

The Modern Female Condition

An explanation of the degradation of modern women

Joel F. Carberry

Copyright 2021 Joel Carberry

All rights reserved.

Review Copy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER ONE: DOUBLE STANDARDS

CHAPTER TWO: WOMEN IN THE WORKPLACE

CHAPTER THREE: BEING STRAIGHTFORWARD

CHAPTER FOUR: AESTHETICS

CHAPTER FIVE: RELATIONSHIPS AND DATING

CHAPTER SIX: HUMOR

CHAPTER SEVEN: FEMINISM

CHAPTER EIGHT: WOMEN ONLINE

CHAPTER NINE: RAPE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, ABUSE, AND LIES

CHAPTER TEN: FINAL WORDS

SUMMARY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ENDNOTES

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

INTRODUCTION

Many of the subjects in this book are based on my personal experiences. The stories I've written here are documented as truly and accurately as I can possibly represent them. The names of people in the events I've written about, with the exception of names not from my personal experiences (i.e. authors, public figures, etc.), are changed to protect personal information. Examples used from outside my personal experiences are cited in the endnotes at the end of the book.

I ask that you keep in mind, as Kate Newman pointed out in her article *Book Publishing, Not Fact-Checking*, that books aren't always fact-checked.¹ I would ask that you refrain from believing or disbelieving any claim, including those of my own, until you have researched the claim for yourself. Research not only the citations that I have provided but also research articles and ideologies that oppose my arguments. Do not read my works and blindly parrot them. Do not dismiss my works without reading them. Maintain your skepticisms until reasonable evidence alleviates them.

I am a man and I prefer women. This book is written from the perspective of a straight White man and it is written about women that live in the United States. I did not write this as some sort of "inclusive" work. I have approached the subjects throughout the book without differentiation between straight women, gay women, trans "women", women of different ethnicities, or women that fall anywhere within the LGBTQ+ group. I did not differentiate between those groups because I don't believe that it's relevant to the matter at hand.

It is my personal belief that men and women are made for each other. However, they aren't made the same. There are many reasons why men and women are different, and some of those differences assist in creating fulfilling and long-lasting relationships. Romantic relationships can create a stronger bond between two people than that of the best of friends. Men and women are not, however, innately compatible. They are not innately compatible anymore, anyway. Many different factors culminate in such a manner that there is a great divide between the genders in today's modern era. I didn't write this because I desired to or because of some peer pressure to do so. No, I wrote this because someone had to.

There is a problem with the current state of affairs between men and women. Most people don't want to say anything about it for fear of being persecuted. In this book I hope to accurately communicate my problems with the way many modern women are, and how they are treated. I'd like to believe that the majority of individuals wouldn't seek to find a privilege that puts them above others, but, whether sought or bestowed, women have attained a "female privilege" that differentiates them from men in the United States.

"Privilege" is defined by Merriam-Webster as: "a right or immunity granted as a peculiar benefit, advantage, or favor".² Privilege can be seen by examining a situation and then considering the inverse. A woman goes out and sleeps with a bunch of men, and she is subsequently labeled as a "slut". A man goes out and sleeps with a bunch of women, and he is met with praise. In this scenario it is clear that men are viewed positively and women are viewed negatively for performing the same action. Privilege can be observed as holding true if there is a double standard. However, this example only proves that men are privileged in this particular case.

Women that are virgins are viewed as righteous, good, and generally seen as having a positive trait. Men that are virgins are viewed as losers, cretins, and generally seen as having a negative trait. In this scenario men and women are clearly not viewed equally, and women are the privileged group in this example. Proving or disproving a singular instance of a double standard is **not** proof that privilege is or is not held by a specific group on the whole. I do not deny that men are favored in certain instances, and I do not claim that those instances are few in number. My argument is that women, on the whole, are more privileged than men in the United States. That concept of women being more privileged than men, on the whole, is my definition of “female privilege”.

It's no stretch to say that men have been putting women on a pedestal for a long time and that the pedestal has gotten higher and higher as time has gone by. We're at the point now where some men will go far out of their way, trying anything they can think of, to please women. Men will buy women gifts, they will do favors for women that they wouldn't do even for their friends, and sometimes men even go so far as to actually give women they don't know money based solely on the fact that they are women. Why are these things problems? They're problems because these things are not even appreciated by women because they have become so commonplace that they are expected.

There is a series of false narratives about the inequities between men and women that I aim to disprove. These narratives range from only being believed by few people to being believed by the majority of people. I attempt to disprove these not in an effort to dismiss the trials and tribulations that women are faced with, but because they are fabricated or over-exaggerated issues that detract from real issues. This book is not intended to be taken as an affront towards women. My hope is simply that people will read this and acknowledge the issues I've presented. A problem must be understood as existing before it can be rectified. I'm not sure that that will be accomplished, but the uncertainty of victory is never a reason to forgo the attempt.

CHAPTER ONE: DOUBLE STANDARDS

Women are not the way they once were. I'd say that by any metric women's behavior has changed drastically over the course of human history. The same can truthfully be said of men, but men have evolved into having an entirely different set of modern problems. Men, in my opinion, have largely contributed in creating female privilege. Men created this problem by imposing and upholding double standards upon themselves. If a group of people is constantly favored by double standards then they become privileged.

I believe that women are treated better than men in today's society. I'm not referring to the law, even though I could easily point out that a man has no say in whether or not a woman decides to abort his child. I'm talking about the day-to-day treatment of women by society. Men are held to a higher standard than women by both men and women. Women are held to a lower standard than men and they are applauded for being below the standard. This difference creates double standards. Why are double standards an issue? They're an issue because the double standards that exist between the genders create a reality in which men and women are not truly equal.

Merriam-Webster defines a double standard as: "a set of principles that applies differently and usually more rigorously to one group of people or circumstances than to another".³ Though it is an argument of this book that double standards exist between men and women, double standards are not regulated to exist between men and women. There are several dating websites in existence that are exclusively for black people, and some services that aren't exclusively for black people offer specific filters for black people. The dating site *eharmony* has a page for "Black Dating", on which they say: "The eharmony Matching System narrows the field from thousands of black singles to match you with a select group of compatible single black men or women".⁴ If you were to attempt to find a similar service for White people then you would be hard pressed to discover one. There was a service called *Where White People Meet* that attempted to fill that position, but the site was shut down after being met with accusations of racism from multiple media outlets.

How do you identify when something is unfair? Observe a fact and consider the inverse. Upon considering the reversal of groups in a given situation I believe you will find that a great many circumstances and situations begin to seem clearly unfair. Apply this thought process not only towards gender but in all applicable cases. A college hosts a black only graduation and you should ask yourself: "Would this be socially acceptable if it were a White only graduation?" I'm not sure if I was given a full year that I could accurately represent every double standard that exists between men and women, but I will outline some of the most prevalent examples.

How many men have been praised for being comfortable with their overweight, unhygienic, bodies? Yet when an overweight, unhygienic, woman seeks admiration for being the way she is, it's provided. Does that sound fair to you? I would imagine it doesn't. Does that sound accurate to you? If you answer truthfully then it probably does. If not, then I'm envious of the world you live in. I can list a personal experience that pertains to this point.

In 2019 I was casually seeing a woman named Jess. I had been on two dates with Jess and both of them had gone well enough. Jess was carrying more than her fair share of weight but I, of course, would make no comment on that. I had not been to her place and she had not been to mine. We

were set to meet on a third date at Olive Garden at 9pm. I arrived, as I do with all established timelines, ten minutes early. She showed up at 9:18pm. I made a joke about her being late and she proceeded to tell me about how busy she had been. She said that she had been so busy that she hadn't taken a shower in the past two days. I was disgusted and decided that that would be our last date. I did not make any comment about it nor did I get up and leave.

She ordered two entrées and I ordered one. I sat there until after the food came and was eaten, and I remained until the check came. She offered to pay the check. I thought it was actually a nice gesture as I had paid for the previous dates. I agreed to let her pay at which point she seemed surprised that I would accept the offer. She then began to say that she was actually short on funds at the moment, and that maybe she could pay for the next date. I simply said "Don't worry about it" and paid the check. We exited the restaurant. She asked if I could show her a YouTube video that I had mentioned to her earlier. I saw no harm in it, and we sat in her car smoking cigarettes while I played the video on my phone. While the video was playing she unhooked her bra. She unhooked it not in a sexy fashion but in the way an overweight man unbuckles his belt after a long day of sucking it in. At that point I could take no more. I exited her car, drove away in my car, and never spoke to her again.

That situation, if reversed, would not be allowed to occur. A man cannot show up to a date both late and unwashed and expect some courtesies to prevent criticism of those actions. I reserved my criticisms towards her out of both courtesy and secondhand embarrassment. However, such would not likely be the case in the opposite situation. I can adamantly tell you that I will never again afford such a courtesy, and you should not, either. If someone does not respect themselves enough to bathe before showing up to a date with you, then turn around and leave. Another example of a double standard is the discrepancy in how sexual misconduct is viewed when perpetrated by a man or perpetrated by a woman.

Paul Sauer, a friend of mine, was at a BBQ in 2019 with both myself and my good friend Jake Richards. We held the BBQ out back of Jake's house and invited several people from around the neighborhood. People from all around the block showed up. Even some people that we didn't know showed up. Paul was 22 at this time. He was sitting in a lawn chair by the grill behind Jake's house. A woman in her early 40s that we didn't know was present. Some friend of a friend had invited her. The woman drank more than her fair share and began drunkenly throwing herself on Paul. He told her nicely that he wasn't interested, but she didn't listen. She forced her lips upon his and groped him.

Paul Sauer angrily threw her off of himself and went inside. Six of us stood and watched. We were unsure of what to do. The answer would've been all too clear if the genders were reversed. If that were the case then we'd beat up the creepy old man and carry on, but what were we to do when it was a woman committing the crime? That woman sexually assaulted Paul, but what would anyone do about it? What could anyone do about it? If we had beaten her senseless, as we would have done to any man that committed such an act, then we'd surely have gone to jail. If we grabbed her to pull her off then she could have said that we manhandled or sexually assaulted her. She committed sexual assault and nobody, for fear of the repercussions that would surely follow, did anything about it. Nobody intervened not because they didn't want to but because they were afraid of the ramifications.

Paul and I were standing out front of Jake's house with two other women shortly after that event. Both of those women had witnessed the event. Paul was saying how messed up the situation was and I was agreeing. One of the women, Tiffany, upon hearing me say that it was "sexual assault" remarked that it wasn't. Paul asked her if she would say the same if the genders had been reversed. You could see the gears turning in her head. You could hear the creaks of rusted iron as the gears began to turn seemingly for the first time ever about the subject. After the cogs had several long seconds to turn, she answered that she had never thought of it that way. It seems that many people never have.

This goes to show that men and women are not viewed equally when it comes to sexual harassment and sexual assault. Women are easily believed to be rape victims but scarcely believed to be rapists. A female teacher will statutorily rape a young male student and will not be sentenced as a male rapist would be. We will excuse the action. We will say "He probably wanted it anyway", "He's lucky", and we will ultimately not shun the rapist as we would if the genders were reversed. We view not only sexual misconduct differently depending on the gender of the perpetrator, but all crime. A woman will commit a crime but will not be sentenced the same as a man. No, she will get a lesser punishment. Women are equal in the eyes of the law until they break it, then they are seen as the poor, disenfranchised, oppressed demographic and they will be spared a man's fate.

If a man beats a woman we are shocked and appalled. If a woman beats a man we laugh about it. It is for that reason that women are able to openly strike a man without fear of repercussion from the public. Women hit men and people laugh. People think it's hysterical that a man would be so easily defeated and so easily bullied. However, if a man strikes a woman there is an uproar. Even if a man delivers a strike to a woman that is overtly given in self-defense there will still be no justification for the man's actions, and women know that. Women use that to their advantage and will instigate unwinnable conflicts with men, but they will win them because men will not return the blows given to them. Men are taught not to hit women. Men are told, from the time they are children to the time they're on their deathbed, that there is no reason and no excuse to ever hit a woman. Women are never taught such things.

Another criminal example of a double standard between the genders is how we view drug users based on gender. Men that use drugs are not seen in a positive light, for good reason, but nonetheless are seen as having a crippling addiction that is undesirable in a relationship. Women, on the other hand, that use drugs are seen as cool, hip, and as if they have the most desirable trait around. It is my theory that more men that don't use drugs are willing to accept the fact that a woman does than the opposite. Doing drugs isn't cool and you're not special for doing them. It sickens me when I see a pregnant woman sucking down a Marlboro cigarette outside of a gas station just as much as it should equally sicken you upon seeing a father smoke right next to his child. I once knew a woman that smoked her entire pregnancy. At first it was in secret when no prying eyes could see the atrocity being committed, but later on she began doing it openly. She dared someone to say something to her and heatedly confronted anyone who did, but most people simply wouldn't say anything about it.

People will absolutely confront a man that smokes in front of his child. Why is one accepted and the other is not? It's because the societal norms for what's acceptable are different between

men and women. Another example of this is the difference between social norms of how men talk to their friend's girlfriend and how women talk to their friend's boyfriend. When a man introduces his girlfriend to his friends, who are typically male, they are compelled to be nice to her. They are expected to greet her as they would an old friend. The man would not tolerate other actions. He would not allow one of his friends to say "I don't like you", "Fuck you", or "You're a bitch" to his girlfriend. The man's friends would not be inclined to say any of those things even if they felt that they were true. It's an unwritten but well understood code that men abide by.

However, when a woman introduces her boyfriend to her friends, who are typically female, they have no such compulsions. They will outright say whatever negative comments they feel like to the boyfriend. There will be no repercussions towards them from the girlfriend. The woman will stand idly by and permit this to happen, whether she agrees or disagrees with the comments made against her boyfriend, and yet as the boyfriend you will certainly face consequences if you repay their antipathetic behavior in kind. Women are free to be as cruel as they please and they are quick to levy such cruelties at a man. Women are well aware of the fact that a man cannot outright say anything against them without the public turning on him.

The public also has a very clear stance on women exposing themselves: "It is okay for women to do so if they choose to. You must accept the fact that women who choose to expose themselves are allowed to do it." There are many men that would not be comfortable with the knowledge that their girlfriend exposes herself online, and yet that thought process is put down by both men and women alike. Whores are called whores and the court of public opinion overturns that verdict and deems your views as sexism regardless of the truthfulness of the statement. Men are expected to accept women's lifestyle choices without complaint, but women are free to judge a man's lifestyle without reproach.

How many courtesies have you afforded to women you've dated that you wouldn't afford to your friends? How many times has a woman had a completely illogical meltdown over something trivial and you've let it slide? Why are these things the societal norm? It all starts from a young age. Girls are treated better than boys. They're allowed to perform worse and still be accepted by their parents and peers. You buy your daughter ice cream even though she didn't get that A in school. Your daughter swears at you and you don't beat her as you would your son. She begins to cry and you swoop in to comfort her. Men are biologically biased towards women. We want to see them happy, cared for, and content. Fathers will, in my opinion, be far less strict with their daughters than their sons. This creates an expectation that they will be treated better by men and they don't even realize it.

Why are these problems? Surely there's little harm in being lenient towards children, right? They're problems because they don't stop there. They're only the beginning of a long downhill slope. An expectation of leniency towards women from men is created and that expectation lasts for life. Leniency towards women does not stop as they grow older. Women can choose to live their entire lives as childishly as possible and will not be called out for it. Women scream at retail store employees and are met with no resistance, but if men tried the same they would be beaten and/or arrested. Men will tell unattractive women that they are attractive, they will look past their drug use, they will accept that women work entry level jobs, and they will forgive a woman's lack

of personality. We ignore the faults of women by saying that they are but human and humans are imperfect, but the same will not be afforded to men and we all just sit back and accept that.

The point of all of this is that men are judged based on their actions but will also be judged negatively or neutrally based on their gender. Women, on the other hand, can be judged based on their actions but will also be judged neutrally or positively based on their gender. This is because double standards reign prevalent throughout our country. Why do men pay for the first date? Why do we refrain from hitting a woman even in self-defense? Why do we repress male emotions but celebrate female ones?

All of these double standards that are in favor of women create female privilege. Women are not treated equally to a man at any point in life. They simply aren't expected to fulfill the same obligations as a man. A woman will perform worse at her job but will still be promoted. A woman will hit a man but will not be met with the same force that she exerted. A woman will cry and men will perform a dive similar to a run for home-plate in baseball to land at their feet and be the first to wipe away their tears. It's no wonder why women are the way they are. It's because as a society, as men, we not only allow them to be but we actively encourage it. Women don't want to hear this because when you're accustomed to privilege equality begins to feel like oppression.

CHAPTER TWO: WOMEN IN THE WORKPLACE

I have personally seen many examples of the difference in treatment between the genders in the workplace. I was once in the U.S. Army. I was not a war hero or some great leader. I was just an enlisted man working his job. I won't tell you my unit, or the real names of people I was there with, or describe how inhumane the job was, or relay to you every single miserable day to day experience I had, but I will tell you a few stories that are germane to the point.

We were on deployment, or rather we were on our way there. We were at JMRC (Joint Multinational Readiness Center) in Germany in 2018. An NCO, SSG Demote, commented to a junior enlisted soldier, SPC Jonathan B. Barns, "SPC Jones is cute, huh?" "Yes, she is cute" SPC Barns responded. SPC Barns didn't know SPC Jones very well because they worked in different offices. SPC Jones was just a typical Army soldier that happened to be female. SSG Demote went and told SPC Jones that SPC Barns had said that she was cute. SPC Jones had a problem with that. Did SPC Jones go to SPC Barns to get his side of the story? Did she speak to him and let him know what her problem was? No, of course not. SPC Jones went to the chain of command and reported SPC Barns for "sexual harassment".

The Army has a program called the SHARP (Sexual Harassment/Assault Response and Prevention) program. The SHARP program has full time advocates such as a SARC (Sexual Assault Response Coordinator), Victim Advocate, and occasionally the assigned Chaplain. The SHARP program is used to report instances of sexual harassment and sexual assault, and when such an instance occurs your unit will record your SHARP complaint and investigate it. The SHARP program, in a word, is a joke. I personally reported a male soldier for sexually harassing a female soldier, and that was after that male soldier had had sexual relations with a 15-year-old girl in his previous unit (a claim that he not only didn't deny, but one that he openly bragged about). The Army's response to my report? No punitive action towards that male soldier. He remained an NCO and transferred to his new unit without incident. I was disgusted.

SPC Jones claimed in her SHARP complaint that SPC Barns was constantly messaging her on her phone. She said that SPC Barns would say things like "Jones, I want you", and that his sexual advances kept coming even though she had told him to stop. The Army opened an investigation on the matter. The Army is not like our court system. In the military you are guilty until proven innocent, and that is not unlike the court of public opinion that watchfully judges the free people of the United States. SPC Jonathan B. Barns had to fight the sexual harassment charge for six months to get it dropped. During that time they had unofficially demoted him from SPC (E-4) to PFC (E-3). Most people auto-assumed that SPC Barns was in the wrong, and so did I. A small female comes to you and tells you that someone sexually harassed her. What are you going to do about it? Stand idly by and do nothing? No. You're conditioned to believe the poor helpless female and you'll rush to her defense as we all did. For the first two months of that ordeal, I believed that SPC Barns was guilty. It wasn't until I spoke to him and got his side of the story that everything became clear to me.

We were in Kosovo at this point in time. I went to the on-post bistro at Nothing Hill with SPC Barns and asked him about the ordeal. He told me that the initial response from the Army, when SPC Jones first came forward with the accusations, was that CPT Perseus made SPC Barns call

his wife and tell her what the allegations were. He was then forced to hang up immediately after stating the allegations and was not given the opportunity to explain the situation to his wife. Thankfully, SPC Barns' wife waited until he called her later in private to hear the full story before making any assumptions of her own. All of this happened because SPC Barns agreed that a woman was cute in a private conversation and SPC Jones decided she didn't like that.

I asked him why his case wasn't dropped if he was innocent. SPC Barns responded by asking me to really sit down and think about it. The first thing the Army did was confiscate their phones and check their messages. If what SPC Jones said was true then why would there be no evidence left behind after the fact? Why would SPC Barns throw away his marriage on a woman he didn't even know on a first-name basis? Why wouldn't his case have already been closed if the evidence was so concrete? None of those things were the case because it was all a lie. The only thing SPC Barns did was answer yes when he was asked if SPC Jones was cute, and it cost him a good amount of his mental sanity over the course of those six months.

After I had spoken to him for a couple of hours, I was convinced he had done nothing wrong. I helped him prepare his packet to fight the SHARP allegation for the next four months until it was dismissed and offered to be a character witness. SPC Barns thanked me afterwards for my support. The majority of people had wrongfully decided that he was guilty long ago and only a very few people took the time to observe all of the facts for themselves. SPC Barns told me afterwards that he had considered putting his M9 pistol in his mouth every day during those six months.

A man, a loyal husband, was brought to the brink of committing suicide because a woman decided she would cry wolf. That's all it takes to end a man's reputation these days. One sentence to your HR department and you could find yourself out of a job. One statement to the police and it could be worse. Ask yourself: With the worst-case scenario being that your career, possibly even way of life, could be destroyed in an instant by the mere word of a woman, then is it really worth the risk of having interactions with them outside of matters directly related to the job at hand? SPC Barns didn't even have the option of not interacting with SPC Jones. He worked in a different office, but the military does not afford you the option of simply avoiding someone when the mission dictates that you must interact with them.

To invite women into the workplace is to also invite sexual harassment, whether real or perceived. It's a fact of life that by tossing a female into a group of ten males that the men will want to get with her. It's inescapable, unavoidable, and it's the natural way of things. It becomes a problem, however, when the group of ten to one is in a work environment. Perhaps if we instituted segregated workplaces then we would have less problems involving sexual harassment. Gender segregated workplaces seem to be something that feminists have secretly, or in some cases openly, yearned for for years. I believe that gender segregated workplaces would eliminate many other problems as well, such as issues with work efficiency.

Women are less efficient workers than men in most cases. In the military we had a completely different, lower, standard for women to pass the APFT (Army Physical Fitness Test). Why? The Army did so because it acknowledged that women are, in general, weaker than men. The correct solution would've been to hold women to the same standard as men. That, however, was not the military's decision on the matter. Not only did we choose to pollute our ranks with women that

were measurably worse performing than men but we also congratulated them on their achievements in mediocrity.

The minimum number of push-ups for my age bracket, for men, that was required to pass the APFT was 40 and had a maximum of 75. The minimum number of push-ups for women in the same age bracket was 17 and had a maximum of 46. This meant that a woman my age could do 46 push-ups and be praised for maxing the event, whereas if I were to do only 46 push-ups I would be scolded for barely passing. The same was true for the two-mile run. I was allotted 16:36 to complete the two-mile run and women in my age bracket were given 19:36. A woman in my age bracket could get the maximum number of points for her run with a time of 15:36, but I'd have to complete the run in under 13:00 to be given the maximum number of points. The Army had plans to change the APFT to the ACFT, a new fitness test that would hold men and women to the same standard, but those plans did not come to fruition during my time while enlisted.

Another thing that induces a form of pure cringe from me is seeing a woman at work trying to overcompensate for the fact that she's a woman. Acting tough, vigilant, like one of the good ol' boys. I say "acting" because that's not really how they are. Some heavy boxes need to be moved, they'll move two of them, and then they'll brag about how they've just accomplished a menial task. This was a huge problem in the military. When I had my first, and last, female commander it was a complete nightmare. Her name was CPT P. Ramone. CPT Ramone once yelled at my platoon for playing the song *Jessie's Girl* on a speaker during PT. She said it was offensive to women to play such a sexist song at work. I want you to actually sit down for a full second and soak in how ridiculous that is. A group of soldiers, warfighters, and "patriots" were accused of being sexist for playing an 80s pop song. CPT Ramone was quick to hand out awards for women and "people of color" but was extremely niggardly when it came to giving White men the same.

CPT Ramone was also quick to give the aforementioned groups of people time off if they got sick, but when my good friend SPC Mark Jules, a White man, had a crippling spinal injury that forced him to walk with a cane for several months he was given no time off. CPT Ramone made sure he was present for every morning formation and would hold him at work until the section was released for the day. CPT Ramone also attempted to give both myself and SSG Jake Richards an Article 15 for fraternization. This was because I lived at SSG Jake Richard's house briefly after deployment whilst trying to find a new home.

CPT Ramone took issue with that fact and stated that because he was an NCO and I was a Junior enlisted soldier that it qualified as fraternization. The fact that SSG Jake Richards and I worked in completely different sections and that it was a temporary arrangement solely for the reason to negate the need for me to pay for a hotel during that time did not get factored into the equation. I noticed, however, that CPT Ramone did absolutely nothing about the interracial couple that actually was guilty of fraternization. They worked in the same office, one was a minority female NCO, the other was a Junior enlisted male, and it was well known throughout the company that they were engaging in sexual relations. They made no secret of it, but because of the ethnicity and gender of the NCO it was such that CPT Ramone did nothing when presented with the knowledge of such events.

I've also observed several instances of women allowing themselves to be objectified in the workplace in exchange for preferential treatment. SSG C. Jennings would constantly send the men down to the motorpool to do whatever heavy lifting the day called for, but would let the women stay in the aid-station with him to file paperwork. Why? He did it because he wanted the women to stay behind with him so that he could make sexual advances on them. The worst of it is that these women would let him do it. They did so because it kept them out of doing any actual work, and I have personally seen similar occurrences many times over.

I saw another such instance of this exchange when I was in AIT (Advanced Individual Training) at Fort Sam Houston. SPC Appalachia, a young female soldier, was in my company. SPC Appalachia knew absolutely nothing of medicine, which was our studied craft, yet she achieved straight A's throughout our courses. This was not because she studied hard and trained for the written and physical tests we took, but because she was fraternizing with an NCO that was one of our instructors. The exact degree of this fraternization is unknown to any living person except for SSG Nett, the instructor in question, as SPC Appalachia gave no specific details while she was alive and she died the following year of a drug overdose.

What is known for a fact is that she had a relationship with SSG Nett that was considered fraternization by the Army. There are very clear-cut rules and regulations regarding soldier-instructor relations which state that an instructor is not to be alone with a soldier at any given time. There must be at least two soldiers and one instructor or two instructors and one soldier present at any given time that there are both soldiers and instructors together. In AIT you aren't allowed to move about on your own as a soldier. You must move from point A to point B in groups of at least two. It was personally witnessed by both myself and by several other soldiers that SPC Appalachia would walk to the shoppette parking lot in a group of three female soldiers, that SPC Appalachia would get into SSG Nett's personal vehicle and drive off, and that only two female soldiers would return from the parking lot.

Two female soldiers would execute the reverse procedure to pick SPC Appalachia up sometime later. This is to say nothing of the classroom attitude between SPC Appalachia and SSG Nett, which could be described as "too friendly". People that conversed with SPC Appalachia were well aware that her knowledge of medicine was nonexistent. Though no third party truly knows the extent of their exchange, there seems to be no other explanation as to how she was able to score so highly on the written and physical tests despite her clear lack of knowledge on the subject. Nobody came forth about this blatant act of fraternization for fear of reprisal from command. The event not being reported is both regrettable and understandable. You may see something occur and know it occurred for a fact, but staking your career on an accusation that is hearsay and cannot be factually proved or disproved is a tall order to ask from anyone.

I'm sure that some people would contend that the fault lies entirely with SSG Nett, but SPC Appalachia willingly engaged in that relationship. There was no coercion of "You'll fail if you don't do this for me". There were no signs of remorse or guilt from SPC Appalachia. She openly bragged about her "accomplishments" on our tests continuously. Her female friends not only condoned these actions but also assisted in covering up their relationship. I feel it necessary to state that though most females I worked with in the military were substandard soldiers, there were a few exceptions.

The greatest exception was my former platoon sergeant SSG Robshaw. SSG Robshaw was fully aware of how the Army treated females better than males, and she went out of her way to truly treat her soldiers equally. She was truly an example of a good soldier, and like most good soldiers that meant that she was forced to pick up the slack from less efficient workers. Perhaps if the military had more leaders like her then I wouldn't have left its ranks. My point is not that all women are inefficient workers. My point is that women are treated better than men in the workplace regardless of their efficiency.

It is important to recognize that the military is a condensed version of society, not a different one. There is a stereotypical personality type associated with soldiers, and while stereotypes often have some basis in fact the reality is that the divide between civilian and soldier is less than the average person might realize. Soldiers begin life as civilians and if they live long enough they will become civilians again. All of that is to say that while it might seem that these things are more prevalent in the military, they are not regulated to it. Women being treated better in a work environment extends far beyond the confines of the military. Promotions, raises, and awards are slapped into the hand of a woman and everyone in management pats themselves on the back. The working-class joe, however, could look upon such favoritism with only disdain. The presence of male accomplishments will go unnoticed, but a man's lack of performance will be noted. The same is not generally true for women.

CHAPTER THREE: BEING STRAIGHTFORWARD

It's nigh impossible to find a woman that is honest and uncomplicated with you. The story I just told you about SPC Jonathan B. Barns could've been avoided entirely if SPC Jones had just come up to him and discussed what her problem was. However, it's been my experience that such an occurrence is truly a rarity. Imagine how simple life would be if you asked a woman what was wrong and she gave you a direct answer. Keep imagining, because you're unlikely to experience it for real.

I think a typical example of this could be shown from going on a "date", wherein I mean that the date was never becoming anything more than a night out. If women declined every date that they weren't interested in then how would they get a man to pay for their food, pay for their drinks, pay for their movie tickets, etc. I have had these exact scenarios play out directly in front of me, and they have occurred many times.

One such example was when I met a woman online in 2017. We had talked for several days before I asked her on a date, to which she said yes. We went to see a movie at the theatre. We saw the movie, enjoyed it, and were standing outside smoking cigarettes afterwards. She was telling me a story about her "ex-husband". She said "So my ex-husband, well really he's technically still my husband, but anyway he-". At that point I had to interject, and I said "Wait, you're still married?" She proceeded to say that it was alright because her husband was stationed in another state than we were currently in. I asked her if he knew she was seeing other guys. She seemed embarrassed and said "Well, I'm really just looking for friends on Tinder. I had a great time with you, and-". "See you around" was all I said before turning and leaving in disgust.

Why would she do something like that? The answer is simply because it works. It's not in a woman's best interest to be straightforward. Acting logically only rewards you with more responsibility, and with that being the case why would they be logical and direct? It's easier for women to beat around the bush, never outright say what they mean or want to say, so that none of the responsibility falls on to them. For example, let's look at a break up after a relationship. Have you ever had a woman say unto you, after you've been romantically together, "I think we should just be friends"? There are four main reasons for why women do this.

1. She assumes that you will accept the agreement to become just friends. She will then gradually respond to you less and less until there's no trace of a conversation remaining and you end up giving up on the "friendship". This makes it your fault for letting the friendship fail.

2. She assumes that you won't accept the friendship. You say that things can't simply regress to where they were before. In this case it becomes your fault for not accepting her request to be friends, and none of the burden lies with the woman.

3. She makes the offer to be friends with the intention of keeping you on the back burner. Women will do this so that in the event that whatever her current pursuit is falls through she can then turn back to you.

4. She legitimately and foolishly believes that the relationship can regress back to just being friends. This is the least common reason by far.

I couldn't tell you if the "let's just be friends" line comes from a place of malicious intent or not. I don't even believe that women, themselves, really know the answer to that. What I can say for certain is that, in any case, women rarely truly have any real intentions of being friends with you after a relationship. Whether malicious or subconscious it is a fallacy that females want to continue a friendly relationship with you after being in a romantic one. A relevant story to this point is one from Frank M. Remington, an old friend of mine, from when he decided to settle down with a girl that he'd been dating for some time.

He was 27 and she was 24. She asked, nay, begged him to buy her a ring and marry her. Frank, willing to prove his love for her, happily obliged. He proposed, she said yes, they got engaged, and all was well. It was well for a time. One day, several weeks into the engagement, she didn't come home at night. Frank was concerned and messaged her asking if she'd be home that night, to which she said "No, I'm hanging out with friends." Frank said that it wasn't a problem and that he'd see her the next day. However, she didn't come home the next day, either. Frank asked her if she'd be home that night. "No," she replied coldly. Frank asked her if everything was alright, and she said that it was.

The next day she said she had some business to attend to and that she'd be home late. She returned home two hours later than she specified. Frank sat down with her to discuss what was going on. She said that there was no problem, that she'd just been really busy, and that everything was fine. They both agreed to communicate better in the future and went to bed. The next night they were lying in bed together. She rolled over and said "Frank." Frank responded with "Yes?" She then said "I think we should just be friends." Frank was taken aback. He took a full second to really register what was said before making his response. "I can't do that" he said. Just like that, she was gone from his life.

Frank tried for a couple of weeks after the fact to get a straight answer as to why she terminated the relationship, but that answer never came. Excuses, lies, and vague platitudes were all that she offered. Perhaps if she had been forthcoming about her problems in the relationship sooner, or at all, they could have been peacefully resolved. However, that wasn't the case. She made the conscious decision to dance around the subject without ever actually setting foot on the stage. She even went as far as to say that Frank was in the wrong for refusing to be friends after that. How typical, for a woman to make a completely unrealistic request and then blame you for not conceding the point.

Corey Wayne, a man that gives advice for men attempting to date women on his YouTube channel *Coach Corey Wayne* and through his books, has observed the problem of "maybe" dates and advised against agreeing to them. What is a "maybe" date? It's when you ask a woman out for a date and she says maybe. It's such a simple concept that you might be wondering what that has to do with the subject of being straightforward. It has everything to do with being straightforward, and that's because the reason that women say "maybe" to a date is because they are testing you. Women will say "maybe" to see how you respond. It's true that they haven't decided at that point whether or not to go out with you. They're waiting to see your test results.

The test is simple. Will you, as a man, agree to a “maybe” date? If you do then you’re not worth the woman’s time. Are you really so desperate for a woman’s company that you’ll stake your entire evening on a “maybe”? The only response that you should give in such a scenario is what Corey Wayne said in his article *9 Principles For Setting Definite Dates*, which was: “It sounds like you are unsure of your schedule. Why don’t we just do it another time?”⁵ I was not aware of this earlier in my life. I have agreed to many “maybe” dates in my time. I would take a shower, brush my teeth, iron my button up shirt, and be ready to leave an hour in advance so I’d be on time. I would then receive a text from the woman I was supposed to meet, about thirty minutes before we were supposed to show up to wherever we were going, that would read something like: “Hey. Sorry about this, but-”, and whatever would follow would always be a vague excuse stating that they wouldn’t be able to make it. I learned that lesson the hard way after being stood up many times. Learn from my mistakes and take Wayne’s advice on the subject.

Another such example of being indirect is the various games that get played when interacting with women. You might ask a woman something like “Where would you like to eat tonight?” You may receive a response along the lines of “I don’t know. Where do you want to eat?” What will ensue is a back and forth ping-pong match of you suggesting an establishment and her refusing your suggestion. Why? Why wouldn’t the woman just say where she wanted to go instead of making a game of it? I’m not sure I have the answer to that question. Perhaps it’s because women get some entertainment value from such games, or maybe it’s because it makes them feel powerful to dominate the situation. I couldn’t honestly tell you why.

The fact of the matter is that women are not required to be straightforward with you. They are encouraged at every turn not to be straightforward. They are rewarded for side-stepping around issues and masquerading their intentions and desires. Women have no moral quandary with using you as a meal ticket, they do not have a problem testing your patience, they take no issue with needlessly playing games with you, and you need to be aware of all of that.

CHAPTER FOUR: AESTHETICS

A key difference between men and women is that men are forced to cultivate a personality but women have the option of doing so. For a man, it's not enough to be good looking. Men have the holy trifacta: looks, personality, and money. You must have at least two of them. If not, then all I can say is "Good luck." Men have sex with who they can and women have sex with who they want. That's kind of the natural order of things, but we've created a reality in which the female figure has become harder and harder to get a hold of as a man. You have to look good, you have to have a good personality, and you need money. We've driven the bar up to the point that "okay" isn't good enough for men, and at the same time we've never raised the bar for women.

I went on a couple of dates with a woman named Abigail while I was living in New York. On the second date we ended up at her house after we'd gone out. I asked her what she enjoyed doing. I don't care if a woman's interests don't exactly match up to my own. In fact, I would be surprised if a woman I went out with shared my exact interests, but what I do care about is that a woman has interests. Abigail's response to my question was: "I don't have any hobbies." I then asked "Well, what do you and your friends usually do?" She responded with "I don't have any friends."

Women, provided that they have looks, have no other obligations. What do I mean by that? I mean that women looking good is good enough for most men. I fell for that trap several times before realizing how dangerously low the standard for women truly is. The standard for women to be "good enough" doesn't even necessarily have to include that they're attractive. The standard can really be boiled down to: don't be fat, bathe, and show basic affection. Even if a woman is fat there will still be men that will accept her as "good enough". Some men even prefer women to be fat. Women that are attractive are already good enough, and attractiveness is subjective.

Physical appearance is a woman's strongest suit. They can get by most of their lives with a good body and they know it. They seize upon the opportunity to use their bodies to garner whatever they can from a man. So much as a wink from across the bar in your direction is a free drink. Many women simply make a living off of child support. Lure a man in, extract their seed, and then vomit a new lifeform onto the planet in the interest of getting that sweet, sweet, American dollar. You're in a real jeopardizing position after your seed is planted in a woman. If you leave her then you're going to pay her for 18 years. If she leaves you then you're going to pay her for 18 years.

Men are unable to ride by solely on their outward appearance and because of that they will turn to the two other components of the holy trifacta: Personality and money. Over the years a man will develop a deeper understanding of things and will become a learned man. He will work and slave away to generate revenue for later years. The result of this is that men age like fine wine. The older they get, the better they get. There are obviously exceptions to this rule, some men are degenerates their entire lives, but exceptions do not disprove rules.

Women, due to what I would describe as a "free-pass" granted because of their looks, generally don't start doing this until much later down the line. They hit the point of decline where their body begins to wrinkle and sag, and then they turn to other methods of retaining popularity. However, by that point it's often already too late to make a significant change. Women age more akin to a banana left on the island in your kitchen because of that. After it ripens it becomes a delicious

treat, but if it lives long enough on your island I think you'll find that it becomes very unappetizing. The once precious looking banana will turn into a rotting husk. It will become a shell of its former glory.

Women are shallow because of this. They're shallow not only in judging others but also in judging themselves. Usually the very first type of insult you'll hear a woman say about another woman she doesn't like will be directed at her looks, such as: "What an ugly bitch." Women are absolutely fixated on aesthetic appearances, and they are fixated on those looks for good reason. Women are hyper-aware of the fact that their looks are constantly depreciating with each passing day. Most women have a good run of things until their 40s. Some unlucky ones decline much sooner than that.

You might think that all of this would mean that unattractive women, as in women that were never attractive, would be exempt from this fault. To a certain degree they are, or can be, exempt. Unattractive women tend to fare better regarding personality and money, but remember that just because a woman is ugly does not necessarily mean she is guaranteed to have those things. Unfortunately, sometimes this actually creates the worst kind of woman. One that is unattractive, lacks a real personality, and has no money.

You must be selective when seeking a woman. Don't be easily swayed just because women look beautiful, but also don't discount women that are less attractive. I said that men have the holy trifecta of looks, personality, and money. Hold women to that same standard. Attempt to find a woman that has at least two of those three qualities. If you find one that meets that criteria then you should count yourself lucky.

CHAPTER FIVE: RELATIONSHIPS AND DATING

It is my belief that, in general, friendship between a man and a woman is damned from the beginning. Men and women do not generally make good friends. The simple fact that straight men want to have sex with women will forever loom over any friendship between the genders. Most men would sleep with their female friends if given the chance. Some women are aware of that and some are completely oblivious to it, but either way the constant sexual tension that infects the friendship weakens it. Women do not have true male friends, and I think that most of them are well aware of that fact. They know that their male “friends” want to have sex with them. They pretend to be unaware, but they know. They know exactly what the score is. Men are friends with women because they want to get with women. In their pursuit of attempting said action men begin to put women on a pedestal. Women enjoy when that occurs.

Women typically have different interests than straight men. Cosmetics, dramas, and artisanal foods are in no way related to guns, fishing, and sports. That is not to say that all of your friends must share all of your interests, but do not most friendships center on common interests between both parties? Why would you be friends with someone if you don't share any interests with them? Some people might ask “What if you do have common interests with a woman? Can men and women be friends then?” I would still contend that even then it is not generally a good idea. If you're friends with a woman and she gets into a committed relationship with someone else can you really tell me that you'll feel no jealousy? When she bends over to pick up something she dropped can you honestly tell me that you don't look at her ass? When one of her relationships fails and she needs a shoulder to cry on, can you actually say that you don't wish you had a chance with her? I would be willing to bet that you couldn't truthfully say those things. These things I'm describing simply don't apply with male friends. A friendship between a man and a woman is more complicated than that of one with your own persuasion.

Romantic relationships with women are preferable to friendships, but they are also wrought with issues. First and foremost, marriage is a largely one-sided arrangement that favors women. Marriage is not necessarily a complete detriment to a man, however. Potential positives (for both men and women) of marriage include: a level of stability in relationships that is otherwise unattainable, shared responsibilities of livelihood maintenance, having a good environment to raise children within a nuclear family, having a positive social status symbol amongst peers, living in a dual income household, and a level of commitment and intimacy between two people that is a rare commodity in modern society. Marriage is not, however, completely fair in terms of the risks that men can face as opposed to women. Given that courts often favor women, if the marriage fails then you may find yourself losing your house, your money, and your children. A man will knowingly disregard such issues thinking that it will never be his relationship that fails. However, that thought process goes out the window when one day it is his relationship that fails.

Men generally put more monetarily into marriages than women, and this can be seen by observing that men are expected to: Buy engagement rings (which are expected to cost at least two months' salary by most people), buy wedding rings, pay for the house, pay for cars, and be the breadwinner for the house. There are men that live as stay at home dads, but that is not the normal household. Men who do so are typically the butt of every joke within their circles, and that's the case whether it's fair or not. It is far more prevalent and accepted by society that women are free

to stay at home and not have a conventional job. Marriage is supposed to be a show of your commitment to a relationship, but, while it is still considered as such, men are the ones that find themselves at potential risk for going through with it. There is not only a legal concern with marriage but also a stigma that, without any evidence, it will be the general consensus that the man is at fault if and when a divorce occurs (i.e. assuming that the man cheated on her, he's never around, he doesn't give her enough attention, he wanted the divorce, or that he treats her poorly).

When the woman is found to be at fault for the cause of the divorce whatever transgression she committed is often blamed on the man. For example, a man will get caught cheating on his wife and will break down and apologize, but no matter what reason he had for being unfaithful we will not accept his rationale. That is exactly how such a situation should be treated, in my opinion. However, if a woman is caught cheating on her husband she will say something to the effect of "You never gave me enough attention" and people will side with her. There is always a rationale with women in which they are not the ones at fault even when there is glaring, undeniable, evidence to the contrary. A good example of that can be illustrated by a story that comes from Jake Richards. Jake is a very good friend of mine, and he has personally witnessed just how far women will go to rationalize situations in a way that makes it anyone's fault but theirs.

Jake Richards started dating Samara in December of 2014. He initially noticed several red flags that came from her but decided to ignore them because he made the mistake (as most of us have made) of too easily forgiving a woman. Samara was over-controlling. She was unable to let Jake slip from her grasp even for a day. At one point, Jake and two of his good friends were going to see a movie at the theatre. While they were driving to the theatre Samara repeatedly called and texted Jake's phone. She was doing this because he was not in his barracks to FaceTime her as he usually was. She called and texted so much that Jake's friends, feeling they were getting in the way of his relationship, turned the car around and drove Jake back to the barracks.

Jake was expected to remain awake on the phone with Samara until she went to sleep regardless of what time he had work the following day. Samara would threaten to break up with Jake over the slightest argument unless she got her way. Jake would usually concede the point in those arguments in an attempt to put his relationship ahead of his personal interests. You might say that it's obvious what he should have done. You might say he should have ended the relationship and walked away a free man. It's easy to look at someone else's problems and say that you'd never put up with them or that you would have done something different. It's more difficult to be the one with the problem. Jake was in an abusive relationship. It may seem clear to you or I what we would do, but at the time the correct choice wasn't clear to Jake Richards.

They got married on October 10th, 2015. Their relationship tumbled downhill at a high speed. Any argument they'd get in, such as her wanting to buy things they couldn't afford, Jake painting the house walls the "wrong" color, or Samara not liking the restaurant Jake took her to, would be met with the response of Samara going outside the house and not coming back inside until Jake conceded the point. She became physically abusive. She would get angry during an argument and strike Jake. Sometimes she struck his arms and sometimes she struck his face. Jake never struck her back. He refrained not only for fear of the law but also because he was raised to never hit a woman.

Every morning he'd wake up, put on his uniform, work for ten to twelve hours, and then return home only to be greeted by Samara throwing a fit. Jake was in a constant state of being perpetually broke because Samara would spend more than he was paid. Every day Jake would gradually lose a further shred of his sanity. He brought food home and she threw it on the floor because it wasn't the food she wanted. He was tired after work and she made him stay awake. He had plans to be at a gathering at 5pm and she would delay their departure until 6pm. Nothing he could do was enough. There was no clear path forward. He no longer had the option of leaving. He was trapped. Finally, a path forward emerged. In February of 2016 Jake left for his new duty station in Korea while Samara stayed in New York. Jake was finally able to have some room to breathe. He lived in the barracks in Korea and would be met with no arguments after work. He could finally sit down and relax in his own domain. Maybe, he thought, things would work out.

Unfortunately, Jake's thoughts of a peaceful life would soon come to an end. After he left for Korea Samara began cheating on him almost immediately, and this was initially unbeknownst to Jake. Samara would say that they needed to take a break, that they talked too much, and she would continuously mention that she wanted to go to Florida for her birthday. Jake asked her why she was so set on Florida. Samara didn't have family there and had never been. Samara answered Jake only by saying that she wanted to go to the beach. She said she was going alone. Samara's coworker, Cheyanne, contacted Jake and told him that Samara had a man living at Jake's house. She said that Samara had also been letting him drive Jake's car. Cheyanne expressed that it wasn't her business but felt that Jake had a right to know. Jake screenshotted that conversation and put it on Facebook. Samara responded by blocking Jake, withdrawing approximately \$1,600 from their joint bank account, and proceeded to abandon his house. In leaving the house behind she also left behind Jake's two dogs and two cats. She left the animals without food or water.

Jake was forced to call his unit back in New York and arrange for another soldier's wife to care for the animals in his absence. Samara had taken Jake's car and had begun driving towards Texas. She headed for Texas because the man she was cheating on Jake with, Francisco, had flown back there. Samara picked Francisco up in Texas and drove him to his mother's house in Florida. Jake found out Francisco's identity and contacted his friends on Facebook. Francisco's stepbrother, Chris, responded to Jake's messages. He sympathized with Jake's plight as Chris was also a soldier at the time. Chris provided Jake with the knowledge of Samara and Francisco's whereabouts, and supplied Jake with Francisco's mother's phone number. Her name was Sage. Jake called her, she answered, and he proceeded to ask if Francisco had recently arrived with a woman. Sage confirmed that he had indeed brought a woman to her house. Jake identified himself as Samara's husband.

Sage explained that Samara had stated that she was not married, that she had just gotten out of a relationship, that she owned the car that she and Francisco drove there, and that she was looking for long-term work in the area. Jake explained the entire situation regarding Samara cheating on him. Sage stated that she didn't want Samara to stay at her house but didn't want to kick her out because she feared that Francisco might beat her because of his anger problems. Sage coordinated with Jake to remove Samara from Florida. Sage contacted Samara's mother, Jen. Jen flew down to Florida, Sage picked her up from the airport and brought her to her house, and then they both confronted Samara about her less than admirable actions. Jen took Samara in Jake's car and drove her back to New York.

In December of 2016 Jake Richards PCS'd (Permanent Change of Station) back to New York. Upon his return he waited for a month before seeing Samara. He initially was adamant about getting a divorce, but he decided to attempt to talk it out. Jake Richards believed in traditional marriage and would not so easily abandon his own. Jake and Samara talked and reached an agreement for moving forward. Samara profusely apologized and promised to never again betray the sanctity of their marriage. For a period of time after that, approximately the next full year, they got along. Samara got a new job, Jake bought her a car, and they were generally a happy couple. However, no promise was sacred to the wretched woman.

In December of 2017 Samara had been working at Petco as a dog groomer for three months. Two of Samara's coworkers, one female named Amanda and one butch female transitioning to be a "male" named Tyler, would come over to the Richards' household. Jake would cook for them and crack open bottles of liquor when they visited. They had been coming around the house for about a month when Samara said she wanted to go to the mall with Amanda and Tyler. The three of them were not alone. They went with several coworkers from Petco. Jake stayed at home and was taking a shower. He stepped out of the shower and noticed that Samara's Apple Watch was sitting on the bathroom counter. The watch began to vibrate and display that Samara had received a message from someone. Jake opened the message. It was from Tyler. Tyler said something to the effect of "What the fuck are you doing? You're married. You need to stop talking to Nick."

Jake began reading a slew of drivel on the watch. Samara was unapologetically cheating on Jake yet again, and worse yet she was making excuses for her actions in that conversation. She would say things like "Jake's not emotionally there for me", "Jake's rude to me", and other such blatant lies. She even paraphrased the quote from *Grey's Anatomy*: "I make no apologies for how I chose to repair what you broke."⁶ Jake read the entire conversation and then texted Samara. He asked her where she was, she said the mall, and then Jake asked if Nick was there. She said that he wasn't. Jake then said that he read the conversation on the watch. Samara then called Jake and began a sobbing apology and said she'd come right home. Jake hung up the phone. She repeatedly called him back, she repeatedly texted his phone, but Jake did not answer. Samara arrived at the Richards' house.

Samara cried, begged, threatened to kill herself, said that he could divorce her and then in the next breath said "please don't divorce me", but Jake would hear none of it. Jake simply said that they would get a divorce after he returned from ALC (Advanced Leader Course), which was held at Fort Sam, approximately seven weeks after that event. Seven weeks later, Jake made the biggest mistake of his life. The strength of his convictions was simply not enough to overcome his primal urges once he returned from ALC. He had raw sex with Samara, and she conceived. There was no longer any possible avenue of escape. Jake, although he wanted a divorce, did not want his child to be raised in separate households. He regretfully decided to give Samara another chance.

Samara promised to change her ways, to stop talking to Nick, and to have Jake's child. Months after that she threatened, several times, to have his child aborted. She never acted on such threats, but she made them nonetheless. At one point, about a month before his child was born, Samara began yelling at Jake because he was "abandoning" her. In reality he was preparing to deploy alongside myself and the rest of our unit. During that incident Samara threatened to drive her car off the side of the road and kill both herself and her unborn child. She did not act on that threat

either. I had left for deployment along with the rest of the unit while Jake stayed behind for his child's birth. Approximately two months into our deployment Jake was flown out to join us. Several months of good pay and smooth sailing sat before us, and we were happy. Jake looked the best he had since I'd known him. He was stress free, he was exercising, and he was proud to be a new father. Such happiness, unfortunately, could not last.

Jake was only a free man for the first couple of weeks. Samara began complaining that Jake was at work too long, that he sometimes didn't have time to FaceTime her during work hours, and that Jake was spending too much money. The only money Jake spent on deployment was at the bistro on base, and I can personally tell you that that was a very insignificant amount of money. Samara then began denying Jake the ability to see his daughter. She stopped sending photos of their daughter and wouldn't put her on camera during their FaceTime calls. Samara then threatened to divorce Jake. He told her to send him the papers. He didn't talk to her for three days at which point she, again, threatened to kill herself. Jake called the on-post clinic back in New York and alerted the FAP (Family Advocacy Program) to the situation. The FAP responded by initiating a health and welfare check on Samara. Samara was made to come into the clinic for a behavioral health screening. She went in and completed the screen, and then she called Jake and gloated by saying that she had lied during the screening so as to not be labeled as mentally insane.

Two days later Samara, again, threatened to kill herself. Jake's mother, at Jake's request, called the local police and explained the situation. The police came to the Richards' house, they admitted Samara to a mental institution, and Jake's daughter was left in the care of Samara's mother. Jake Richards alerted his chain of command to the situation and they sent him back to New York on the first available flight. Jake took his daughter into his care immediately upon arriving in New York two days later. Samara remained in the mental institution for two weeks before being discharged. Immediately following her release the divorce was initiated. The divorce took about four months and was finalized in July of 2020. Jake, to this day, only gets to see his daughter on the weekends. He pays Samara well over \$1,000 every month as part of the divorce settlement. Samara continues to leech off of any man she can dupe into paying for her apartment in exchange for sex.

That story is a cautionary tale, and it is filled with several fatal flaws. Jake got married too early and didn't have a full perspective of who he was marrying, he didn't terminate the relationship at the first signs of abuse, he didn't have Samara's mental health evaluated the first time she threatened suicide, and he had a child with a narcissist. Jake is well aware of the mistakes he made during the entire ordeal and is not soon to repeat them. Learn from his mistakes and do not repeat them yourself. Not all marriages are equally damned to failure, but you must exercise a great deal of caution when committing to a marriage.

Marriage can be positive or it can be negative, but the point is that the negative sides of marriage more easily affect men than women. Outside of marriage, a regular relationship and even dating can also have such inequities. A good example of dating being inequitable is the fact that guys buy dinner. It is assumed to be the proper and chivalrous action, but has become such a commonplace ideal perpetuated by both genders that it ceases to be a nice gesture and becomes an expected one. Feminists tout themselves as advanced individuals that break the constraints of traditional gender roles, but are quick to submit to said gender roles when it benefits them. My friend, Frank Remington, always pays for the first date. It's how he was raised to act. Frank expressed to me

that in his experiences, this gesture of payment usually is met with no thanks or even acknowledgement. The same is also true of many of my experiences with the same subject.

I've had many, many, many bad experiences while dating. I'll tell you the story of what's probably the worst date I ever went on. I began talking to a woman on a dating app on July 2nd, 2020. Her name was Ashley. We seemed to hit it off pretty well. She shared some of my political views, she was also a veteran, and she was a solid 6/10. Good enough for me. It came out, after we had been talking for a couple of hours, that she had a 7-year-old son. I foolishly let that slide and kept talking to her. The next day we were talking on the phone and she mentioned that she had PTSD. I did not initially consider that to be a red flag. If you've been in the military then you have an elevated risk of developing PTSD. However, then it came out that she had been in the National Guard. My respect for her veteran status disappeared and my suspicions about her PTSD grew. What are the odds that a National Guard soldier, who never deployed, legitimately has PTSD? I don't have a study on that to provide for you, but my speculation is that the odds dramatically decrease.

She told me that her PTSD was from a car wreck that she had been in. That made two red flags, and we had only been talking for a day. On the night of July 3rd, 2020, Ashley said "I know this is a long shot, but are you free tomorrow?" A woman initiated the date? That's such an uncommon occurrence that there was no way I could refuse. I asked her what she had in mind. She said that I could drive up to her house, leave my car there as she drove us to her parent's lakeside property in her car, and that we'd watch the fireworks and then come back to her place. She said that the property was where they drove boats and jet skis. Boats? Jet skis? It sounded good to me. We agreed that I'd show up to her house at 10am on July 4th, 2020.

The following morning, I woke up two hours prior to the specified time. I didn't have her address, but I had a general idea of where her house was. I knew it would be about a thirty-minute drive, so I got ready early. By 9am I had showered, cut my nails, brushed my teeth, ironed my button up shirt, and I was ready to leave. I texted her at 9:10am and said "Hey, good morning." She responded at 9:30am and said "Hey! I just got up." I asked for her address so I could show up on time. She responded only with the word "Haha". I can put two and two together, and I said "Do you need some more time to get ready?" She said that she did, gave me her address, and asked that I show up at 10:15am.

I showed up to her house at exactly 10:25am, figuring that she needed the extra ten minutes to actually be ready to leave. Her house looked nice from the outside. I thought to myself "Nice house, jet ski, 'veteran'. Not bad." I knocked on the door. She answered the door and said "Hey! Don't judge me, but the house is kind of a mess right now. Haha." I responded by saying "Haha, judgement mode engaged" in a jovial tone. I walked inside the house.

Have you ever seen the show *Hoarders*? It wasn't bad enough to be on the show, but damned if it wasn't trying. Upon entering the house I found myself in a hallway. Immediately to my right was what used to be an entrance to the living room. It had two baby gates stuck in the doorway, one on top of another so that they created an adult-height gate, and there were boxes and items piled up to the ceiling behind that gate. Further down the hallway on my left were stairs that led to the second floor, and just beyond that was the kitchen. I walked into the kitchen. There was stuff

piled up all over the kitchen counter. Books, magazines, a bike helmet, random bottles of pills, and various other items covered the counter completely.

I excused it all. She lived with her roommate, who was her “best friend”, and her son. Maybe they had made a mess yesterday? No. There was too much stuff piled up all over the house for it to have been a one-off. Ashley walked just beyond me and knelt on the floor. She began using a rag to wipe up dog excrement. Maybe the dog had voided its bowels right before I walked in? Ashley said, while on her knees right next to stale dogshit, “Sorry about this. [The dog] shit on the floor last night.” I didn’t respond to that comment. Your dog defecated on the floor and you just left it there overnight? This had to be a one-off. Nobody actually does that.

She mopped up half of the waste before saying “That’s enough. I’ll just leave it for my roommate to clean. I know, I’m horrible.” I could do nothing but stare at her. I did not have a response. What could my response have even been? Are you truly so lazy that you would rather leave the feces of an animal on the floor of your house than take one minute to clean it up? Are you a savage? I said nothing, and when I said nothing she said “My roommate is a narcissistic bitch anyway. Well, she was my best friend, but then she moved in and I don’t know anymore.” “Okay” was all I could say. She then went to let her dogs inside from the backyard, but before letting them in she told me “Be careful. My dogs hate men.”

I could not suppress the physical need to roll my eyes. I averted my head so that she could not see me roll my eyes harder than I’d ever rolled them in my life. The dogs came inside and they did not give me any issues. Ashley told me that the biggest dog, Bandit, had viciously bitten the neck of one of her neighbors’ small dogs. She said that when the neighbor saw his dog in peril, he attempted to free his dog from Bandit’s jaws. Bandit released the dog only to then bite down on the neighbor’s hand. Ashley remarked that she was annoyed that she had to pay the bill for the veterinarian and the bill for the neighbor’s hospital visit. I said that if an animal attacked my dog, who is too small to defend himself, that the animal wouldn’t be alive.

Ashley then began telling me a story about her previous boyfriend. She said that he was a felon, that he had been involved in a botched bank robbery, and that he psychologically abused her. She said that she wasn’t able to leave him because “The sex was just too good.” I still did not leave. I know exactly why I didn’t leave. I kept thinking to myself: “This is all just a one-off. Things will improve when we get out of here.” I didn’t have a response to her story. Ashley, seeing my lack of response, said “Oh, but that’s all behind me. He’s gone from my life.” A small consolation.

Finally, at approximately 11:30am, Ashley was ready to leave. We walked into her garage and I saw her jet ski. The jet ski had surely seen better days and looked inoperable. I remarked that it looked as though it hadn’t been used in a long time, and Ashley responded by saying “It doesn’t work right now. I’m still working on fixing it.” This had to be a one-off. She got into her car and I opened the passenger door. Sitting in the front passenger seat was a solidified bowl of oatmeal. A spoon was stuck in it. Ashley apologized and blamed it on her son before throwing it in the back seat. This had to be a one-off.

We stopped for food and then drove for an hour before reaching our destination. We made it to the property at about 1pm. Imagine my horror when she pulled into what looked like a trailer park

beside a lake in Fort Morgan, Colorado. Immediately I became concerned. I was already concerned about everything that had already happened, but I still hadn't left. My opportunity to leave had passed. I was trapped. She drove us up to her parent's property, we parked, and we went to meet her family.

The property had two trailers on it. You might imagine that this property was square or rectangular, but you'd be wrong. The property was in the shape of an obtuse triangle. It was sectioned off by rope on one side and chain on the other. A heavy figure emerged from the first trailer. It was her stepmom. I was introduced to her and then the three of us went inside the trailer. Immediately upon walking through the screen door I was inside a small kitchen. There was a doorway without a door to the left that led to an empty room. There was a doorway without a door to the right that led to the bedroom. I looked to the right. I saw a naked man in his late 40s passed out on the bed. Before I could even really soak in how bad that was, Ashley walked into his bedroom.

"Daddy, wake up!" She shook him awake. He grumbled, he groaned, and then he stood. Ashley walked back into the kitchen before the dad drew the hospital curtain closed around his bed. I was the only sane person in the room. Somehow the sight of her father being naked in front of me, or in front of herself, did not bother Ashley. Somehow the stepmom wasn't bothered by me seeing her husband's naked body. It wasn't a one-off. I had to leave. I had to escape. I was an hour's drive away from my car. I was in the middle of nowhere. I had only one option.

I decided that I would never speak to Ashley again after the day was over, but I had to maintain my composure long enough to get a ride back to my vehicle. I would bide my time. I opened a beer and sat down. The father came through the curtains and into the kitchen after he got dressed. Brief introductions were made and I returned to minding my drink. The father went to heat up some leftover food from the fridge, but when he turned the microwave on the breaker tripped. Ashley walked to the screen door and yelled to the trailer across from us "Hey! What're you running over there?" A young boy's voice called out from the other trailer's window in reply and said "I'm only running the microwave. What're you running over there?"

Ashley responded by yelling "We're only running the microwave." "Well, then one of us is a liar," the boy yelled back. Ashley was, in fact, the liar. The trailer that we were in was also running an AC unit that ran off of the wall socket. Finally, some other trailer boy said that he would go reset the breaker. The breaker was reset, the father tried again to use the microwave, and the breaker tripped again. That cycle repeated five times before the father was able to heat up his food. Ashley decided that she would introduce me to the rest of her family outside. I was just glad to get out of that God-forsaken trailer.

I won't make you sit through reading the exact same story three times, but what happened next repeated three times before my very eyes. Outside, Ashley called over one of her cousins to meet me. "Hey," said Ashley, "this is Joel." The cousin and I shook hands, and then the cousin asked how long we'd been together. Ashley told her that it was our first date. The cousin responded by saying "And you brought him here?!" It didn't inspire a lot of confidence in me, but I had already decided that I would never see any of those people again anyway. Then, about twenty seconds later, Ashley called over another of her cousins. The exact, and I mean **exact**, same conversation

played out the exact same way again. Then, about thirty seconds after that, Ashley called over another of her cousins. The exact, and I mean **exact**, same conversation played out the exact same way again.

I thought that I was losing my mind or perhaps having a stroke when I saw the exact same situation occur three times in rapid succession. I was broken away from that thought when one of Ashley's cousins, cousin Luanne, came up to the two of us. "Joel, you have to come ride on this boat with us" she said. Riding in boats is fun. What could possibly go wrong? "Sure" I said as Ashley and I climbed into a small motorboat. The boat was on a trailer attached to a pickup truck. There were eight seats in the boat, and all eight were filled. Ashley, cousin Luanne, Luanne's husband, three young cousins that looked like carbon copies of one another, another cousin, and myself were onboard. Somehow, I ended up at the back of the boat next to one of the clones and Ashley had ended up at the very front of the boat. We were lowered into the lake and cousin Luanne began to drive the boat.

I got soaked. I was sitting there at the back of the boat just waiting for the entire ordeal to be over with. Cousin Luanne drove that boat around the lake for about thirty minutes before pulling back up by the landing of their property. There was no dock to be seen. There was only a metal staircase descending from each property that disappeared into the water. Luanne pulled up by the stairs and one of the cousins whose name I never caught got off, and then another one of her cousins got onboard. The man that boarded was named cousin Michael, and he got behind the wheel of the boat. Cousin Luanne then seemed to notice that I was at the back of the boat.

"Joel, you should come sit up front with Ashley, seeing as how you two is on a date and all" she said. "Oh, really?" I said in a sarcastic tone. One of the young clones moved to the back so I could sit in the front, and then cousin Michael drove the boat out into the lake. Ashley got splashed with water and complained. Michael let loose a redneck giggle before saying "First date and she's wet before ya even touched her, EHhehHOOO!" I ignored the joke. Cousin Luanne then said "Ashley, we'll have to convince Joel to stay the night! You two can stay in the tent outside the trailer." Cousin Michael spoke before I could, and he said "First date and ya already gonna get it on, EHhehHOOO!"

Ashley responded by saying "Oh, no. We don't fuck on the first date." I was now sitting there in blistering anger. I did not respond to those comments in an attempt to be the bigger man. I did not scream or yell at cousin Michael because there were three kids onboard. I did not cause a scene. I remained silent. Cousin Michael continued to make juvenile jokes the entire boat ride. At one point he said "I bet Joel's just waiting to get back on dry land so he can call an Uber and get outta here, cause our family's so fucked up, EHhehHOOO!" I responded by saying "That's a pretty meta joke." "Uber don't even come out these ways" said cousin Luanne.

Ashley asked if I was okay. I said that yeah, I was. She said "Well, it's just that you're being pretty quiet." "What do you want me to say" was all I said back. She seemed saddened by that. I thought about jumping off the ship and swimming towards the shore. It was only maybe a hundred meters, but what then? I had my phone and my .38 special revolver in my pockets. My phone would surely be destroyed and my gun would surely rust. I sat in silence and bided my time.

Finally, after about 45 minutes, cousin Michael headed back towards the stairs that led to their property. He stopped the boat about ten feet away from the stairs.

“Michael,” Ashley whined, “you have to pull closer to the stairs. Joel has shoes on.” Michael laughed the way only a slackjaw can, and he said “Joel doesn’t wanna get his shoes wet yall, EHhehHOOO!” The shore was right there and I could take no more. “Don’t fucking worry about it” I said angrily, and then I jumped off the side of the boat. I was waist-deep in water, but I had the sense to take my phone out of my pocket and hold it above the water before jumping. I trudged to the stairs and climbed up to the property. I took a deep breath before turning around. Everyone in the boat looked uncomfortable.

Ashley got out of the boat and joined me at the top of the stairs. She said “How’re you feeling?” I responded only by saying “I want to go home.” She seemed saddened and said that we could leave after saying goodbye to her dad. We walked to the front of her dad’s trailer. For some reason I just didn’t have it in me, even then, to revoke the normal courtesies that I afforded women at the time. “Hey,” I said, “it seems like you were planning on staying the night up here. I don’t want to put you out of your way. If you want, I’ll find my own way home and you can stay here.”

Her response was what flipped a switch in me. “Well, did you want a ride back?” It was the way she said it. She said it as if I was, in fact, putting her out of her way. After all the nonsense that I’d been subjected to that day I just couldn’t let that tone slide. “You know what, don’t worry about it” I said. “I’d say it’s been fun, but, ya’know” was the last thing I said before executing a left face and walking away. I walked for about half a mile before getting service on my phone. Uber, it seemed, had nobody near my area. I called my dad and said I needed to be picked up. My dad simply asked for an address. I gave him the address of a gas station that was three miles from my location, and I started walking.

I didn’t make it another five minutes down the road before a sheriff’s car pulled over to harass me. Two blonde females stepped out of the car and started asking me questions. Normally I would just politely answer their questions and be on my way, but not that day. “What’re you doing?” “Walking.” “Where’re you going?” “Gas station.” “Buddy, the nearest gas station is miles away,” said one of the women. “Yeah” was the only word I spoke. They looked at each other, got back in their vehicle, and let me pass without incident. I called my friend Frank Remington and told him the story of what had happened as I walked, then I called my friend Mark Jules and told him the same. I kept walking after the phone calls had ended. I was walking in the middle of nowhere. There were barely any houses. There was only abundant farmland surrounding me.

I felt the weight of my own foolishness crash down upon me as I trudged through the farmland. How stupid was I to have not abandoned the date while I was still next to my car? I felt guilt for failing myself, I felt anger at how I’d wasted my day, and I felt shame for allowing my standards to be low enough to indulge that woman’s nonsense. My shoes were heavy and soaked with water, my feet began to blister, the sun was beating down on me, I had no water, and the folly of it all became too much to bear. My stomach wretched. My head pounded. My mental sanity had been stretched too far and finally I screamed. I stood alone amongst the empty farmland, and I screamed. I howled like a madman at the emptiness around me. I screamed until I could scream no more, and then I kept walking. My dad picked me up just before I got to the gas station. It turned out that the

gas station had been out of business for a long time anyway. About an hour later I received a text from Ashley. It read "I'm sorry that you let my cousin change your opinion of me." I said "Don't worry about it" and blocked her number.

You might have read that story and said to yourself something along the lines of: "If that was me, if I was there, I would've walked out immediately", or "I'd never put up with that." I hope that you said that with some conviction in your voice. It's too easy to say that. You need to do more than say that. You need to say that and stand by what you said. That story was a turning point for me. That was the last time I would afford women courtesies that they don't deserve. You need to recognize when a woman isn't redeemable and you need to, sometimes literally, jump ship. Learn from my mistakes. Make no excuses for women. If you see red flags being emitted then you need to cut sling load and never look back. Some men will forever excuse women. You cannot allow yourself to be that way. You need to draw a hard line in the sand and recognize when it's being crossed.

CHAPTER SIX: HUMOR

If there was one point among all the ones I've written here that I'd consider an absolute true fact it's that women aren't funny. Not even remotely close, but doomed are ye who proclaim so. Even in the face of glaring evidence to support your claim you will be deemed a sexist, and thus your opinion drowns in the echo chambers of a deep leftist well. Women are not funny and they have such a low comedic threshold that they deem commonalities as great works of humor. They have the inability to project their own humor. When any small and often unintentional portrayal of "humor" is displayed it will be met with a high-pitched cackling produced by a group of "funny" women. Men don't think women are funny, yet women are easily wooed by men's humor. Why? Is it a coincidence that women don't woo men with their humor while the opposite is true, is it because men constantly attempt to oppress women by refraining from laughing at their works, or is it because my generalization that women aren't funny is correct?

Recently, one of my friends shared a female comedian's skit on Facebook. He shared it with the caption: "Proof that women will never be funny". I watched the video. It was about three minutes long. I can tell you, as someone who is something of a savant when it comes to wasting time, that it was a complete waste of my limited time on this earth. Why am I bringing this up? Why does it matter that some "comedian" I've never heard of isn't funny? I'll tell you why: It's because I always read the comments, and after watching that grossly unfunny video I went to the comments. There was nothing but praise for her there. Everyone was saying how funny she was, how great her act was, and how attractive she was. None of those things were true. She wasn't funny, her act was (at best) mediocre, and for me to describe her physical appearance would require verbiage that is unbecoming of this book.

That whole ordeal wouldn't be noteworthy if it were an isolated incident, but it's not. What types of jokes do female comedians tell? They tell jokes that are akin to *Great Value* brand food. They're bland and generic. They joke about how dirty their pussies are, how many shoes they own, how they're such whores, they shriek, they scream, they make awful impressions of men, and they constantly joke about how they're lesbians. They joke about the same mundane, boring, and minute "problems" that women face on a day-to-day basis that every other female comedian jokes about. The sheer repetition of these jokes wears them out and makes their acts stale. It's not that those kinds of jokes or those subjects can't be funny. It's that women deliver those jokes in unfunny ways. A large part of comedy isn't even the joke itself, it's the delivery of the joke, and for some reason women just don't deliver. Good comedians are individuals, they have a distinct personality a certain manner of speech. Female comedians embody the typical social justice warrior archetype. Not only is their act stale, but it becomes such that you can't tell any female comedian apart from another. The acts are the same, the personalities are the same, and the cringe is the same.

Female comedians joke about the things that men hate about women, and the absolute worst of it is that their jokes aren't funny. Being scammed is always a negative thing, but some scams steal more in exchange for less than others. Female comedians commit one of the worst scams I could imagine committing: They promise laughs and they don't deliver. You have one job as a comedian and that job is simply to make people laugh. You want to hear a funny joke? Matt Walsh said "I don't mean to imply that women aren't funny. I would never imply that. I, in fact, am stating it explicitly."⁷ That's funny.

I might also point out that what I'm talking about is not a recent phenomenon. Christopher Hitchens observed the same truth in his article *Why Women Aren't Funny*. He wrote: "There are more terrible female comedians than there are terrible male comedians, but there are some impressive ladies out there. Most of them, though, when you come to review the situation, are hefty or dykey or Jewish, or some combo of the three."⁸ That article was published in 2007.

Being funny is more than just telling a joke. It's being able to laugh at the jokes of others and being able to play off of the jokes of others. Not being able to take a joke is a common problem amongst women. God forbid you say anything that could even be construed as offensive around women, or else you'll quickly find yourself a pariah amongst females for the slightest slight against them whether it's real or perceived.

I once had my character attempt to be slandered on social media for a joke that I never actually said. I used to work on an ambulance as an EMT. The hours were long, the job was grueling, and the pay was nearly nil. It was one of the only companies that would hire me at the time because I was only 19, and many of the ambulance companies didn't pay for insurance that would cover their interests if they employed anyone under 21. They hired another 19-year-old after I'd been there for almost a year. An attractive woman by the name of Jane donned our uniform and joined our crews.

One of my coworkers, Jed, encouraged me to ask Jane out after a couple of weeks. I did, she said no, and that was the end of it. I stopped my advances as I had been raised to do when a woman says no. I maintained communication with her only as pertained to the job at hand. I believe I took the appropriate course of action in the situation, but that didn't stop the problem from occurring. After that event Jed would make a joke every time I came into work. "You here to see your girlfriend," he'd say and then laugh. I responded, every time I was met with this joke, with "She's not my girlfriend." She worked a different shift than I did. Shifts were 12 hours long at the minimum. After I had initially asked her out I barely saw her, and when I did we'd exchange "hi" and "bye". I never thought more about it but months later she made a comment online about me. Seemingly unrelated to anything I've just told you, we had a female paramedic that worked on my shift that went by Judy. Judy had blatantly committed medical malpractice directly in front of me and my friend, RJ. RJ and I filed a report about it and she was fired.

Judy then made a Facebook post stating that we had all screwed her over for no reason. Keep in mind that Judy had been fired from five different ambulance companies in less than a few years' time before joining the company I was at. Jane commented on that post. At that point in time, Jane still worked for the same company that I did. Jane said that I was a creep who went around telling everyone that she was my girlfriend. Judy responded that I was a complete pig for doing so. Jane then went on to describe our shift captain as a "fat retarded drunk". I was livid. It was too easy to screenshot the public conversation they had, send it to shift captain Richard, and have her fired. That's exactly what I did. Jane was fired the next day and unbelievably she had the audacity to message me and tell me that I was responsible for ruining her life. She said that she planned to work the "dead-end job" for another few months to save up until she could afford to move out of state. She ended it by saying that I should kill myself. Needless to say, I didn't heed her advice.

I committed no crime. I asked a woman out, she said no, and that was all. Someone else made a joke about it, a joke that I never engaged in or showed any approval of, and this woman thought it acceptable to attempt to publicly attack my character. I was able to quickly clear my name at the station when this got out, thankfully, as nobody had ever heard those alleged claims fall from my mouth (because I never said them). Truth beat the wolfcry. Although that may read as an absolute victory, I can assure you that it wasn't. It was stressful for me to be put in such a circumstance without cause, and there have been many men that have fared worse in the face of such attacks in recent years. You could say a joke wherein the joke is supposed to be offensive, you could make a joke that gets intentionally misconstrued, or someone else could make a joke that involves you in some way and women will find a way to be angry about it.

Comedy is, to me, probably the most important aspect of life. Being able to see how unsound the world is and laugh is basically a requirement in the lines of work I've been in. Sometimes a joke is simply observing the absurdity of a situation out loud. Sometimes a joke is the knee-jerk reaction a joke is met with. When you say something that's clearly offensive for the sake of a laugh and it gets one then you've succeeded. One time I was in a group call with a few of my friends. Some were White and some were black. Jay, a White man, made a joke about "niggers". DC, a black man, laughed so hard he cried. His response to the joke, moreover than the joke itself, made the rest of us laugh. DC didn't get offended because he knew it a joke, and because he wasn't a nigger.

It's a ubiquitous problem that plagues our civilization: Not being able to take a joke. Thin skin seems to be a modern building material when developing young minds. Previous generations were taught to "man up" to tough situations. Being offended by something is a choice you make. You have the power to hear a joke that you deem in poor taste and walk away without saying anything. You have the power to realize that it was a joke and is not intended to actually represent one's beliefs. Unfortunately, that also means you have the power to hear a joke, interpret it the wrong way, and be insulted. That reaction is, in my experience, a more common reaction amongst women than men. Although, I have also noticed a subset of men that appear to fake taking issue with a joke in front of women solely for the sake of attempting to increase his reputation with those women.

The issue that comes with not being able to take a joke is more than just suffering from a lack of comedic sense. The issue is that being less accepting of jokes also means you are less capable of dealing with anything that you find offensive. If you can't even take a joke then what hope do you have of holding a sensible debate about anything? We program people to refuse jokes that are "offensive" which, in turn, leads to people refusing anything that they deem offensive. One track minds that reject ideologies not because they are logically flawed but because they offend us have become normal. We discredit our opponents not with reason but with emotion. You said something that I don't approve of, and you are wrong for it.

CHAPTER SEVEN: FEMINISM

The *Titanic* began to sink. The water was cold. There was no land in sight. The call rang out, piercing the ears of every sinking soul, and it said “Get to the lifeboats! Women and children first!” The value of a man’s life and a woman’s life was all too clear. We valued a woman’s life more than our own. We valued it so much more that we would sooner damn ourselves to the icy brink rather than let them slip beneath the water. Women were valued above men for a long time, and what did women proceed to do? Complain. They began to complain and they never ceased complaining.

I don’t disagree with saving women and children first. As a society we value women and children more than we do men and that’s fine. Far be it from me, or anyone else, to damn a child or a woman to a fate that we could save them from by way of personal sacrifice. My point is not that valuing other life more than your own is a bad thing. My point is that we afford this courtesy to women and their response is to turn on their heels and spit on us. Women expect you to treat them better than you’d treat a man, but women will also condemn your chivalry on a whim.

There was a time when you could claim that women were oppressed in the United States. Not having the right to vote, being paid less money for the same work as men, and not being allowed to work outside of their gender roles are just a few examples that you could point to. Those things did happen, it’s true. Depending on who you ask you will be told that there are either three waves of feminism or four, but in either case where we find ourselves now is undoubtedly the least righteous portion of the cause. Feminism, if it was ever anything else, has become a joke. I didn’t always think that. I used to blindly agree with feminist ideals earlier in life, but, around 2009, I had already begun to oppose the idea of modern feminism. I then found YouTube videos from Phil Mason and TJ Kirk on the subject. Their arguments against modern feminism resonated with me and furthered my hatred of the foul movement.

Feminism had ceased to be about equality. False narratives and fallacies became prevalent throughout their literature and utterances. No longer would a reasonable person be able to look at their cause and say “I agree.” White knights, however, would draw their metaphorical swords to defend these women at any cost. Feminism had started to become more about being more equal than others. Women, by this point, had become equal in the eyes of the law, but that accomplishment wouldn’t be left to stand on its own. No, now feminists demanded “equal” treatment by society. When legislation had covered their cause entirely they continued to ask for more. The envelope was being pushed further and further across the table without meeting resistance.

A YouTube video from *Sky News*, titled *Why Office Air Conditioning Is Sexist*, showed the news anchor saying: “There I was thinking it was just me that had a problem, but turns out it’s the air conditioning that’s sexist.”⁹ Radhika Sanghani, the featured guest in the video, then went to explain that men intentionally keep the air conditioning at a level not comfortable for women. The same argument regarding sexist air conditioning was given by Kastalia Medrano when she published her article: *It’s August, It’s 2016, Let’s Just Acknowledge the Office A/C Issue*. She wrote: “Because it is August, this is your reminder that the standard office air-conditioning is indeed sexist. It just is.”¹⁰

Air conditioning is not sexist. The modern convenience of not sweating through several liters of water during the workday is something that our ancestors wish they had. Finding the time to engineer a fictitious plot that suggests we use air conditioning to oppress women indicates to me that you don't have any real problems to complain about. Male and female body temperatures are, on average, equivalent. I would contend that a true act of sexism would be to enter a mostly male workplace knowing that the men prefer the temperature a certain way and expect every man to cater to your desires. We're talking about a non-issue. You're cold? Put some layers on. Also, look up iron deficiency.

Many feminists have claimed that video games are sexist. Video games, regardless of whether or not they contain sexist ideals, do not perpetuate or create sexism in real life. In the same way, paintings of war do not create war. A person could look upon *General Custer's last stand at Battle of Little Bighorn, June 25, 1876* and think to themselves "The Indians were savages", but the belief that they were savages would have to be a preconceived notion.¹¹ You would not merely look at a piece of art and be convinced of an ideal. Moreover, I find the notion that video games are fueled by sexism no more credible than the shills saying it. Feminists claim that video games over-sexualize women which supposedly leads to men treating them like objects in real life, but I would argue that no one could sexualize women more than women themselves. Feminists jump at the chance to call a character design over-sexualized, but say nothing of real life whores and e-girls that do a fine job of sexualizing themselves of their own accord. If you are incapable of playing a video game without feeling the full weight of the patriarchy crashing down upon you, then don't play video games.

However, my problem with these people is not simply the fact that they sit there and say "Video games are sexist." My problem is that they have made a living out of being, what I would call, "professional victims". They say something that most people disagree with online and then attempt to profit off of the expected backlash. Anita Sarkeesian was given almost \$160,000 from backers on Kickstarter in 2012 after creating a campaign for making videos about sexism in video games. Zoe Quinn developed the game *Depression Quest*, which was released in 2013. Both of them were public figures of #Gamergate. Both Sarkeesian and Quinn presented their argument regarding "online harassment" before the United Nations on September 24th, 2015. During her speech at the United Nations, Quinn stated: "-in support of social networks that don't downplay what's happening, that don't tell them to just get offline and hide which we've seen in cases like Kathy Sierra's doesn't actually even work."¹² I completely disagree. People like Quinn and Sarkeesian constantly drum up what's happening, citing that they've received "death threats" online, and instead of doing the sensible thing and just blocking people that bother them or turning off their computers they instead call for the silencing of their dissenters. Getting offline is exactly what you should do if you're unable to handle the raw criticism of the internet. Quinn went on to say: "There are individuals on services like YouTube that have made a living off of abusing people like Anita and I who monetize this."¹² She complains about people making a living off of criticizing her, but people like Quinn and Sarkeesian make their living off of demonizing and criticizing the works of other people.

They come into the United Nations, demand that we censor the internet, and every useless head in the UN (which is to say all of them) bobs their head up and down in agreement. People like this

could easily solve their fictional problems by turning off their computer and walking outside, but they actively choose not to because that wouldn't turn a profit. To paraphrase a quote from King of Bros, "What we have here is a beautiful symbiotic relationship between a bunch of parasites. Sarkeesian, Quinn, and games media get to thrive while the hosts, gaming and gamers, suffer and wither away at the hands of what they're peddling."¹³

BuzzFeed posted the video *36 Questions Women Have For Men* to their website, and the first question was: "How does it feel to be the same sex as Donald Trump?"¹⁴ Some questions posed by the video include: "Why are you surprised when women are funny? I'm probably funnier than you", "Why do you think we're obsessed with you when we hookup? Nine times out of ten, I just want you to leave, too", "Why can't I sleep with as many people as I want to, without being judged?", "In what world does 'no' mean 'yes'?", and "Why do you have to sit with your legs so wide open? I get that you have balls, but I don't stand around with my arms wide open to make room for my boobs."

Questions directed at men for the sole purpose of instigating arguments that attract people to your website is a marketing tactic. The questions posed by *BuzzFeed* do not require answers as they are rhetorical, not actually questions, or are intentionally attempting to create dissent in an attempt to have more people come to their comment section to argue which would do nothing but increase revenue for them. Their very first question, "How does it feel to be the same sex as Donald Trump", is a non-argument. It is to say nothing. One could easily pose the question "How does it feel to be the same sex as Elizabeth Báthory", and it would be just as pointless.

Many feminists have claimed there is a "wage gap" that is the result of gender discrimination. They argue that there are studies to facilitate the idea that women are paid less than men for doing the same job. Some even argue that the wage gap still exists (because of gender discrimination) today even with the Equal Pay Act of 1963 being in place. The American Association of University Women says: "Over half a century after pay discrimination became illegal in the United States, a persistent pay gap between men and women continues to hurt our nation's workers and our national economy."¹⁵ It goes on to allege that "Women working full time in the U.S. are paid 82 cents to every dollar earned by men".

The wage gap, in the manner that feminists explain it, is an easily debunked myth somehow thrown about as if it were commonplace for women to be paid less than men for doing the same job. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 notwithstanding, ask yourself this: If it were legal to pay women less than men then why would companies even bother hiring men? It's obviously not true, yet women have been claiming it is for years. You would have to be willfully ignorant to believe there was a gap in the sense that they tell you there is, and yet stating that can, and will, result in your subsequent labeling as a misogynist. Do women on the whole earn less money than men? Perhaps, but not in the sense that feminists would have you believe. Working at the same company, in the same building, performing the same job, with the same level of experience, and with every quantifiable metric being the same the pay would be equal. If it wasn't then it would be illegal.

The American Association of University Women has a FAQ page about the pay gap on their website. One of the questions listed is: "Why don't women just choose higher paying jobs?"¹⁶ They answer their own question by saying: "Seeking out jobs in higher-paying occupations - such

as those more typically held by men - does increase women's earnings, but only to a point." They are not able to outright state that women would earn less money than men if they worked the same job because that wouldn't be true, but they come very close to saying that. Another FAQ on the page is: "Aren't you exaggerating by talking about the gap if it's not caused by discrimination?" They answer that by saying both: "The gender pay gap is an estimate of the actual gap in pay between men and women, not an estimate of the effect of direct pay discrimination", and "Researchers have estimated the proportion of the gender pay gap that is the result of direct gender bias or discrimination by statistically accounting for the effect of all other measurable factors such as job tenure, education level, work experience, hours worked, college major, geographical region, race and ethnicity, and other factors. The remaining 'unexplained' gap between men and women is assumed to be a result of gender bias and discrimination."

The gender pay gap that they are citing is "not an estimate of the effect of direct pay discrimination." The "unexplained" gap is **assumed** to be the result of gender bias and discrimination. Something cannot be explained therefore I assume my narrative to be true. The crucial point, again, is that they are not able to outright say that a woman will earn less than a man for performing the same job, in the same building, at the same company, with the same level of experience. To put what I'm saying in less pleasant terms: They are intentionally trying to give you the false conception that women will always earn less than men and even go so far as to blatantly say that seeking a higher-paying job will only increase a woman's earnings to a point. What kind of message is that?

On September 5th, 2014, a CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) report was published that showed that an estimated 19.3% of women (1 in every 5) in the United States had been raped in their lifetimes. Massive amounts of social media posts and mainstream media articles rammed stories about it down everyone's throats. Many feminists regard this number as true and accurate and cite it as proof that we exist within a "rape culture".

The 1 in 5 rape ratio is derived from a report in 2014 that was based on a survey that was conducted from January to December of 2011. The numbers from the survey would appear to indicate that 1 out of every 5 women in the United States have been raped. However, I would ask you to consider the credibility of such claims. You can read it for yourself on the CDC's website. The report is titled *Prevalence and Characteristics of Sexual Violence, Stalking, and Intimate Partner Violence Victimization — National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, United States, 2011*. In the report they state the method for arriving at their conclusion as such: "In 2011, a total of 14,155 interviews were conducted (7,758 women and 6,397 men). A total of 12,727 interviews were completed, and 1,428 interviews were partially completed. A total of 6,879 women and 5,848 men completed the survey. The estimates presented in this report are based on completed interviews."¹⁷ Those interviews were conducted via telephone.

12,727 phone interviews had been extrapolated to represent the then approximate US population, in 2014, of 318,805,154.¹⁸ That means that the CDC used interviews from **0.0039%** of the population to form a conclusion applying to the entire population. Conversely, the BJS (Bureau of Justice Statistics) has a report that uses NCVS (National Crime Victimization Survey) data, titled *Criminal Victimization, 2014*, that lists the number of rapes and sexual assaults together in 2014 as 284,350.¹⁹ The NCVS, as stated in the *Criminal Victimization, 2014* report, "obtains

estimates of crimes both reported and not reported to police”. You might wrongfully assume that that would mean that their findings would equal or outweigh the findings of the CDC’s report, but you would be wrong. My advice is to read both and then decide which one you think is more credible and believable.

Cathy Young published an article in 2014 that represents the same argument I’m presenting regarding the CDC’s overinflated statistics, titled *The CDC's Rape Numbers Are Misleading*. Young wrote: “For many feminists, questioning claims of rampant sexual violence in our society amounts to misogynist ‘rape denial.’ However, if the CDC figures are to be taken at face value, then we must also conclude that, far from being a product of patriarchal violence against women, ‘rape culture’ is a two-way street, with plenty of female perpetrators and male victims.”²⁰

Based on the BJS’s report it would seem that we don’t live in a rape culture, but the reality is that “rape culture” could be disproven without the use of numbers and studies at all. Rape is illegal. People found guilty of rape are locked away and condemned by the public. If we truly lived in a society that encouraged and approved of rape then why would we outlaw it? Why would we ostracize people the second they’re accused of it? Why wouldn’t we walk around raping every woman we saw? I’ll tell you why: It’s because “rape culture” is a myth. The same argument could be mirrored against people that complain about systemic racism. Would we allow a black president to be “elected” if the black community were truly systemically oppressed?

Many feminists disregard opposing arguments from men citing that their opinion is invalid because they are “mansplaining”. “Mansplaining” is an imaginary term concocted for the purpose of dismissing arguments that feminists cannot refute. If you explain to a feminist that she is wrong and your argument is logically sound then it is irrelevant that you are a man and she is a woman. Arguments should be able to stand on their own merit without the need to arbitrarily discredit the opposition. If you cannot disprove an argument purely with logic and evidence then you should concede the point. Conceding the point, however, is something that feminists rarely do and is also not generally something that anyone spouting leftist arguments will typically do.

Katy Gallagher, an Australian politician, accused Mitch Fifield of “mansplaining”.²¹ She stated that he was being patronizing and condescending whilst engaged in an argument with him during a debate in a senate committee hearing. Fifield asked her to imagine if he said she was “womansplaining” to point out the hypocrisy of her argument. *Wikipedia*, in their article about Katy Gallagher, wrote: “Ultimately, Fifield posited the use of an imaginary phrase ‘womansplaining’”.²²

On October 7th, 2020, Vice President Mike Pence debated against senator Kamala Harris during the 2020 presidential election. Immediately after that debate, the media accused Mike Pence of “mansplaining”. Erika D. Smith published an article the next day, titled *Harris showed Black women how to be ‘angry’ and handle a condescending white man*. Smith wrote: “With just one exchange, Harris out-Midwestern-niced the Midwestern nice master, exposing Pence for the overconfident, condescending, weak and scared white man that he really is”, and “Harris reset the notion of what is acceptable behavior for Black women interacting with white men in power.”²³ Such statements are only acceptable when made against Whites or men.

In response to all the claims of Mike Pence “mansplaining”, Tucker Carlson stated: “The category women doesn't really exist, neither does the category men, because gender fluidity is real and you can choose your gender, but women are also simultaneously so different from men that you have to treat them in a completely different way or you're a bad person. Are you following this? And if you do that you're ‘mansplaining’. That’s what they told us on TV last night. What kind of adult uses the term ‘mansplaining’? Get some self-respect.”²⁴ He also said: “When a man interrupts a woman it must be sexism. There is no other explanation. In order to treat women equally we have to treat them very differently from men so as not to disturb their delicate sensibilities. It's insane”, and “What you have here, which you have so often, is yet another unhappy rich lady complaining about oppression. No wonder the American population is so desperately unhappy. Look at who's leading them. The most privileged in our society never stop whining about their own lives. It's unbearable.”

Feminist arguments are very left in nature. Their arguments use similar tactics and foundations to leftist arguments, which is to say that their views are based in emotion rather than logic. If you debate against one and begin to use sound logic to disprove their views then you will likely be met with ad hominem attacks. You will be called sexist, misogynistic, a chauvinist pig, you will be accused of “mansplaining”, and you will be told that you are part of the problem. You will not, however, be given a logical explanation as to why your argument is incorrect. Feminists will never back down from their confused arguments. They will hit rock bottom and they will keep digging. While I was writing this in Google docs I noticed that the word “womansplaining” is listed as a spelling error, and that it is recommended to be spelled “mansplaining”.

Another term that feminists like to spout is “toxic masculinity”. What is toxic masculinity? The definition varies depending on who you ask and which source you read, but it essentially is a way of describing masculine attributes that are somehow perceived to be damaging to society. Some definitions include such things as virility and stoicism as components of toxic masculinity. The simplest way to explain it is that it is a term used to attempt to demonize masculine tendencies and attributes, but I argue that there is absolutely nothing toxic about masculinity or about masculinity’s effect on society. What is wrong with virility? What is wrong with stoicism? What’s wrong with men being men and women being women? The world seemed to work just fine for almost all of human history with these things. Do you think that the concept of masculinity is truly damaging to society when every society that has ever existed was built by men? No. You know what is damaging to society? Demonizing the entire male population, flooding your country with immigrants, putting women in politics, telling five-year-olds they’re transgender, diversity quotas, and censorship are damaging to society. Most feminists advocate for all of those things, and somehow they have concluded that the biggest threat to modern society is straight White men. Does that sound like a logical conclusion to you?

There are many other such ludicrous assertions that feminists make and each are as revolting as the last. They all share some commonalities. Commonly, they’re non-existent problems or highly over-exaggerated first-world problems. When I was deployed to Kosovo, a fellow soldier saw a woman walk around with a bruised and bloodied face. In Kosovo it’s socially accepted to beat your wife when she doesn’t act the way you want her to. You know how many feminists I’ve personally heard talk about Kosovo and the injustices women face over there? None. **Zero**. That’s because they don’t care. They don’t care about the wellbeing of women, as they claim, they care

about their own advancement here in the United States. Actual issues are thrown by the wayside in favor of “sexist” air conditioning, of “sexist” video games, and of fictional issues conjured for the purpose of disparaging men.

A market was created where women could sell their victimhood for a profit. I recently went to a bookstore to buy a copy of *Watchmen*, and when I entered there were two directions to go around the counter. Left, the longer way, or right, the shorter way. I went right and was immediately met with a shelf of books that capitalized on modern feminism and victimhood. *Men Explain Things to Me*, *THE GENIUS OF WOMEN*, *THE FEMINISM BOOK*, *SHE HE THEY ME*, *OUR WOMEN ON THE GROUND*, *NO VISIBLE BRUISES*, *A BLACK WOMEN'S HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES*, and *ANTI-RACISM* assaulted my eyes. Imagine claiming you're persecuted, writing a book on how you're persecuted, and then raking in money for publishing your persecution. At that point it starts to sound more like profiting off of a narrative rather than legitimately trying to express your concerns, to me.

Feminists have actively tried to convert the female figure from an appealing stature into that of a repulsive troglodyte, all the while complaining that they don't owe anyone the satisfaction of seeing a normal female body. Indeed, they aim to normalize ugliness. Dyed hair, breast reductions, androgyny, obesity, lack of personal hygiene, and unsexy clothing are pushed down your throat under the guise of being “normal”. Those things aren't normal. They're disgusting. The concept of wearing unpleasant clothing yet expecting it to be received the same as wearing something that compliments your appearance is an unreasonable request. Dyeing your hair a completely unnatural color (i.e. pink, purple, blue, etc.), which is not normal, will never be met with a response that mirrors the normality of a response to regular hair colors. Obesity, lack of personal hygiene, and presenting yourself as androgynous are not things that are typically desirable traits to have. These things aren't normal, and when I see people complaining about them not being accepted as normal I am then forced to ask: What reaction, other than disinterest at best, is expected? The reality is that people that do things that aren't normal are well aware of the fact that they are not normal. They claim that they want these things to be normalized, but I don't believe that. I believe that they intentionally aim to break out from societal norms and that if everything I listed became the norm that they would proceed to find something else outside that norm. In other words, they will never be content with accepted cultural norms no matter how widely encompassing those norms are.

Women today consistently protest that it's okay to sell and expose their bodies and yet are equally quick to claim that sexualizing acts of women is wrong. Encouraging this behavior, I believe, has led to a spike in online pedophilia. Children twerk on TikTok only to be defended by would-be rapists saying “They're just dancing. You're the one that's part of the problem for sexualizing it.” That is complete nonsense. Dancing in a sexual manner is absolutely sexual in nature. Encouraging, or even tolerating, teenager's and children's “right” to do such acts is to provide your neighborhood child-molester with free softcore child porn. I would argue this problem stems entirely from feminist ideologies that condone such behaviors. Free the nipple, gay pride parades, and feminist rallies are just a few degenerate gatherings that people drag their kids to in order to feed them propaganda. Children may be less intelligent than adults but that doesn't stop them from being able to digest neatly packaged indoctrination products.

We live in the most advanced society ever to exist on the planet and yet women continue to complain. Women claim that the male dominated patriarchy keeps them down, that men intentionally and actively attempt to oppress women at every conceivable avenue, and that society has always been run by the patriarchy. I reject those complaints. Women are ungrateful. They do not appreciate the modern conveniences and rights afforded to them. They speak as if men stone them in the streets after they earn 77% of what the male prostitutes earn, but that simply isn't the case. Women in western society today enjoy levels of privilege that no being has enjoyed before, and yet they still find a way to complain about it. What the hell happened? Technological advances happened. Washing machines, microwaveable meals, and the internet happened. Technology erased the need for traditional gender roles and the eradication of traditional gender roles is precisely what led to our current mess.

A slippery slope argument is often viewed as a logical fallacy, but I would argue that some such arguments have merit based on reviewing the facts afterwards. Feminism started as an "ethical" cause, but some people were wary that giving them equal rights would lead to a great divide between the genders. What happened? The belief that all people are created equal, and should be treated as such, was abused and used to create conditions in which women garnered more rights than men. Rights not only of a legal standing but also rights afforded by the general public. Women have succeeded in skewing the court of public opinion to look upon them more favorably than men.

The same such conclusion would seem, to me, to be true of the civil rights movement and what ultimately became of it. It stemmed from the same belief: The belief that all people are created equal, but some people were wary that giving them equal rights would lead to the destruction of the White man's country. What happened? The black community weaponized the sympathy given to them and used it to crack down on the White man. Cops kill criminals and sex offenders in the line of their duties and that leads to rioters and looters pilfering the country, and anyone who speaks out against these criminals is demonized as a racist (I do not support the police, I merely observe these facts). Is it truly racist to observe the moral shortcomings and crimes of a demographic? If so, then is it wrong to be racist?

Do you remember the arguments opposing gay marriage before it was legalized? Many of them were slippery slope arguments. Some people argued that legalizing gay marriage would only lead to further forms of degeneracy such as normalizing transvestites, normalizing transsexuals, normalizing pedophilia, and that it wouldn't even ultimately appease homosexuals. Well, those people were absolutely right. Drag queens read to children in schools, parents proclaim that their young children are transsexuals, there is a very real attempt to normalize having sexual relations with children, and the gays still complain about oppression.

It's hard to maintain the credence that a slippery slope argument is a fallacy when it's constantly proved to be an unerring determination. A man enters life with no presumptions of how particular groups of people will act but instead basis his opinion on the actions of individuals. Over the years he notices trends, hears whispers in the streets, sees firsthand the inclinations associated with those groups, and begins to see that certain groups generally act in specific manners. Would it not be irrational at that point for the man to connect the dots but decide to ignore the image they've created?

CHAPTER EIGHT: WOMEN ONLINE

Men will give women money just because they're women. To clarify that, I want to make it perfectly clear that I am referring to giving a woman money in exchange for **nothing** just because she's a woman, and this is typically seen when men give money to women that they don't even know. If you haven't seen this, perhaps because you live under a nice rock, it happens prevalently online. It happens often enough for women to observe it occurring and capitalize on it.

Just recently I was on an online dating site and I saw a woman's bio that read: "@ [REDACTED] on insta and on venmo if you're into that. Close that wage gap!" The wage gap doesn't exist in the manner that many people claim it does, it's disgusting to unironically e-beg for money solely based on the fact that you're a woman, and that was far from the first time that I'd seen something like that. Though the wording varies slightly, the message is always the same: "Give me money for free."

We created simps by normalizing inequity. "Simp" is a term used prevalently online that refers to a man who puts women on a pedestal. Simps fund e-girls. An "e-girl", as I define one, is a woman online that makes a profit off of selling her body or begging for money. Simps have made women's condition worse. Simps coddle women. They tell women that their imperfections are perfections. How could you expect women to improve their performance when their mere existence is enough for men to throw themselves at their feet?

Simps give undue attention to females just for having a pulse. The government gives free money to its people just for existing but at least has requirements, although they are loose, in place in order to be eligible for such payment. A simp bestows money and attention without any filters aside from the requirement that the recipient is a woman. Governments and e-girls both have standing armies. The difference is that a government pays and gives benefits to its soldiers, and that is in direct disparity to how e-girl armies operate. E-girls are heralded as queens and their orders are executed without payment or enslavement being necessary.

Simps are paid only with the knowledge that they've defended a woman's honor online, and they do so in the vain hope that the woman will give a fleeting acknowledgement to their efforts. Simps hold the notion that if they just message one of these girls enough, if they just donate enough money, if they can moderate their chat enough, then maybe they'll have a chance of getting with the girl. E-girls feast off of the loneliness of men. They see the market to profit off of men that, for one reason or another, aren't able to get with a woman and they seize upon that market's throat and throttle the coin from its pockets. They throw not bones but fragments of cartilage, and their clients rejoice.

Women constantly complain about being objectified, but online they're the ones openly objectifying themselves. Cam whore websites aside, of which there are plenty, I constantly see women on dating apps that offer to sell pictures of themselves. Even when they aren't selling pictures directly I see them post lewd photos to social media and then host a link to an electronic payment site. They don't want to be objectified yet they constantly reinforce that behavior.

There's also a prevalence of women that stream things, such as video games, and they make sure to have their cleavage well in the center of the camera at all times. I've noticed that they're generally worse than men at whatever they're streaming, but they constantly rake in more money than men by flaunting their body alongside the stream. This goes beyond streaming, mind you. It stems into every possible corner of social interaction online. Twitch, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Snapchat, Onlyfans, and YouTube are filled with this behavior. Anywhere you imagine it could exist it exists. Women actively degrade themselves for money and somehow this is actually seen as a positive thing by women. Women don't call out other women for selling their bodies.

Some people believe that prostitution should be legal and it seems that most people have no problem with cam whores at all, but I contend that both of these things are bad for society on the whole. Simply ask yourself if you'd be okay with your daughter exposing herself for money. What about your wife? What about your mother? What about your sister? The thought of one of them taking money in exchange for degrading themselves probably disgusts you, as it very well should. Why then do so many people rationalize these behaviors? The evil you tolerate in life can easily come back to infect your household.

Besides selling their skin, I have also noticed trends from women online that are just awful. Women have the most cookie-cutter bios that could possibly be conceived on their dating profiles. For instance, women have a tendency to use the following verbiage in their bios: "dog/cat mom", "vibing", "adventure", "travel", "420 friendly", "polyamorous", "give me your best pickup line", "I won't message first", "I love Netflix", "I'm not on here often, add me on snap/twitter/insta @ [REDACTED]", "love to meet new people", "foodie", "will love your dog more than I love you", over-specific physical requirements (i.e. must be 6ft tall to ride), over-used tv show/movie references, identifying their astrological sign, "if my dog doesn't like you, we can't be friends", "sassy", "future trophy-wife", "anxiety", etc.

Describing the basic elements of a human being does not qualify as a unique autobiography. It's akin to outlining the ingredients contained in a cake rather than describing the flavor. The APPA (American Pet Products Association) states that: "67% of U.S. households own a pet, which equates to 84.9 millions homes."²⁵ That means that you aren't special for owning a pet. You have a dog? Yeah, I'll bet. You and every other house on the block have one. Owning an animal does not make you a mother, either. Stating that you're a "dog mom" is so generic and tiring that I feel my eyes glaze over whenever I see a woman say as much.

"Vibing" is a non-descriptive way of saying absolutely nothing under the pretense of saying something. Saying that you like adventure or traveling is also to say nothing. It's a generic statement made by those who frequently accomplish neither. Divulging the verity of your systemic "recreational" drug use is both unsurprising and unappealing. Using the Mormon practice of polygamy to mask your inability to commit to a relationship is nauseating.

Requesting my best pickup line is a broad way of saying that you want the man to initiate the conversation, and the complaint I have about that mimics the same complaint I have regarding stating that you won't message first: Both of those scenarios create circumstances which provide the opportunity for the woman to put forth zero effort while still having the man exert constant effort. Someone could easily make the false claim that men's bios read the same way. The

difference is a clear, stark, contrast in effectiveness. Women can write the most generic bio that might total only two sentences, they can upload only two (heavily filtered) photos, and they will still receive men's attention. Men, if they tried the same thing, would be met with zero matches. This is because the standard for what's acceptable is higher for men, as it is with many things in life, whereas the female standard is measurably lower.

I could go on to dismantle and dissect every possible generic statement contained in the typical female bio, but I think I've made my point. The point being that these bios are lazy. They appeal only to the lowest common denominator and offer nothing in the way of accurately representing oneself in any sort of marketable manner. A lot of women on dating apps look the same. They use the same filters, wear the same clothes, and the only real distinguishing thing that women on dating apps have is their personality. However, many women make no attempt to have, or portray, a unique personality. When women look the same, when they sound the same, they begin to blend together. It's like walking into a smoothie store and looking at the menu, except that the menu only has flavors like: Strawberry-banana, banana-strawberry, strawberry with banana, banana mixed with strawberry, etc. You try to order a Blueberry Acai but the smoothie store employee just shakes his head and says "I'm sorry sir, but we've been out of those for a long time." You could obtain a smoothie, sure, but you'd be paying for one that you don't even want.

Another subject of complaint is that, I find, there's constantly a presence of inaccurate or misleading information in women's bios. Your profile should be accurate and true to who you are as a person. It should not be riddled with half-truths or deceptive information. For instance, a woman might say that she enjoys shooting and she might have a profile picture of her firing an AR-15, but that might not necessarily be true. When you talk to her about said hobby and she begins to tell you about her "magnum .44", and how the AR is "easy on the shoulder", it becomes clear to you that she doesn't actively engage in the activity as much as she would have you believe. For those not in the know: It's a .44 magnum, not a magnum .44, and to say that an AR is "easy on the shoulder" is to state the well-known, obvious, fact that the AR-15 generally has a low perceived recoil. This is not a hypothetical example. That is an example from a recent conversation that my friend Frank had with a woman on Tinder. She claimed that she was into shooting but was clearly not. When Frank noticed her amateur hour comments on the subject, he asked her if she really liked shooting. She admitted to knowing nothing about firearms despite her claims to the contrary. She stated that she only said she was into firearms to be, and this is a verbatim quote, "relatable and attractive to men." The general principle remains the same with other subjects.

Hiking, snowboarding, fishing, and hunting are stereotypical male hobbies. If you liked hunting and you saw a woman that said she liked hunting then it would obviously seem attractive to you because she shares similar interests with you. That's the idea. This is intended to lure you into a conversation with them based on what is ultimately a lie, a facade. This is not to say that women do not or cannot enjoy these hobbies. There are some that genuinely partake in such ventures. This is simply to say that lying about having hobbies is a greater offense than not having them at all.

I would go so far as to suggest that you refrain from using dating apps for dating. They should be used for getting sex and little else. You have to keep in mind that women's egos are vastly inflated on these apps because they have a constant surplus of men trying to get with them. Women on dating apps are generally talking to at least twenty guys at any given time, and that's just the

ones that they're talking to. They usually have over one hundred matches on the backburner. Given that this is the case, women have the ability to pick and choose which men they want to get with. I have to point out that everything I just said applies to the vast majority of women on dating apps. That is to say: Overweight junkies also get their pick of the lot. Why? The reason is because there is always some guy, somewhere, that has lower standards than you do. That guy with lower standards, he understands the game. The game is to lower your standards to the point that you get laid, but you have to ask yourself something: Is that game worth playing? You're better off pursuing women in real life where, perhaps, their egos haven't taken up the entire room.

Being a man and looking for love online is like being homeless and feverishly foraging through a dumpster behind a food kitchen. You haven't eaten in days, your belt is a rope that you tie tighter every time you stand, and you can't remember the last time you sunk your teeth into a juicy steak. You sift and sift through the already feasted on food desperately hoping that you will be graced with the presence of one edible scrap, yet the scrap never comes. You find yourself knee-deep in the remains of other people's garbage to no avail. You leave the dumpster, trek to the next, and repeat the process growing hungrier and hungrier with every failure.

You're starving. Every dumpster you visit you pray is the last. You swipe left on another dog mom only to have the next anxiety-plagued foodie slapped into your face. Your stomach aches. The next profile says she's in an open marriage. You try to vomit but only wretch futilely. The next says she's just looking for friends. You collapse to your knees. The final blow is struck from a woman that linked her Onlyfans. A man can only endure so much before letting the soft bigotry of low expectations overcome him. You give in. You settle. You tell yourself you're content with the stale nourishment of settling for a relationship. You gaze into the window of the nearby five-star steakhouse and see a happy couple scarfing down fresh meat, and you tell yourself that what they're eating is no better than what you are.

CHAPTER NINE: RAPE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, ABUSE, AND LIES

Rape is perceived to be a horrible crime. Some people consider rape to be worse than murder. We, regrettably, live in a world where bad people commit atrocities. I am about to talk to you about the subject of lying about rape, sexual assault, and abuse. None of what I'm about to say is to imply that those things don't occur. I'm not here to dispute the well-understood severity of those crimes or to deny their existence. I'm here to tell you the dirty, muddy, gritty fact that people lie and that sometimes people lie about very serious subjects.

In this chapter I'm going to use several anecdotal stories to demonstrate my points. I'm aware that anecdotal evidence is anecdotal, but the points I'm going to make aren't easily proved with studies and hard facts. That's because not many studies are conducted about false rape claims or false sexual assault claims, and because many instances of such falsehoods are never actually reported to any authorities. Many times they are simply stories you hear. If I told you that I did my good deed for the day by giving a homeless man \$100 then would you assume that to be true at face value? Would you be able to prove or disprove what I said? If nobody saw me give him \$100, if there was no police report stating that such had occurred, if there is no video footage of me giving him the money, if there was no evidence whatsoever for you to be reasonably sure one way or the other, then what would you believe? What reason would I have to lie about it?

We've been programmed to believe certain things regardless of the evidence, or lack thereof. Believe all women, #MeToo, 1 in 5 women, six million Jews, the coronavirus "pandemic", systemic racism, systemic sexism, Epstein killed himself, Killozer was insane, the Las Vegas shooting was done with a bump-stock, the TSA is effective, rape culture, the ATF's actions in Waco were justified, toxic masculinity, the war on drugs has been successful, Kyle Myers was distributing hash oil, etc. You've been fed the same propaganda as I: Women are oppressed, you're the one oppressing them, and when they speak out you need to listen. Publicity, fame, money, and sympathy are things that many people seek. Weigh the facts, consider the motive, and decide if you believe something is true or not. Why would I lie about giving a homeless man \$100? Maybe I would lie because I wanted you to believe that I am a good samaritan, maybe it's because I have a sob story about how I was once homeless and want your sympathy, or maybe I just felt like saying it even though it has no grounding in truth.

Frank Remington, the friend I mentioned before, started dating Kathy in 2017. She was a girl from his hometown. She mentioned early on that she had been beaten and sexually assaulted by her ex-boyfriend, Sam. She said that Sam had beaten her so badly in high school that she wasn't able to go to school for several weeks. The thought of this upset Frank. Kathy seemed like a nice enough girl and the idea that someone would do such a thing to her was alien to him. He expressed his sympathies and they continued on. About a month into their relationship, Frank came home on leave from the Army to see Kathy. They went together to Kathy's longtime best-friend Sarah's house. Kathy told Frank that she and Sarah had been best friends almost their entire lives. They'd been at Sarah's house for a couple of hours and were sitting in her backyard. Sarah remarked to Kathy that Frank seemed a lot better than Sam. Kathy gave Sarah a beaming, meaningful, look. Frank asked "Was that the guy that beat you?" Kathy attempted to blow it off by saying "No, that was a different guy." Sarah was surprised to hear that and asked "Which one of your exes hit you?" Kathy nervously said that she'd tell her later.

Sarah was not content with that answer. Sarah said that she had known all three of Kathy's previous boyfriends and was never aware that any of them had hit her. Sarah continued to press the issue and demanded to know which one of them did it. Kathy looked obviously embarrassed, changed the subject, and the moment passed. Later that evening, when Frank and Kathy were alone, Frank asked her if she lied about the beatings and sexual assault. Her refusal to answer his question confirmed Frank's suspicions. If Sarah had been best friends with Kathy before high school, then how did she have no memory of Kathy's absence from high school for weeks? How had Sarah never seen the bruises? How did Sarah personally know all three of Kathy's exes yet never once hear about any beatings or sexual assault prior to the conversation that Frank was present for? Frank terminated the relationship upon finding that he'd been lied to.

Frank is good looking, attends a decent college while trying to get his degree, and treats women well. Despite all of that, Frank has still had a hard time finding the right woman. It is absolutely no stretch to say that he's talked to several hundred women in his pursuit of dating. Frank and I have discussed, many times, our suspicions about rape and sexual assault statistics. You may see numbers such as 1 in 4, 1 in 5, or 1 in 6 women in the United States have been/will be raped in their lifetime. I covered the subject of such statistics in chapter seven, but I would like to present you with a less empirical claim. I asked Frank to quantify the percentage of women he's talked to in his dating endeavors that have claimed to have been raped, sexually assaulted, or abused. Frank estimated that about 70% of the approximate 300 women he's talked to have claimed that at least one of the above-mentioned acts has happened to them, and you have to bear in mind that during Frank's lifetime he has conversed with women in similar age brackets to his own (i.e. when he was 20 he dated women that were approximately 20 years old).

Arbitrary guesses would seem irrelevant to me were it not for the fact that I also have noticed that an unproportionally large number of women have claimed the same to me, and that many of my friends have observed that the same holds true for their experiences. It seems to be a common belief that 1 in 5 women in the US have been raped in their lifetime, and yet I have personally seen little evidence of this surface in my life experiences. It seems that of all the women I've ever actually known only one has been raped and one has been sexually assaulted, but it also seems that every other woman I talk to when dating claims to have been raped or sexually assaulted. If I were to take every claim at face value it would seem that 1 in every 2 women I've talked to has been raped or sexually assaulted. Does it just so happen that my friends and I run into unfortunate women more so than everyone else, or is it possible that an unknown portion of these claims are false?

An example of a claim that you should be skeptical of comes from my good friend Jake Richards. In mid-2020 Jake Richards started dating Casey. She was close to the post that Jake was stationed at in the army. Casey told Jake that a man had raped her several months earlier that year. She said that she had problems stemming from it but that she was trying to regain control of her life. Jake, being a rape victim himself, understood. Jake had been raped the previous year in his own house. An outdoor block party was going on, he drank until he could barely stand, and then a mid-thirties woman from across the block took his hand and led him into his bedroom. Jake was so out of it that he didn't even realize what was happening until it had already begun. It bothered

him for months but eventually he accepted what had happened and was able to move on with his life.

Jake understood the struggles of rape victims better than most of us ever could, and when he was told that his girlfriend was facing similar problems he aimed to help. They dated for several months and though they got along very well they had serious problems in the bedroom. They would be mid-coitus and she would break down crying and would say she was having a flashback. I asked Jake about flashbacks. I was curious if they are like how they're portrayed in movies. Jake said he wouldn't know because he'd never had one. Though he didn't exactly understand the nature of that specific problem, he supported Casey the best he could.

Anytime she would have a "flashback" he'd stop the sex immediately and console her. About two months into their relationship Casey opened up to him about her rape. She said she had been traveling and needed a place to stay for the night, and that a man she knew from college was in the area. He offered to let her stay the night at his apartment. She accepted. The man lived in a shared apartment with his male roommate. Each of them had their own rooms. He showed her to the couch that lay in between both rooms. Casey, with the explanation to Jake that she feared that she'd be raped by his roommate if she stayed on the couch, said "I want to stay in your bed." They both stripped to their underwear and got into bed. She said they were laying there for a while. She said that she was on her stomach and then he suddenly got on top of her, pulled her panties aside, and began raping her. She was so shocked that she said nothing the entire time. They slept together afterward and she left the next morning. She never filed a report with the police.

Jake relayed that story to me the next day because he wanted a second opinion to the doubts the story had put in his mind. You can try to avoid blaming the victim, but there is a certain level of personal responsibility involved when putting yourself in certain situations. Taking your clothes off to sleep in a bed with someone you know only in passing from college, being discontent with the couch (for whatever reason), and electing to put yourself in the bed in the first place are a few examples in this case. I'm not trying to outright state that this wasn't rape, but I am pointing out the grey area that rape now encompasses. I would also ask that you keep in mind that this is one side of a story and that every story has two sides. How much of what Casey said is true is unknown. The nameless rapist is known by nobody any of us know other than Casey herself, and thus he cannot be reached for comment. Rape is often not considered rape when perpetuated by a female but many actions against females are considered rape. For example, Jake was raped but because that rape was committed by a woman many people do not see it as rape. However, when someone like Casey so much as claims that she was raped it will be accepted as a fact by most people that it is rape and that the rape occurred.

I told you about SPC Jones' false sexual harassment accusation towards SPC Jonathan B. Barns, but that was not the only such falsehood I saw during my time in the military. SPC K. Garfield went to command during our deployment in 2019 while we were in Kosovo. She claimed that five men had raped her simultaneously and gave a full sworn statement about it. SPC Garfield was called into the commander's office the next day to recount the story again, but upon doing so she changed two of the names of the "rapists" as well as the time, date, and location of the rape. You might think that because she ruined her own story that the so-called rapists would've had their names cleared quickly, but the Army kept the alleged rape case open for over six months.

Why did SPC Garfield do this? SPC Garfield was from a rich family and wanted to buy a patch of land in Texas to use for drilling oil. She had to be present to buy the land, or so she said. At first she tried “killing herself” by allegedly taking too much hormone medication to get sent home, but when that didn’t get her sent home she turned to the ole’ reliable wolfery. It worked. She was sent back to rear detachment in New York while the five men stayed with us to suffer the social outcasting that occurs whenever someone is accused of such crimes. She told her friend, PFC Johnson, all about the attempted suicide plan. When that didn’t work and she formed her new plan she couldn’t have anyone exposing it. Naturally, she said that PFC Johnson was one of the five men that raped her which instantly discredited his account before he’d ever said it. PFC Johnson, because he was still under investigation for rape, did not receive any of the deployment awards the rest of us obtained.

I am aware that anecdotal evidence is anecdotal, and because of that I will end this train of thought with a final, more empirical, story. Paul Nungesser was accused of rape by Emma Sulkowicz (also known as “Mattress girl”) in 2013 while they were both attending Columbia University. Sulkowicz stated that she had a consensual sexual encounter with Nungesser in her dorm room on August 27th, 2012, but that the encounter became nonconsensual when he choked her, struck her, and proceeded to anally penetrate her.²⁶ Sulkowicz had a discussion with Natalie, Nungesser’s ex-girlfriend, in which they exchanged stories about how Nungesser had raped both of them. Sulkowicz filed a complaint with Columbia University in 2013 that requested that Nungesser be expelled. Natalie filed a complaint a few days later. Columbia University found that there wasn’t substantial evidence to take action against Nungesser.

When the university did not take any action Sulkowicz then filed a report against Nungesser with the NYPD in May of 2014. NYPD did not pursue charges against Nungesser. In September of 2014 Sulkowicz began carrying a 50lbs blue mattress around everywhere she went. The mattress was the one from her dorm room that Nungesser allegedly raped her on. She carried it around to project the message “Paul Nungesser raped me.” She carried that mattress to class, she carried it to get food, she carried it anywhere she went when she left her dorm room. She carried it until her graduation in May of 2015. Nungesser lived his life facing constant harassment. Columbia University allowed Sulkowicz to walk around with a symbol that constantly reminded people that Nungesser “raped” her.

On June 3rd, 2015, *Ceci N'est Pas Un Viol* (this is not a rape) was released.²⁷ *Ceci N'est Pas Un Viol* is a work of “performance art” by Sulkowicz. I put “performance art” in quotations because the video is better described as pornography. It depicts Sulkowicz having sex with an unnamed man in her dorm room at Columbia University. It is clearly supposed to be a recreation of her alleged rape at the hands of Paul Nungesser. Does that sound like something an actual rape victim would do, or does that sound like a piece of propaganda designed to be consumed by the masses?

Sulkowicz claimed Nungesser raped her and the media and public masses believed it without a shred of evidence. However, as time went on and details came out, Sulkowicz’s story seemed like a sinking ship. It had holes. The biggest piece of evidence that her claims are false, in my opinion, are her own messages to Nungesser **after** the alleged rape. Those messages read as follows:

Jean-Paul Ezhno (Paul Nungesser)

Wednesday, 29 August 2012 at 16:10 EDT

"small shindig in our room tonight ~ bring cool freshmen"²⁸

Emma Sulkowicz

Wednesday, 29 August 2012 at 16:34 EDT

"lol yussss"

"also i feel like we need to have some real time where we can talk about life and thingz"

Jean-Paul Ezhno

Wednesday, 29 August 2012 at 16:34 EDT

"word"

Emma Sulkowicz

Wednesday, 29 August 2012 at 16:34 EDT

"because we still haven't really had a paul-emma chill sesh since summmerrrrr"

Another excerpt from this conversation is as follows:

Emma Sulkowicz

Sunday, 9 September 2012 at 18:35 EDT

"whatever i wanna see yoyououoyou"

Sunday, 9 September 2012 at 18:36 EDT

"respond-i'll get the message on ma phone"

Jean-Paul Ezhno

Sunday, 9 September 2012 at 20:47 EDT

"lol sorry i was at the studio only saw this now"

Wednesday, 3 October 2012 at 17:10 EDT

"oh hai. happy born day! you better be celebrating muchos, no? also: donde estas tu i mi viva? see i'm so desperate with out you, i even try to speak spanish. anywho: merry happy days!"

Emma Sulkowicz

Thursday, 4 October 2012 at 10:02 EDT

"I love you Paul. Where are you?!?!?!?"

Does that sound like a conversation that would occur between a rapist and a rape victim? Some people have tried to say that it was nothing more than a victim trying to cope with the situation, but do those messages give you that impression? She didn't blow off the messages, she didn't express disinterest in conversing or meeting with Nungesser, and she accepted an invitation to a party from Nungesser two days after he supposedly raped her. I might also add that Sulkowicz didn't even deny that those Facebook messages were real. Cathy Young wrote an article, titled *I Didn't Rape Her*, that said: "Nungesser provided The Daily Beast with Facebook messages with Sulkowicz from August, September, and October 2012. (In an email to The Daily Beast, Sulkowicz confirmed that these records were authentic and not redacted in any way[)]".²⁸

Another article by Cathy Young, titled *Discredited, the Legend of Mattress Girl Just Won't Go Away*, said: "Yet we are asked to believe that two days after this attack, both victim *and* rapist would banter as if nothing was wrong; that she would come to his party and respond to his request to bring more girls with 'i'll be over w da females soon'; and that 'I want to see yoyououyou' means (as Sulkowicz claimed in her *Jezebel* annotations) she was 'desperate' to talk about the rape."²⁹

I'd like to quote Cathy Young one final time. In *The Mattress Story Under More Fire* she wrote: "A young woman who was brutally raped two days ago agrees to bring girls to the rapist's party and jokes about it? I fully understand that a traumatized victim of a violent attack can behave irrationally, but too many things here strain credulity".³⁰ That sums up my thoughts on the matter perfectly. In total Nungesser was accused of sexual misconduct by four different people. Two women claimed that he had raped them and one woman and one man accused him of sexual assault. None of those claims were found to be true, though they also cannot all easily be disproved. However, just because something cannot be disproved doesn't mean that it's true. The concept of a God cannot be disproven, but does that mean you should believe in one? I do not mean that you should not believe in a God, but I am saying that your reason for believing in one should extend beyond "I can't disprove him." You cannot empirically prove that I don't own an invisible unicorn that can't be detected by any being or machine besides myself, but should you then believe me if I claimed to have one? If you cannot disprove a rape, is it then a fact that the rape occurred?

The point I'm getting at is not that rape doesn't occur or that all women who claim rape do so falsely, but rather that citing false statistics such as "1 in 5" and encouraging that we believe all women regardless of the facts makes it easier for women to falsely claim rape and get away with it. These things only end up detracting from the credibility of women that have actually suffered from such crimes. "Rape" is a word thrown about so carelessly that it loses the severe impact it's supposed to have. Wolf is cried so often that the sheep are unable to discern when they're in danger. This perpetuation of lies and loose definitions only serves to harm people that rightly deserve justice for the crucibles they're endured.

Unfortunately, you absolutely cannot take any allegation you hear at face value. You must investigate the claim, hear both sides of the story, and view all the facts before coming to a conclusion. If you blindly accept every story you hear as true then you will be suckered into believing many falsehoods throughout your life. You would be wise to approach each and every claim, of any nature, with a healthy amount of skepticism. That same skepticism should also be applied to the very words you are reading right now.

The result of all of these false claims from women? A feeling. A feeling exists in the workplace now, it exists at school and in college, it exists whenever you're outside your house or talking to a stranger. The feeling is one of unease and despair. You keep a joke to yourself for fear of offending someone, you don't hit on a woman for fear of slander and false accusations, and you feel like you can't talk about this feeling. The feeling that if you somehow offend or slight a woman that you will be persecuted is ever-present and not untrue. Men are nervous about talking to women, they are nervous about talking about women, and those fears are not unfounded.

It only takes one sentence to ruin your life: "He raped me." It doesn't matter if you weren't even there. It doesn't matter if you were there and you didn't touch her. It doesn't matter if you were there and you touched her consensually. Your reputation will be dragged through the dirt and the mud without mercy. What if she had been drinking? What if she said she had been drinking? What if she enjoyed it but regretted it the next morning? What if the police questioned your mother and asked her why you did it, why you raped her? What if your mental sanity simply couldn't withstand the constant baseless accusations, you chambered a round into your 9mm handgun, and you blew your brains out? What then?

CHAPTER TEN: FINAL WORDS

Let's say you go out and buy an old beater car. The wheels have dry rotted, the paint is coming off, and the engine doesn't sound quite right. What happens when you see those problems and decide to fix them? If you replace the wheels, if you give it a new coat of paint, and if you fix the engine then the effort and care that you put into the car will be repaid to you by way of the car functioning better. The car would actively grow better with each and every modification and repair that you made.

A machine will reflect the exact level of effort you put into maintaining it. A machine is inanimate. Its reaction to your maintenance is known before you ever begin the job. You get a dog, feed it, play with it, and it will love you. The reaction to your efforts is known beforehand. A person's reaction to your efforts remains unknown until after the fact. Though you cannot truly know what their reaction to your efforts will be, it would generally be an accepted line of thought that treating someone well would result in more or less of the same being requited to you.

However, women are complacent. They will sponge up your endeavors and affection and will become, over time, numb to your continued altruistic behavior. Gradually they will stop seeing your positive impact as positive enough. Women will leave a man high and dry without any reservations after becoming bored with the relationship. Excitement need not be sought from another person, but that is often the easy answer that women tend to elect above the imagined hardship of putting forth effort into the relationship. The honeymoon phase ends. The castle's foundation was made from sand rather than stone, and it crumbles away with the first pressure applied to it.

How did we arrive here? It wasn't always like this. It used to be that men would marry women, that the man would go to work, that the woman would work in the form of staying home and tending to the house and children, and everyone at the end of the day won. It used to be that there was pride in a woman being feminine and in a man being masculine. It really did create relationships that stood the test of time. A lightbulb would go out in the house and you'd change the lightbulb.

We now live in a society that discourages those ideals. There is no pride in a woman being feminine. There is no pride in a man being masculine. Women are encouraged to be fully independent whether or not that's the right way to live for the particular individual. Men are berated for their "toxic masculinity" and actively encouraged to be feminine. Relationship timelines are now measured in months instead of decades. A lightbulb goes out in the house and you move into a new one. Nobody is encouraged to maintain or fix anything. We exist wherever convenient. We leave whenever it becomes inconvenient.

In J.R.R. Tolkien's book, *The Two Towers*, King Theoden says: "but now my heart is doubtful. The world changes, and all that once was strong now proves unsure. How shall any tower withstand such numbers and such reckless hate?"³¹ What is a man to do in the face of women's malfeasance? What can any of us do to change the way things are? Can things even be changed for the better?

If you are a woman then do not let yourself fall into the descriptions of my writings. If you are a man then do not tolerate the malefactions I've described, don't settle, don't allow yourself to be walked over, don't put women on a pedestal, don't put up with abuse, don't excuse the shortcomings of women, don't condone narcissistic behavior, and don't believe everything you hear without researching the facts for yourself. Treat women no better, or differently, than you would treat the common man. Women will not hold themselves accountable. You must hold women accountable to the same standard that you would be held to.

Why are my views like this? People say that sexism is taught, not learned. While I'm sure that's the case for some, I would have to say that that's untrue for me. Was I taught sexism from a young age? No. I developed my negative views of women close to the age of 24. A switch wasn't flipped, it wasn't instantaneous, it was a very gradual process for me to form my current opinions. I wasn't raised in a sexist home. I never went to a sexist school. In fact, my mother homeschooled me alongside my sisters.

Nobody taught me to have a predisposition about someone just because they were a woman. If you would've asked me when I was 21 if I thought less of women for being women I would've told you that I would never hold a discriminatory opinion against anyone based on something they didn't choose. Women didn't ask to be born women. Men didn't ask to be born men. Nobody started with an RPG stat-sheet and picked their race. You didn't get to decide one day if you were male, female, White, or black. These are things that you didn't get a choice in and neither did I. That's what I would have said.

Now? I can't honestly say the same thing anymore. After witnessing many times, firsthand, the blatant favoritism given towards women, after observing the unfair gifts given to them and being told I'm wrong for questioning why they're treated better, after working alongside them and finding that I'm the only one actually working, if you asked me the same question I'd tell you: Yeah, I think less of women. Nobody taught me to be sexist. I learned it from women.

I'll end by saying that there is a chance that you weren't aware of the problems that I have highlighted in this book before you read it. If that's the case, then you might begin to notice that these problems seem to be everywhere. It might seem that they're so prevalent that you begin to question whether or not they're truly as bad as you perceive them to be, or if you're seeing these problems everywhere because of the Baader-Meinhof effect. If you find yourself pondering that issue, then it's imperative that you realize that these problems existed before you realized their existence. The real question that you have to ask yourself after accepting these problems as reality is: "What am I going to do about it?"

SUMMARY

I make no claims that my opinions are formed in the mind of greatness or that I am an expert in studies of the female psyche. I'm just a man who's tired of seeing the privilege of women parade around uncontested. The female condition is not like a flat tire. It's not a singular broken item that can be repaired or replaced. It's a multifaceted and complicated problem that is beyond the ability of one man to fix.

The goal of this book was not to dissuade you from pursuing women, to say that you can easily live without a woman in your life, to paint women in a bad light needlessly, or even to contend that all women are bad people. The goal was to explain my perception of the current state of female privilege and to give examples of the inequities between men and women. Perhaps you've read the words lining these pages and felt a range of emotions. Maybe you feel ecstatic that someone finally put your feelings into words, maybe you're happy that you've read such a work of literary art, or maybe you just don't "get it".

To stretch out the pages any further than what I've written would be to pad out, or take away from, the points I was trying to make. The point is that women are a crucial component in a man's existence but they can be a detriment if you associate yourself with the wrong ones. They bring the female element into your life, induce a sense of euphoria like no other, and can provide a level of intimacy in the form of a romantic relationship that is otherwise unattainable in a friendship. Just make sure you find one that doesn't fit into the narrative of this book. Good luck.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to thank Frank M. Remington. He's an old friend that I knew in the Army. He's a man well-versed in the subject of women, having slept with over forty of them at the time of writing. He provided several quotes for this book that read as follows: "Women want men to take charge only when convenient to their laziness", "Maybe a lot of men wouldn't only want women for their pussies if they had at least one more redeeming quality", and "The recent influx of trans 'women' is due, in part, to people giving up on being a man fearing that a man's life is too hard."

I'd also like to thank a few men that have served as good friends to me. Thanks to my good friend Jake A. Richards, who provided two quotes for this book that read: "What it is, is that women are unable to be satisfied. Women are catered to from birth and so once a man stops trying to 'impress' a woman she will then seek that attention, gratification, and catering from elsewhere", and "One of the plights of modern women is that they all live as if they are in the lead role of a Lifetime made-for-TV film. They have to be the center of attention, their problems have to be the world's problems, and they are unable to take any form of responsibility for negative actions. Late for work? Depression. Calls off a date? Anxiety. Lies? Was scared to tell the truth. How fucking pathetic."

Thanks to my good friend Marcus Daniels, who provided a quote for this book that reads: "When deep-dive VR becomes a viable technological and financial option the roles will be reversed, and women will have to either adapt or die in the marketplace of relationships." Thanks to Paul Sauer, who provided a quote for this book that reads: "I don't want to work with women anymore, but don't quote me on that." Thanks to my old friend David "King" Koster for his support.

Lastly, but certainly not least, thanks to my good friend Mark Jules. He provided a quote for this book that reads: "Imagine knowing that the only reason anyone is interested in you, the only reason anyone talks to you, and the only reason that anyone pretends to care about your opinions is because you have a hole that they can use to gratify their sexual desires. Imagine knowing that your only 'ace up the sleeve' in any interaction is either putting out or pretending that you'll put out in the future. Imagine no longer, friends, because that is already the reality of the modern woman."

ENDNOTES

1. Newman, Kate. "Book Publishing, Not Fact-Checking." *The Atlantic*, 3 Sept. 2014, www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2014/09/why-books-still-arent-fact-checked/378789/. Accessed 03 Nov. 2020.
2. "Privilege." *Merriam-Webster*, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/privilege. Accessed 10 Nov. 2020.

Definition 1

3. "Double Standard." *Merriam-Webster*, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/double-standard. Accessed 10 Nov. 2020.

Definition 1

4. Eharmony Editorial Team. "Meet Black Singles on Eharmony." *Eharmony*, 27 Feb. 2020, www.eharmony.com/black-dating/. Accessed 12 Nov. 2020.

Paragraph 1

5. Wayne, Corey. "9 Principles For Setting Definite Dates." *UnderstandingRelationships.com*, 30 May 2016, understandingrelationships.com/9-principles-for-setting-definite-dates/26159. Accessed 28 Oct. 2020.

Paragraph 6

6. Rhimes, Shonda, and Mimi Schmir. "Grey's Anatomy." Season 2, episode 24, 7 May 2006.
7. Walsh, Matt. "Matt Walsh Tries to Laugh at Feminist Comedian Samantha Bee (WARNING: 98% Will Fail)." *YouTube*, 13 June 2020, www.youtube.com/watch?v=i-HYnhISQeY. Accessed 14 Nov. 2020.

Timestamp 2:53-2:59

8. Hitchens, Christopher. "Why Women Aren't Funny." *Vanity Fair*, 1 Jan. 2007, www.vanityfair.com/culture/2007/01/hitchens200701. Accessed 15 Nov. 2020.

Paragraph 9

9. Sanghani, Radhika. "Why Office Air Conditioning Is Sexist." *YouTube*, Sky News, 4 Aug. 2015, www.youtube.com/watch?v=MNH0bmYT7os&t=55s&ab_channel=SkyNews. Accessed 14 Oct. 2020.

Timestamp 0:01-0:20

10. Medrano, Kastalia. "Air Conditioning Is Sexist." *Time*, 24 Aug. 2016, time.com/4464848/sexist-air-conditioning/. Accessed 07 Oct. 2020.

Paragraph 2

11. Fuchs, Feodor. General Custer's Last Stand at Battle of Little Bighorn, June 25, 1876. 2017.
12. Quinn, Zoe. "UN Live United Nations Web TV - Launch of the Broadband Working Group on Gender Report." *United Nations*, 24 Sept. 2015, webtv.un.org/watch/launch-of-the-broadband-working-group-on-gender-report/4506718502001. Accessed 25 Oct. 2020.

Timestamps 1:24:20-1:24:29 and 1:27:01-1:27:08

13. Bros, King of. *Medium*, 28 Sept. 2015, medium.com/@Doomskander/many-of-you-are-no-doubt-aware-that-recently-anita-sarkeesian-and-zoe-quinn-went-to-the-un-to-de74275535a9. Accessed 13 Nov. 2020.

Paragraph 18

14. Edewi, Daysha. "36 Questions Women Have For Men." *BuzzFeed*, 26 Jan. 2016, www.buzzfeed.com/dayshavedewi/36-questions-women-have-for-men. Accessed 02 Oct. 2020.

Timestamps 0:00-0:03, 0:28-0:54, and 1:21-1:30

15. "The Simple Truth about the Pay Gap." *American Association of University Women*, 8 Dec. 2020, www.aauw.org/resources/research/simple-truth/. Accessed 19 Oct. 2020.

Paragraphs 1-2

16. "Pay Gap FAQs." *American Association of University Women*, 15 Sept. 2020, www.aauw.org/resources/article/pay-gap-faqs/. Accessed 19 Oct. 2020.

Question 6 (Why don't women just choose higher paying jobs?) paragraph 1, and question 7 (Aren't you exaggerating by talking about the gap if it's not caused by discrimination?) paragraphs 1 and 3

17. "Prevalence and Characteristics of Sexual Violence, Stalking, and Intimate Partner Violence Victimization - National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, United States, 2011." *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*, 5 Sept. 2014, www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/ss6308a1.htm. Accessed 02 Oct. 2020.

Methods - paragraph 2

18. "U.S. and World Population Clock." *Population Clock*, www.census.gov/popclock/. Accessed 04 Oct. 2020.

Date selected to ascertain approximate United States population: September 5th, 2014

19. Truman, Jennifer L, and Lynn Langton. "Criminal Victimization, 2014." *Bureau of Justice Statistics*, Aug. 2015, www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cv14.pdf. Accessed 15 Apr. 2021.

Page 2, table 1, Rape/sexual assault, column 2014a. Page 11, paragraph 5

20. Young, Cathy. "The CDC's Rape Numbers Are Misleading." *Time*, 17 Sept. 2014, time.com/3393442/cdc-rape-numbers/. Accessed 16 Oct. 2020.

Paragraph 8

21. Gallagher, Katy, and Mitch Fifield. "'What's Mansplaining?' Senator Mitch Fifield Offended by Senator Katy Gallagher's Allegation." *YouTube*, 10 Feb. 2016, www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZOXh5repOWI. Accessed 02 Nov. 2020.

22. "Katy Gallagher." *Wikipedia*, 30 Nov. 2020, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Katy_Gallagher. Accessed 02 Nov. 2020.

Content #4 (Controversy), paragraph 1

23. Smith, Erika D. "Harris Showed Black Women How to Be 'Angry' and Handle a Condescending White Man." *Los Angeles Times*, 8 Oct. 2020, www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-10-08/harris-kamala-exposed-pence-patronizing-white-man-vp-debate. Accessed 17 Nov. 2020.

Paragraphs 5-6

24. Carlson, Tucker. "Tucker: Democrats Will Justify Court-Packing by Citing Diversity." *YouTube*, Fox News, 8 Oct. 2020, www.youtube.com/watch?v=PVArMkO-zCI. Accessed 17 Nov. 2020.

Timestamps 7:55-8:51 and 11:06-11:26

25. "Pet Industry Market Size & Ownership Statistics." *American Pet Products Association*, www.americanpetproducts.org/press_industrytrends.asp. Accessed 09 Oct. 2020.

Paragraph 6 (2019-2020 APPA National Pet Owners Survey Statistics: Pet Ownership & Annual Expenses)

26. "Columbia University Rape Controversy." *Wikipedia*, 3 Dec. 2020, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Columbia_University_rape_controversy. Accessed 03 Dec. 2020.

Content #3.1 (Allegations by Sulkowicz), paragraphs 1-5. Content #3.2 (Allegations from others), paragraphs 1-2

27. "Ceci N'est Pas Un Viol." *Wikipedia*, 21 Feb. 2020, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ceci_N'est_Pas_Un_Viol. Accessed 04 Dec. 2020.

Paragraph 1

28. Young, Cathy. "Columbia Student: I Didn't Rape Her." *The Daily Beast*, 3 Feb. 2015, www.thedailybeast.com/columbia-student-i-didnt-rape-her. Accessed 23 Nov. 2020.

Paragraph 10, Facebook messages (attached document just below paragraph 10)

29. Young, Cathy. "Discredited, the Legend of Mattress Girl Just Won't Go Away." *Reason.com*, 28 July 2017, reason.com/2017/07/28/discredited-the-legend-of-mattress-girl/. Accessed 22 Nov. 2020.

Paragraph 16

30. Young, Cathy. "The Mattress Story Under More Fire." *Minding The Campus*, 22 Feb. 2015, www.mindingthecampus.org/2015/02/10/the-mattress-story-under-more-fire/. Accessed 22 Nov. 2020.

Paragraph 5

31. Tolkien, J. R. R. *The Lord Of The Rings Part Two: The Two Towers*. Del Rey, 2012.

Page 155

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Joel F. Carberry was born in Houston, Texas, in 1994. He was homeschooled at first, but was eventually enrolled in online school. He got his high school diploma from Insight School of Colorado. Joel became an FAA certified Private Pilot at age seventeen, and was certified as an Emergency Medical Technician the following year. He spent a year and a half working on an ambulance as an EMT, and he later went on to enlist in the U.S. Army at age twenty-one as a Combat Medic. During his time in the military, he was deployed to Kosovo (a peacekeeping mission that involved zero combat). He was honorably discharged at age twenty-five at the rank of SPC (E-4) after completing his contract. Joel does not align himself to any particular political party, as no party completely represents his interests. This is the first book written by Joel, and he has since started writing a second book: *If You Give A Gay Their Way*.