or may not be attracted to well-developed teenagers aged 13 to 17.

The quintessential tenet of Victimology is *infantilization*. In the context of Blue Knightism, infantilization is the deceitful proposition that the much-exaggerated “immaturity” of teenagers renders them incapable of consenting to sexual relations with older people.

Much has been written about the subject and there’s no need to belabor the matter here; suffice it to say that subjecting people from age 3 to age 23 to a never-ending barrage of infantilizing influences, particularly in the Prussian School System and in the mass-culture directed at young people (infantilizing influences that artificially arrest the natural development of youngsters into adults by depriving them of relevant information regarding male-female relations, forcefully distracting their attention from the subject, and persuading them that it’s just “not for them” to behave as adults do in terms of their romantic, sexual, or marital lives), works to instill infantilization into the public’s collective consciousness and to convince even the hormonal teenagers themselves that they are not yet ready for sexual relations, regardless of the clear, unambiguous messages given to them by their own bodies.

(When things were radically different, as throughout all of history, teenagers proved ready enough to take upon themselves the responsibility of managing their own sex lives rather than having them managed by Big Sister)

The White Knights of Victimology become apoplectic whenever the issue of “violence against women” is brought up; in their misandric and *gynocentric* view, the Earth and all that dwells on it should be turned upside-down and inside-out to make sure that women’s sense of comfort won’t in any way be infringed on. Ever over-protective, ever over-sensitive, the White Knight will rush to the defense of any damsel-in-distress in his vicinity (or seek them out afar, if need be), lest she be made to feel displeasure at the hands of an “evil man.”

The norms in modern society are a perfect reflection of the misandro-Feministo-Victimologisto-gynocentrism possessed by the White Knights and by their manifold fans in the media-academia-NGO-government complex. This worldview is so deeply ingrained into the mentality of so many people that it’s becoming increasingly harder to imagine society running according to any different lines of thinking; but our imagination is the one thing our adversaries can’t take away from us, try as they will!

The persistence of Knightism is explained by humanity’s gynocentric programming; for a whole lot of people, it takes great mental efforts to overcome the instinct to rush to a damsel-in-distress’ defense. However, the deliberate agitation run by the media-academia-NGO-government complex plays an integral, critical part in fostering the White Knight and Blue Knight modes of thinking in the public’s consciousness. Consider:

1. Does the media's Mighty Wurlitzer not highlight and mass-advertise whatever dubious "men bad, women good" sob-story it can find - or concocts such out of whole cloth?

2. Do the Gender Studies departments, and similar abominations, not engage in a frenetic cultivation of a sense of victimhood on the part of the female students and in guilt-tripping the male students into feeling ashamed of their own masculinity?

3. Do Feminist advocacy groups and lobbies not regularly write policy-papers for governmental committees or meet with their representatives inside parliament to advance their preferred legislation?

4. Does the police, for instance, not demand from the government increased funding for the endless "anti-abuse" programs run by the plethora of useless departments on its payroll? And does the government not grant the requested funds?

What else motivates the Knights beside their over-active protective instinct? In fact, as mentioned previously, some other factors are involved in the formation of the victimological mentality.

One, the personal monetary or career gains to be made by victimological endeavors. Bureaucracy always seeks to expand and to do what's best for *its* interests (Jerry Pournelle's *iron law of bureaucracy*), hence the police

and its lap-dog-reporters in the media always promote the narratives of Blue Knightism, working in conjunction with Feminist academics and activists to craft recommendations and guidelines for the government to approve the expansion of various police departments and to increase as much as possible the funding for existing ones.

Two, envy. The less men are able to find sexual fulfillment with young women due to it being severely criminalized, the more likely they are to confine their searches for sexual contentment to older women. Similarly, when sexually-alluring pornography and viable sex-bots are made illegal, men are left with no choice but to seek out flesh-and-blood women, even if these aren't particularly sexually appealing to them. Thus, we see that older and uglier women stand to benefit men's attention by criminalizing young sexuality and alternative sexual outlets, which reveals a common source of the fanaticism with which they call for tougher measures to be applied in bogus "sex-abuse" cases.

Three, the female gynocentric *sense of entitlement*. Women truly believe that society is meant to serve them and their interests exclusively, and whenever they enter politics, the media, academia, or any organization, they promote exactly those notions intended to increase both the collective weal of womanhood and their own personal gain *as women*. "Is it good for women?" is the one question constantly plaguing their minds, often to the exclusion of most other consideration and definitely

superior to them all; self-conscious of their own femaleness, only seldom do they depart from the screeching Feminist mob to advocate what's truly best for male-created civilization. Gynocentrism robs us men of all we have - and then spits in our faces.

If you think that an unfair picture of women has been painted here, just consider the lopsided way in which the media-academia-NGO-government complex is run. Whenever you're dealing with this enormous, multiple-tentacled entity, you constantly hear a roar, usually a deafening one, thundering somewhere in the background: "what about women?" Yet, when have you ever heard the question asked: "what about men?" Do legislators ever dare ask it? Does the media ever demand answers from the apparatuses of power regarding the way *men* are treated? Do universities pay their professors to write and to lecture about the plight of men, who are the sex of the homeless, the sex of the war-slain, the sex making up most of the prison population, the sex always discriminated against by the courts, the sex at whose expense all jokes are permissible?

As always, the relevant question is not "who writes the laws?", but "for whom are the laws written?" The Feminists always remind us that (ostensibly) the system is run by men. But why not ask: *for whose benefit* is it run? That is the question at the heart of gynocentrism. In other words:

1. Do the male legislators who pass one anti-male statute after another do so to advance male interests, or female ones?

2. Do male Feminist professors who blame all the ills of the world on fellow men do so for the Patriarchy's benefit, or for the Matriarchy's?

3. When male billionaires donate astronomical sums to Feminist NGOs, and when "disproportionately male" governments use our tax-money to do the same, is it all done in the interest of men - or in the interest of women?

4. When Puritan male judges steam, fume, and vapor about teenage sex, calling the men accused thereof every epithet in the book and some original ones on top, do they seek to help out fellow men, or -- just the opposite -- to use their power to engage in White and Blue Knightism on behalf of women?

5. When the male Feminists who own the media use their information/disinformation outlets, their brigades of journalists, to agitate against "penis-having victimizers" and to regurgitate, parrot, and channel every Feminist talking-point out there non-stop, is it really all done with a view to favoring the welfare of men? Is it not rather done to support the misandric causes of the Gender Activists?

A Feminist knows that whatever vile campaign she launches, it will receive support, promotion, and publicity from the respective organs of the media-academia-NGO-government complex, who will do all in their power to protect her from any negative externalities of her anti-social “enterprise.” In contrast, a pro-male, anti-Feminist activist simply stands no chance in the contemporary social climate; we are indeed guerrillas surrounded by hostile armies screaming for our blood.

Some of the sharpest minds employed by the FBI, the GCHQ, etc., are busy spooking up on bogus “sex-crimes,” particularly those that occur on the internet, while real, life-and-death crimes can go unsolved for years on end. Such is life under gynocentrism *and* *victimology*. Wouldn't it be great if this were in reverse? One can only dream!

Male sexuality, which is an *active force*, and has to be so, has been thoroughly pathologized by people with a feminine-typical mindset, who consider passivity to be a high virtue and denounce the active pursuit of one's needs and wants as “harmful,” usually masking this misandric bias with appeals to the prevalent and socially-approved victimization-based morality.

Masculinity, which is the source of our civilization, is being pathologized by mental weaklings who sanctify failure and misfortune as these provide them with the pretext to stick their noses where they don't belong and “do good.” The do-gooders need the modern

victimological climate exactly as fish need water; without it they have no leg, moral or financial, to stand on.

Everything men enjoy has been pathologized. We are told that we are monsters who need to be locked in cages of varying sizes lest we use our liberty to “oppress” the female sex, which coincidentally is the sex that lives longer, receives shorter sentences than men for identical offenses, whose health and welfare are allocated a disproportionate share of the government’s annual budget (collected mostly from men), retains its privileges of yore without sharing in the duties of its contemporary male counterparts, is entitled to an endless succession of tax breaks, has entire sections of the penal code devoted solely to its weal, and so and on so forth; and then we are told that *we* oppress *them*! With our liberty, no less!

It should come as no surprise that those who abhor liberty almost invariably support victimology-centered policies; in order to have a tighter grip over society, the government and its shills need to convince the public that common, normal things are horrible abuses; only by spreading hysteria, panic, fear, uncertainty, doubt, demoralization, and tension can the modern totalitarianism of deep states, funded through black budgets, sustain itself and exacerbate its hold over the public’s consciousness. If you’re not scared of your own shadow, they see it as a failure on their part.

Victimology is the glue holding together a grand coalition composed of such outwardly dissimilar constituents as Feminist agitators and veteran police officers, for instance. They all need you to believe that women are the victims of men and that teenagers are the victims of old people; without this false premise, the entire gynocentric framework will collapse like a house of cards. The agent in charge of handling “abuse images” cases needs the Feminist academic-propagandist just as surely as she needs him to carry out in practice whatever hysterical recommendations she and her colleagues have concocted from within the chambers of university.

Sex-hysteria (the hysteria about imaginary “rapists” and imaginary “pedophiles”) becomes especially grating when one considers just how widespread involuntary celibacy truly is. As a matter of fact, even marriages have become rather sexless in recent decades; all studies indicate that people today, *including teenagers*, are having less sex than ever before! With so little sex going on, one has to marvel at the accelerating rapidity with which sex-hysterical laws are passed each year; it’s almost like Puritans have taken over society and socially engineer it to their liking! (Actually, it’s exactly so)

Mass involuntary celibacy did not emerge out of nowhere. It had been preceded by more than a century of fear-mongering regarding “sex-crimes” of this or that type. Misandric narratives, shared by everyone in authority, have made it so that men can’t pursue their

sexual interests in meaningful ways; the result is a vast, spreading sexlessness that's becoming more and more acute each passing year.

Needless to say, it is men who are its chief, perhaps singular, sufferers; as the less-desired, more-desiring sex, men are at a natural disadvantage at procuring sex relative to women; when an infinity of anti-male and anti-sex laws are passed, and when the social climate is poisoned with unceasing Puritan-Feminist agitprop, an inevitable consequence is a steep decline in sexual activity all across the board *and particularly among men*. Another inevitable consequence is the breaking-down of families as men and women fear and distrust each other and are made incapable of true bonding.

In the midst of this ferocious moral panic, people are looking for victimizers here, there, and everywhere. Gynocentrism being what it is, the male sex is being blamed for all that women consider to be less-than-perfect in its capacity to fulfill their each and every whim. Not only men as such, but specific categories of men -- regardless of the falsity and mischaracterization inherent in said categories -- are castigated as moral pariahs and the public is called upon to chase them out of town or to hang them up in the public square.

One such category is that of “pedophiles.”

Normal male sexuality has been vehemently pathologized and psychiatrized.

Every normal, healthy, heterosexual man is attracted to females that exhibit signs of fertility, which manifest as *secondary sexual characteristics*. The age at which females grow secondary sexual characteristics varies between different populations and between different females of the same population, and can be broadly bracketed as ages 10 to 14. It's during these years that females grow pubic hair, bud breasts, widen their hips (thus increasing their waist-to-hip ratio, making it typically feminine), and otherwise show obvious, visible signs of being fertile.

It should be noted that the different races of mankind possess different rates of development. Girls of Sub-Saharan African ancestry often reach puberty around age 10, whereas girls of East Asian ancestry usually reach puberty no earlier than age 13. The other races are somewhere in between. This point is important to bear in mind whenever one examines male-female dynamics involving girls of these ages; what may be shocking for one population can be quite unremarkable for another.

As healthy heterosexual men, our lizard brains, also known as hind-brains, command us to feel intense sexual attraction to females who possess secondary sexual characteristics, and exclusively to them. They alone elicit our erections, the undeniable indicators of our sexual excitation. It is deviant for men to experience sexual attraction towards any person that doesn't fit the

description of “female who possesses secondary sexual characteristics.” And it is equally deviant, if not more-so, for men to *lack* attraction to females who possess secondary sexual characteristics.

Millions of years of evolution command and compel us to seek reproduction with fertile females. It can be safely proclaimed that every healthy heterosexual man would engage in sexual activity with every healthy fertile female if he could, minus immediate family members.

By no means does it mean or imply that women of all ages are equally attractive. We need not claim that 13-year-olds are as sexually attractive as 23-year-olds, just as we need not claim that 26-year-olds are as sexually attractive as 46-year-olds. However, the observation still stands: “when there is grass on the field, men *will* play ball.” Sex *will* occur because millions of years of evolutionary programming, infinitely stronger than the Puritan-Feminist social engineering of the last two centuries, demand so.

Sexual attraction to fertile females is absolutely common, normal, natural, and ingrained into the deepest parts of our brain. There is no way around it, and those sexual deviants and agitators who deny this reality are lying to the world and lying to themselves. Females with breasts, however small, and with hips wide enough to signal fertility, will always find normal healthy heterosexual men to have sex with.

The attraction to teenagers is very often fully reciprocated. Females develop a sex-drive sometime around puberty, give or take a year or two. Hit by raging hormones, that sex-drive can often turn quite feral. And it is directed towards men whom females of all ages find attractive, primarily military-age men with masculine physiques and at least modest charm. A teenager may be 15-year-old, but lust after men aged 15 to 45; if she wills it, she'll do whatever it takes to seduce one, which naturally won't be a difficult task. The attraction, after all, is *mutual*.

Even our Puritan-Feminist society, perennially beset by victimological agitprop, recognizes that teenagers have raging sex-drives that may not be so easily suppressed; thus in some countries, it is permissible for teenagers to have sexual relations with fellow teenagers.

The absurdity here is that, should the male teenager reach legal adulthood before his female partner, their relationship will instantly become yet another “classic case” of “serial child rape.”

Moreover, as already noted here, hormonal women lust after men well older than themselves, in accordance with whatever criteria make men desirable in the eyes of women. Apparently, then, the *power imbalance* that supposedly characterizes all age-gaps in favor of the older party alone renders normal sexual relationships “serial child rape.”

So much for Feminism being a sensible ideology!

In this regard, pornography is nothing more and nothing less than the *documentation of sexuality*; and, as such, so-called “child pornography” is almost always the mere *documentation of teenage sexuality*. Since it contains documentation of the sexuality of females who possess secondary sexual characteristics, it naturally serves to sexually gratify any normal, healthy, heterosexual men who happen to come across it.

It is disingenuous to argue that a woman is fundamentally abused by documentation of her sexuality at age 17, but ceases to be fundamentally abused by documentation of her sexuality at age 18; there is simply no fundamental difference.

Documentation of sexuality is plain-and-simple not “an abuse.” Females voluntarily choose to document themselves and spread said documentation far and wide, often feel excellent for doing so, and earn male attention -- in a sense, appreciation -- for it. It matters not if said females are aged 15 or 35, or whether or not they choose to charge money for access to their services or give them for free. The same, by the way, applies in the real world as it does in the digital one.

Various anti-pornography laws reflect the fervent Puritan-Feminist effort to stamp out male sexuality as much as possible, since pornography provides a sexual outlet to many men; all anti-pornography laws are tools

used by Puritans and Feminists to criminalize normal male sexuality. They declare various types of pornography (i.e., documentation of sexuality) to be “abusive” without providing any evidence whatsoever to support this proposition (*there is none*), and use their own definitions to categorize normal men as deviants and to imprison them for years behind bars as “child abusers.”

(As a general rule, all things that men enjoy are either criminalized or denounced as *victimizing*, and pornography is certainly no exception to the general rule)

All 16-year-old males who possess erotic images of their 16-year-old girlfriends are “pedophiles” who possess “abuse images” and belong in jail, according to the reigning ideology. Every man seduced by a 14-year-old, even if she purposefully lied about her age, is called a “kid rapist.” Every man who arranges a meeting with a prostitute who looks 25, but is in fact 17, is denounced as a “child abuser.” Every day we see the Puritan-Feminist worldview in action: prison, prison, prison! That is where all normal, healthy, heterosexual men belong, they tell us.

White Knights and Blue Knights throw around the term “pedophile” rather liberally. Its meaning is “someone who is sexually attracted to those who have not yet reached puberty.” Yet it is being used to hunt down precisely those men who engage in sexual activity with

females who *have* reached puberty! As currently used, the term “pedophile” is nothing but a *false accusation* directed against normal men with normal male sexuality, intended to pathologize their sexuality and to falsely categorize it as a psychiatric disorder.

Let’s set the record straight here. Possessing an erotic image of your 15-year-old girlfriend does not make you a “pedophile.” Having sex with females with breasts and wide hips does not make you a “pedophile.” Experiencing an erection when a teenager walks by you down the street does not make you a “pedophile.” This term is simply being used to obscure the reality of normal male sexuality.

Puritan-Feminists regularly use terms such as “pedophile,” “child-abuser,” “kiddie-diddler,” “kid-fucker,” and so on, to describe normal male sexuality, specifically the *normal male sexual attraction to teenagers*, which they despise for a reason that will presently be explicated.

“Every man would have sex with every fertile female if he could, minus immediate family” must be a Male Sexualist axiom. To embrace it is to embrace biological reality; to deny it is to deny the facts on the ground. Our enemies assert that sexual attraction to teenagers is aberrant; we proclaim it to be perfectly natural. They justify their position by invoking agitprop conceived in academia 20 years ago; we invoke *millions of years of evolution* to support our position. They have

government on their side; we have the truth, and it shall set us free.

(Among chimpanzees, by the way, the age of pubescence is precisely the age when sexual relations commence - not later)

Blue Knights hate men, hate masculinity, hate sexuality, hate teenage sexuality, and most of all hate *male sexuality*. They hate pornography because they hate men, who consume it; they hate prostitution because they hate men, who avail themselves of it; they hate teenage sexuality because men are attracted to teenagers and because teenagers are attracted to men; they hate young families because they are extremely envious of them; they hate all that men enjoy, because they want to punish men for our successes and to redirect all our resources to Feminist causes.

The inmates are running the asylum. The perverts, freaks, and sickos of *Puritanism-Feminism* have taken over society and rule it with an iron fist. They seek to criminalize documentation of female sexuality in general, and documentation of the sexuality of *young* females in particular, because they hate it that men enjoy themselves, and in addition, seek to suppress evidence regarding female nature.

That's because victimology teaches us that women (especially teenagers) are asexual and thus inherently victimized by sexuality, while the documentation of

young female sexuality proves the exact opposite thing: that the sexuality of young females can be very wild and extreme!

This completely contradicts the White and Blue Knight narrative regarding women, so they seek to deprive the world of the evidence disproving said narrative. The more men are exposed to documentation of young female sexuality, the less likely they are to believe the lies about the asexuality of young women, and thus the less prone they would be to support legislation that criminalizes sexual relations with teenagers and criminalizes young families.

We are engaged in a war for the truth. The truth is that female teenagers who possess secondary sexual characteristics are both sexually attractive to healthy men, *and sexually attracted to them*, which means that it's not male sexuality that is immoral and depraved, but the ever-intensifying criminalization thereof.

The desire to suppress evidence of female teenage sexuality is perhaps the primary reason why Feminists and their allies are so obsessed with banning anything that can be (im)plausibly designated "child pornography." A picture is worth a thousand words, and a video is worth a million, and Feminists definitely don't want men to be exposed to the equivalent of millions of words that absolutely disprove the Feminist narrative. Sure, envy of young women plays a major part in motivating the Feminists to fixate on this issue; but it's

more than just envy - it's about whether society will accept the Feminist narrative, or altogether reject it.

A teenager is not a “child,” documentation of sexuality is not “abuse,” and passionate sex is not “rape.”

Feminists cannot allow the Male Sexualist account of reality, i.e. the factual account of reality, to be known, as it shatters their worldview to smithereens. They must use the full force of the authorities to hide away from the public pertinent knowledge regarding the true nature of male-female relations, or men may revolt against the misandric tyranny that has taken over the world.

Modern Puritan-Feminists call teenage sex “rape” because that's how they define any sexual action they disapprove of. In previous times they might have used a different word, equally shallow and meaningless, to describe teenage sex; they might have used “degenerate,” for instance. Indeed, even today some people use that definition, being unaware of the fact that they are the *degenerates*. For nothing could be more degenerate than defining the very healthy sexual attraction of all heterosexual men to fertile females as anything other than *normal male sexuality*.

Our ancestors lived short lives, often dying in their late 30s or early 40s. The idea that sexuality only becomes normal when one hits some arbitrarily-chosen age, be it 15 or 18, is absurd and contradicts all of history. Rather, sexuality becomes normal no earlier and no later than

when one become a *sexual being*, which usually occurs at puberty. That's when both sexual desire and sexual appeal set in. Nature commands us to reproduce - or be erased from the gene pool. The denial of nature is the very root of Puritan-Feminist degeneracy.

Feminists hate everything about nature, because nature made men, not women, the creative, the strong, and the intelligent sex. Similarly, Feminists hate the fact that nature makes women *as valuable as their fertility* - and not any more valuable than that. Since a woman is as valuable as her fertility, it follows that young, nubile women are more valuable than older, less fertile women whose ova carry many mutations. The Puritan-Feminist war against male sexuality is a war against nature itself. That "a woman is as valuable as her fertility" rips apart the entire Feminist con game. They wish not to see the reality staring them in the face, but we will show it to them!

Young women are not any less sexual than older women, whether or not they are as sexually attractive as them. To repeat a point made earlier, we do not contend that 14-year-olds are as sexually attractive as 21-year-olds. But we do contend that females with fertility signs, *by virtue of having those fertility signs*, are sexually attractive to men of all ages, and that as such it's absolutely *natural* to feel sexually attracted to them, and absolutely *unnatural* to not feel sexually attracted to them.

It is perfectly normal for men to try to procure sex with fertile females, and perfectly normal for women to give in to men's sexual advances and give them sex. To punish the former for trying to obtain sex is as ridiculous as punishing the latter for allowing men access to sexuality; we are indeed living in a ridiculous world. Men are commanded by nature to pursue; women are naturally made to be pursued. Any attempt to socially engineer this state of affairs away would crash in the face of cold hard reality, and would amount to misandry should it focus on criminalizing the male part of the equation.

Male Sexualism stands for the affirmation of human nature. It is 100% natural for men to sexually desire women who possess secondary sexual characteristics and to attempt to have sexual relations with them; it is 100% natural for young females to sexually desire men and to successfully seduce them; it is 100% natural for young people to engage in activities that lead to reproduction (whether or not these activities actually result in it), as that is nature's unbending will.

Male Sexualism is men's single authentic *resistance movement*. We resist the Puritan-Feminist onslaught against our sexuality and against our very being. We resist the criminalization of normal, healthy, heterosexual male sexuality. We resist the rule of low-testosterone, effete degenerates who hate their own masculinity over virile men. We resist the rule of Female Supremacists who consider the female sense of comfort

to be civilization's supreme and ultimate value. And we resist the fear-mongering campaigns conducted by cynical, Machiavellian, despotic *agents of the state* who wish nothing less than to usher in our total subjugation to their Puritan-Feminist tyranny.

Male Sexualism is not actually a "pedophile movement," whatever that even means. Actual pedophilia, i.e. attraction to prepubescents, is both rare and overwhelmingly homosexual. That's not the banner representing our worldview, although we may find some allies among that crowd, if they will see us as their allies, which is rather doubtful.

(Obviously, if "pedophilia" means "attraction to teenagers who exhibit signs of fertility," then every single heterosexual man with healthy testosterone levels is a "pedophile," and in that case, we are indeed a "pedophile movement")

Modern pedo-hysteria, which is the modern hysteria over real or imaginary "pedophiles," is a mere ruse designed to grant the state the pretext it needs to invade the privacy of every citizen, seize the property of every citizen, use surveillance to monitor every citizen, and prosecute every citizen based on hysterical definitions of his actions. Pedo-hysteria is about holding us captive as the Puritan-Feminist state's hapless guinea pigs. Pedo-hysteria is designed to fix in place, legitimize, and even vastly expand the tyranny of blue pills (lies

about the world), blue balls (sexual frustration), and blue uniforms (an all-powerful police-state).

Feminism's motto is: "comfort uber alles." Women's comfort, that is. Feminists will do all in their power to prevent "rapists" from receiving any kind of empathy, not to say sympathy, from the public at large. The last thing that the Feminists want you to do is explore the *real* circumstances that lead to rape and determine whether or not a so-called rapist's actions actually constitute a moral offense.

Feminists announce, "Rape is not about sex, but about power," and hope that we'll swallow their lie. No, Feminists; it is often enough about sex, and the most relevant questions to ask about the ostensible rape problem are these:

1. Does the action advertised as "rape" really fit what we would normally consider to be "rape," or is it something else, far more benign (or maybe it's an outright false accusation), that agenda-driven Feminists sell as "rape" because it's in their very narrow, rape-hysterical interest to do so and only for that reason?
2. If we determine that it's actual, real rape, then: how do we prevent involuntarily celibate men from being so sexually frustrated that they can only satisfy their burning, urgent *biological needs* through rape? Does anyone need more "men are evil" lectures? Or perhaps society can do some things to dramatically alleviate the sexual frustration that leads some men to commit rape?

Feminists don't want these politically-incorrect questions to be asked, *and yet here we are, asking them.*

It is in the interest of every man on Earth to finally, after a century and a half of toxic Puritanism-Feminism, be rid of misandric laws that use his own normal male sexuality against him, do away with legislation that entrenches the ever-more-totalitarian Feminist ideology by defining normal male sexual behavior as inherently victimizing, and repeal the statutes that ruin the lives of countless men and further privilege women at the expense of men.