

---

# Rense.com

---

## Beautiful Women: Sex and Social Control

By Henry Makow, PhD

5-5-3

At the mall, my wife and I passed a 30-foot-high banner suspended from the ceiling. It didn't say "Obey." Rather it displayed a 19-year-old girl wearing nothing but a bikini.

"That makes women feel inadequate and insecure," my wife remarked.



While women cringe, men are supposed to pant and salivate. Thus, both sexes are programmed to seek a shallow and impossible ideal.

I could honestly tell my wife she needn't feel insecure on my account. These girls are great to look at but not worth the trouble. I used to be married to one and recorded the experience in my book, "A Long Way to go for Date." My experience taught me to separate a woman's appearance from her character. Like many immature men, I used to idolize beautiful women. They ceased to be human beings.

Marilyn Monroe once said, "I always let men fool themselves. They were obviously loving someone I wasn't."

Women actually find pedestals uncomfortable. Soon they pity and resent the men who put them there.

A producer married to a beautiful starlet said, "I treat her as though she were ugly."

Men should never forfeit power by worshiping a woman. The essence of masculinity is power. Women crave male power, expressed as male love. When a woman falls in love, she surrenders "power" in exchange for love.

Men and women are equal in terms of dignity and self-fulfillment. But they do not find fulfillment in the same way. Women find it in self-surrender. By insisting on equal power, feminists emasculate men and neuter women. Their marriages remind me of roommates.

BOYS ARE NEEDY. MEN ARE DEMANDING.

Gentlemen. The measure of a woman is not what she looks like but what she will do for you.

What good is a gorgeous woman if she makes your life hell? After the sex urge has abated, what else can she do? My ex couldn't master anything that wasn't also a natural function.

Men have been brainwashed to think they're evil ogres who must cater to women in exchange for love. That's what women do! Feminism has turned men into women. (I'm exaggerating when I use the term "cater.")

A feminine woman adjusts to the man she loves. She is yin to his yang. Men should seek feminine women in the ranks of pleasant or even plain-looking women. They have skills and personality. They are rational and decent. They don't think they are special and aren't so obsessed with their appearance.

Love makes a woman beautiful. Making love, you're looking at her face, not her body. If she loves you, her face is spectacular.

## THE (HOMO) SEXUAL REVOLUTION

The 1950's-60's sexual revolution was designed to destroy family and morality by turning heterosexuals into homosexuals.

As I have described elsewhere (<http://www.savethemales.ca/091101.html>) the Rockefellers have long promoted eugenics and population control. They funded the fraudulent Kinsey Report that encouraged homosexual behavior. This led to the media-hyped Hugh Hefner and Helen Gurley Brown who retailed promiscuity and mocked marriage. <http://www.savethemales.ca/130103.html>

Heterosexuality is not a sexual preference. It is the natural life cycle, characterized by marriage and family. This is the way we grow.

Homosexuality is arrested development caused by inability to form a permanent bond with a member of the opposite sex. This is usually due to overbearing mother, distant father, or sexual abuse as a youth.

Generally homosexual relationships are distinguished by a desperate quest for love through sexual gratification. They tend to be short term and numerous. Gay

writer Andrew Webb says the dominant homosexual ideology regards "unfettered sex as the defining feature of gay identity." Gay relationships he says "are a joke and rarely monogamous."

<http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2001/0111.webb.html>

Increasingly this ailment has inflicted heterosexuals too. The (homo) sexual revolution has crippled our ability to bond. Feminism (which is lesbian at heart) has emasculated men and taught women to fear men and usurp their identity. Heterosexuals have difficulty forming a permanent bond. A friend observes a "sadness" among the single young women he knows. There are so few men fit to take on the responsibility of family.

## SEX AND MORALS

I was born in 1949 and can remember when sex was consecrated for marriage. It was harnessed to raise healthy families and build society. People found their identity and fulfillment in family.

Morals are spiritual laws that uplift and protect us. Sex is the most intimate experience two people can have. It must take place in the context of love because humans are also rational, emotional and spiritual beings. Anything else is degrading.

The elite media portrayed the (homo) sexual revolution as "liberation." People could copulate free from the "restraints" of morality. As a result, all human relationships have been debased. Strangers are suspicious of every glance, word or smile. Men can't show affection for other men. Adults can't admire children. Society suffers from arrested development i.e. a juvenile obsession with appearance, sex and genitals.

I am not opposed to pre marital sex but would restrict it to long-term relationships, the fewer the better. I admire women who consecrate themselves for their future husband and family.

## ELITE CONSPIRACY

This assault on heterosexuals, motherhood and the family in my lifetime confirms the existence of an elite conspiracy. The annihilation of "bourgeois" marriage and family is a basic tenet of Communism.

Wealthy capitalists bankrolled Communism. It was never about class, equality and public ownership (bait for "innocents.") Communism is an elite program to destroy Western Civilization. Its aim is totalitarian government based on private instead of public monopoly, i.e. very big government in the service of very big business.

(We scoff reflexively at any mention of a "Communist conspiracy." Why do you think that is? The "elite" media shapes our attitudes.)

Elite "Communists" took control of the United States under FDR and have been in charge ever since. They're called liberals, neo conservatives and feminists now.

Carroll Quigley, Bill Clinton's professor at Georgetown University, had access to their records and wrote in his book "Tragedy and Hope" (1966):

"It was this group of people...who provided much of the framework of influence which [enabled] the Communist sympathizers and fellow travelers [to] take over in the United States in the 1930's. It must be recognized that the power these energetic Left-wingers exercised was never their own power or Communist power but was ultimately the power of the international financial coterie." (Quoted in Steve Bonta, Inside the UN, p.21)

As long as half-naked girls fill our billboards and our minds, we are easy to control. Sex starved, stunted, and isolated, we can't resist satanic forces.

By rejecting shallow sexual snares and building healthy lives based on our natural heterosexual roles, we spit in the devil's eye.

Henry Makow, Ph.D. is the inventor of the board game Scruples and the author of "A Long Way to Go for a Date." His articles on feminism and the new world order are found at [www.savethemales.ca](http://www.savethemales.ca) He enjoys receiving comments at [henry@savethemales.ca](mailto:henry@savethemales.ca)

## Comment

From Sheryl Jackson  
[moonfyre1@earthlink.net](mailto:moonfyre1@earthlink.net)  
 5-5-3

Dear Dr. Misogynist,

The thing I resent most about what you write is that your Zionist ass is so "sincere and truthful"..... You sound like you believe the OldeWhiteBoyKrap you spout..... And you learned so much from your "Beautiful and Stupid" wife who made your life hell..... I would point out to you that the rich and undeserving perpetuate the myths you talk about..... It is not wymyn who came up with the game plan..... Men did..... They want wymyn who are compliant, obedient and wimpy..... I call it being "DickWhipped" .....

Why would any womyn want to KowTow or Cater to a man, with his mood swings, his fractious needs that are unstable and ever-changing with his mood, and then having to pick up after his ass supporting the adage "a man's job is from sun to sun, while a womyn's work is never done."

The only reason that your granddaddy gave us the vote was because the FatAssedWhiteBoys thought they could control the votes and get their man elected..... He did not give us the vote to make us have a voice but one more control.....

It is nice that you think you are happy, as we all seek that, but to pass on your "wisdom" is to deny men the joy of having wymyn who love them for what they are..... You perpetuate the myth that men make better decisions and that men can do more and better than wymyn..... Yet by your own admission, you were an asshole of the first order because you were selfish and bound to your ego..... Maturity changed you..... Well, you are preaching to a bunch of men who are young, stupid, selfish, beer drinkers also..... You are denying them the joy of growing up and realizing what you have, that wymyn are certainly more than you thought we were..... As the sex wears down, they are brothers and sisters? Well, that is what happens in most adult relationships..... What you are teaching keeps men from trying to meet wymyn and to have a relationship where they can become all that they can be.....

Nowhere in your prattling have you mentioned that all zygotes are female until the fortieth day after conception. Or that more females are born than males..... or that we have nine of ten of us born with both lobes fully functional while you boys have only one in ten males born with both lobes functioning..... That more of us live to the age of five, that we are healthier, stronger emotionally and mature more rapidly than men.....

Wymyn can go longer without food and live longer without food than men can, that is why fat is a female thing, Men are not becoming wymyn they are becoming more vain, selfish, hateful, vengeful, violent, criminal and cruel than we are..... men are the carriers of 97% of all gross birth anomalies and diseases, while wymyn only pass on .5% of the anomalies, the attending doKtors are responsible for the remaining two percent.....

Why do wymyn want you to put down the ring on the toilet? You do not think we are the ones who leave the pubic hair on the porcelain throne do you? We don't have to lift the ring to pee..... So how could we be the ones who do that?

You worry like an old lady who has too many cats..... Your femininity is there for all of us to see..... What could be wrong with men becoming more like wymyn? We are more stable, more capable, and more apt to do the right thing for the majority than young men are..... They make choices that are for themselves and they want wymyn to shut up and put up with their stupidity and Krap until they grow up..... Stay home and live with your mother..... She doesn't mind that she has to take care of your sorry asses..... It gives her some purpose and something to do, yeh, right.....

You are a Krap stirrer of the worst order and your stupidity perpetuates the New World Order Agenda of division..... Divide families, both nuclear and

extended, divide friends with fear and loathing, divide religions and their constituents, keep everyone fighting over the usual Krap and Small stuff and ignore the reasons that we need unity..... Mainly, this country is being taken down the tubes by the Four Horsemen of the WhiteHouse and you perpetuate the very thing you say that feminism does.....

We teach wymyn they can go on without the man who beat them or left them when the going got rough..... We teach wymyn that if they want to be warriors or compliant to the male egos she has the right to do that..... If she wants to be a trophy and live that lifestyle, she can do that and if she doesn't want to get married and have a family she can do that..... If she wants to work for PG&E as a lineman instead of a secretary she can do that..... We teach wymyn that if they wish to have a life without the benefit of a male she can do that..... That her value and worth is not just in her ability to be a more traditional type of female, but that she has a brain of her own with which to think and that she can earn her own retirement and her own insurance and her own life without having to cater to a male who will not benefit her life in one iota..... That she is more than her ability to KowTow to a man and his misogynistic ways.....

You are an American Zionist who is using his limited writing abilities to perpetuate the very myths that made this country go backwards in time..... We kept your asses eating when we all lived in caves, because men did not always bring home the mastodon, but we always picked the fruit, the berries, the veggies and the tubers that kept the village going..... Your desire to return to the fifties where "men were mean and wymyn shut up" is shared by those who seek power internationally for creating a totalitarian government..... You are in bad company, and you are stirring the pot of stink.....

Have a nice day, Dr. Misogynistic,

Sheryl Jackson

### **Comment**

From David Hess

5-6-3

Mr. Makow,

Did you even bother to read the whole of Mr. Webb's article? Here is a quote from it for you from the end:

"Ultimately, though, HIV prevention efforts will not take root until mainstream society welcomes gays into the fold. After all, how can we ask gay men to respect the well-being of larger society if we don't ask mainstream society to respect the health of gay men? Legalization of same-sex marriage, domestic partnership benefits, and other measures that would allow gays to have culturally supported,

monogamous relationships would go a long way towards curtailing excessive promiscuity, not to mention protecting the public health. At the same time, homosexuals must be held to the same legal, moral, and cultural standards applied to heterosexuals both in and out of committed relationships."

Your extremely selective quoting from Andrew Webb's article completely distorts his true message. What Mr. Webb is asking for is acceptance and support for the homosexual community. Do you think you support him, and your gay friends, and offer the acceptance he seeks when you write:

"Homosexuality is arrested development caused by inability to form a permanent bond with a member of the opposite sex. This is usually due to overbearing mother, distant father, or sexual abuse as a youth."

Where is the valid scientific research you cite to be able to make this claim? Where are the interviews and personal examples you share so that others can question and validate your work? You do not make any such claims nor do you give such examples because there is not a shred of truth to your 'the sky is falling' writing. You are a sad, hateful man Mr. Makow and your prevalent homophobia shines through your writing like a great beacon. Perhaps your pseudo-scientific propaganda will sway the feeble of mind, but most will dismiss you for the hate monger you are.

With regards to the birth rate being down 50%, if you were a true researcher and scholar it would be become evident to you that if the birth rate is down (I do not know where you get your information to be able to verify if it is true) it is far more likely due to the urbanization of our society. We no longer live on the farm, Mr. Makow. It is no longer economically necessary for people to have large families. In fact, it is economically advantageous to have fewer children today because of the skyrocketing costs. So, if you are looking for a cause, instead of falsely demonizing homosexuals for what you see as a decline in our society, you would be better served to do what professional journalists do, follow the money.

### **Comment**

From Founders' America  
foundersamerica@hotmail.com  
5-6-3

Dear Sheryl Jackson,

Some men believe women are too shallow-brained to think deeply.

I don't think that about you, and I think Dr. Makow is mostly correct in that essay.

Best,

-Richard

P.S. Good civilization declines when mother -  
the feminine, seductive side of mother - : ----- ©1995

CIVIL SOCIETY DECLINES WHEN 'MOTHER' RULES

MATERNALISM = EMOTIONALISM = IRRATIONALISM

EQUALS

FEMINISM = LIBERALISM = MARXISM

Communism is liberals' ultimate response for meeting the needs of the few, but at the expense of the many; an enslavement of the productive to the needs of the unproductive; a plan for making everyone equally happy or, as is mostly the case with Marxism, miserable. Such is the power of empathy in "Mother" for her "children." She would rather see her offspring corrupted and dependent on her, rather than have one of them suffer alone.

Mother despises the ruling class because it reminds her of Father, and she fears he'll liberate her children from her clutches--he might let them grow up to become independent of her (s)mothering emotionalism.

Mother especially disdains the middle-class since that large pool of citizens can protect the ruling class from any revolt coming from the poor, and from which pool the ruling class can draw good, future leaders. Mother would destroy the upper and middle classes in order to reduce the pain she feels for her downtrodden poor.

Mother's warring is far more brutal and extensive than Father's because her violence is hysterical, irrational and frenzied while Father's is calculated and controlled.

The political Right's killings worldwide these past sixty years are small compared to the savage carnage wrought by the Left. Mao's cultural revolution in China and the Khmer Rouge's Killing Fields are the latest examples of Mother losing control and slaughtering her children out of an emotional rage (read my essays, "Trucfemism" and "Liberals' Love-Crimes: Why Left-wing 'love' begets Right-wing 'hate'").

When Mother rules in a society it signals that maternalism (emotionalism) has ascended to supplant paternalism (rationalism)--and civil society declines, accordingly.

Paternalism builds civil society; maternalism destroys it. American civilization is in rapid decline because Mother has meddled by direct or indirect means for over

a century. Father has been in retreat, appearing impotent to counter her irrationalism.

President Clinton and his liberal Democrat supporters "think" like hysterical, emotion-dependent women; they are too emotional and maternal in their relationship with the citizenry, and fickle in their decision-making and controlling in their concern for the citizenry. And because they're more likely to accommodate the exceptional case at the expense of the well-being of the many -- more likely to adjust society to meet the needs of exceptional cases, but only because the exceptional case is more immediate, pressing and emotion-packed for them than are the long-term needs and well-being of the many -- liberals' liberalism has become a grave danger to the requisite underpinnings for maintaining civil society in America, for keeping savagery at bay (read my essay, "The Donahue Syndrome").

President Clinton's "I can feel your pain" waffling on issues results not from any deep analysis of the facts, or even from any political opportunism, but from an innate inability to reason. He is incapable of applying inductive and deductive analyses to issues. He can't discover correct solutions because he, as with most liberals, is unable to think beyond the emotionality he currently feels; his emotions change from day to day, depending on whichever emotional trigger is strongest--gays, feminists, the poor, Fidel Castro, his reelection, sexual conquests, etc.

Mother can't think as well as Father because Mother's emotional bent suppresses her reasoning faculty, especially when the emotion is very strong. Women are more emotional than men because empathy is an evolutionary trait that benefits their offspring, since an emotional woman is more likely to bond with her children and, ergo, is less likely to abandon them. Men's greater lack of emotional response makes them more daring and adventurous, and much less tied to familial duties; a strategy necessary for freeing men up, at times, for inventing or exploring or building or fighting to evolve higher levels of civilization (read my essay, "Two Legs Of The Same Whore").

President Clinton can't reason well because he's PSYCHOLOGICALLY FEMININE, which nature in him helps to explain the large number of women who voted for him, and who hold greater affinity for liberal Democrats' social agenda than for conservative Republicans' "Contract with America" (read my essay, "Emoting Women Vote and American Civilization Crumbles").

Rational men have built and ruled societies throughout the ages, with few exceptions, while women eventually destroy them with their emotionalism. Greece and Rome are good examples. It has been the battle waged between maternalism and paternalism -- between emotion and reason -- that drives political affiliation (Note: There are rational women who are men's equal; they're rational and conservative in their politics but more weak for the emotional argument than are conservative men).

Most people don't understand the battle or the nature of the combatants, more often than not confusing maternalism for paternalism. Pundits incorrectly call what has damaged America these past 130 years "paternalism." For example, Richmond Times-Dispatch editor Ross Mackenzie writes in his inspiring commentary on America's Independence Day that "We are now in the process of reversing years of paternalism" ["Rejoicing In This Sweet Land of Liberty," Richmond Times-Dispatch, July 2], as if Governor and then presidential candidate Franklin Delano Roosevelt didn't sound more like a woman than a man when he planted his socialist seeds in 1932: "I assert that modern society, acting through its Government, owes the definite obligation to prevent the starvation or the dire want of any of its fellow men and women who try to maintain themselves but cannot." It sounds good but masks the seeds for a society's collapse through its government.

A rational man would have beseeched the citizenry to work harder and pull together to struggle against adversity, not whine about starvation and (s)mother the citizenry with false relief, false hope and numerous heavy-handed bureaucracies for dispensing them. Hunger during the Great Depression was being handled quite well by churches, private charities and by ordinary citizens coming together in their communities to reduce suffering among the destitute. Would that Roosevelt had simply called on Americans' kind heart and ingenious mind to make a recovery . . .

But after promising to cut the deficit and taxes and reduce federal spending, Roosevelt moved in the opposite direction upon taking office, creating a massive federal bureaucracy of commissions and agencies (many of them created as payoffs to his cronies and friends who were assigned to run them), which expenditures helped to prevent any real economic recovery. After ten years of feel-good talk and no improvement -- with billions of dollars in deficit spending, with little change in unemployment and with a growing welfare class -- Roosevelt's diversion of capital from business and industry into massive make-work programs had suddenly been shunted back to industry to help fight a war, and the real recovery began.

Roosevelt had prolonged the Great Depression for ten long, grueling years until WWII gave a tremendous boost to an employment and production rate that barely changed while he fiddled, giving him undeserved credit for what was really a war-based recovery instead of scorn for his decade-long mismanagement of the economy. But the full cost of Roosevelt's socialism wouldn't be felt or understood for fifty more years when, in 1994, Americans awakened from liberal Democrats' Great Society slumber, only to discover a nation full of whiners and wimps lacking any moral virtue, work ethic, or sense of self-reliance.

President Roosevelt's maternalism spawned this ever-growing dependency class with its plethora of social welfare programs that feed it. And President Johnson,

another maternalistic "man," redoubled Roosevelt's social-welfare efforts with his Great Society agenda in the Sixties.

Roosevelt began the Social Security System, unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation, and agricultural subsidies. But more critically, Hoover's defeat installed a majority of maternalistic Democrats in both houses of Congress, thus silencing the rational masculine mind -- paternalistic mind -- of Republicans, in order to construct every conceivable kind of social welfare program for weakening the citizenry and the nation. Such a history of emotional seduction could come only from the mind of an intrusive, (s)mothering woman-- only from what I've termed "emoting feminine mind" (read my essay, "Restoration Revolution or Futile Posturing").

Roosevelt and his Democrat Congress were emoting socialists. They appealed to emotional weakness in the citizenry; especially in women who not long before had acquired the vote to forever change -- and for the worse -- the face of politics in America. The emoting feminine mind of Roosevelt's leftists FELT rather than THOUGHT about the long-term consequences of their "solutions"-- their socialism; they could only feel the immediate pain in the citizenry and sought immediate "solutions." That their sixty years of government-can-fix-everything maternalism gave us this economic and cultural house of cards can't be logically refuted; that those "men" turned a once-independent citizenry and nation into an effeminate class of selfish dolts is becoming more apparent with each passing year.

Maternalism caused all this social wreckage not paternalism, which masculine nature is characterized more by aloofness and self-sufficiency than with intrusive and doting "helpfulness." Mother gets her pleasure from emotional stimulation, so she craves social chaos. Mother intrudes and dotes to cause social conflict; ergo, she likes open borders, gay rights, forced integration, or any cancer on civil society.

Where did the confusion about the terms "maternalism" and "paternalism" originate? I believe people have confused physicality for psychology. Because a person appears to be a man doesn't guarantee that he has the psychological make-up of a man, about which common stereotypes and historical traditions correctly identify as strong, silent, and resolute in fixing things -- getting things done -- rather than as incessantly talking and emoting about them in hope of avoiding tough decision-making, as liberal women and President Clinton generally are wont to do (read my essay, "The Progressive Jew in 'Weimar' America").

Another source of confusion is Christianity, which history and influence on the Western mind have been mistakenly termed "paternalistic" because "men" conceived, built and rule that religion. The psychology of Christian authority is feminine not masculine. One would be hard-pressed to show that Christianity is a masculine religion, although the Old-Testament Christian Church is far more masculine as compared with the New-Testament Christian Church (read my

essays, "The Jesus Connection" and "Jesus: Liberal and Communist and Social Worker").

Liberals have a stake in using the term "paternalism" to describe liberal Democrats' social wreckage. If men caused this social chaos, then women surely ought to be given a chance to run things for a time--right? Wrong! That's only a ploy to keep intact their mostly hidden power and influence. And conservatives who use "paternalism" to describe liberals' mothering only harm their cause by confusing the public. Mother has been running and ruining America for a long time while disguised as "men" in liberal Democrats' political party.

Women have had a heavy influence on American social thought beginning in the nineteenth century; especially from the time maternal and henpecked Abraham Lincoln began the slaughter of 600,000 white men to placate the liberal and effeminate New-Testament congregations in the North; congregations greatly invigorated against the South by feminist Harriet Beecher Stowe, whose book, "Uncle Tom's Cabin," prompted Lincoln to say this upon first meeting her - "So you're the little woman who wrote the book that started this great war!" (read my essays, "Novelists Tell Lies" and "Lincoln's Folly").

Yes, the emotion in maternalism -- not the reason in paternalism -- plunged America into civil war. And maternalism's influence crept forward from Lincoln's day to create this confused and debased generation through ever-expanding feminism (Note: As with President Bush, President Lincoln's political facade masked his emotion- alism--helped hide his feminist, irrational, and maternal character).

Maternalism has so badly damaged this republic's social and economic infrastructure that recovery is very unlikely without massive suffering. From the Bible's account account of Eve's seduction of Adam to present-day seduction of Americans by liberal Democrats, maternalism's emotion- based promise to provide for citizens' every need has been the bane of rational men who have conceived and built grand civilizations throughout the ages. And the seduction runs deep and wide in today's America, with emotion slaying reason at every turn -- with women playing fireman and policeman and doctor and soldier and fighter pilot and statesman and engineer and scientist and priest, and with nobody at home to raise the children -- and with all those occupations being debased because women can't match the skills of the men who might otherwise have filled those positions. To those caught up in the insanity -- in the emotionality of this age -- all of that sounds extremely "sexist." But to rational minds it strikes a strong chord, when considering all that history teaches humanity about what does and doesn't work in keeping good civil society.

History teaches that when men become emasculated and accommodate the wishes of feminists, then civil society declines. In the case of American civilization, it portends the death of the noblest experiment in democracy ever conceived--and portends another round of Dark Ages.

What do we know of fathers?:

They are explorers, inventors, builders and reluctant to be too tied to familial duties. Regarding the rearing of children, they allow more risk-taking while mothers are more guarded about a child's testing his/her limits and environment. Fathers exercise less control than mothers, and are anxious to see their offspring strongly independent while mothers may intrude in their children's affairs for decades (read my essay, "Crazy Women: Crazy Society").

From Roosevelt to date, Mother has created over 80 major welfare programs, wasted \$5.4 trillion in her war against poverty (since 1964), and created this massive and ever- growing dependent class of citizens and immigrants.

Miss Taylor Caldwell wrote this in "Dear and Glorious Physician," to describe the bad consequences of Mother's rule:

"Rome has decayed into a confused democracy and has acquired feminine traits . . . A feminine nation has an insensate desire to control and dominate."

That describes liberal Democrats and their social engineering schemes; that describes NOT PATERNALISM but MATERNALISM!

Get it right, folks!

Founders' America P.O. Box 71024 Richmond, Va 23255

### **Comment**

From Big D in Seattle

To Sheryl Jackson Subject: Nice Job On Rense!

I read with pleasure your reply to the good doctor's article on Rense.com because it reminded me of why there are growing signs of a big turn around again on the part of MEN that will be standard fare in the future times ahead. A man's strength is absolutely superior in all way's over a female's. Always has been and always will be. In the times ahead, the times when everything is falling apart right down to cinders in what were once streets, because of bitch jobs like you out there today, women are going to have to tread very, very, very softly, and nicely, around men because they will simply kick the holy shit out of them otherwise and there may not be any laws or courts to stop them. And it will be all your fault and females like you. I'm sure a lot of men will love to run into you out there when those times come around in order to kick your man hating ass. It won't be me, however, because I'm sure you must have yourself looking like some kind of Marlboro Man with tits and I wouldn't want to puke on your logging boots looking at you. Real women don't talk, write or think like you bozo.

You misinterpreted everything the doctor conveyed, you dumb jerk. Talk about "lobes." where in the hell are yours? He's a Zionist? My big white fat macho \*ss he is! He is right-on about the sex and bitch scene in current times. Why don't you find yourself a nice liberal website to haunt (try neoconvervatism.com) and leave the thinkers with brains on Rense alone.

What a sick \*\*\*\* you must be. You sure write like one.

Big D from Seattle

From Sheryl Jackson

5-6-3

Thank you so much for your well thought out response to my commentary and your so intelligent abilities to communicate..... You are exactly the type of male I love to have in my group. I work Maximum Security with the Kriminally Mentally Ill males of the state of California. Most of them are pedophiles and rapists..... which category do you fit into? probably pedophile..... You hardly seem brave enough to be able to have a relationship with an adult female..... Your anger is in direct response to your inadequacies and feelings of failure and lack of accomplishment..... Your thinking that wymyn need to be beaten into submission is directly related to your own inability to have sex with a live partner..... Bless your heart, you seem to be a real mess..... Big D in Seattle? I would imagine that you wish you had a Big Dick in Seattle..... But the measure of a man is not in his equipment but rather in his ability to use it to make both him and his partner enjoy it..... I would imagine you are about 300 pounds, eating doritos and drinking diet pepsi while cruising porn sites on the web..... Have you ever heard of Echelon? since you wrote to me, you have been picked up by Echelon and their New Homeland Security..... They will be tapping your computer from now until they catch you..... Have a nice day, and make sure when you respond to others that they are not being watched by Echelon..... You sure made my day..... Thank you for writing.....  
Sheryl Jackson

## Comment

From Horst Hartmann

horst@nakis.gr

5-7-3

Homosexuals ARE mentally ill people, their behavior IS neurotic. You will find homosexuals only in developed societies, neither are there homosexual wild animals.

Homosexuality is a symptom of social decline. (Which in no way should justify any kind of hate towards these people! Let them do as they please! As long as they

don't harm anybody, noone has a right to bother them. They are merely pitiable.)

The anthropologist Malinovski was doing extensive research on the Trobriand Islands located at the northeastern coast of Australia. His book "The Sexual Live of Savages" is giving deep insight into our developed societies.

Their communities are matriarchic there is no suppression of child- and adolescent sexuality. Thus people are able to develop in a very healthy way. The Trobriands don't even have a word for any kind of sexually aberrant behavior, homosexuality is something inconceivable to them.

Grown up they live in voluntary monogamous relationships, they are free to break their relationships at any time, but it happens very rarely. Violence, crime, greed are unknown, their language doesn't have a word for theft!

Malinovski and later Wilhelm Reich in a book based on Malinovski's research show clearly that the patriarchal society was introducing sexual suppression and out of suppressed sexuality developed all the symptoms from which we are suffering now. They show that healthy sexuality as seen in the Trobriand society is in no way lewd, promiscuous or anything our deprived 'cultivated' minds might like to believe. On these islands sexuality has the place in people's life which it should have: neither suppressed nor overindulged in, just an expression of being alive like eating and drinking and many other activities of healthy people. Reich said "usually people don't waste a thought on their little toe, but once they hurt it, it will become the most important part of their body".

The same happens to 'cultivated' people in patriarchic societies. Due to suppression from earliest childhood on sexuality has become the most important subject in people's lives.

Let's re-establish matriarch society! Yes it will be the end of our 'culture', but consider what we have to lose and what we could gain!

[Disclaimer](#)

[Email This Article](#)

---

[\*\*MainPage\*\*](#)

<http://www.rense.com>

[\*\*This Site Served by TheHostPros\*\*](#)