



A Women's Liberation Guide to Men

Sam Fryman

A *Women's* Liberation Guide to Men

by Sam Fryman

(the cover illustration is *Nightmare* by *Henry Fuseli*)

© Sam Fryman 2005, all rights reserved

Contents

Introduction	3
Chapter 1 - Love Factually – the true meaning of love	8
Chapter 2 - Modern Man - the sex beast with ten fingers	23
Chapter 3 - The Psychology of Sex	37
Chapter 4 - Male Psychology – the hand that rocks the cradle	49
Chapter 5 - Raising the Male Child – setting Truman free	58
Chapter 6 - Evading the Beast - how not to get raped	71
Chapter 7 - Choosing a Mate – finding your man	83
Chapter 8 - Keeping Mr Wonderful – how to live with your man	96
Chapter 9 - The Princess Diana syndrome – the rejection of true love	106
Chapter 10 - Feminism – Wicked witch or best friend?	115
Chapter 11 - Women and Business – dealing with Mr Scrooge	125
Chapter 12 - Meeting Dr Frankenstein – saving women's body and soul	145
Chapter 13 - Defeating the Evil Weed – women and smoking	162
Chapter 14 - Women and The Teacher – don't stand so close to me	173
Chapter 15 - The Ultimate Women's Liberation – liberating your mind	180
Chapter 16 - The Lady and the Guru - a rational take on religion and spirituality	182
Chapter 17 - Lies are a Feminine Issue – overcoming the killer answer	192
Chapter 18 - Desperately Seeking Ally McBeal - women and the law	208
Appendix - A Meditation Technique to Help us Gain Control Over Our Mind	218

Introduction

In the genuinely funny 1993 comedy, *Groundhog Day*, *Bill Murray* plays a cynical TV news presenter and weatherman who is forced to go on an assignment he finds degrading with his new producer, *Andie MacDowell*, to cover the Punxsutawney *Groundhog Festival*, which is not incidentally itself a fiction, but a real life event carried out annually on the second of February in this small US town in Pennsylvania.

The movie however is a fantasy, though a very clever one, and after drearily carrying out his assignment once again the character Murray plays, *Phil Connors*, attempts to escape just as fast as he possibly can back to the city, where he evidently finds the comforts which please him that this – as he sees it – backward little town full of “hick” or yokel types clearly lacks.

For example he jokes at the expense of the genial but dizzy lady housekeeper he is lodging with, *Mrs Lancaster*, that not only does she not *have* espresso coffee, but she likely does not even know *how to spell it*.

On his way to the Groundhog Festival he meets a series of characters who mostly want money from him, whom he cynically evades, and describes the apparently old school friend he has been accosted by, who is now a high-pressure insurance salesman, as *a giant leech*.

Likewise he turns down the offer of a dinner invitation from his producer, *Rita*, played by *Andie McDowell*, and their mocking and devious camera man, *Larry*, on the grounds that Larry eats with the bad manners of some kind of pig.

Larry's conclusion, expressed to Andie McDowell's producer part is that -

there are a lot of things wrong with Phil

and calls him repeatedly an egotistical *prima donna*.

Phil's life goes through a dramatic change however, when in horror he discovers as he wakes up early next morning that he is repeating the same day over, but nobody realises but him, and each new day he wakes up is the same one over and over again.

This is a very clever idea and concept, because this really is man's life and arguably also women's.

For we each one of us go through the same old routine most of the time, day after day, unless we lead a very dramatic life like a big businessman or a movie star, and even then life can become samey as one exotic city or filming location begins to look just like another, and we have a feeling that once we have seen one sleepy little Mexican village we have seen them all.

But Bill Murray as Phil Connors has this lifestyle enforced on him taken to an extreme, in which he is confronted by the same experiences and people he has seen day after day behaving in almost exactly the same way and saying almost exactly the same things.

Eventually Phil learns to turn this situation to his advantage, and uses the knowledge he wheedles out of a pretty local girl he learns one day to seduce her on the next, by pretending he was an old classmate at her school who was always in love with her.

As he canoodles with her on the settee he promises to marry her, so that she will agree to let him stay and give him the sex that is his goal, knowing that he will never have to keep that promise and that she will have forgotten about him entirely by the next day, which for *her* is always *the first*.

And as young men especially, a great many males do the very same. They make a promise to a girl under the duress of passion in order to get their “wicked way”, which they may not even remotely ever intend to keep.

The truth currently is that in our “liberated society” the average man would like Phil Connors, do or say virtually *anything* he thinks necessary to get a woman into bed, and now that women too have been liberated by the contraceptive pill and other techniques, nowadays that promise may not have to be so great.

For women are now in a dream of romance and sex in which they think sex is love, and maybe love is sometimes sex, for they are confused about the meaning of the term just as are the fictional ladies in *Sex and the City*.

For surely a man who wants to go to bed with a woman obviously *loves* her, doesn't he?

As ridiculous as that question is to any *truly* experience women, it is sadly alas, what too many women still believe, especially if the man concerned is - if she is honest with herself - “out of her league”, which strategy of “plumbing the lower divisions” many men well know is the way to get easy sex from women whom they never intend to have a serious or long lasting relationship with.

But then we see that few women, perhaps *Katie Holmes* excepted, any longer seem to care anyway whether they stay virgins or not until they do meet a man they really want to be partner with or marry and *can* get.

Rather most girls are intent upon losing this once *priceless* quality of virginity at the very first opportunity, and thereby going to a permanently devalued status in the eyes of millions of men.

For does any woman really think a man is happy that he is not the first and only one?

He is happy *only to the degree* that if she is not “unused”, then when he finally leaves or dumps her for another, he won't feel too guilty in that process, for he can hardly be blamed for “ruining her” as would have been the judgment on him in former days, can he?

But any girl or woman who imagines any man does not *still* think that a girl or woman who is a virgin is the most prized and desirable female on the planet is living under a very large delusion and deceit.

For example we have heard of a good number of men who have slept with maybe twenty different women, but who then go on to marry or settle down with a virgin, so he is for her the only one.

And then of course, there is a more powerful reason than ever for seeking this virginity in women now, which is *the fear of sexually transmitted diseases*.

It is suggested to you, that the time is not far off when no man or women will ever get into bed with a member of the opposite - or even same sex - without some kind of certificate or guarantee that they are disease free, and laughably, this may eventually even *force* upon men and women in general a state of pre-marital inexperience and virginity which they are currently doing everything in their power to destroy.

But we seem to have forgotten about Phil Connors, and what he has done with his "eternal life" in *Groundhog Day*.

And on one of many repeated days, Andie McDowell as *Rita*, when she finally believes his story, asks him that very thing, and learns that he has been wasting his "eternity" having chosen to flick cards several hours a day until he can effortlessly toss them into a hat.

But the main story of the movie is that Phil Connors can in one day learn and do anything he wants, he can rob banks, he can tear up the town, or even drive himself and the groundhog into a pit and get blown to smithereens, yet each new day wake up without a scratch and everything OK.

But what he cannot do is *win Rita's love*.

Each day he tries all the tricks he has learned, with all the facts he has sneakily collected from her about her likes and dislikes, but when it gets to the bedroom scene, she insists that *tomorrow* (which for him never happens, you see) would be a far better day to continue their new relationship, and in desperation at her failure to understand, he tries to persuade her to stay and everyday gets slapped over and over.

There is something really funny about this happening repeatedly, as Bill Murray has a permanently bemused and slightly arrogant face which looks like it was designed just for women to slap, but he later goes into a depression as do so many real men and boys, after this continual rejection starts to bug him which he can do nothing about.

So after going through a lot of self-destructive behaviours, including successfully "killing himself" many times over in a hilarious variety of different ways, Phil eventually decides that he must grow up and become a cultured and caring man.

He learns to play the piano expertly, he learns to ice sculpt, he learns French poetry, he learns to treat all the townsfolk's diseases and prevent the accidents they would otherwise have had, he even acts successfully as relationship counsellor to a young couple who are having doubts about getting married, and by the end of the movie he is the greatest citizen in town, a transformed man, and so dazzling are his talents and his goodness and popularity, that for once Rita finally decides to stay the night with him, though more out of a satisfied state of tiredness than any sexual desire.

And thus the spell is broken. The next day he wakes up he is in real life again and a new day finally dawns.

This movie has been well loved and very popular for over a decade, because the truth is we all want to believe in fairy tales and the idea that there is such a thing as true love.

The same was true regarding the story of Princess Diana, which countless millions of women believed in like a fairy tale.

And thus as we shall argue later, the huge outpouring of emotion at her death was not so much for the lady herself, whom we shall also see later few people really knew or understood – including largely herself – but rather for the death of a dream, and of the belief that the fairy tale romance of a young girl becoming a princess and “living happily ever after” could ever happen to anyone.

For if it couldn't happen for a beautiful princess like Diana who married a real life royal prince, how on earth could it happen to ordinary women and girls like them?

But we are here challenging that assumption.

On the contrary, we are saying that for almost all girls and women in the world, the dream *could* come to life, the fairy tale *could* come true, but for that a girl has to know how to be a princess, and also *how to find her prince*, and this book is going to tell her amongst other things how to do that.

We are also going to do our very best to show women *based on inside knowledge* not only the true nature of men, and how to relate to them, but also how they should raise their child, in particular a *male* one.

In this process, we also have to report to women everywhere, that the “feminist” who claims to be a “women's liberator” is often nothing of the kind, and can actually be the true enemy of a woman's relationships with her children and her man.

If the reader doubts this, we are going to explain to her exactly *why* in great detail.

And we need to tell her too that this “wicked witch” is to be found not only in fairy tales like *Snow White*, in which the witch poisons the beautiful young girl to prevent her having her true love with her *Prince Charming*, but in *real life* even sometimes amongst the close “friends” whom an innocent and kind young woman may imagine to be true ones.

For the author is not himself talking from fantasy, but from several decades of personal observation and experience, and also from the study of the lives of hundreds or thousands of others and the most diverse spectrum imaginable of psychological and philosophical literature.

So do not think that this gentle introduction is a sign of weakness or ignorance. For in this book you will find knowledge that is little known elsewhere, nor understood even by your parents, if you are as a reader a young girl.

The mature woman also will find the answers here to many mysteries regarding men's behaviour and even her own, which may have baffled her so far throughout her entire life, so without further ado, let us proceed.

Chapter One – Love *Factually* – the true meaning of love

In a sense we could say that all good fiction and drama is about *love*, in the broadest meaning of the word, or on the other hand, about *the absence or denial of it*, just as in fact we could also describe all real life dramas in the same way.

We are all – from the highest to the lowest, from the most criminal to all but a true saint – in a lifelong search for what we call “love” and “acceptance” and “meaning”- and arguably the saint also is in search of love, because he or she is perhaps more sensibly looking for the more reliable and consistent love of a “god.”

And for *women* in particular, this quest to love and be loved – whether by a man *or* a woman - is seen to be at the very top of their agenda, far above the desire for even children, career or material luxuries.

We might argue that our goal is *acceptance* rather than “love”? But where is the real difference?

As *Hazrat Inayat Khan*, a Sufi mystic wrote:

those whom we love, we forgive anything of, and those whom we hate, we forgive nothing of

So even as regards our boss or colleagues or subordinates at work, this same principle applies – if they *love* us, they will *accept* all from us, and if they *do not* like or love us, we will get only resistance, condemnation, rejection and disrespect however hard we might try to compensate or please.

Witches – both ancient and modern – have offered “love potions” to get some person to fall in love with us, but all such spells are empty fantasies because we find in reality that *whatever we do, however hard we try* another human being either loves and accepts us *or they don't*.

If we desire a person whom we discover in the course of time does not love us, the logical and sensible thing to do is to let that person go, lick our wounds and try our luck with somebody else until we find someone who will.

But that is frequently not what humans - both men and women – actually do, is it?

So how can we explain the illogical behaviour of both men and women in seeking to get love from someone who clearly doesn't love them as they wish?

Let us not try to give a facile answer to what is obviously a complex issue, but rather let us look at the “solutions” on offer to the female public at large right now to the problem of “finding love.”

The hit British “chick flick” movie, *Love Actually*, was an orgiastic smorgasbord of romantic involvements, ranging from what appeared to be a roughly ten year old boy’s crush on a girl classmate to a romantically unsuccessful young man’s frustrated lust, or from a mature middle-aged marriage verging towards the rocks between respected actors *Emma Thompson* and *Alan Rickman*, to the pretend prime-minister *Hugh Grant*’s obsession with a working class office girl in his employ.

In fact this cleverly put together movie did its best to try to feature almost every imaginable basic permutation on the romantic theme – such as an unspoken love by a man who takes the wedding video of the girl he loves who is marrying his best friend.

If however we look at each of these relationships individually, as diverse as they appear, we find that they have all got one thing in common, which is – *they lack realism*.

First, let’s take the love of the ten year old boy - who is step-son of dour male-hero actor, *Liam Neeson* - for his pretty classmate. There is no question that boys do develop feelings for girls at roughly that age – the final year of what in the UK is called *primary education* – before they progress to *secondary school* at around age eleven, which traditionally was generally a single-sex school, but has since the late 1970s now been made mostly into a mixed-sex one.

But the question is – *do we really want to encourage boys to obsess on girls at such an early age, when they have got so much growing to do generally speaking?*

And then, do we wish to encourage this obsession further, by continuing to place them in a mixed-sex environment, in which they will likely wish to take their immature fascination even further still, and try to develop it into the fantasies of romance and even maybe (shock horror, alarm bells ringing please) into a *sexual* one.

For example, the age of consent is currently sixteen in most Western countries, but we find a sizeable percentage of *children* are having sex by thirteen to fifteen, or in some cases even earlier, and thereby creating for the UK the highest teen pregnancy rate in Europe.

In the movie, the romantic fantasy of the little boy jumping security gates and dodging guards to reach his little pre-teen beloved is portrayed as the outcome of his obsession, but what will such a *real life* boy do, encouraged by the fantasies of this “pre-teen romance” he has maybe watched with his mother on the video of this movie, or perhaps has put into the player and watched alone some time when she is not there?

Perhaps he will start stalking this little girl, who unlike in the film quite likely won’t have the slightest interest in him, because even by twelve she may be starting to sexually mature, whereas he will still likely be a grubby little boy lacking the sophistication that her growing mind finds only in *older* people.

And then, let us look at the practicality of such a boy declaring love to a girl which she may therefore throw back scornfully in his face.

Perhaps as an emotionally immature and legally irresponsible child, he will show the same anger of some older men rejected by women and turn on her violently. Or at the very least, he may start to mistrust and disrespect girls and women, as he will feel cheated by the movie fantasy he was given which had a successful ending, rather than the humiliating rejection he will likely suffer.

Who knows?

But surely by encouraging what we call “love” at such an early age, we are going to cause any number of the same traumas and tragedies that so called “adults” face.

We place the word “adults” in quotes quite deliberately, because it appears that when *actually* it comes to “love”, very few of us are truly “grown up.”

And so we are beginning to get an answer now to our question – *why do what seem to be “adults” pursue members of the opposite sex who don’t actually love or care about them and therefore don’t return their feelings?*

And the answer seems to be – *because actually, few so called “adults” are really adults at all, emotionally speaking, or shall we say, when it comes to “love.”*

For let us look at Alan Rickman and Emma Thompson’s relationship in this movie.

He is a middle-aged boss of some kind of trendy media company married to the “handsome”, mature, but slightly frumpy Emma, and being tempted by a sexy young employee, who has the body of a shop window mannequin, and is offering him any kind of “work” he wants her to do at his whim.

First let us ask ourselves an honest question – how many men in such a *real life* situation could resist such an offer?

We honestly put it to you - *not many*.

Which perhaps in itself says yet more about women’s unrealistic expectations of the behaviour of their male partners, as well as the modern “naughty” society we have built, which places men seemingly unavoidably into so many arenas of excessive temptation.

It is an interesting quirk in the movie, that it is never *overtly* shown whether the character played by Alan Rickman *actually* gets his “love” or not in exchange for the beautiful gold pendant he has bought this seductive girl, which his humiliated and tearful wife had earlier discovered by accident believing it to be a Christmas present *for her*.

But judging by her reactions, we assume he has got his end of the deal, and at the conclusion of the movie we find Emma Thompson welcoming him back into the family, which again we find statistically unrealistic based on real life cases and media and law reports we are aware of.

So again, the movie is painting some unreality for us – it is telling men *it's ok* if you are a middle-aged businessman to have a relationship with the office girl, because your wife will accept you back anyway; and equally implausibly it's telling the woman who has inevitably become a little wrinkled or frumpy, as middle-age or older age does to both sexes sooner or later, that her man will return to her “greater love” with his tail between his legs.

Then we have the brash “foot in his mouth” young man who despairs of finding a girlfriend – his attitude tells us, he doesn't mean *girl friend*, what he really means is *sex-partner* – claiming that British girls are all “stuck-up.” He eventually invests his money in a plane ticket across the Atlantic and seemingly effortlessly hooks up with a bunch of American beauties, who throng around him as he orders a *Bud* in his quaint English accent, and take him home and seduce him into a bout of group sex.

Do we really need to analyse this ridiculous and unworkable teen fantasy?

And of course, should male teenagers doubt the realism of such a fantasy, their minds are anyhow kept upon the intermittent images of a pretty actress stripping off and playing out nude sex scenes, who eventually goes on a date with the actor she is doing them with, as if this was a really good way to start a relationship, all of which seemed like a desperate attempt by the movie makers to ensure that it would gain acceptance just on the “soft porn factor” alone.

We do not wish to be a censor, but we are just pointing out that this admittedly cleverly made, glossy and titillating “hit” movie is one of the most unrealistic and misleading pieces of “drama” to ever emerge from a film studio.

For we also have the now famous *Colin Firth* (*Mark Darcy* from *Bridget Jones* and *Mr Darcy* from *Pride and Prejudice*) playing an idealistic author, whose girlfriend cheats on him, and later becomes romantically involved with an improbably beautiful young housekeeper, who just as improbably strips off to her underwear to jump in and save his manuscript which she has somehow managed to cause to blow into a lake.

Though this Portuguese girl does not speak a word of English, the key moment here is when she strips off and he admires her slender form – that is how he appears to fall in love *actually* – which again, seems to be an implausible basis for a relationship, given they have not been able to exchange even one sentence, and the subtitles in the movie explain that *on every other level* they are actually totally at odds with one another already even without realising it.

For example, she frivolously suggests in Portuguese that in return for him using her name *Aurelia* as a character name in his novel she should have *fifty percent* of his publishing royalties, while in English he is offering her *only five percent*.

This rather different outlook on “split of income” does not sound like a great basis for a relationship, but it does not stop him deserting his relatives' Christmas party to hurtle across air, land and sea, till he finally tracks her down, and makes one of these exhibitionistic romantic gestures – a proposal of marriage in front of a crowded restaurant - in the mockery of Portuguese he has been able to learn in the interim, which seems to give us the message *love conquers everything*.

And finally we have the equally unbelievable desire of make-believe Prime Minister, Hugh Grant, for some cute but dim wide-hipped office girl, who again embarrasses himself in a dozen ways tracking her down and declaring his love to her likewise.

We frequently see in romantic movies and soap operas that when a man takes the step of asking a woman for advice on his frustrated or failing relationship with a woman he desires, but does not know if his feelings are returned, she says that he should *go to her*.

You know – this grandiose romantic gesture is supposed to conquer all.

So the idea appears to be, if a woman doesn't want or love them, all men have to do is dress as a medieval knight, jump upon a black or white steed, canter up to her front door, and make some kind of embarrassing soliloquy in an effort to win her heart – “aw, it's *so* romantic!” the onlookers say, that is, if they don't throw up.

But when the truth is, this lady may think the man is stalking her, she may hate his guts, he may have totally misjudged her feelings for him, but such movies as *Love Actually* has this “go to her!” script from end to end, telling him that what we know in many cases to be “impossible loves” can somehow be rescued by these ridiculous and often undesired “romantic” displays.

In the UK currently, up to two out of three marriages are expected to end in divorce, so does this not tell us that we are going about our close relationships with the opposite sex in a rather “cavalier” and unrealistic way?

For example, we also see in the same movie that an American girl played by *Laura Linney* of *Truman Show* fame, after she finally make the connection with the guy she loves, who has been for several years only a few desks away, is within hours of declaring their “love” for one another undressing and planning sex with him until her mentally disturbed brother she emotionally supports interrupts on the telephone.

Is this really the way to make a relationship last – jumping straight into bed with a guy she has hardly had a conversation with in all the time they've worked together?

It is not love actually, actually it is just *crazy*.

For have we never had this experience of admiring someone from afar, maybe even for years, and when some opportunity arises that we find ourselves alone with them, and get to talk to them, and for the first time *see them as they really are*, the spell is broken, the illusion fades?

For in the movie, had Colin Firth and the Portuguese girl been able to communicate, likely their misjudgements and insults of one another would have become clear, and quite probably they would never have got together, which miracle they accomplished actually by *not being able to understand one another*, and thereby *turning a deaf ear to one another*, as many couples desire to do to one another in real life after a few months or years too long together, by which time, as they say, *familiarity has bred contempt*.

This latter relationship is especially revealing in our pursuit of the opposite sex.

In that the tendency is for both parties to “fall in love”, not with *the person themselves*, but with *our fantasy idealization of what we wish the other person to be*.

We are all part-time playwrights, in that we find others who look like those whom we want in our play – we trial and interview them for the role, and then *we cast them*.

The trouble is that what we don't see, is that they are busy writing *their play* also, in which they have cast *us*, but may not remotely have the same script or plotline in mind as ours!

That is, in short, when we meet a person we find desirable, and whom we want to give a leading role in “our play”, as our *real life* partner, we do not do the logical and rational thing – that is to carefully, soberly and systematically find out what they are really like – what their views and opinions and beliefs and value systems are.

Rather, just based almost entirely on *how they appear to us* we accept them, which would be a worrying enough risk in itself, but then we do something *far worse*, which is frequently the *real* cause of the mischief in relationships.

Which is - *we project all our hopes, dreams and ideals upon them, regardless of who they really are as a personality and human being*.

It is no great revelation to point out that most people will use their parents as role models for this selection process, but that theory only becomes complete, when we realise also that many people will deliberately choose partners who are unlike or preferably *opposite* to their parental models as they are acting rebelliously.

But it only takes a small amount of observation to note for example, that many women will pick men who have certain key characteristics in common with their fathers, for instance, that they are practical people, fond of DIY, etc.

Or a girl whose father was a teacher, professor or minister, will likewise tend to go for an academic “bookish” type of man, unless she is acting in *rebel mode*, in which case, she will go for someone *as unlike him as possible*.

We can easily see that this is the principal reason that parents and daughters will get into conflict over boyfriends. If she does not feel loved by them – as millions of daughters do not - and therefore is not in harmony with them, in a desperate effort to try to establish her own independent identity she will pick a boyfriend as far as possible from her parental role model.

Then she may find herself in a script like in David Bowie's *Life on Mars*:

*It's a god awful small affair
To the girl with the mousey hair
But her mummy is yelling “no”
And her daddy has told her to go...*

But is this really freedom? Is she picking the opposite of the ideal set by her parents, because she really wants that person intrinsically, or just as a rebellious act to hack her parents off?

What it certainly actually is not, is *love*.

So we see that *generally speaking*, we are selecting members of the opposite sex, not by a rational logical assessment of what they are really like as human beings, but based upon their desirable appearance, what we wish them and project them to be.

When they perform according to our desires, that is, correctly fulfil *our ideal*, they get our approval, *our love*, but when they don't the condemnation and rows come, we blame them for not being the people we wanted them to be, *but never actually checked for the reality of to begin with*.

So how can we call that love?

How can we regard as love what is really rejecting the true identity of another person, and condemning them for not living up to the idealised image version of a partner we held long before we ever met them yet now demand they be?

So as this is clearly not love, as we are not ever in love with the real person *but only with our own ideal*, which we have "hung" upon them, *what is really loving another person all about?*

The answer surely has got to begin with *respect*, and about taking the time and trouble to get to know another person *as they really are*, and therefore *before* we decide if we "love them" or not.

Obviously, if we go to bed with them within hours or even a few weeks of meeting them, we cannot possibly have had time to carry out this assessment and "getting to know" process properly.

That is – of course it is inevitable that we all have an ideal of what we find acceptable, desirable and attractive in another person, but we have to be realistic about to what degree the real person we meet can *ever* come up to such an ideal, as the chances of changing our partner are - as only long and bitter experience has taught most older adults and women in particular - *very slim*.

For example, if a woman has observed her prospective partner in his own house or flat being untidy and unconcerned about a state of affairs she considers unacceptable, she had better realise she will likely get the same should they eventually live together, so that *logically* she is going to either have to do the extra tidying and cleaning herself, or else accept living in a less tidy environment than she is accustomed to.

But women do not generally behave this way, they generally think – *just wait till we are married, I will soon sort him out, and get him to clean up his act*.

And she may succeed to some degree by bullying and nagging him into doing things he has no desire to do *naturally*, but he will resent it, and when he resents her enough, he may well be driven to have an affair or leave her to get some affection somewhere else and get away from her henpecking of him.

Does this all seem trivial in terms of the supposed issue of our discourse – *the true meaning of love*?

We would say, *not at all*, because as we said, if we *love* someone, we will *accept* their “faults” or shortfalls with regard to our ideal, in the sense of *being tolerant* of them, and therefore our lack of acceptance of another person, actually reveals *we do not truly love them*.

We may however *feel* and *think* that we love someone, but still drive them crazy with our criticisms and objections to their habitual behaviour.

And clearly, that is because we ourselves have some kind of axes to grind or chips on our shoulders that we wish to take out *on them*.

We may have grown up dominated by our parents and older brothers or sisters, and it gives us a feeling of empowerment to have somebody else to order about, someone lower in the pecking order than ourselves – which could be either a bossed about woman or a hen-pecked man.

So we have to realise that many times we could be just working our complexes out on the other person, blaming them for all our problems, which tendency we must learn to become aware of and accept is unfair on them.

This kind of thinking was actually codified into a best selling book in the nineteen-seventies called *Games People Play*, by *Eric Berne, MD*, which originated a field of therapy called “transactional analysis”, whose goal was to focus on *what people actually do* in their relationships, rather than trying to analyse *why* they do it as traditional “on the couch” analysis attempt to do.

That is, Berne was explaining that most people’s behaviour is *not* logical, honest and sensible, but consists of various kinds of psychological games, which we might imagine are only the pursuits of clinically sick minds, rather than being the commonplace behaviour patterns and psychodramas in the average person’s life, which in actuality they are.

For example, a woman could be playing a game called “Hit Me”, which is played in the following manner:

Move 1 – a woman deliberately riles a man until he loses control, knowing he will eventually snap and hit her

Move 2 – he hits her to stop her driving him any more crazy than he is already

Move 3 – she judges him as an abusive bully and coward

So this “game”, played by millions of women worldwide daily, looks insane to a balanced woman – that is, the women who play this game are clearly deliberately inviting abuse.

But the “logic” is, although she is physically assaulted by the man, she gets the “payoff” of *judgement*, of *feeling morally superior to him*, which for her is clearly of more importance than avoiding being hit.

There are other “games” pointed out in Eric Berne’s book played by the population in general, such as what he calls *Schmiel* or *Blemish*, which is a game that seeks to find a person’s sore or weak spot to use that against him or her.

That is, in a civilised and tolerant society and mentality we *do not* seek to draw out into the open the sore points of others, but once we get caught up in these judgemental “games”, these are exactly the kind of behaviours and strategies we daily employ.

We now have a generally *judgmental* society, which is encouraged by the media gossip and scandalous “revelations” regarding celebrities and others who are unfortunate enough to come into the public domain by being involved in some sort of juicy allegations or court case.

We *want* to hear about the man or woman who does an axe murder, molests children, embezzles their employer’s funds, or cheats on six different wives who don’t even know each other exist, because we are addicted to judging others, and *it makes us feel good about ourselves by comparison*.

We can condemn that person without guilt when the media gives us permission to do so, and as they go to prison or end up with some enormous fine, we laugh at, mock and despise them for their allegedly proven wickedness or stupidity.

It is rather like the “two minute hate” in George Orwell’s *1984*, when the masses are encouraged to ritually scream and hurl abuse at the “common enemy” condemned upon their public TV screens, and thus available to take out all their negative and hateful emotions upon.

Of course, quite often, as with the modern media in general, the viewers and readers don’t necessarily even remotely know *the truth* about the person they are condemning, and our personal experience of knowing first hand about incidents we later see reported in a newspaper suggests that they get or tell it *wrong* an alarming number of times, as if they didn’t even care, and unless we are a rich person who can sue them to retrieve our reputation we may find that there is very little we can do to stop our names being dragged through the mud and perhaps irretrievably sullied.

All this kind of judgemental and often *hate based* behaviour is allowed and encouraged by our modern “caring” society and government, and little or no protection for the victims of media assassination is given, except as we said to the rich.

So we are given the message *it's ok* to judge and condemn people we don't even really know, and hear only the TV, magazine, or newspaper gossip about, rather than following what Christ said according to the New Testament

Judge not, lest ye be judged

So though we have no wish to be a “bible-thumper”, we are just pointing out, that in the absence of the largely now despised by many women “traditional religion”, once these “moral restraints” are removed which old-fashioned religion used to provide, the stage is set to abuse and victimise *anybody*, if we release society – as is being done – from all standards of “right and wrong.”

And thus, as we are all as a society encouraged to be finger-pointing, intolerant and judgmental in general, inevitably we take the same attitude when it comes to our relationships with a member of the opposite sex, and again, surely this cannot be taken to be *love*, which should obviously be based on *tolerance* and *respect*.

In answering our question however more fully - *what is love?* – we need to distinguish, as is amazingly rarely done despite the thousands of psychology and relationship books and “counsellors” and “therapists” out there, that there are two parts to the answer to that question.

There is firstly *our love for others*, and secondly *their love for us*.

So typically when a woman says she is “looking for love”, she really means the latter, whereas she may *claim* that it is the former she is offering.

But if she is really *offering* love, surely she cannot be so judgemental, hypercritical and intolerant, as we find so many modern women are of men?

As encouraged by car adverts which feature men being thrown out of windows into a swimming pool by their female partners for borrowing her car without permission, and such similar negative images and legitimised abuses of men in the media, man in general has become for women in general the common enemy, the *Emmanuel Goldstein* of Orwell's *1984*, whom they are encouraged to have a “two minute hate” at, and hurl blame, abuse and condemnation at for all their problems and ills.

But in a sense, the modern society has become even worse than *1984*, as the hate and condemnation directed at men for their alleged failure to please and love women is really a twenty-four hour affair.

Incidentally, the present author grew up in an era when *1984* was regarded as an English Literature syllabus course book, and not the political manifesto of the British “New Labour” party and current American administration, as any woman who doubts that this seems to be more or less fact, should either read that amazing book or alternatively locate a good summary of it as for example is to be found on the online encyclopaedia, *Wikipedia*.

The similarities between Orwell's book, first published in 1948, and the current state of play in the world since the never-ending "war on terrorism" was declared in 2001, are *astounding* even as to detail.

But the real issue in our discussion of *love* is that we see that while we are playing these psychological games of judgement and working out our frustrations and unresolved complexes upon the other person in the relationship - which they quite likely have done nothing whatsoever to deserve apart from *loving us* - we cannot truly say that we love anybody in the real sense.

Thus the goal of Eric Berne's *transactional analysis* therapy was to become "game free" and reach a state of "intimacy", psychologically speaking - which means having an honest, sincere, tolerant and respectful relationship with the other person that all experience and media news tells us is currently very far from the reality of modern relationships between men and women.

That is, only those who are able to rise above emotional games and point scoring exercises, taking their frustrations out on the other person, can call themselves mature, and therefore *capable* of true love, and as society as we know it is composed mostly of people playing such loveless games, we put it to you therefore that such a genuine true love is an unrealistic and dishonest goal which is pursued at the expense of the other person in the relationship.

Let us say that again to give us a chance to draw our breath in shock.

The author is saying, counter to almost every suggestion from the media, TV and movie dramas and current psychological thinking, that in the absence of such "game free" mental and emotional maturity - *the pursuit of so called "true love" is an unrealistic and dishonest goal which is pursued at the expense of the other party.*

Is your newspaper or magazine "agony aunt" going to tell you that?

She sure as hell is not!

She would go out of business, which we honestly believe she should, as since just as the *Love Actually* movie does, she is giving us unrealistic, immature and destructive solutions to the many "matter of life and death" problems in relationships which practically *all of us* of both genders really have.

For all we are saying is that it is time to be *realistic*, it is time for us all to *grow up*.

That is - we have to accept that we are not mature people, we are not so kind and loving, and as twentieth century philosopher, J Krishnamurti - admired and respected by the wise and great worldwide, including even celebrities such as martial art genius *Bruce Lee* - tells us, should we be so unrealistic to need him to do so anyway:

Everybody is selfish, and primarily interested in themselves.

Any philosophy which starts out with a concept other than the above is not realistic.

We are all mostly immature, self-seeking people, and whilst the *self-seeking* part cannot be condemned, since it is an unavoidable biological reality – as per *Richard Dawkins'* best selling book, *The Selfish Gene* - it is the *immature* part which concerns us, as that is the part causing all the trouble.

Because we are discontent with *ourselves*, we think that we can “find love” from someone else, which will make everything all right.

But this primitive and generally *violent* emotional demand we put upon others is as unrealistic as it is unfair.

We are saying it is a “violent” demand, because we see what we get when we do not please someone whom we declare or alternatively refuse our love to – hostility, aggression, insults, threats, and possible even physical violence in many cases.

Women who are “betrayed” in love frequently cut up a man's suits, smash up his prized possessions such as his car, or even resort to physical violence of the worst kind, such as the famous *Mrs Bobbitt* who severed her husband's sex organ, though of course we admit that men are just as bad or worse, especially as regards threats and physical violence against women.

A surprisingly large number of women however seem to glory in such acts of “vengeance” and it is a subject of conversation amongst some sectors of women to trade these stories of vengeance they have carried out upon their current or former men and laugh raucously about their exploits.

These kinds of women even have a favourite saying to justify their frequently illegal and sometimes barbaric acts:-

Vengeance is a dish best served cold

Which actually, makes these acts even more callous or barbaric, because that means they are not just done in the heat of the moment, so therefore at least *partly* excusable, but are carried out as pre-meditated, cold blooded vengeful acts, which really is the domain of the psychopathic personality, rather than a warm-blooded, kind, caring, tolerant and forgiving human being, which the author, currently in some doubt, still imagines and hopes women to be.

Regardless of judgements on these acts however, which incidentally, if discovered, would deter any prospective new partner of these women in his right mind from *ever* having anything to do with them, we have to ask again, how realistic these ladies expectations were of what they would get from *any* man.

We know of many cases, and no doubt far more are hidden, in which women have sexually betrayed men, so this is hardly one-sided behaviour.

For example, famous actor *Michael Caine* only discovered long after he was a star that he had a half-brother he had never seen, whom his mother had borne secretly to another man yet had never told about - all that you will appreciate in an era which was very sexually repressed in comparison to the current one.

So now we have hopefully been honest and realistic enough to accept that few or none of us are angels or saints, or “unconditionally loving” people, perhaps we can see what our problem in relationships with the opposite sex really is.

For example, many women in business or politics or any other arena of power have become tough, ruthless, competitive, and aggressive in their working lives to “achieve” or “get to the top”, but then imagine they can “succeed” in their relationships in the same manipulative, ambitious and power hungry way.

The competitive business world and undue competition in the professions encourages an animalistic greed, aggressiveness and paranoia, and if we spend most of our waking hours living in that state does it seem rational and realistic to imagine we can suddenly transform into a kind, caring, loving person as soon as we arrive home, put our briefcase down, and take off our business suit and switch into casual clothes?

The reality is that we *cannot*. The dichotomy between the aggressive, somewhat ruthless, self-centred, greedy person we feel we need to be in the office or market place to succeed or even survive, and the sensitive, respectful, giving and forgiving person who is a success *in human relationships* is too great.

We may start to treat our partner and children like employees who have to be bossed about, bribed and kept in their place, or else customers who have to be flattered, manipulated and deceived *in order that we get more from them than we give*.

Equally, there is a famous book on this subject of “business tactics” included on some college or university business courses, called *Everything is Negotiable* by *Gavin Kennedy*, which explores this issue of how we “negotiate” with others that has become almost central to our lives.

Basically, *Gavin Kennedy's* book teaches us a lot of tactics on “how to get the best deal” which if carried out by everybody, as is generally happening now, would result in an ever more competitive, deceitful society, as basically everyone is trying to get the best deal for themselves, which they can only do *at the expense of someone else*.

To put it at its simplest, the logical outcome of *Gavin Kennedy's* philosophy as presented in this book is a mindset that says – *I am worth more than you, I deserve a better rate of pay than you for my labour, I deserve more money when I sell the same item as you do, I deserve to get a better price than you when I buy, etc, etc*.

And so using the “clever strategies” he explains in his book we “get one up” on others, and privately have a wicked *J R Ewing* smile as we cheat them and scorn their naivety and mock them as “mugs.”

So this we do to other human beings *daily*, or even if we work in a call centre or government department, we *defend and support the policies of those in authority who do these things*, but then we still imagine we can be “loving people” when the business or work clothes come off.

For example one man reported to the author that in his work as a computer support person on a telephone helpline, he was instructed to “get the caller off the line” as quickly as possible, and just cut them dead, whether their problem was sorted out or not.

This company, whom we shall not bother to name, because we feel such practices are so widespread that it would be unfair to mention any particular one, offered a free support package with the purchase of their PCs, which obviously was just a sales gimmick they did not honestly imagine they could *properly* carry out.

For example, if they had been honest, knowing that some people are just simply *unable* to understand and follow the advice of the helpline operators, they should have said something like – *we offer up to thirty minutes advice on your problem, but if our advisers are unable to deal with it in that time period, you should hire an independent trouble-shooter, trainer or consultant.*

Likewise in human relationships, instead of trying to seduce others with false promises we likely can't properly keep – e.g. a man promises lifelong fidelity, or a woman promises to be a sex goddess, but finds she has lost interest after the birth of her first child – we need to be more honest with others, both to give *and receive* respect.

So perhaps in order to *honestly* define love actually, we can only ever define it in *the negative sense*, that is - *in terms of what it is not.*

And what it is not is *nagging, bullying, manipulation, humiliation, violence, insolence, undue judgment or condemnation, deception, depersonalisation, etc. etc.*, which unfortunately we find tend to be the ingredients of most modern relationships between men and women, and therefore cannot be said to be “loving ones.”

Likewise with *respect*, we cannot really say what it *is*, but what it is *not* – i.e. *insult, humiliation, degradation, abuse, etc.*

So we play around with these words all the time – saying “I love you”, or “I respect you”, but it is mostly nonsense and meaningless, because *our actions* soon prove that we *do not* love nor respect the other person.

We are selfish, demanding, wanting our own way all the time, and the only real starting point of maturity, and therefore *the possibility of being a loving person* in the true sense, is by *admitting* to this, admitting to our selfishness, our immaturity, and not pretending to others we are such “loving”, “caring” people, when really ninety-nine point nine percent of our efforts are directed at *looking after number one.*

The aforementioned *J Krishnamurti*, explored this issue of *love* in voluminous detail in a thousand different lectures, and stated it somewhat like psychologist Eric Berne (*Games People Play*) in that, again, it could only be described “negatively” as *what exists or remains when all selfish thinking has died down*.

The “games” and psychodramas of Eric Berne’s transactional analysis are based on our “thought habits” – our mental routine judgement and manipulation of others, and justification to ourselves of our selfish plans.

Only when all these “acquisitive mental hobbies” cease, can there be *love*.

Without getting too cosmic, we are saying, that only when the mind is *innocent*, like a young child’s *before corruption sets in*, can it be truly loving, because there seems to be no barrier between us and the other person.

Some of us will have experienced this oneness with another person, when *all* barriers have at least temporarily broken down.

This does not necessarily mean that we have to go blabbing all our darkest secrets to that other person, which when this intimacy has gone we may later regret, because sometimes to speak aloud certain private things is an imposition and burden (e.g. of secrecy) on the freedom of others, and not the gift we may at the time intend.

It means rather *the acknowledgement of that other person’s right to exist as a free and independent being*, and our celebration of them, just as we celebrate the existence of some great movie actor, sports hero, artist, scientist or musician by contemplating them with reverence and respect.

We appreciate *their existence, their being* – it makes our lives and world richer, more meaningful.

This respect and even reverence for the identity and life of the other person, should be the goal of a relationship between a man and a woman, or in fact between any two human beings even of the same sex, and we put it to you that this oneness and harmony that can only exist when tolerance, forgiveness and *genuine* respect is there - which we see in reality means *when their opposites* are not - is actually *love*.

Chapter Two – Modern man - *the sex beast with ten fingers*

In the black and white horror movie classic, *The Beast with Five Fingers*, starring *Casablanca* supporting actor *Peter Lorre*, a one-handed expert pianist is murdered, and for the rest of the movie we are led to believe a disembodied hand wearing his ruby ring is crawling around his mansion, playing the piano at night, and sometimes even eerily slithering around and strangling people as they sleep.

The horror comes from the fact that this hand seems to be “possessed” and beyond any control, just as many women tend to perceive a man in the grip of sex desire.

We wish to lay before you here a simple fact, which women do not generally seem to know or admit, which it appears so called “scientific research” has omitted to properly investigate.

That is, it is our considered opinion and experience that the sex desire possessed by the average human male is a far stronger and more persistent urge than that possessed by the average human female.

Part of the evidence for this is that many women – for example on TV or radio phone in talk shows – confess to never having had an orgasm, and in many cases not even caring about the fact very much, and since these are just relatively ordinary women who are phoning into and appearing on such programs, they clearly must statistically represent *millions*.

In former generations and even the present, there must also be countless millions of Western women who have never had sexual intercourse with a man, as indeed there must equally be millions of men of that kind.

This is seldom talked about by the modern media, who portray life as a never ending series of sexual experiences and adventures, with a social life in which like in the well known US TV series, *Sex in the City*, girls and women are always getting new boyfriends, and men are always ending up in bed with them before the first reel is through.

In the average soap there are any number of sexual relationships and encounters going on, and ridiculously in most of them, for example the amusing and inventive but ultimately corrupting “legal comedy soap”, *Ally McBeal*, by the end of a season or two nearly everybody in the cast has had sex with everybody else.

But for millions this is very far away from real life, and many men and women *in Western society* can go for decades or even their whole life without ever having a genuine sexual encounter with a member of the opposite sex.

We are emphasizing in *Western society*, quite deliberately, since though most modern Western women may not have considered it, in other non-Western cultures, due to the fact that there have usually been strong traditions and customs such as arranged introductions and marriages this phenomenon has been far less likely.

We would wish to take up this topic in detail in a later chapter of *how to find a mate*, but for now we will just say that the image of arranged marriages most Western women are being “sold” - i.e. of some poor girl who is more or less forced into slavery, marrying a man she doesn't love - seems to be a very biased one, and ignores completely the countless millions of arranged marriages throughout the ages and even currently *which have worked*.

Whereas in the present West, when up to two out of three marriages are expected to end in divorce, perhaps we should hesitate to so fast condemn the time-tested traditions in these older cultures, when we have not thoroughly considered if there may be some good sense and value in them *if properly conducted*, rather than carried out *in a corrupted form* as may be happening many times nowadays, and thereby bringing the whole concept of arranged introductions and marriages into disrepute.

But our topic here is *the male sex drive*, and as it is perhaps the issue which causes women the most anxiety, due to the fear of rape or even molestation of their children, understand it afresh and thoroughly *women must*.

For simply to accept what appears to the author to be *an established fact*, i.e. that the male sex drive is a far more powerful force than the female one, if acknowledged, must surely lead women to take a more tolerant, cautious and understanding attitude with regard to this major aspect of men's behaviour.

Do we need more evidence?

Millions of women freely admit to *regularly* faking orgasm, whereas no man can - he either ejaculates and has orgasm or *he doesn't*.

If a woman were as intent on orgasm as the man, despite a man's incompetence in satisfying her, surely all she would need to do is to stimulate herself at length, and let a man wait for her to get near her peak before he embraces and enters her?

But women in general *can't be bothered*, because the truth is, that *most of the time* their desire is just not that strong.

And then because women are being brainwashed by magazines such as *Cosmopolitan* and dramas of all kinds including the ubiquitous aforementioned *Sex in the City* to think that they should be having a wild sex life, if they find their sex drive *in real life* is weaker than the rumours and storylines on their TV screens have suggested it should be, they think there is something wrong with them and may even go to their doctor or seek counselling.

Our message to such women, whom we believe based on our own experience and that of many other men to be *the vast majority* - is that in most cases there is absolutely *nothing* wrong with your sex drive. It is simply not *naturally* supposed to be the hungry volcano which so many men experience, and which all this ridiculous media propaganda and fantasy is trying to persuade women theirs should also be.

Shall we tell you why they - the media - are doing it, why they are encouraging this myth of woman as the man hungry sex goddess?

Because many of those in the media are really not mentally very balanced – they are in many cases, psychologically speaking *quite sick*.

That is, we find that these same kinds of high flying media and celebrity women, who are so into sex, are also into heavy drinking, hard drugs, or any number of other exciting and dangerous “habits.”

This kind of thrill seeking, like driving a fast car at a dangerously high speed on a winding mountain road, as we see for example the *James Bond* villainesses doing, is clearly the near suicidal behaviour of a woman who is damaged to the extent that her animal survival instincts have been blotted out.

And also, we should point out, as in this James Bond scenario, there is involved in such behaviours frequently an immature, insecurity and envy driven *competition with men*.

For example, take “bungee jumping” – that is, hurling oneself off a bridge or high building or whatever on a long piece of elastic.

Would any woman *or man* in their right mind do such a thing?

Commonsense and a properly functioning survival instinct would deter any *balanced* woman from ever doing such a thing which all reason tells her could result in her own death.

For example, let us say, even supposing we are one hundred percent confident that this piece of elastic won't snap, or come loose from its fixing at the upper end – how does a woman (or man) know that the sheer *fear* of such an experience might not cause a heart attack, or other sudden stress damage to her sensitive body and brain, that she might not even at the time be aware of?

So the women who are taking up these exciting and thrill seeking, anti-survival and anti-commonsense hobbies, we put it to you are really all *addicts* of kinds, and they abound in the media, because those who seek celebrity and fame are generally insecure and exhibitionistic in any case, a theme we shall explore in detail in a later chapter on the life of *Princess Diana*.

This is just simply to say that the *insecure, addicted and damaged women* who are so numerous in the media, are doing their darnedest to persuade the rest of the more “normal” and sensitive women, that wild sex and thrill-seeking in general is the road to happiness, whereas we put it to you that for *either sex*, these paths are just avenues to danger, self-destruction, degradation, and against a more balanced, mature woman's natural instincts and desires.

Let us take for example “swinging” sex parties and sadomasochistic practices, which many late night “sex documentary” TV programs are encouraging women to believe are normal and a good idea.

We know *in real life* however that most *balanced* women do not like these things, but naturally and understandably find them threatening, and for example, many find the whole idea of oral sex disgusting, as do many men when the equivalent act is requested to be performed on a woman.

We could even go beyond that, and say that many men and women, especially of the more intelligent and evolved kinds, find sex *per se* a somewhat disgusting and animalistic act, which their animal instincts impose on them whether they like it or *not*, and many times *the latter* is often the case.

As Krishnamurti points out, the *psychological* seeking out of sex, rather than the natural instinctive desire, is due to the fact that we all feel trapped, and creatively blocked in a society that makes endless demands on our time and freedom, and forces us into routine and soul destroying work, and consequently the abandonment and temporary "liberation" of sex is sought out constantly not so much in pursuit of *joy*, but in a quest for *relief* from the general pain and imprisonment of our everyday lives.

Or let us put it differently again.

If asked at the end of our life, or even at any point during it, what we as a man or woman regard as the most important, worthwhile and valuable experience we have had, do we really think any one of us is actually going to say – "oh, it was definitely that bout of sex and orgasm I had doing it with Miss or Mr X in the back of a car in 1998"?

Not likely - the odds are that on our death bed, we are going to look at our children, or our husband, wife and friends, and think of *all those who have loved us and whom we have loved*.

So we are being told a big lie when we are constantly being asked to put sex at the top of the agenda, because the *real* human drama which has any meaning, is about *love* and *not sex*, which is really just an incidental affair which makes no lasting impact on our hearts and souls.

This is *real life*, what *real* men and women *really feel and think*, but you don't hear a lot about it in the media, because as legendary Canadian singer-songwriter *Joni Mitchell* said on her *Travelogue* album, regarding the modern world:

sex sells everything

If we deny sex as the number one motivation of every man and woman, we threaten the entire culture of modern capitalism, because some sexy woman or promise of sex is being used to sell everything from cars to carpets, from sofas to sojourns on exotic Greek paradise islands in the Aegean sea.

So therefore, the mainly *commercial* media, does not want to air any such negative views on sex, because *it would threaten its own existence and survival*, at least in its current form.

The larger point however is that although our topic here is the *male* sex desire, we have to show that its status can only be properly understood, when compared to the comparatively far weaker desire of *the balanced, mature female*, and that *fact* we say is currently being denied by a deliberate misinformation policy coming from the mainstream media.

Shall we say more – for example *most* women do not seek out pornography as *most* men at one time or another will do.

There is an urgent, burning desire, especially in *young men* to know about women's bodies, and to see naked as many as is humanly possible, and also if possible to impregnate them.

The average man, would happily have sex with a different woman he finds attractive every single day of his life – consider for example *Playboy* founder, *Hugh Hefner*, or England's very own “super-stud”, night club owner, *Peter Stringfellow* - whereas we do not find the *average* woman remotely desiring the same, for whom the women's magazines and agony aunts are constantly telling us that *sex is love*.

Whereas for men, sex is really mostly *just sex*, and *love* for them is quite another, very different thing.

A male emperor buys or arranges for himself a harem, but we do not see an empress behaving in the same way. She may have a lover or two, but just look at for example, the behaviour of *Elizabeth I*, who never married and has been described by some as *the Virgin Queen*, as compared to that of her father, *Henry VIII*, and his famous six wives, to say nothing of any mistresses he may have had “on the side”, a theme which was recently explored by a BBC TV drama starring *Truman Show* and *Surviving Picasso* actress *Natasha McElhone*, entitled *The Other Boleyn Girl*

Let us put it bluntly, though trying not to be too crude – a man has got this somewhat wrinkly and clumsy thing he didn't ask for protruding between his legs, which is liable to go stiff and uncomfortable at any moment some object of sufficiently alluring female sexuality appears, whereas women's sex is both *physically* less visible and obtrusive, and also is a much slower burning force to set alight.

Women should not underestimate how shocking this experience of erection is to a man when he first experiences it as a young boy, and even potentially embarrassing if it happens in some public environment such that it can be seen clearly bulging under his clothes.

This principally animal desire is the driving force that has kept man seeking a mate and breeding throughout hundreds of thousands or arguably millions of years of evolution.

It has got him through ice ages, famines, plagues and other global catastrophes which otherwise might have seen the race off, so *it has got to be very strong* or else *the human species would not have survived* throughout the long aeons of his primitive and technologically backward evolutionary past.

So the enormous power of this male sex desire *must* be acknowledged by society as a whole, and women in particular, and steps must be taken to see that we are all safeguarded from its consequences, just as we are protected from guns, poisons and nuclear weapons.

Twentieth century kundalini yoga author, *Gopi Krishna*, called this *male* sex desire -
the giant that we must master

That is, how is a puny little immature man supposed to defeat *a giant*?

Only a truly heroic and systematic program of self-discipline and self-restraint, which the vast majority of men are likely unable to carry out, can ever hope to defeat this giant. And in fact, according to the aforementioned Mr Krishna, we cannot perhaps ever defeat it completely in the sense of total celibacy, and neither should we try, but we must simply gain a “relative mastery” over it, such that it takes its proper place in our life without damaging the lives of others, including of course *women*.

So we are saying here, men in general have a sex urge which is sometimes as dangerous and volatile as a stick of dynamite that they are frequently powerless to defuse, and instead of fearing and mocking and condemning men for this, women have got to start taking a *realistic* attitude to this *problem* men have got, which generally speaking *women do not have*.

Because let us again look at the long evolution of our species.

Biologically speaking, in almost every species it is *the male* who does the chasing and the butting of horns with the other rams to see who can win the rights to mate with the female.

It is clear that this is also still somewhat a part of our modern so called “civilisation.”

As India liberator *Mahatma Gandhi* answered when asked what he thought of Western civilisation –

It would be a very good idea.

So what could possibly drive a male, including a human one, to make the enormous efforts and take the enormous risks often necessary to successfully acquire a mate?

Only an overpowering sex urge could surely do that, as otherwise his *survival instinct* would not allow him to put himself in such dangerous situations as could quite plausibly even end his life.

So we are saying that a man's sex desire is possibly even stronger than his desire to survive. History has proven time and time over, that he would in many cases rather have sex with a suitable mate than not, even if it means his eventual death, which due to rivalry and jealousy from other men, it frequently has throughout the ages.

Because, we see, evolutionarily speaking, *he has passed on his seed*, he has accomplished his “biological mission.”

But what is a woman's “biological mission”?

It is clearly to *select and accept* a suitable mate, of the many suitors she will typically be accosted by, and to bring forth a new life.

And for this purpose, she needs a wholly different biological agenda – she needs behaviours which centre around her *safety and security* so she may protect this new life form she is growing, both in the womb, and later as a baby and young child in a safe and comfortable environment.

So *biologically speaking* does she need orgasms?

Certainly a modern human woman *does not*, and in fact, neither likely did her wholly animal ancestors, as she did not have to chase the man or butt heads with other women for him, as such a desire would perhaps lead her to doing, but just to accept or reject him, which surely currently is pretty much what she is doing now.

So here is a simple theory and explanation, which it seems “modern science” in its great “wisdom” does not place before us, which would suggest that the sex desire of women *biologically speaking* does not need to be anything like as powerful as that of the male, and surprise, surprise, if an *honest* survey of opinions of men and women were taken, we would find that *it is not*.

Thus now we have hopefully established that women's sex desire is *naturally* far weaker than men's, and that it is only the crazy alliance of the addicted thrill-seeking women in the media and the capitalism-driven advertising and drama production industries who seek to persuade a woman otherwise, we have now got to deal with this *fact*.

And how we deal with this male *sex beast with ten fingers and a very large (or sometimes not so large) thumb*, is certainly *not* how we are dealing with it now – that is, *encouraging it at every turn*.

The feminists and “women's liberators” do not want women in general to take any responsibility whatsoever for their dress or sexual behaviour.

Amongst their other “wise words of advice” are slogans like

If you've got it girl, flaunt it

But if that is what women choose to do, out of the ninety-five percent plus of men and even *boys* who are not fully in control of themselves, a small percentage are going to crack under the strain of all this sexual “in yer face” behaviour of women, and do something that likely they, and surely every sane woman are going to regret.

Please, my fair ladies, understand – the average man is *tortured* by his sex desire *at times*.

And especially those lacking opportunity for *real* sex experience – by for instance no longer having an arranged marriage partner as used to happen in most Eastern cultures – are going to be driven sooner or later to some desperate act, whether that is by immersing themselves in pornography, going to prostitutes, or raping or seducing some innocent, or even not-so-innocent woman, or even perhaps worse, some naïve and maybe virginal young girl.

So the handling of this male sex desire has got to be taken as seriously as a nuclear weapons limitation treaty, and administrated with equal candour, because just like nuclear weapons, if this powerful desire of man, this monster, this Godzilla-like giant, is let loose on the public, it can literally destroy the whole world, which arguably is what we are now seeing before our eyes.

For if we doubt that it is man's uncontrolled sex desire which is laying the world to waste, let us consider man's motivation.

It is put to you, that almost everything a modern man does is either directly or indirectly to impress women, in order to satisfy this every hungry desire.

Ask young men who have a burning desire to form a pop or rock band what is on their minds, and we find it is *to become objects of adulation by women*, like the Beatles and all the rest, and therefore *get loads of sex*.

Oh yes – of course they may like music as well, but the point is, you don't have to be famous or join a band and play on stage if you just like playing music for its own sake.

As 70s rock star *Todd Rundgren* sang:

*I'm in the clique
I'm in the clique
I can get a chick
Cos I'm in the clique*

Women throng around even minor celebrities like flies around dung, and boys and men know it well.

For example, UK stage magician and TV personality, *Paul Daniels*, recently revealed that he had bedded several hundred women in the course of his career, even though he was only a relatively diminutive and unathletic looking figure, who could not be judged as particularly handsome by any stretch of the imagination.

To get on that stage and show some clever tricks, or sing one's heart out, or play that screaming guitar solo, or alternatively to be the hero on the sports field, is a certain route to countless womens' beds, as those pop and sports stars and other celebrities who have bedded hundreds or even thousands of women have conclusively proven.

Or those who are more sophisticated and intellectual might become expert in classical music or jazz, or become a feted academic of some description, and again, it appears no matter how lacking in good looks or social graces, they will find at least *some* attractive women will always welcome them to their beds.

On the inside page of most books *written by men* we will generally find a dedication to their lady or wife.

Generally speaking, a man will work hard in life to try to make a name for himself, small or large in a profession, or strive be a business success, and really, it is very hard to avoid the conclusion that almost all of this is being done as some sort of elaborate "mating display", just as a peacock makes a huge display of his colourful tail feathers for exactly the same reason.

Except for this sex drive of men, we put it you that likely they would do very little except cater to their basic survival needs, and it is no surprise that after men have just had sex most tend to enter such a near comatose state of inactivity.

And women may feel very proud of this fact, that virtually all modern men's activity is really dedicated to them, and has as its motive pleasing and impressing women in order to get approval and therefore *sex* from them.

But we would suggest women emphatically should *not* celebrate this fact as they currently generally do.

Because this sex desire of man has now become virtually the *only* motivating force in his life, and though most women are currently revelling in the unprecedented power over men this has brought them, we are suggesting you ladies do not see where this is all going.

Because basically what we see is that man in general is now acting *without foresight*, in that his mind is focussed on *the short term gratification provided by sex*.

That is, if a man is a businessman or industrialist in his quest to be "the big noise" - a "mover and shaker" who gets his face and story in *Fortune* magazine, or even on the financial pages of the local rag - he aggressively builds up a company and fortune, by which route his many willing and frequently attractive female employees will whisper about him in hallowed tones, as though he were some kind of god.

But as his goal is to be like some kind of small or big time emperor, with a harem of willing women in tow, once he has achieved this goal, he may alas not care to concern himself with the human, social and environmental consequence of what he has done.

For example, let us take the case of Rupert Murdoch, the media mogul, who owns huge satellite broadcasting and newspaper companies worldwide.

A few years back, he had his satellite dishes installed in what was previously the idyllic Tibetan *Shangri La* kingdom of *Bhutan*.

Within months, this province, a peaceful Buddhist sanctuary for centuries, was experiencing an unprecedented crime wave of violence, burglary, vandalism and so on, but there has been no sign so far that Mr Murdoch cares, which concern would have been demonstrated one sees by rapidly taking all the television equipment *back out*.

That is, of course no modern educated person believes that what people see on television influences their behaviour, do they?

Well ask the governors and police in Bhutan about that one, please.

Of course equally, when one has such massive power as do these captains of industry and media moguls, there are other “kicks” and “highs”, but essentially it is this sex desire which is the force that initiates such efforts, and remains the mainstay of the will to hang on to or expand one's power.

But because the goal of this originally sex-based mentality is really *sensual or material gratification*, whether it is by sex, or by owning huge houses, estates, luxurious cars, private jets and the like, it *lacks* the foresight and vision that is required to act in a socially and environmentally responsible way, because as we have said, it is ultimately functioning on *short-term gratification*.

Thus we see lack of regard by industry in general for the environment, and neither does the government concern itself adequately with the environmental damage and pollution, by for example instead of trying to blame the consumer and put responsibility on him or her for recycling waste, rather making industry properly accountable for all the environmental damage it is doing, and insisting for instance that all product packaging should be “biodegradable” as is perfectly possible, but we see *is not done*.

Because the members of the government too, who are mostly hooked on sex themselves, as their numerous affairs clearly demonstrate – many of which only come out years or decades later *if ever* – are also looking at the short-term gratification of *getting re-elected* as their priority, rather than focussing on the *principles and ideals* which would change the whole of society – that is, *our individual and collective lives* - for the better.

Do we doubt that *men in power* are having loads of sex, far more than the average man?

Let us just take the case of current England soccer manager, the Swedish born *Sven Goran Erikson*.

Since only a relatively few short years ago taking over the helm of the England national football team, whose progress we should point out is a major national obsession in England, he has bedded several beautiful ladies despite having arrived in the country with an already long term and glamorous girlfriend in a theoretically “committed” relationship.

Again, the likeable and popular Sven, whom we do not wish to condemn as a human being, as well as likely being the best England manager for a generation is getting on a bit, balding and hardly an oil painting, but his status alone ensures him that a seemingly endless stream of beautiful women will jump into his bed.

So what do we imagine the *really* powerful and rich are doing in terms of their sexual goings on, remembering that unlike Sven, they likely have the *power* to stop their antics ever getting into the public domain, such as a media boss like Rupert Murdoch, who actually controls substantial areas of the global media *himself*?

It is also worth mentioning that in the case of Mr Erikson, the whole British Football Association has actually gone into disrepute, allegedly by nearly everyone in the office having had sex with the secretary.

And we put it to you, that we have only heard of all this because of the high profile status of soccer in the UK, and so it must therefore be going on all over the Western world, even in some sleepy little town *near you*.

Above all, we would wish to point out that this seeking of sensual gratification, which is primarily sexually motivated in man's never ending quest to bed women, is not *love* for womankind, nor really anyone else, as we defined love in the previous chapter.

Rather the excessive interest and devotion to *women as sex objects* and undue mental preoccupation with sex, leads to the same negligent and irresponsible behaviours as with any other kind of addiction.

The only difference is that, men who are addicted to sex, like our "hero" *Sven*, will *appear* to be responsible, because they have to look responsible in a superficial way that fools women and gains their approval, and without wishing to be insulting, we feel obliged to point out that currently the larger part of the female gender is genuinely deceived into accepting this "skin deep" moral and responsible façade.

For example, George Bush and Tony Blair have likely taken us into a needless war, which apart from maiming and killing many thousands of innocent people on both sides, has now resulted in even British citizens being unsafe to walk the streets of London, due to the threat of terrorist bombs, as well as making the lives insecure of many peoples elsewhere around the globe for the same reason.

They make fine sounding speeches, and tell us that it is all being done with the best of intentions, but perhaps their absolute refusal to negotiate with the "terrorists" is really saying – *we are willing to sacrifice as many of our own citizens – i.e. you and me - as it takes, to show you that your suicide bombings and so on will not make us change our plans one iota, will not make us withdraw our troops and military bases from your country, nor cease our domination of your people, and control of your natural resources.*

When perhaps all that is required is realistic, fair and understanding negotiations to solve these problems, or acquire the oil we currently need, and then *none of us* need live in fear.

But women in their millions must have voted both Mr Bush and Mr Blair back into power following the declaration and onset of the war, so clearly women are settling for what seems to be a dubious love and morality, instead of a real one.

Again, kundalini guru, *Gopi Krishna*, states that our society is descending into chaos and war because its leading minds are losing touch with reality; and surely this descent into sex obsession and pursuit of personal aggrandizement by the fortune hunters who seek to be “king of the castle” over the rest of us, is a key factor in all this mental and simultaneous moral deterioration.

On the smaller personal scale of private lives, women discover all the time that men have betrayed them due to this relentless and out of control sex desire, for even the most beautiful of women is not safe from desertion and betrayal, as the Princess Diana story proved, and we suggest also sadly, that *most women* who imagine they have not thus far been “betrayed” are likely living under an illusion.

For we are simply saying, that if society places enough temptation in front of men, all but a few *very rare* saints are going to crack and give in, though likely due to terrifying fear of women's response to their infidelity, and sometimes even to avoid hurting them, *they won't ever tell*.

So we therefore suggest that women are wrong to tolerate and celebrate this sexual obsession of men, and therefore *sexual devotion* to women, as it is in fact only giving them a dubious short term illusion of “ownership” whereas a devotion which is based on sex can just as easily be transferred to another women, because we see that men's devotion and loyalty is not to any particular individual woman, but *only to sex*.

Thus, there is *no security* either personally or politically for women, in a world which is dominated and governed by sex obsessed men.

For equally, criminals and gangsters will commit any kind of theft, fraud or violent crime to get “the spoils” and therefore “the glory” of being a big dude in their little patch, who gets respect, and *therefore women*.

When we look at any kind of gangster saga on TV or movie, we do not see any men in these gangster families who lack girlfriends or wives, as we have pointed out millions of adequately good looking and intelligent modern men currently do, in this so called “civilised” society, which we can surely see by now, is mostly nothing of the kind.

We also find the same devotion in the millions of female employees and aides of big business men, regardless of the negative and destructive effects of their business activities, such as the aforementioned Mr Murdoch's exploits in Bhutan.

Again, we see that the mass of women worship and respect *power*, rather than looking with discernment at just what kind of human being is holding these reins of power, and how that is affecting the world as a whole, both in the present and the long term.

But in assessing and administrating this admittedly mighty sex desire, let us not get too carried away.

It is simply not true that the average man thinks about sex every fifteen seconds or whatever, as typically female psychologists who don't have a male sex organ and therefore *don't know*, tend to say - his desire does not function in that way.

If man were left to his own devices, without constant bombardment from sexual images and provocative sexily dressed women all around him all day long, it would be a lot less powerful than it currently is.

A man lost in his hobbies of DIY, sport, science, music or art, can go for hours or even days, without giving it a single thought, *until or unless* he sees some provocative image of female sexuality.

A man's desire stays dormant for long periods *unless stimulated unnaturally* by the media or provocative women around him, but from time to time, because of the biological apparatus ceaselessly at work inside him, a pressure builds up which *demands* release.

So in summary, the message to you ladies is that the male sex desire is not wholly what you have been led to believe.

Firstly, it is far more powerful than a woman's sex desire, and women have to accept that as a *fact*, and therefore *take responsibility for their sexual conduct and behaviour towards men*.

Secondly, it is not celebrated by all men in the way you may have imagined, it is to some extent an unwanted and troublesome desire - especially to a more evolved, civilised man - which comes unbidden many times when he does not actually wish for it, and would much rather do something else.

Thirdly, the desire that man currently has, is far greater and more dangerous than it would otherwise be, because we are living in a hypnotic sex crazy, media-led society, and this is not only stimulating men's own desire to a level they do not actually want and cannot really cope with, but has thereby become a very serious threat to the safety and security of women.

Put simply, if women *chose* to dress less provocatively, and the media ceased bombarding men with teasing images and suggestions of sex, men's desire in general would cease to be the boiling kettle it currently is, waiting to overflow at any minute and commit some barbaric acts of molestation or rape upon women.

If you ladies would stop boiling this kettle of male desire, we assure you, the male ardour and beastly sex desire would *cool down*, and nobody's fingers would then get burnt, not even the ten fingers of *the beast* himself.

To those women wise enough to listen and take heed, we say – the feminists are telling you not to take any responsibility for men's sex desire, but the author, a long term expert on men you will appreciate, says that most men are not going to take responsibility for it themselves – they don't know how, it is a giant to them, and too strong – so if you ladies don't, *no one else will*, and women and girls will continue needlessly to be propositioned unwelcome, molested, sexually abused and raped.

Finally, by women *en masse* realising that if they want a *civilised society*, in which women are loved *as human beings*, rather than only hungered after and worshipped as sex objects - leading many men to do socially, politically and environmentally damaging things, which may result even in the destruction of the whole world in any number of ways - they should surely change their emphasis in what is desirable in men to using as their basis a man who is capable of *unselfish love*, as opposed to accepting only the worship of *the sex beast with ten fingers and a thumb*.

For as we watch before us the struggle by smaller nations to try to acquire nuclear weapons, do we not find it a rather ironic coincidence, that these missiles, which if unleashed can maim and kill us all and destroy our whole civilisation and even most life on our planet, appear like gleaming erect phalluses, all waiting to explode on us in an orgiastic rape of the whole planet?

It is time for women to make a sane choice about the kind of man they wish to encourage, accept and respect, for *you ladies alone have the power*, and to favour and choose the idealistic, mature and caring man rather than the principally sex-driven man, who – let us put it honestly, without hopefully being *too* crude - is now busy in his quest to screw as many women as possible before he dies, and in that process unfortunately, is currently *screwing the entire world*.

Chapter Three – The Psychology of Sex

If we were to look at the previous chapter with only a superficial glance, which we of course hope the *serious* reader will not take, we might imagine that the author is condemning sex, and no doubt critics of this work will add this immature observation to their likely long list of generally equally undiscerning attacks.

But we are in fact doing nothing of the kind.

It is merely a matter of *emphasis*. That is, we really were only asking the question:

Which do you want your life to be ruled and dominated by – love or sex?

And it really is an either/or situation.

One of these qualities *must* predominate, because if a man puts sex first, he will do this at the expense of his relationships, and therefore generally speaking *of women*.

Whereas if he places *love* first, he will likely many times have to deny and inhibit his own sex desires, especially those he holds for other women, so that his passion does not break loose and destroy his family relationships and likely his own life also in that process, when his affair is found out and typically he then gets kicked out.

Whether a woman is right or wrong in kicking a man out for having an affair is another issue. But as we said, these are not black and white issues – we are not saying – *sex is good*, or *sex is bad* – we are saying sex is a *part* of our existence, by which we are able to have pleasure and create new life, though by no means *all* of it.

So we are not making some ridiculous puritanical attempt to “seek out and destroy” sexual activity wherever it may be found, but rather to deal with the issue in a mature and civilised way, which will bring peace to society, instead of the chaos, confusion and insecurity we have got now.

In all our thinking, we should resist the impatient and immature efforts to think in extremes, jumping to one conclusion or another, but realise that life is not so much black and white, yet rather many differing colours and shades, and so we have to take a far subtler approach to the solutions to the complex problems before us than that which so many modern thinkers and commentators trouble to do, with their quickly dashed off newspaper columns and “sound byte” remarks.

But what we should do in particular is *avoid the tendency to examine life second hand*, that is, *through eyes other than our own*.

We are living in a society in which as J Krishnamurti - allegedly “the New Age World Teacher” - pointed out, we are taught *what* to think, not *how* to think.

In particular, instead of using our own minds and powers of intuition, deduction and observation, we tend to rely on the so-called “experts.”

Women readers of this work, who have an academic or scientific background, may be alarmed at the lack of quotes from “academic research” in this thesis.

But we put it to you in the gravest possible terms that it is by our undue reliance on the “intellectual” or “academic” that we have got ourselves into this mess to begin with.

The great saints and sages of all eras were not generally academics – that is, beings such as Buddha, Mohammed, Christ, Moses, etc.

They rather fitted the description laid out in the ancient book of Chinese wisdom, the *Tao Te Ching*, which stated

those who follow the Tao (i.e. the true way of Nature and path of wisdom) are not extensively learned

There are definite reasons for this, which are demonstrated partly by amongst other evidence, the remarkable findings of a BBC TV documentary first broadcast in the 1970s called *The Foolish Wise Ones*.

This documentary looked at a number of so called “idiot savants”, such as that depicted by *Dustin Hoffman* in the award winning movie, *Rainman*, which central character was based on a real still living person, who despite appearing to be mentally retarded, also had some amazing talents such as being able to memorize pages of a telephone book or encyclopaedia verbatim in a very short space of time.

In the BBC documentary in particular, were shown three cases.

One of an adult man, who though unable to perform even basic arithmetic was able to instantly tell the day of the week from any date in history; another a young boy who could play any piece of music he heard by ear after merely one or two hearings; and lastly another boy who could accurately draw complex buildings from memory after merely a single quick viewing of them, yet had no previous artistic or draughtsmanship training whatsoever.

In each case, a highly trained and qualified academic expert in the respective fields was baffled by these performances, for example judging the untutored boy who could play the piano to have the aural music perception abilities perhaps of a Mozart.

So where is the explanation for these *facts*?

The academics included in the documentary program had *none*, and we have heard of nothing further to date from *academia*, which explains these so called “idiot savants”, whose skills in their respective fields make the rest of us look like we really are the true idiots and not they.

Any good teacher knows that he or she can teach many ideas to the *average* young child with little or no problem which most adults struggle with or fail to understand.

But once these same children get to the age of even twelve or thirteen, their minds begin to dull, and by fifteen or sixteen most are incapable of doing any major learning *in the real sense*, but only of reluctantly building a few more stories of facts or information, which they largely take in without any great analysis or understanding, based upon the foundations already established by their long years of indoctrination.

Yet the mind of a young child can soak up new information like a sponge and work like lightning, and every adult whatever its supposed IQ - even these so called "retards" and to some degree "mongoloids" - successfully learn a language, totally unaided and untutored by any school or adult in any formalised way.

Though it was not emphasized in the documentary, we wish to point out here that the common factor in the genesis of these "idiot savants" is that their retardation *blocks them* from the formal educational system. They are "untutored genius."

Equally, we have all heard of immigrants who arrive on the boat one day, who cannot read or write even in their own language, and so many years later, they have somehow become millionaires.

The common factor, is that, *freed from conventional education*, all these people, including the idiot savants, *think for themselves*.

It sounds easy doesn't it, if we say to others "think for yourself", but actually it is almost the hardest thing in the world.

Because, from the moment we can understand, we are being given a never ending series of commands, of dos and don'ts, of rights and wrongs, and of cans and cannots, in which most of us remain imprisoned for the rest of our lives.

The child however, before it is brainwashed by a combination of its parents and the formal education system still has the capacity to think for itself, whereas few adults generally do.

In the case of the truly great artists, scientists or philosophers, or even greater thinkers and "seers" such as the *genuine* Indian *rishis*, or as we have said, the prophets such as Buddha and Christ, this brilliancy of the original mind of the child never leaves them, and it is from this powerful mind of the child developed by experience and adult intuition that their understanding comes, quite often beyond anything the modern scientists from within their imprisonment of collected knowledge can see.

So what we are saying is that *the wise*, who wrote for example the *Tao Te Ching*, and were once governors of countries such as ancient China, presided over an era of happiness and *peace* which our modern scientists and academically trained leaders are failing to do.

So it thus seems sensible that we should listen to the wise - such as, as we have mentioned, Buddha and Christ, and also the modern philosophers such as Krishnamurti and Gopi Krishna - and not so much to the mere academics, who lacking the *holistic vision* of these advanced beings, have some *knowledge*, but don't have the *wisdom* to use or understand their knowledge safely for the public good.

So the author is saying – we do have a choice, we still have a power of *seeing* reality as it actually is, if we are able to learn to cast aside the prison of preconceptions that has been put upon us by the formal educational system, and the layers of “truths” that the so called “experts” and media have indoctrinated us with, with or without our consent.

For let us make a final simple and largely undeniable observation about these so called “experts.”

They are governing the world right now, advising government on all matters from economics to law and order, to how best to care for our health, but we see the chaos around us in virtually every field – the exploding crime statistics, the economic collapse in many countries, the worrying pollution, the unpredictable outbreak and appearance of diseases, which all shows that these “experts” are really not as expert as they seem, or need to be.

This does not of course mean we should disregard the genuine knowledge science has brought us, for example, about the nature of the universe, or the technology and medicines that have helped millions to be free of unduly hard labour or certain contagious diseases.

But in the psychological and sociological fields in particular – that is, the field of human relationships – we need above all to begin to think for ourselves, because this field is the one we are all obliged to deal with everyday, and so we *all* have to become experts in.

So the author is asking you to do what for many people will be a very hard thing – to think afresh, disregarding all the suggestions and “authorities” you may have heard so far, and simply assessing what is put before you on its own merit, as either of equal validity as that which you have heard so far, or else in fact as the author himself believes - a more discerning, complete and honest view.

Therefore in this chapter, we are asking you to consider as if for the first time, all that you have ever believed you understood about sex.

For already we have pointed out that the media society has encouraged women to take onboard ideas which may not be true for sizeable portions of the population, such as that the average man thinks about sex every fifteen seconds, or that oral sex is a good thing desired by and acceptable to men and women.

That is, to put it differently, all the authorities and so called experts in many instances may be like the courtiers in the *Emperor's New Clothes* fairytale, and we are saying that rather we must all be like the innocent young child who points out that the king is actually naked, when everyone else has been deceived, or is pretending and deluding themselves into thinking they also see these “finest clothes.”

So no more preamble, let us take up the case of *real life sex*.

Point number one must be that sex is rarely as good as it is portrayed or expected to be. As is often said, the journey is often more interesting and satisfying than arriving at the destination.

If there is any real satisfaction in sex it is surely not merely the physical sensation of pleasure during it which generally lasts for only a short time anyway, but the feeling of union and intimacy with the person we admire or love.

We see sex depicted in the movies as this glorious and wonderful thing, but unless it is with this wonderful person we love most times it can be an at least partially disappointing event, if not a total disaster.

The widespread existence of sex therapists proves that it is rarely the wondrous event that is portrayed in the movies, even with a genuinely loved partner, particularly after the initial thrill of being with the person whom we have so long desired has died away.

How sex experience is perceived by any individual however, can only be as related to *their habitual conscious state*.

That is, a man or woman who can play a musical instrument well, or is expert at some sport, may get a satisfaction out of those things far beyond than what they ever get from sex, but those who have few or no creative outlets other than this physical act will tend to regard its importance as far higher.

That is, the pig in the farmyard is content with farmyard food, and thrives on it, but the gourmet in the restaurant seeks out ever subtler gustatory delights with his or her finely tuned and discriminating sense of taste.

So it is really necessary to point out that we have different kinds of people in the world, some who will glory in sex just as some people will glory in eating a plateful of black forest gateaux or strawberries and cream, whereas others regard eating as mainly only a necessity, not to be dwelled upon, and certainly not to be sought out as an obsessive hobby and preoccupation.

No refined person can really glory in gross physical sensations such as food or sex, because they see it is such a temporary pleasure, *it has no lasting value*, just as children if allowed to do so will wallow in mountains of sweets, whereas few adults unless using food as an emotional comfort will do the same.

As we explained in the chapter on the true meaning of love, what *mature* adults really get satisfaction from is *intimacy* or "oneness" with a loved one, which can last even for hours with one person rather than the brief elusive moments of climax of the sex act.

Or even should we become truly mature people, such a state of being can be a lifelong experience of seeing the joy of life and feeling love everywhere we go for our fellow woman and man, and Nature in general, though this kind of permanent perspective, we feel to be likely only the province of true saints.

But as we pointed out when discussing Eric Berne's *Games People Play*, because most people are unable to arrive at a state of "game free" existence, where true intimacy with and trust of another person is possible, we find that they cannot get their "joy" this way and therefore can only find this sense of "freedom" in sex.

As Krishnamurti again points out, for most people it is only in the overpowering sensations of sex or even pain, that the ego temporarily vanishes, and that is why this sense of temporary "liberation" is so sought out by them via the sex act.

Logically therefore, we see that someone who is emotionally free and with few or no complexes is able to experience this intimacy with others in a whole variety of other ways, for example in musical performance or just a deep meaningful conversation, where each is exploring the other and him or herself, and perhaps thereby getting to a state of meaning or harmony that likely they can never achieve by the mere overpowering sensations of the sex act, which generally speaking is an act merely of *physical* union that leaves both parties asking afterwards - *how was it for you?*

In the sex act, people may briefly experience the joy of losing their tortured egotistical selves - that is forget all their problems, fears and identity concerns - but they generally must lose proper communication with *the other person* in that process, who also is likely being overpowered by sensations whilst inhabiting his or her own private mental world.

We do not wish to be rude or crude, but let us be somewhat graphic to make the point clear.

A man who is pounding away at his wife's flesh in the course of the sex act is really not thinking about anything much except for this sensation that is dominating his consciousness, and his overpowering need for relief.

Depending on her feelings about the man, and her sexual responsiveness, a woman may be thinking about any number of things, or even overpowered herself by physical sensations and hungering for some kind of union.

But as most *mentally balanced* women tend to report that what they like most of all is the hugging, embracing, and lying in one another's arms *afterwards*, again it points to the feelings of being wanted, desired and loved as paramount in women's minds.

However, due to the above mentioned inability of most men and many women to rid themselves of their psychological complexes, we find that many are locked into some kind of psychological games conducted through the sex act.

In particular, we have these themes of domination and submission, in which either party may wish to dominate and let us say "pleasurably torture" the other party, or rather be dominated and likewise have some combination of pain and pleasure inflicted on them temporarily overpowering and suspending their will.

Again, we see that even in torture there is this sense of freedom on the part of the person being tortured, because it temporarily blots out their sense of ego – all their usually weary and compulsive train of thoughts and worries - and this is why some people can even voluntarily request and submit to being whipped, because it gives them this same release from their everyday selves that only the relatively short duration of the sex act or else some powerful drug can ever give.

So for the same reason, we often see that drug use is found in the same people who indulge in the sadomasochistic practices. It is about a personality in pain that is using very powerful means to at least temporarily escape from itself and enter a land of “mental liberation.”

Of course powerful drugs are usually a much better route to escape than mere sex, but can wreck a person's whole life, and are therefore only sought out by people with fairly serious problems, which in some cases can be just in some vulnerable period in their life, such as right after being dumped by a boy or girlfriend.

Thus again we see, as will be explored further later, that we should structure society so as to avoid these harrowing relationship crises, where men or women are dumped by incompatible partners, having perhaps been used temporarily only for emotional comfort or sex, which need not be if young people are carefully guided only to partners who are more suitable for them.

But leaving drugs aside we see for example just from the behaviour of adolescents, that boys and girls who have formed an attachment to each other will chase and tease and hit each other, in these “*I'll get you*” type games of submission and domination, that therefore in their relationships with the opposite sex, men and women are typically really acting out a very primitive and childish psychology upon one another.

To be more sophisticated about it, men and women use the arena of sex to act out their psychological repressions.

Such well known “manuals” as *The Joy of Sex*, suggest this is a legitimate thing to do, to act out these inner fantasies of power and submission, like for example that portrayed by the silent movie heroine who is chained to the railway tracks as the train approaches, which is a very dark and grisly fantasy to say the least.

They are therefore suggesting this is some kind of valuable therapy, to free all these inner demons in the safety of a loving relationship between a woman and man, or in some cases even in a “swinging” or “group sex” environment.

The question is - are they right?

Firstly, we might ask – what's wrong with straight sex? Why are not a few positions and straightforward penetrative sex enough to satisfy both partners, which seems to be all the rest of the mammalian and primate species of the animal kingdom want to do?

There is this burning desire, a magnetic coming together, which we then satisfy by embracing one another and rubbing our private parts against another for a sufficient period of time, so why do we need all this paraphernalia of whips and chains, masks and hoods, and beating and torturing one another?

We shall answer this in a way you likely will not expect and have probably never heard before, because in a world that consults “experts” who produce a five hundred page thesis of complicated theories and findings, which only leave us *and likely them too* only ever more baffled, our solution is perhaps too simple and obvious, but therefore *constantly overlooked*.

The reason we are so compulsively indulging in fetishes, is because *we are having sex too much*, and therefore, straightforward sex no longer satisfies.

As to the specifics of why any particular individual has one fetish or another, is not really the issue, and pretty much a dead end.

Suffice it to say, that as in the classic scientific experiment of *Pavlov's Dogs*, in which a dog is eventually made to salivate at the sound of a bell by first being made to associate food with the bell, equally men and women can learn to associate certain objects, materials or scenarios with sex desire, so that their passion can be triggered and intensified by the mere suggestion or actual appearance of these things.

For example, to someone who has a shoe fetish, just mentioning the idea of high heels will be enough to start the process of excitation.

This is obviously a *hypnotic process*, and therefore in a sense dehumanising.

For does any of us really want to be made to salivate at the sound of a bell, when there is no food there, or likewise grow sexually excited by a woman taking a leather glove from her handbag or whatever who may pass us in the street, but whom otherwise we have not the slightest opportunity of ever dating and mating with?

These are clearly all forms of addiction, and overshadow the freedom of the lives of those who suffer from them, by obscuring more worthwhile things they could be doing with their time and energy, and frequently costing themselves a great deal of their money to furnish as with any other addictive habit.

For those who doubt the truth of the above statement – i.e. *obsessive fetishes obscure more worthwhile things* - let us give a few example.

For instance, suppose we ring a dentist with a severe toothache but he says he cannot help us because he has another appointment.

But the reality may be - *and this is serious as is your toothache* - he (or even she) may be in the grip of some addiction, and have to urgently attend “the rubber club” or whatever to be beaten or humiliated or play out some bizarre sexual and pain based games.

Or you may be married to such an obsessed man who is busy spending his free time and money going to a lady who will tie him up and beat or abuse him, when his time and money could be far better spent on buying some new furniture for your house or having a nice holiday abroad.

And the man himself – he might have become a great artist or musician, he might have learned to build his own house or properly service his own car, or fly a plane, or a thousand other things we feel could legitimately have given him a lot more satisfaction than being tied to a post by a woman dressed in leather or rubber and whipped.

So as we have said – the answer is not so much to try to psychoanalyse these fetishes blow by blow, or the psychology behind them.

It is to say – this is not really sane, and millions of men are doing it today who were never doing it before, and so why?

And the why is that *we have placed sex too high on our agenda*. We are shoving sex in the faces of everyone everywhere, and it is doing none of us any good at all.

That is, if sex were a rare event, to be hungered and longed for over many days and nights and then given to one another as a great gift, our desire would be so strong we would need no fetish to stimulate us.

The fetishes are growing due to three factors in particular.

Firstly, due to an unparalleled need to escape from a mechanised and regimented society, which creatively and physically blocks and controls us, and gives us little sense of freedom.

Secondly, due to the promotion of sex as the only legitimate publicly available means of such escape, apart from alcohol and tobacco, which in themselves are not generally sufficient to fully do the trick unless used to a dangerous extreme.

Thirdly, due to the fact that we are having *too much sex, too often*, and therefore, the desire is dulled, and it needs complicated scenarios and bizarre shocking experiences to bring the flagging desire properly to life.

That is, anyone who has ever camped out in the fresh air under the stars or even been genuinely hungry knows that in such a state the simplest meal, such as some plain soup and a few pieces of bread, seems like the greatest feast.

But when we sit in our comfortable houses and cosy armchairs with mountains of food in our freezers and refrigerators, having snacked half the day, and eaten when we are not even really hungry, we do not get any great satisfaction out of even the finest of gourmet meals.

We just guzzle it down, say “that was OK” and then get quickly back to our computer screens or TV sets.

So the same is true of sex.

Gopi Krishna, the Kashmiri kundalini yoga expert, pointed out that there was a tradition in India of a newly married couple being separated soon after the marriage by the wife returning for some time to her parents' home.

Whilst a modern Western man would likely go crazy under such an arrangement, we should perhaps consider if there is some wisdom in this practice.

That is, generally speaking there are a thousand "sex gurus" now giving advice on how to "rekindle the flame" or "get the spark of passion back."

But pornography and prostitution has proven one thing in this respect – the only thing that will reliably excite a man's flagging desire is *the presence of a new female to be partner to or look at.*

Pornography sells because "fresh meat" must be found to titillate men's flagging desire. It matters not how beautiful a girl or woman is – if a man sees enough of her his desire diminishes and eventually disappears.

There is perhaps a biological basis for this, in that once a man has seen a woman naked, and by implication likely *mated* with her, since he has accomplished his "biological mission" it makes sense that he should no longer feel such strong desire *for that female.*

So it is quite likely that women are not arguing with men's conscious minds, but with *hundreds of thousands of years* of evolutionary programming, and thus their efforts are generally doomed to failure.

Realising that their naked form no longer does it for their man, women therefore resort to a thousand tricks – all the sexy lingerie, all kinds of clothes, shoes and hairstyles to effectively one sees - *fool him into seeing her as a different woman.*

Or equally she can put on a new *personality*, for example, by transforming into a "dominant lover", using handcuffs, whips, sex aids or whatever, and again, *The Joy of Sex* fans and authors support all these tactics.

But we are saying – hang on – this is getting crazy, and it's getting desperate.

Women will laugh and joke to one another about all the clothes and sex toys at their *Ann Summers* sex merchandise party or its foreign equivalents, but actually there is often hiding underneath all the surface frivolity and fun *a very real desperation.*

The real truth may be that they are actually in competition with other women, or even the female prostitute, to give a man what he seems to want, and thus much of this merchandise she is paying for, not out of genuine desire, but out of fear that she will fail to please her man sexually, and therefore risk being deserted for another, while *Ann Summers* and all her disciples go laughing all the way to the bank by successfully exploiting, not women's true *desires*, but *their fears.*

For most women, even those who are considered beautiful, look into the mirror and find many faults with what they see.

They do not see “the goddess” which they hope their men do.

And it is true that once a woman lives with a man, he will see her sooner or later *as she really is*, first thing in the morning, makeupless, braless and as they say “warts and all.”

Not a great many women we would suggest are good looking enough to pass such a severe test with flying colours.

But in some ways most men are pretty dumb creatures, and they are satisfied with a lot less than many women imagine.

A woman may not have a gorgeous face, but a nice pair of breasts, legs or a shapely bottom is enough to excite a man *who has not had so much sex “forced upon him” that his natural desire is too dulled.*

And here we put it to you, is *the key*.

Any experience we have which we have too often – for example playing the same piece of music on our hi-fi over and over – will bore us eventually no matter how wonderful it originally seemed.

For if this were not so *we would stagnate, we would not progress*. We would not seek out new experiences and expand our horizons and our minds, and the human species would be in a sorry state or rather more likely by now extinct.

So instead of trying to stimulate a flagging desire with sophisticated, tiresome and sometimes bizarre techniques, the best policy would perhaps be as Gopi Krishna suggested - *to have some periods of separation apart.*

For example, if a man has not seen his wife naked for several days or even weeks he may well feel some freshness and genuine excitement in that rediscovery .

Just as if we visit a place or hear some music we have not heard or seen for sometime, it is *like the first time* once again, we see or hear it as new, with fresh and alive ears and eyes, and we appreciate it so much more than were it put before us everyday, which after a while we would likely not even bother to notice, listen to or look at.

It is put to you that this is in fact *the only way* to keep passion alive between a couple, because it is based on an undeniable psychological reality – that is, that people tire of the same sight, sound, taste or other sensory experience when it is presented them too frequently, time after time.

If women and men do not take this route, both parties – though more likely the man – are going to sooner or later find their satisfaction elsewhere – whether it is in pornography or visits to prostitutes or having relationship damaging affairs.

Or worse – a man may even leave his wife or long term partner, to start over again, until a few months or years down the line he also gets bored with his new “love”, as he inevitably will, rest assured, as both history and the throwaway never satisfying sex industry has proven.

So we are saying that women should resist this prompting from the media and peer pressure to become a “sex goddess” for their men, because they are only going to spend and tire themselves out, and in many cases these experiments may backfire, and a man may just mock or despise a woman’s desperate attempt to sexually please him.

That is – desperation and indignity is unattractive. A woman who throws herself at men is less attractive than one who seems a challenge and plays hard to get.

The same is true in the bedroom.

Whilst we do not wish to teach the art of enticement we are saying that a coy woman, who does not know if she even desires sex, is a thousand times more exciting than one who blatantly pulls her clothes aside and asks a man to get on as if he were going for a bicycle ride.

We are merely pointing out that for women to sexualise themselves by wearing tarty clothes and trying to learn exciting sex “tricks” is a desperate and undignified road to take which will likely fail in its goal in any case.

For most adult and mature men would simply prefer a woman who keeps herself clean, healthy and respectable and just acts tastefully with regard to dress and sex.

Above all it should be noted that men do not *stay* with “sex bombs” – they stay with and care about women who are friends to them, women whose company they enjoy, women who care about their thoughts and feelings, and also women who are not too clingy, because they have at least some life of their own independent of their relationship with him.

But if affairs are to be avoided, and relationships are to last, the suggestion here is that women must cease to put sex at the top of their agenda, or imagine that it is always at the top of men’s, and both partners should exercise some *space in their togetherness*, perhaps having periods apart (but *not having affairs with others in those periods*), to keep the freshness and mystery of and respect for one another going, and therefore have no need to descend into kinky sex practices, orgies and other unneeded and costly games.

Rather if men and women instead choose to develop themselves mentally and creatively, and learn to understand one others fears and anxieties and complexes through *intimate conversation*, both the burning desire for anxiety based sexual games of escape, and the need for such games should eventually disappear, resulting in a more fulfilling relationship, which may contain less frequent but more satisfying bouts of sex, based on the feelings of genuine love and respect the partners will then have for one another, when instead of becoming emotional and psychological punch bags for one another they will finally become *true friends*.

Chapter Four – the Genesis of Male Psychology – the hand that rocks the cradle

In the modern horror movie, *The Hand that Rocks the Cradle*, we find *Rebecca De Mornay* as a wronged nanny who is hell bent on vengeance against her employers, who have, little do they realise, caused her doctor husband's suicide due to an allegation the lady of the house made against him.

But we put it to you that in their role as mothers and child carers, women have an even more scary role, especially from the point of view of the young child who is totally incapable of resisting her god-like power in any way but by the protest of screaming or perhaps the unlikely rebellion of choosing to refuse to eat.

We are not trying to make out that women as mothers are all monsters, like the malevolent nanny in the movie, but we are definitely saying that as far as modern life is concerned -

the hand that rocks the cradle does indeed rule the world

Women are very frequently complaining and upset with men's immaturity, but tend to forget one thing – *likely the immature and somewhat worthless man you see before you is the creation (or mistake) of some woman or other.*

But it's no good blaming this other woman – *it's all his mother's fault for spoiling him* – because rest assured, once you ladies have your own little *male* "bundle of joy" the odds are about nine out of ten that you will do exactly the same too.

For if we watch most women with their *male* children, we see that they are thrilled, proud and excited that they have possession of this totally helpless creature, which they consider belongs to them - their "little darling" - who is of course more wonderful than any other child who has ever been born.

In this vain excitement, generally speaking a woman does not rationally consider nor understand the effect of the undue praise and indulgence which is heaped on the average little male child as it develops, and to her delight shows such undying devotion to its mother that she will surely never as reliably get from any adult man.

It is therefore not too difficult to kick a whinging man out of the family home, whose loyalties may always have seemed suspect, because this love between mother and male child is it seems one hundred percent reliable, and *real love*, not tainted by the average man's constant beastly sex demands and other irritating habits.

For she is like a sculptress with her creation, with absolute power over its development, or at least so she imagines.

Because, whether or not its father is present, likely she wishes to be the dominant power in this child's life, and will frequently prevent its sometimes jealous father - whose mother's focus of love he has likely lost to it - from applying discipline when he considers it misbehaves whereas she does not, or even if she does accept that some form of discipline is required, she tends to go about it in a very different way than does a man.

For a woman will tend to persuade and promise rewards to gain a child's cooperation - that is, use the carrot - whereas the average man will tend to just object to a child's behaviour in a direct "no nonsense" way, and is more likely to use the stick than the carrot.

Many women now proclaim with pride, under the persuasion of the "anti-child abuse" pressure groups - *I never hit my child* - but is this policy always really the wisdom it seems?

Let us take an example.

Suppose a woman is struggling with a misbehaving child in a supermarket, and no promise of sweets or persuasive words are getting it to respond as she desires, stressed as she is coping with the busy environment and heavily loaded shopping trolley.

It maybe starts screaming or knocking things off the shelves, which is apart from anything else very embarrassing to her - so what are her options?

All children will throw rebellious tantrums at some stage, often in the most inconvenient places, and this is really a very serious issue and "flashpoint", because if a child throws a tantrum and makes a stubborn rebellion every time it doesn't get its own way, surely this is creating a pattern that is a blueprint for its entire adult life.

For that child thereby grows up *uncorrected*, always accustomed to being able to get its own way if it protests and howls or begs enough, as its mother *gives in to get peace and relief*, and then the problem child become a problem adult and it is too late to do anything about it.

For example there are single parent mothers of children who go on night shifts, working their fingers to the bone, just to feed their layabout male child's drug habit.

And clearly when such a male youth has a slave for a mother, he is never going to be a responsible and considerate person in his own relationships with adult women.

More likely he is going to be a sex addict, a drug addict, an abuser of women to a greater or less extent, and likely also a criminal or gangster, because he has been not taught by her "justice" and "fair play", but rather has learned due to her over indulgence of him how to connive and bully to get his own way.

Understandably, feministic influenced women may at this point be howling -

Hang on, are you trying to blame women for everything that's wrong with men?

Well can we put it this way?

If *Van Gogh* paints a bad picture, or *Einstein* makes an arithmetical mistake, we are going to blame Van Gogh and Einstein aren't we?

So as women are *currently* the ruling force over male children, their "creator" effectively in the psychological sense, who on earth else are we supposed to blame if they turn out wrong?

Because typically when a father tries to impose discipline on a male child he is prevented by the woman – "*don't you dare raise a hand to my little darling*" - and we see this tendency of women to protect and defend *what is wrong* in male children persists throughout their whole lives.

A woman whose adult child has murdered someone is frequently in total denial about it. She says "*my wonderful little boy would never do such a thing*" even in the face of the most overwhelming evidence, like finding the dead person's body in his garage with his finger prints all over the murder weapon.

So why don't these women see sense? Why don't they give a misbehaving child a good smack – *when appropriate* – and stop it getting out of hand?

The reason is because the woman is *in love with the child*, she is infatuated with it, and has lost her objectivity.

The man however is not infatuated with it – he may be proud in a "*that's ma boy*" way, but he is not emotionally wallowing in its mere existence as a woman does.

Rather he sees calmly and objectively where these tendencies are going if not corrected, and firmly *stamped out* at an early age, but when she howls in protest at his efforts to stop the mischief, and *force* the child to behave in an orderly way, he gives up and sits on the sidelines as a spectator as she proceeds to make an emotional and psychological mess out of her child.

We see in adult life how many women will defend the criminal or otherwise antisocial behaviour of their men, just as they do with their children, and deny they do anything wrong.

A young vandal smashes a neighbour's window, and the mother says to the complaining neighbour "boys will be boys", without even an apology.

A case reported in a UK newspaper a few years back, was of a young child smashing a centuries old stain glass window in a church, to whom the priest in despair and anger gave the child a slap.

So what did the child then do?

Can you guess?

Did it say “sorry” to the priest for smashing up in moments perhaps his most prized possession in his sad and lonely life (he was a *Catholic* priest you see, and not allowed to marry) and take its punishment “like a man”?

Of course it did not – it went screaming to mummy about this nasty priest who had hit him, and this irate mother then came furiously to give *the priest* a telling off, and we must say in passing that in this crazy topsy turvy age, that perhaps the priest was lucky he did not have a case of child abuse levelled against him.

So now we have old men and women being beaten up by gangs of teenagers, put in hospital beds from which they pathetically stare out at us on a TV screen or a newspaper photograph, and we say “ain’t it awful” as we return to our dinner, but should we care to think even a little we see that these *abominations* only continue because no adult is allowed to raise a hand against these *little criminals*.

So is the author in outrage demanding it’s time to bring back the birch, and instigate without delay *hang ‘em and flog ‘em* policies?

No – what he is saying is that if at the critical stage of young children’s development they had imposed on them *firm and fair rules of discipline*, if necessary occasionally supported by either the threat of or actual carrying out of a timely physical slap, the juvenile vandal, delinquent and hospitalizer of male and female pensioners *would never appear*.

However once these young and not so young hooligans and thugs exist, as unfortunately they now do in their hundreds of thousands if not millions in every Western nation, society must certainly be protected from them, even if that means electronically tagging them and imposing curfews on them to stop them terrorising other adults and forcing them to cower inside their homes, scared to go out for fear of what these teenage and twenty-something thugs will do to them should they dare to show their faces in their own locality and venture out.

But nothing much is done about this, just as the mother does little about her wayward child, but rather continually makes excuses for it, because the prevailing force leading modern Western governments is of this same female “mothering” kind – in the UK for example, the government’s current administration of society is routinely referred to as “the nanny state”, which treats its citizens like children, and unfortunately also ensures that most of them *stay that way*.

Do you doubt that? Do you doubt that women are ruling the world?

It’s not what the feminist propaganda tells you, is it? It is always telling you, women are powerless, and the world is not fair on women, no matter how many new rights and jobs that men used to have which you ladies are awarded.

Let us look for example at the voting system.

Both in the US and the UK any party seeking election courts *the women’s vote*.

Why?

Because the truth is that women have got more votes than men, which can easily be seen in the UK.

Firstly, there are more adult women than men, because men's life expectancy is shorter, so statistically there must be more adult women voters than men.

Surprised? Nobody ever told you that?

Well, they wouldn't would they, because they don't want *men* to realise, that not only have they lost all their other rights – such as the right to have sex with their wife and see their own children, both of which “privileges” are now completely at the whim of women – but that because there are now more women voters than men they can effectively neutralise and render *impotent* the entire male vote, and simultaneously decide who gets elected by always holding the casting one.

No statistics seem to be easily available on this topic, but we would guess also due to men's generally apathetic and disempowered state and women's growing feeling of empowerment and desire for political involvement, that a far higher proportion of women than men actually *use* their vote, so that really now, every Western government is really elected *by women*.

And in the UK, by the first ever woman prime minister Mrs Thatcher's tactic of introducing a so called “poll tax” upon every occupant of a house, which millions of men refused to pay, at minimum several hundred thousand men deliberately absented themselves from the electoral register to avoid payment, *never to return*, and therefore *lost their right to vote*.

If we combine that, with the fact that the parties available, now do not represent traditional male views, such as the simultaneous destruction, again by Mrs Thatcher, of *real* trade union power in the UK in the 1980s, we find that even were men desiring to vote they no longer have a party to vote for, as the existing parties are gradually all becoming feminist havens, supporting “women liberating” policies, because all the vast majority of these “political representatives” desire is *to get re-elected*, which therefore inevitably requires they must have *the support of women*.

Hey presto – therefore – women not only now rule the roost in the domestic world of their family life, and kick the man out of the family home altogether if felt necessary, they elect male (or sometimes *female*, if available) puppets, who will put into place the political agenda they desire – which is of course, more jobs, rights and empowerment *for women*, and more tough laws to deal with uncooperative and misbehaving *men*.

For example again let us look at what happens to adult males if they politically protest, in a world in which a man is in fear of even touching his own children, and prevented by their mother in any case from disciplining them.

Even if he is engaged in a legal, peaceful protest, we see many times, some big burly policeman will come along and beat him senseless with a big stick, blood pouring out of his head, and tear gas spray him, handcuff him, and lock him in the back of a police van, or maybe now even torture him by firing into him the terminals of an electric "stun gun."

All this barbaric beating and torture of "misbehaving" adult *males* is allowed, but women and especially children, no man is allowed to touch.

Is there not some inconsistency here?

So we do not see women protesting about this unequal state of affairs against men, but why would they want to anyway, because it is women who are seeking liberation for themselves and not men?

And as we are writing a book about *women's liberation*, why should we care also?

Because really, there will be no true liberation for women, until there is also justice for men.

There will be no liberation for women, because until men are again allowed to discipline children in a fair and firm *non abusive* way, we will grow an unruly, out of control generation of male youths, who instead of growing to be responsible young gentlemen will instead turn out to be cheats, liars, bullies, unfaithful seducers and users of women, useless as fathers, and in the extreme cases, rapists, addicts, drug dealers criminals, molesters and savage beaters of old people, physically weak men, and women and children.

Can all that really be due to men being kicked out of their traditional disciplinary role in the home?

Well let's not argue about it. Let's just look at the soaring statistics for whatever kind of bad behaviour you wish to name.

The statistics for teenage pregnancies, vandalism, assault on and violence against the person, drug addiction, burglary, theft, rape, serious assaults and murders on old people, etc. etc. have since the early 1960s – when feminism began in a major way, and women got "liberated" and millions of one-parent families appeared – all gone through the roof.

If we draw a big graph showing statistics over the last forty years, and the red line on it says "crime statistics" and the blue line says "women's liberation" we will see that these lines run almost completely parallel.

Only someone in total denial of reality could question that these two issues – that is, women's so called "liberation" - which is really nothing of the kind except in the superficial sense - and bad behaviour of all kinds, are totally interrelated phenomena.

And unfortunately we see that this near total state of denial is what millions of modern women are in, especially the hardened feminists.

Please – do not for a moment imagine we are not for women's rights to a decent life, with freedom from fear of attack or molestation from men, freedom to earn their own living in the vast majority of occupations, and to have generally speaking the same human rights as men do.

All we are against is *the destruction of the traditional family and the destruction of men and children thereby.*

That is, the traditional family has *a man in it*, who is keeping order and protecting and imposing discipline under the children, which the too emotional and soft-hearted average woman will typically fail to do.

Because again, all we are saying is that mothers in general are acting with their male children under the slogan “my little boy will never be hurt by anything, he will be given the freedom to do anything he likes, and can do no wrong.”

She cannot *hurt him* by denying him *anything*.

But when millions of children grow up with that agenda – *I will have anything I want* – that brings us to societal chaos.

Because we *all* have to limit our desires to live peacefully and cooperatively with others or there is constant conflict, bullying, intimidation, war and crime, which any fool can see by looking at the media is *what we have got now*.

So in actuality to deny children the presence of fathers is actually to abuse them in the true sense.

That is, by not teaching them *at an early age* that they cannot always have everything they want, as that is uncivilised and unfair to others, we *make them* into addicts and criminals by default.

They end up drug and sex addicted or behind bars, in therapy, or “boot camp” or whatever, and the adult mother cries “what is wrong with him, that boy is no good!” when she herself has been his downfall, and likely without realising it has become *the mother of his conflict*.

We are now even seeing a rising generation of bullying, violent females, and again, though it is *never* admitted in the media, the obvious fact is that these girls become out of control and often able to threaten and physically dominate their own mothers *due to the absence of a man in the home to stop the mischief*.

How shameful it must be for a woman, who believes she has given her whole life to her sons or daughters, that as soon as they grow large enough as teenagers they can turn on her and physically dominate her and thereby rule the roost.

Can women please stop hiding from this shame and realise that they would be better having a man there to protect them and instil respect for them from their children, even if he has to say “don't you dare *ever* touch your mother again, or I will beat the living daylights out of you!” ?

Of course we are not suggesting remotely that any man should actually *do* the above, but if a mother – who surely should be the most respected person on the planet – is physically threatened by her children to whom she has given so much, surely at least a stern threat is legitimate in response to such savage and ungrateful behaviour?

And we suggest to you that millions of women, now cheated out of having a less than perfect but still extremely useful man in the home under the promptings of the feminist and “women’s liberation” agenda, would be so relieved and grateful for his protective and law enforcing presence once more.

For what is such a woman to do now, like the many we have seen on TV *Jerry Springer* type shows, who is being threatened and maybe even physically abused by her teenage daughters or sons?

Likely she will go to the doctor and get some *Prozac* or tranquilisers to help her cope, or go into therapy - all this, you see, when there is *actually nothing wrong with her*, except that she has been bullied into submission by her teenage horrors of either gender, whom she is too mentally or physically weak to sort out alone.

For seeing all these atrocious modern family horror stories before our eyes, as unveiled weekly on Jerry Springer and all its other cloned imitation shows, any sane person would baulk at the idea of having children at all, as we see many millions of Western men and women are in fact therefore now doing.

Yet we accept this chaos, we bury ourselves in our romance, or our favourite movie, or our glittering or not so glittering career, and our circle of friends who tell us they understand, sympathise and agree with us, as the drinks go down and the cigarettes are handed round.

We talk about the latest feel good “women’s issues” show, and the antics of *Brad* and *Jennifer*, or whomever else the media thrusts in our faces, to keep our minds off *the truth*.

And that truth is – our children are growing old but not wise, the happy adult life which we dreamed of as children is not becoming reality, and we are locked in a deadly battle with our children, our partners, our employers, employees or colleagues, with the hooligans and would-be muggers and rapists on the streets, and now even with strange people from foreign lands who seem to want to blow us all up, maybe on account of something our governments did to them, which we don’t really have the time or energy to fully investigate and understand.

We may hold jobs and homes and cars, but we don’t feel *peace*, we don’t feel *secure*, and all the media offers us, is not *solutions* to our problems, but ever more sophisticated escapes, just as the Roman society at its decline also descended into riotous living, sex orgies and crime, as we clearly are now doing the same.

The politicians we would wish to place trust in are likely not going to sort it out for us. How could we expect them to when each year they make decision upon decision which actually make things *worse*?

The government offers more nursery places for a woman's children, but does not offer her security as she travels to work on the tube or bus, in fear of being maimed or blown to pieces by a terrorist bomb.

And who then will look after your child?

But don't worry about it too much, because you are after all leaving your children in the hands of total strangers anyway for much of their young lives, though we admit you have been *forced* into this scenario by little do you realise - *the feminist agenda* - which though claiming to liberate women, has actually by kicking men out of the primary breadwinning role, *forced* millions of women to work and neglect their children involuntarily, which we know millions of women are both unhappy and guilty about.

So in the next chapter, we are going to try to help a lone woman with one or more children - we are going to try to be at least to some degree the man in her life, giving her the advice she likely will never otherwise receive or has never had.

For the fact is generally speaking, you ladies *do not* know how to raise male children, and the undeniable evidence is in all the crime and troubled youth statistics before your eyes.

Chapter Five - Raising the male child – *setting Truman free*

In the well known movie, *The Truman Show*, we see likeable comedy actor *Jim Carrey* in a serious role, struggling to find his identity as a man who has been deceived from birth into being the star of the ultimate TV soap opera and reality show – *since he does not even know he is in it* – living as a prisoner inside a giant film set, so large, that it is boasted to be the only manmade structure visible from space apart from the Great Wall of China.

Truman's father has been killed off in the script at an early age, fake drowned in a traumatic sailing incident, which was deliberately manufactured by the show's megalomaniac creator and director, *Christof*, to ensure that Truman is forever afraid of water, and therefore too scared to plan an escape which would forever finish the world famous soap that has made its director and the other cast members and producers – all of whom have *real lives* outside of the show – into very rich men and women indeed.

So we see Truman is a *one parent family* of a mother, who when his father breaks back into the cast against its directors wishes denies his father's very existence and lies to him about what he has seen, just as his onscreen "wife", *Meryl*, lies to him about who he is and why she is with him, which in truth is just because she has been written into the part and therefore made a rich woman and *success*.

But Truman's own life is mediocre.

He doesn't really love his onscreen wife, he knows somehow she doesn't really love him, and he dreams of exploring and escaping her and his imprisonment in the small town he lives in, to find both his father and the girl he really loved who has also been written out of the script, because she would likely have spilled the beans and explained to Truman about his fake life and true status as *a prisoner in a fake world*.

We have dwelt on The Truman Show story at length, because we feel it really is very much like *the real life* saga of millions of modern men.

He is trapped in a bullying, competitive, deceitful world, with a woman he likely does not love, having been rejected or cheated out of his *true love* by one means or another, doing a job he hates, which he is in fear of losing, and even his best friend he finds out is really nothing of the kind but is secretly betraying him, just as many men have also discovered in real life for example by such a so called "best friend" having run off with his girlfriend of wife, which all rumours and experience assure us is *a very common occurrence indeed*.

As the *Doctor Hook* song said:

When you're in love with a beautiful woman, you watch your friends.

Few men, except the rare noble ones, will hesitate to ditch a male friend when a desirable woman they want is at stake, and in the movie we find that it is Truman's own self-appointed father, *Christof*, who sees to it that he never gets his true love.

Christof plans Truman's entire life for him, right down to the career he ends up in and the girl he marries, and genuinely believes in his delusion that this total manipulation of Truman's life and deception of him is *love*.

Though the boy Truman wishes to be an explorer like his hero, *the great Magellan*, his teacher explains to him that he is "too late – there is really nothing left to explore", and his fake wife calls him irresponsible when he plans to go on a long journey away from the island he is trapped upon, and asks derisively "isn't having a baby enough of an adventure for you?"

For she knows that when she has his baby he is trapped for good, because as a responsible man Truman cannot therefore ever leave her, at least until the baby is grown up.

In the end however Truman finally discovers the deceit all around him, and though it almost costs him his life, he escapes and we assume eventually finds and reunites with the woman he loves.

We are going into some considerable detail with this movie, because we feel that it demonstrates very much not only the life, but *the mentality* of the average man.

He starts out seeing life as an adventure, he wants to do so much, but as the years go by he gets beaten down, made to feel small, then seduced or trapped into a marriage likely long before he would really wish – as we see happened even in the case of *Prince Charles* – and then his life is over in real terms, that is, in terms of the person he once dreamed of being.

Perhaps he wanted to be a doctor, an actor, a great artist or musician, or maybe even an astronaut or mountaineer.

But more likely he is stuck in sum humdrum office job, or driving a truck forever around the huge impersonal roads that join together the broken pieces of our western world, while his wife grumbles about money and his lack of care and attention for her, and maybe even his less than averagely sized sex organ, which incidentally you must realise is possessed by *fifty percent of all men minus one*.

We are here trying to establish a fact that most women do not really dwell upon nor hardly even consider – *most modern mens' lives are in the final analysis a worthless heap of trash*.

For when if like so many present day men - which is surely at least a minor form of mental illness - he goes off to some woman dressed in leather with a whip and boots who beats, insults and humiliates him, maybe even defecates or urinates on him and calls him a "pathetic nothing", "a worm", "a piece of garbage" – to put it politely – we have to accept sadly, that all too often *she speaks the truth*.

From the first day a boy goes to school he is in a competition he can never win.

He gets bullied, mocked, humiliated, beaten up, forced to compete with other children who are tougher, better looking, smarter or more confident than him, and though he was perhaps once the apple of his mother's eye, after enough of this sort of treatment he is likely never going to feel so confident and secure ever again.

A sober watching of the *Stanley Kubrick* movie, *Full Metal Jacket*, will – if she can bear to watch – give a woman a pretty good idea of the kind of depersonalization and dehumanization that is generally imposed on men, and that too from an early age.

However he has been treated by his mother at home, the dominant emotion in his life becomes not then *love*, but *fear*, and he spends most of his youth in this state of anxiety and insecurity, occasionally trying to shine at one thing or another amongst the throng of other aggressive competing boys and girls around him, but mostly fails and gets beaten back down until finally he gives up.

Of course, along the way, he meets a number of bullies, who typically try to threaten or bully him into submission, and if he acts wrongly towards when the odds are not in his favour, will definitely use the opportunity to beat him up. But being a boy, we think – well, you know – he just has to take his punishment like a man, this is surely just “par for the course.”

After his tears dry – though his many traumas do not generally ever heal - he somehow eventually finds *something* someone says he is at least mediocre at, and if he is lucky he finds at least one kind-hearted teacher who will say a good word about him, and then he tries to put his whole energy into that one thing, to try and win back his feeling of acceptance, confidence and self-worth, which he once got at least in some measure from his mother.

For as he matures he becomes aware of girls, for the attention of which there is an even more furious and competitive struggle going on than for the mere dubious praise of the teacher, and so he finds that he must somehow shine to gain their acceptance and favour also.

On leaving school and going to college or first entering work, he will quite likely long after having given up on the beautiful girl he once desired find that some less attractive but supportive girl will appear to “nurture him”, to soothe him in his pain and loneliness, and effectively therefore take over where his mother left off.

We would recommend to you the well-written *Andrew Gold* hit song *Lonely Boy* which sums up pretty well in terms of *feeling* such a young man's lot.

So do we think all this is OK?

Is that what you ladies wish your boy children to be – bullied, beaten, humiliated and made to feel like nothing by the school education system and their “peers”, until all that is left is a broken heap of male confusion, the tender pieces of which are picked up by some girl who likely doesn't deserve him, but in his insecurity and shame he believes to be the best he can get?

For we have seen countless men who choose a wife *far below them* in looks and intelligence, and even job status, and the reason for this is – *because inside them they are frightened little children, they are scarred, and grateful that even a plain or inferior woman will nurse and accept them and tend to their wounds.*

That is, you ladies, *or your parents' generation*, have created a race of psychologically immature and child-like men, who are unable to cope or deal with life without the presence of a supportive and dominating woman or girl.

But women on the whole have failed to realise that is *they* who have created these weak and confused men, especially since the days of “women's liberation”, for without question they have been the dominant influence on the development of young boys ever since, yet still imagine that the sorry and alternately feeble or violent specimen of modern male they find before them is just what men in general are naturally like and supposed to be.

But if we look at history, we find that *in the past*, most men were not like that at all.

Look at the heroic acts of the *hundreds of millions of men* who fought in the two great wars of the twentieth century for example, the great deeds of heroism and selflessness they carried out.

Millions of men walked directly into the jaws of death for their women, their children and their country, and in that process, millions of them truly died, even many of them still in their teens.

The *Kirk Douglas* movie *Spartacus* is a great favourite of men all over the planet, and though Kirk Douglas frequently played heroic but irresponsible womanizing roles, in this movie he actually played a genuine male hero, as his somewhat barbaric qualities were seen as justified in dealing with the oppressive Roman regime which had enslaved him, and as he was sold into slavery from early age, his only relationship was with the slave girl, *Varinia*, played by *Jean Simmons*, whom in the movie he meets when she is a servant at the gladiatorial training school.

Again, it is useful to elaborate on this movie, as it is clearly a role with which many millions of men identify with very deeply.

For *Spartacus* is a slave, as so many men now feel themselves to be, who is forced to fight even to the death with other slave men for the entertainment of the rich, just as the modern man is forced to compete for whatever enslaving job he can get, also while the rich profit from his labours and live the high life that is constantly thrust in his face by the TV celebrity gossip and glossy magazines.

He may at some point try to make an independent life for himself, by starting some kind of business, but few such businesses succeed, especially in this era of huge corporations and globalisation, when nobody wants to deal with an unknown but all the time wish to choose a well known brand name or company they rightly or wrongly believe they can trust.

Even a window cleaner, or a man who cares for other people's gardens, has got a degree of control over his life and freedom from direct orders given by some exploitative and uncaring boss which guarantees him some self-respect even if he does not get rich. But few modern men are now lucky enough to get into such a situation of comparative security and dignity.

Thus most now end up as only largely down-trodden slaves of some unscrupulous business or corporation, ever in fear of losing their jobs, and having to accept all kinds of unreasonable demands upon them, not especially in an effort to climb the greasy ladder of success, but merely to hang on to their likely lowly employed status.

For in the capitalist system, which applies just as much to and equally enslaves millions of *women*, there must always be a far larger number of *Indians* who do the "donkey work" than there are *chiefs* who give the orders and take the credit and the spoils.

And whilst the disempowered, emasculated "new man" is apparently grateful – just as we see the many obviously mentally disturbed modern men who are happy to be beaten, whipped and defecated upon – to be thus a slave in an cold, callous uncaring and dehumanising empire run by equally cold, callous and selfish beings – the *true-man*, who has not yet totally lost his masculine identity, is definitely not.

Rather, he is the modern *Spartacus* who wants to fight against and break free of this enslaving empire all over again.

When men worldwide defiantly join in the climax of the whole movie, which is the scene where the remnants of the defeated slave army all stand up to be counted and proclaim "*I am Spartacus*" in defence of the real one who has led them and gained their hearts, causing a tear to roll down Kirk Douglas's cheek, they really mean –

You greedy, enslaving globalising capitalist pigs – we are sick of you living high on the hog, abusing and dominating us all, and sending us off to fight in your needless wars to be maimed and slaughtered - we are not going to take it any more!

And we feel that this is the spirit of man that is sadly lacking in the world today, and thus the exploitation of the Third World for the benefit of the wealthy West, and the so called "war on terrorism" and other seemingly pointless wars rumble on. There is no *Spartacus* any more to object and put a stop to it.

So here, we need to debate something with you ladies in considering this issue of *how to raise a male child*, which is - just what is a man supposed to be after all?

For there are really only two options.

Either he is going to be a *Spartacus*, a mature strong man, not dependent on women's love and permanently attached to female apron strings, or he is going to be a little boy, forever in need of mummy's warm breasts and words of support and pats on the head.

And unfortunately, whether wittingly or not, we find that too many women are producing only *the second kind of man*.

Which is really no surprise, because just as a girl needs a woman as role model to teach her how to be a woman, a boy needs a man to teach him how to be a man, except there is no longer one there in the feminist-oriented family, or else his authority is gone over the boy, and his mother has taken over the boy's welfare and development, and then such a boy becomes not a "true-man", but a female-centred one, as to teach him to act and think like *herself* is logically all she knows how to do.

If we look at the incredible popularity of the recent male "superhero" series of movies, *Spiderman*, we see that this is what boys really want to become.

They do not wish to become emasculated child-care assistants with child slings around their necks, as many dominant modern women would have them be.

Because all we are really saying to women is that if they do not make their boy *strong*, which means not only physical capability, but above all *mental maturity and emotional resilience*, he is going to have a very sad, dehumanized and miserable life, as we have described above.

Truman's life in the movie would be a dream in comparison to what your average little boy is going to get under the current status quo, because unlike Truman, our real life little boy is not going to have some invisible benefactor to pull the strings for him who will see to it that everything turns out all right.

So we freely accept that if women do not truly care about the fate of their little boy as we have indicated above, and do not agree that he should be strong, independent and heroic, but instead think that for him to be ushered through life by a sequence of manipulating, dominant and cossetting women is just fine and dandy, obviously we are going to part company here philosophically speaking.

Thus the remainder of this chapter is only for those women who actually - with or more likely without the aid of a man - are going to see the wisdom of having a son who grows up to be strong, brave and confident, and therefore she may see, will sooner or later be very grateful to her, an asset to her, and supportive of her in her old age until her last dying breath.

In a doctor's waiting room was found a notice containing words of wisdom

Show a child hate, he learns hate

Show a child respect, he learns respect

Show a child impatience, he learns impatience

Show a child love, he learns love

And so on.

The point is that a child's mind is like sponge – it absorbs whatever it sees, *both good and bad*.

Especially when it is very young – that is, up to say the age of five, six or seven, we have to really show it total love, protection and care, to give it a feeling of security that will never die, whatever may later befall it on life's long and unpredictable journey.

We would argue that such full-time caring and attention *cannot* be given by a mother who is only part-time and must work for a living, because that most special relationship of love and trust cannot possibly be built by anything but her constant loving presence, and not by a figure who come and goes unexpectedly without warning, which can surely only lead to insecurity.

For we have witnessed or heard stories of children who scream when their mothers must leave, going off to work and leaving them with some child minder.

But little do women realise, that though this screaming after a while stops, a permanent trauma remains, as the child's mind hardens and schleroses under the strain of the betrayal, and this feeling of abandonment which cuts so deep at such an early age will likely remain with it for the rest of its entire life, causing problems no therapist nor treatment program will ever reach.

We urge women in the most serious terms, to not listen to the modern so called "parenting experts", who are only expressing immature theories in a society that is thoroughly deluded and constantly making efforts to batter square pegs into round holes.

Rather, we would suggest and hope that they listen to the wisdom of the ages, as for example expressed in the works of the various prophets and saints, and *some* more modern "gurus" such as Krishnamurti and Sufi saint, *Hazrat Inayat Khan*, who pointed out that we should beware of permitting *any* evil or dubious person *ever* being in close proximity to a young child, because at no other time in its life is so deep an impression made upon its sensitive mind.

Thus, for a woman to hand a young child to a babysitter or "childminder", other than a *very trusted* relative or immediate family member, is likely a disastrous step whose consequences she can never fully know.

She simply wakes up to the fact one day, that she has a somewhat disturbed and maladjusted teenager, but *does not know why*.

Therefore, she must be a true guardian angel to that child, protecting it from all harm, yet she must also not cease to apply *fair and firm* discipline as it grows and begins to understand, which if rightly carried out at an early age will become a routine part of its behaviour long after it has forgotten what she has done.

That is, the toddler stage child, which is starting to develop an independent will of its own must to some degree be trained like any other animal, before it is capable of reliably responding to reason and mere verbal requests.

With a young child, whose ego and wilfulness is growing, though it must be given freedom to safely explore, it must also respond promptly to the orders of its mother when asked to do reasonable things.

For example, if it is time to dress the child to go out, there cannot be allowed a screaming match to go on each time.

If the mother has handled the child properly, that is *if it is certain she loves it*, it will respond to her requests and disciplinary actions with respect, whereas a poorly brought up and mishandled child will be fighting her *reasonable requests* all the time, and as time goes by will grow into a rebellious teenager, by which stage it will be virtually impossible to modify the behaviour of.

And we must here point out a hard fact – we see that animals tend to take on the personalities of their owners and trainers – for instance, notice how a horse will respond well to a good rider or jockey – and thus any potential mother had first better take a good look at herself.

If she is an impatient person, desperate for a family, just as a device to leave home and live an independent life, she is undoubtedly going to produce a child who has got all her own confusions and faults.

For we can catch other people's psychological traits like a disease, even as adults.

For example, if we keep company long enough with others who swear or drink heavily, most of us if we persist with such contact will start to a lesser or greater extent take up those bad habits ourselves.

So when ever as adults we have to be careful to keep good company, lest the bad habits of others may drag us down, therefore so much more so must a child have sane and sober and patient influences around it.

In particular, women should resist the tendency to treat their male children like a little boy. For if we baby talk a little boy, and smother him with kisses and cuddles and compliments, *a little boy he will forever remain.*

Boys as they grow older do not need hugs and kisses and physical love, and arguably neither do girls, so it is suggested that women don't make the mistake of addicting him to it, or else he will not be able to survive without this kind of constant physical support from a woman, which as an adult, he may for long periods be forced to live without.

In this age of so called sexual equality, surely we want men to be at least *equal* in sense and maturity to women, so it is suggested that women talk to their male children just as soon as they can - *as an equal* - telling him (within limits) all her thoughts, dreams and fears, so that he grows to be an understanding person, instead of a confused little boy who always needs his mummy.

Women should observe also, that when a boy learns to be a good listener and an understanding person at such an early age, that too will stay with him all through his life, and will benefit him enormously in his relationships with adult women and even men.

Ladies should look out for a tendency to treat their male children like little darlings who can do no wrong, and on the other hand make tough demands on their girls to act responsibly.

Both genders should be expected to be responsible, but not *downtrodden*. They must just feel the invisible presence of gentle but safe limits on their freedom, but must also be aware of other serious barriers over which they are firmly not allowed to cross, for instance making vulgar or insulting remarks or exposing themselves in public.

It is also recommended that women avoid playing tickling and similar games with their young boy which may excite him unduly, as these pursuits will again tend to addict him both to physical excitement, and prepare him to be more physically and sexually fixated on women in adult life.

Rather it is likely better to do more developmental though enjoyable *activities* with a boy, such as playing games which exercise his mind and wits, whether board games like chess, or word games of various kinds, such as Scrabble or crosswords.

Equally any interest a lady has in art or music can be shared, though we would advise against steering him – unless he spontaneously shows a natural desire – into pursuits such as dancing, or other activities which might be regarded as unmasculine, since these would make tend to make him potentially into a target and object of mockery by other boys and girls.

Above all, we see, that the recipe here is, as he gradually matures for a lady *to become her boy child's best friend*, which will prepare him to be friends to all others in adult life, both men *and women*.

A lone woman should also see to it that her boy does some sport, and if she is herself capable of any, such as table or lawn tennis, or even some form of *non-aggressive* martial art, that would be a very good thing to share with him.

If not, a woman should encourage him to do these things perhaps with some male relative or friend *whom she can trust*.

If that person turns out to be an estranged partner, women should for the sake of their child not throw away that chance, as long as they are sure that their boy is safe with that person, regardless of any bitter feelings towards such an ex-partner.

For without getting paranoid about it, a woman must at all times realise there are dark forces around her, some close, most further away, which would seek to destroy this young and enlightened citizen and potential hero she is trying to raise.

Until the child is around ten, and starting to truly become its own person, she must watch like a hawk to protect it from these “abusers” of one kind or another, who are not likely so much physical abusers, but rather low-minded and envious people with cruel agendas, who may attempt in one way or another to distort or traumatise *the child's mind*, though in these current low-minded days, physical abuse is of course not out of the question.

We have to point out here, that possibly the main threats to a child's *true* development are in fact the nursery or school and the other children there.

There is a widespread attempt by the prevailing powers in general to try to socialise children at a very early age by throwing them into group nurseries and such like.

Women sometimes agree to this, because they fear that their child, especially if an only one, will fail to develop social skills and therefore may become isolated and bullied if they don't subject it to this kind of an environment.

We are rather saying however that this is an error of potentially enormous magnitude.

The child may have any kind of awful experience a woman may never even discover when it is out of her sight alone with these dubious people.

For in this largely self-centred and uncaring society, does she honestly think anyone else cares for her child as she does herself?

For example, using a hidden camera device, several middle class mothers of young children discovered that the childminders they so easily hire were abusing them, in one case almost shaking a defenceless infant to death as it refused to stop crying.

And moreover, the child who is pushed into the nursery at such an early age will feel an awful sense of desertion, or if it does not, perhaps due to the great trust it has learned for her based on her earlier behaviour, it may be surprised that she has unwittingly placed it into some kind of traumatic situation and take that as a trust breaking act of betrayal.

The civilised woman whom we assume to be the only class of female reader of this work, should remember that other children are on the whole almost little savages in comparison to those of a decent woman who carefully brings up her own child with a love they have never known, and thus her child must be protected from these little monsters until it grows to the stage where it can better take care of itself.

It is better that her boy has just a small number – perhaps even only one – local friend or friends - whose parents she well knows, and that this boy or girl friend child of theirs she knows to be well behaved – by for instance observing it for some time alone in *her own house*.

Rather than being forced prematurely into potentially traumatic and uncivilised nursery environments, where all the other children are aggressively competing with him for the attention of the few “group mothers” available, her child can gradually learn about the largely uncivilised and ever-warring world out there, by watching television and discussing the issues with her.

For instead of worrying that the child is lonely – it after all has *a loving caring mother* after all, so how lonely could it be? - she must realise, there are many avenues to success in life which do not require one to be a “social butterfly”, in a society we observe, which demands of children a regimented and corrupted conformism, but is afraid of them being true personalities and individuals, whom you see might actually “make a difference” and *change things for the better*.

For example, some children never play sports with others - though we don't recommend that – but instead obsess on some subject such as science, music or art, and thereby become a great expert in one of these fields, as we see in the lives of many geniuses throughout history.

Women must realise when raising their child, that the current society is the enemy of true freedom and happiness, which would necessitate the fostering of free-thinking and individuality, but rather seeks to make the individual boy or girl and for that matter adult, into a mindless, consuming cog and slave in the capitalist system.

It is suggested however, that should our little boy or girl show some unusual talent or obsession with some activity, we never attempt to *force* or too enthusiastically encourage such a pursuit, but just *support* or facilitate any natural inclination, which for all we know may be a passing phase or a lifelong pursuit as only time will tell.

It is of course also now desirable as we have said in these savage times, for a decent young boy to learn some kind of martial art, but the emphasis in this must be on friendliness and “sport” rather than aggressiveness, and only a martial arts teacher who also teaches morality and self-control like the “masters” in the *Kung Fu* series, should be allowed to be let loose on your child.

The important thing is merely to develop a *confidence* in his physical ability, which can then be an asset to him all through his life.

As we have said, above all a woman must show *patience* to her child, and thus we cannot see how she can hold down a full-time or even sometimes a demanding part-time job and simultaneously give this kind of fresh attention to a child, if she is too stressed out from work as well as trying to juggle all the other balls of modern life.

We well appreciate that the current system and lack of good relationships between men and women will make this kind of devotion difficult for her, but to every problem there is some kind of solution if we look at the possibilities with enough seriousness and flexibility.

As we have said, the biggest threat to the *true* development of a woman's child, which the media never tells her about, is not actually some hidden bogeyman, who is a comparatively rare event despite the media overkill, but the *school* she sends or permits her child to go to for so many important months and years of its primary developmental phases.

A woman must as carefully as possible choose a good school for her child, and by that we mean not one that is necessarily academically brilliant, but one which has an orderly atmosphere in its classrooms and a caring but sensible mentality in its teachers.

She should definitely sit in on classes in any school she considers sending her child to, for if they refuse her this right to observe, how on earth can she entrust her child to an environment she has never seen?

Any *reasonable* school would permit a mother to make this observation, perhaps for a morning or afternoon, and if they refuse, it is likely a sign that they *do not wish her to know* what is going on in those classrooms, which as likely as not nowadays is a chaotic undisciplined atmosphere of havoc, in which no child should ever be placed.

Again, we would suggest the right to use *mild physical discipline*, of the "ouch" variety by caring teachers, to restore order to classrooms, which you will appreciate need only be used on those who already are out of hand, and thus likely not on *her child*, which no doubt if she has followed the prescriptions given in this chapter, will be a very obedient, respectful and model one.

For instance, rather than just using physical force on a pupil without consultation, parents should be invited into the classroom – or even observe on a camera – how their child is behaving, and discussion between the teacher and parent can then take place on how to deal with the behaviour, which may culminate in either the parent imposing some discipline on the child, or in an extreme case, the child being expelled from the school if the teacher is not given permission to impose some kind of mild or effective discipline upon it.

But in their paranoid clamour to stop all physical discipline of children, labelling it all as "abuse", the feminists have overlooked the fact that physical discipline in schools has been mainly used – except of course when abused by bad sadistic teachers, who never should have been allowed to teach – *to protect the good children from the bad*.

That is, not only to *physically* protect the good children from the savage ones, but also to maintain an orderly atmosphere in which otherwise the teacher will be unable to teach, and a civilised woman's child will be unable to learn.

The other typically overlooked point, is that *good teachers* generally never need to use physical punishment, but *only* if they have *the option* to use it, and the children *know that*, and the same is true of children over the age of seven or likely at maximum ten, in the case of physical punishment in the home, which generally speaking should no longer be required *if the job of disciplining them at an early age has already been done rightly*.

Where parents will not cooperate with the school, children who are persistent offenders in classes should be taken out and have their problems thoroughly investigated, which in most cases we will find originate from the home.

But to be realistic, a woman has in the present either got to find a good school she approves, or alternatively *home-school* the child until it is old enough to take care of itself properly, possibly supported by those martial arts skills we have mentioned, as bullying amongst late teenagers is still a possibility both in the further education or working world, and though such skills should preferably not ever be used, the confidence gained by *the mere possession of them* is the issue here, and will deter the bullies from trying to push what is obviously a very confident person around.

A woman should use all the resources of information, including the Internet, and look for information on how to carry out home-schooling if felt the best option, and perhaps to some degree should connect and ally herself with other parents with the same views.

Another alternative would be to find a better location to live in, such as a more peaceful rural environment possessing an old fashioned type of “country school” with smaller class sizes, and having more caring and sane human beings as teachers.

Further understanding and instructions on the development of children can be found by reading J Krishnamurti's work *Education and the Significance of Life*.

At heart however, a woman must realise, that a child's real development ultimately depends on *her own*.

Thus inexperienced and immature young girls, who know little about life, should be prevented by social restriction and taboo from having children, until they have developed themselves more – for instance, by working or doing some kind of service in the community for a while – and have taken the necessary time and care to establish a proper relationship with a man who is a responsible person and will do his best to support her and any children she may have.

Then this awful nightmare of unhappy, neglected, abused, addicted and delinquent children might finally end.

Chapter Six – Evading the Beast - *how not to get raped*

We have already pointed out and explained why the male sex desire is considerable stronger than the female. For not only is it stronger, and even more *visibly* so, but it functions in a different way. That is, male arousal can be very sudden and quick.

Once he has that erection the average man could in theory have orgasm and ejaculation in a matter even of seconds, if he was sufficiently excited with what he saw or even with some mere suggestion or idea that was somehow arousing him.

As we have explained, many men and some women have fetishes of various kinds which can act like hypnotic triggers to sexually arouse them, and some of these triggers can seem bizarre to those who have not much immersed themselves in the sexual world for very long and even those who have.

We wish here to point out a very important piece of scientific experimental and psychological knowledge, which was that carried out by the Russian physiologist, *Ivan Pavlov*, around one hundred years ago.

His very simple and easy to follow experiment was an exercise in “conditioning.”

That is, he first trained one of any number of dogs to associate the appearance of food with the sound of a bell, which he caused to ring as their food appeared.

All animals including humans will salivate at the appearance of food, especially if they have not eaten for some time before.

However, his stroke of genius was that he then decided to see how the dogs would respond if he merely rang the bell, but *did not* introduce the food.

And what he found was that consistently the dogs would still salivate at the sound of the bell, regardless of the absence of any actual food to justify such a response.

He was thus able to make the dogs salivate at any time of day or night, *merely by ringing the bell alone*, without ever needing to give or show them any food.

It is very important for women and men to understand this experiment and the full implications of it.

For this is really a form of “hypnosis”, and it is something which if we are civilised human beings, we should *never* use on another person.

Because, put simply - was it really fair to those poor dogs to keep ringing that bell and making them hunger for the food that they were too dumb to realise was never coming, was it not against their *animal rights* to torture them so?

And if we say “yes” to that, is it equally fair to do the same to *human beings* - that is *women or men*?

So hoping that the reader agrees it certainly is *not*, there are really two issues here.

Unkind men use forms of hypnosis on women to get them to obey, and unkind women use differing forms of hypnosis on men, also to get men to obey.

In the case of men, false promises are used, which you see are forms of *suggestion*, or *make-believe*.

That is, a man who shows great interest in a woman and offers her enthusiastic words of love or worship - *which he actually does not mean* - is *suggesting to her* that what he says is true, is real.

And by *her desire to believe*, if she finds him handsome or attractive in various ways, especially if he appears to her to be of higher intelligence or status, and therefore likely perhaps outside of her usual ability to get, she has thereby really "hypnotised herself", or depending on how we interpret it, she has accepted his *hypnotic suggestion*.

Those who imagine that hypnosis is only something which occurs when someone lies on a couch with closed eyes and has "a hypnotist" slowly talk them into a trance, do not see that this is really a much more widespread and in fact daily phenomenon.

For let us be clear. We are saying that if someone tells you something, claiming it to be true, for example, they may say "there is a treasure chest of gold buried in your back garden", surely you will not simply believe them, you will want some *evidence* or *proof*?

But when an attractive, powerful and sophisticated man puts his arms around the average woman and whispers "sweet nothings" in her ear, all this rationality disappears.

But clearly, to believe that to jump hook, line and sinker into some kind of romantic fantasy which the TV dramas and novels falsely *suggest* is an OK route to having a relationship and *real*, is more likely than not an act of gross irrationality and sheer madness in which the most probable outcome is that a woman will get used and deceived.

But millions of Western girls and women every Friday or Saturday night get dressed up to the nines in their "glad rags", and paint their makeup on to go hunting for this fantasy of love, and if they get anything, ninety-nine percent of the time they are likely only to get *sex*, and sometimes of a brutal or sordid variety, which when they awake in the morning they will generally realise has not made them feel happy or loved, and they likely but for the influence of drink did not really even want.

And moreover, while a girl or lady is "under the influence" of drink, she is likely to believe even more lies than she would normally, which of course the equally inebriated man is even more willing to tell than he otherwise would be if in his "right" and sober mind.

In passing, we will just add that any *woman* in her right mind would choose a man more carefully than if she was buying a car or house or picking out and training for a career, rather than *as described above*.

So can not you ladies please see, how the way you are going about it currently is really very dangerous and wrong?

The other aspect of “hypnosis” applied by men to women, is that they use their intimidating physical presence or even threatening behaviour of some kind, to get women to cooperate with them *out of fear*.

There is no need for women to be ashamed of such an admission or acceptance that is true. We all, including men, tend to tread very carefully around very physically powerful and violent looking men, but again, the key here is to evade such men so carefully that they never get in a position to intimidate and therefore dominate.

This however many women do not do, but rather are magnetically drawn to a physically powerful and often violent man, whom they imagine will be their physical protector, and in the case of the less high-minded women they also imagine they can use to bully other men.

But the trouble with that way of thinking, is that if a woman puts her trust in this physically powerful and temperamental or violent man, who is going to be brave enough to protect her *from him*?

For example, there is the lady who went back to the hotel room of ex-world heavyweight championship boxer, Mike Tyson, and then cried rape, when he did what most powerful men in such a circumstance might very well do, though whether there was any *genuine consent* or not we shall likely never know.

But though Tyson was convicted, surely the *real problem* is that we have got a society that now thinks that it is OK for a girl who hardly knows a man to go back to his room with him on a first meeting or date.

So let us imagine that this boy and girl or man and woman who have really just met, have been in a night club or party drinking together, they have been embracing and kissing, and quite likely most men in that condition will have had an erection as soon as they have a close embrace with a woman they really desire.

So even before they get to his room *or even hers* together, she has on her hands what will almost definitely be *a very sexually excited man*.

Many men, especially though not only the young, are in such a situation not going to be able to rest or cool down again until they have had sexual relief, that is, by either having the sex act with her or another woman or by stimulating themselves to orgasm.

So from women we will generally find two typical responses to this situation.

The first kind of woman, and we suggest *the saner and wiser one*, will say “a woman or girl must be crazy to think she can agree to go back to a strange man's room, whom she has been kissing and fondling with, and imagine he will not expect her to go *all the way*.”

The second kind of woman however will just say – “we do not care how the woman has behaved, men have just got to control themselves and realise that *no* means *no*.”

And unfortunately this second type of lady is currently to be found in high places, broadcasting this immature theory of men to her “sisters” all the way down the line.

So if women follow the recommendation of the latter lady – *as so many women currently are doing* - they will surely have the right to get men convicted of rape on such occasions, as of course eventually happened in the Mike Tyson case, but what they will certainly *not* succeed in doing is *prevent women from getting raped in the first place*.

We put it to you that this second type of woman, the feministic type, who quite often does not even have sexual relationships with men, is so concerned with punishing and convicting men who have been accused of rape, that she is blind to the fact that such a policy of giving girls and women the freedom to put themselves in *compromising situations*, and expecting that they should be safe, is indeed getting some men convicted but is, we repeat, *not preventing women getting raped*.

Fortunately, women themselves, after countless attacks on them, some reported and some not, are finally but slowly waking up to this fact that it simply is not safe to tempt men and encourage them in these ways and expect them to be *capable* of controlling themselves.

In fact, in many cases, the only real factor that prevents many women from getting raped in situations like in clubs or parties where so much gratuitous drinking is involved is that, quite often, the men who would like to commit these undesired molestations are themselves too tired from drink and therefore *physically incapable* of the act.

But this is no certain means for women to be safe, for example some men may routinely stay sober at such gatherings in order to have their wits fully intact, with which they can carefully pick out their victims and manipulate and seduce them with maximum effect.

The reality is that it simply is not safe for any woman, unless in a private party amongst friends she has long known and is *certain* she can trust, to *ever* get so drunk that she may inadvertently encourage or tempt *any* man in such a way.

For as we have said, the issue here is of *hypnosis*.

When lonely single men or even sexually frustrated married ones – who may not be getting any cooperation from their wives in this respect – venture out onto the streets in any major Western city on a Friday or Saturday night, they now see the enticing spectacle of gangs of giggling and over friendly girls or women tottering on sexy high heeled shoes, with shorts skirts nearly up to their waists, bare backs and sometimes nearly full bosoms on display.

A man who has not had any sexual relief for days could get an erection even at the mere *sight* of such a likely semi-drunken gang of partially covered girls.

Fuelled by alcohol, many men will do a thousand things they would never otherwise do, as for that matter will many women.

But the trouble is, when one mixes this alcoholically mellow, warm atmosphere and the heady sight of half-naked glamorous women thronging in front of and around him, a man's desire may get to the point where it is very difficult to contain.

We hear recently in the media that some gangs of men in the UK have adopted a strategy of blocking off streets with cars at either end, and trapping women walking home from bars or night clubs and sexually attacking them.

So though these are only a small few genuinely criminal men, and we appreciate many women who gather in bars and nightclubs are quite legitimately seeking a mate, we are also saying, to adopt such a brazen sexual display in a modern society, full of men who were *always* of strong desire, but many of whom are now *sex-obsessed* due to media influences, pornography, and a generally frustrating and unfulfilled life, is not merely dangerous, but virtually insane.

For women are thereby putting men into a state of excitement that, although ninety percent of men will still be able to control themselves – *albeit often resentfully* – a very dangerous ten-percent may not, and there is not ever going to be any reliable way for women to tell *which kind of man is which*.

The observation that is so often mentioned in cases of rape against women is - *but he looked so normal, just like the average man in the street*.

Infamous British “Yorkshire Ripper”, Peter Sutcliffe, who murdered at least a dozen prostitutes, was a relatively handsome man who was a steady worker and apparently happily married to a wife, but this didn't stop him carrying out the most savage of crimes against women, and he had even been interviewed during the investigation by the police and let go without ever being regarded as a serious suspect.

So we are suggesting to you that any woman in her right mind will at minimum avoid any too serious entanglement with drink, unless she has very strong reasons for believing she is in a safe environment.

But even there she may be deluded or deceived.

For generally speaking, in *any* environment, even at a party with work colleagues, she cannot assume that the men who are so apparently civilised every day will not regard her very differently if she advertises herself in a sexual way.

As we have said, the viewing of a woman's exposed long and slender legs, or the contours revealed by her tight dress of well formed hips, thighs or breasts, which is all the typical kind of modern "party dress", may bring out "the beast" in any man, even one whom she has known *as a colleague or "friend"* for years, and feels she is completely safe with.

By putting on such an unaccustomed display, she is really pressing his buttons in a hypnotic fashion, which may cause his animal instincts to come to the surface, overpowering his normally civilised and self-controlled façade.

But unfortunately women revel in such "hypnotic control" over men, who are in a very real sense "salivating" like the dog at the ringing of the bell, even though quite likely *no food is on offer*.

So as a man travels round his daily environment, for example, in a mixed sex workplace such as an office, or even in a crowded street, he is constantly assaulted by all these kind of hypnotic sexual symbols.

We are going to be very straightforward and simple about it so that every woman may clearly know.

High heels excite. Flat ones don't.

Bare legs and particularly dark shades of stockings excite. Covered legs – *unless in tight trousers or jeans* – don't.

Tight dresses showing the contours of the torso, bottom and breasts excite. Loose and less clingy dresses don't.

Bare backs, shoulders, or exposed cleavage excites. All these areas when covered up do not.

Protruding, erect or "perky" nipples visible under clothes excite. Invisible ones don't.

Painted lips and finger and toe nails excite. Unpainted ones don't.

Partially or wholly bare feet generally excite men as do almost any other exposed parts of women's anatomy, apart from probably the head and hands, as long as no nail varnish or extravagant makeup is used.

Equally, certain hairstyles can be exciting - long flowing hair is considered generally more exciting than short, as is blonde or red hair as opposed to darker colours. Any very ornate and sophisticated styling of hair can also be exciting, such as to *some* men, an adult woman with a pony tail or pigtails gives a "naughty little girl" kind of message out, *whether she thinks she is doing so or not*.

So although practically all of the above, and more, must be obvious to most women, we are saying, although perhaps not in so many words, these “tricks” and choices are obvious to men also.

That is, all the “pro-sexy” choices, stated first in each case above, are taken as hypnotic signals by men, which in some cases, they may be literally *powerless* to do anything about.

Now, if women are going to blame men for this, we would like to ask where is the woman who has not got *one single bad habit* which she feels powerless to overcome?

It could be eating chocolate, smoking, or fiddling with her hair, or nowadays even gambling, drugs, alcohol or *self-harming*.

Or even is she is drug free it could be a habit of worrying, shopping, talking compulsively or judging and criticizing others, which again, she feels is so ingrained she seems to be unable to *consciously* control or give up.

For example countless modern women have got into huge amounts of debt, unable to control their spending habits.

We *all* have got something, which has become *no longer in our conscious control*, we have been doing it so long.

So if *learned* behaviours like smoking, can be so hard to give up, how can women say that the overt sight of a woman's *uncovered* sexuality which is buried in his biological nature and psyche at least a million years deep can be always within his control?

For we assure you most gravely, in *no man*, but a true saint, is sexual desire *ever* under such firm control.

If you have heard stories *even from men* that suggest different, unless they have some kind of physical problem that is causing their lack of desire or functioning, they are all fantasies and lies.

This situation is not seen clearly because of men's own extreme hypocrisy about sex, which accuses other men of having some uncontrollable desire *whilst they do not*.

For we see, the real and somewhat sinister truth here is that – men only want *themselves* to have the right to sex, and not *other men*.

They want to keep a big secret the extent of *their own* powerful fantasies and sexual desires and activity, whilst condemning other men as weak animals for thinking and doing *the very same thing*.

It is a very simple and animalistic hypocrisy they are carrying out, which is clearly based on the concept – sex is a right and OK thing *for them*, but a wrong and not OK weakness *in other men*.

Perhaps you ladies are not aware of this game that is happening amongst men of pretending to one another they are too civilised to be thinking about and engaging in sex, but the point is, that you should not be fooled that *any man* is above these kinds of desires, and we put it to you that women in general therefore should not for example take their intimate personal medical problems to a male doctor where avoidable, but only to a female one.

Unless of course she is a lesbian, and therefore could be taking undue advantage of your uncovered or embarrassed state for similar reasons.

Especially if you are a very attractive woman, is it asking an awful lot from *any man* that he control himself if you have to undress for him for a medical examination, unless there are other females present who can thereby ensure that he does not become too tempted.

We do not wish to overstate the case here, as there are surely millions of good hearted male doctors and surgeons who would not ever dream of taking advantage of a patient in such a way, but we are just suggesting that women understand that even a seventy year old man can feel desire at the sight of a beautiful sixteen year old or thirty year old woman, and that is *reality*, whether we like it or not, and therefore both men and women should be *modest* in their sexual behaviour, and hide their darker animal desires behind a very well constructed code of civilised behaviour.

Because at the end of the day, it is not what men *think* that it the issue, it is what they are driven by temptation to *do*.

So the obviously sane and sensible way to go, is to place as little temptation before men as possible, so that in due time, men will seldom even *think* these thoughts.

And do we really need to repeat – *this is the very opposite of what women and society are doing to men right now?*

And part of this trouble is that in a woman's – we are suggesting *dangerous* and *misguided* – attempts to look and *feel* sexy and desirable, the messages she is sending out attract not merely the men she would wish to have respond to them, but *men in general*.

Thus the lady in the office who wears high heels and sexy clothing to attract one of her male colleagues, may wish the signals she is transmitting to be received *only by him*, but she ignores the fact that unwittingly she is also exciting every other male in the office, likely including the door man she sees every morning and the janitor whose territory she may unwittingly wander into on some vague errand some day.

For a woman who bends down in front of a man in a tight or short skirt, perhaps to reach a filing cabinet draw or low shelf, is showing him an image of sexuality that at least half a million years of evolutionary programming have designed him to associate with the onset of sexual activity.

Just like any dog we see in the park he sees a female rear pointing up in the air only a matter of feet in front of him as a signal to mate.

And unfortunately countless modern women are just revelling in this power to hypnotise men, without thinking realistically what he is going to do with this desire, when he is getting in so many places.

From the long shelves full of “girly” magazines in the newspaper seller’s shop or stall, to the huge billboards also now showing even naked women - in their effort to gain his attention *via shock* - all the TV shows and movies, where boy meets girl in reel one, and by reel two or three – that is, within an hour of *his* time - they are having sex; and finally by the deluge of pornography available on the Internet, that seems to pop up even in the unlikeliest places, should he be so strong willed in any case to try to avoid it, which predictably millions of modern men when so continuously tempted will not.

Before the 1960s, pornography was hard for any man to get, and was probably mostly a rich man’s pursuit, but now all any man has to do is click on some piece of junk mail he never asked for which somehow has got into his inbox.

And then with one click *he is there*.

He is in a “paradise” full of naked women who seem to be unceasingly desiring of and willingly offering him sex, which as he well knows, is *very, very far* from the experience he has of women *in real life*, unless he is some famous stud celebrity or multi-millionaire who can “sweep a woman off her feet” and into his bed by dazzling her with a glamorous lifestyle which promises her all the luxuries, grandeur and “high life” of which she has ever dreamed.

This, combined with all the TV sex, is all too much temptation on men, and stoking up his desire to the level of a furnace, which in the final analysis does him no good, and just makes men in general more of a danger to the *real life* women they meet.

But the governments of the world do little to stop all this, under one excuse or another, with the result that in the UK we have recently had a fourteen year old boy raping four girls who were *all under twelve years of age*.

We are saying something very simple, which alas women – not realising how powerful men’s desire really is, and unrealistically imagining it can easily be controlled like their own – neglect to their own peril and that of their female children.

We simple *cannot* have an environment in which sexual ideas and signals are constantly fed into the minds of boys and men and have anything but a dangerous society for women and young girls, whom if this over-stimulation of the male continues, will be ever more and unceasingly at risk of sexual attack.

The feminists in particular seem to be failing to acknowledge man has a very powerful, very easily and quickly arousable sex desire, which once stimulated is then hard to extinguish, and when stimulated unduly in millions of men in so many countless ways, as we have said is needlessly and dangerously *putting women at risk* as well as young girls who in their inexperience and naivety may be much easier prey.

The widespread stimulation of this desire is *not in men's hands*, and the widespread depiction and encouragement of *woman as sex object*, which includes the showing of such series as *Sex in the City*, is continually presenting to men the idea of woman as a delectable fantasy creature to be hunted and taken like an animal - not as *a human being to respected*.

And we must say, women in general's own unduly provocative behaviour is doing the very same, regardless of any additional media stimulation.

That is, if women want to be free from the fear of rape, they must not only avoid dressing in a way that stimulates men's sex desire unduly, they must prevent other women from doing the same.

For by example condemning the women who use their bodies to making a living, appearing naked in men's magazines etc, or even stripping on stage for "respectable" drama roles, whereas we know in truth that the latter is really a desperate strategy to "get bottoms on seats", just as is the case with so many TV dramas and movies in their endless quest for ratings.

The slogans used by women in encouraging other women to use their bodies – even as prostitutes – such as "if you've got it girl, flaunt it" - women have got to start realising are just causing the disrespect and abuse of the entire female gender.

If men *knew* that their was *no expectation* of sex on their first, second or even twentieth date, they would not you see *prior to the date* fantasize in such a manner that could eventually lead to a "date rape."

Just as we have seen so many times depicted this idea that a boy's mission is to try to have sex with a girl on "prom night", the suggestion is that at least *some girls* will be willing, which must be based on *the true real life behaviour* of some young women.

So this has got to stop, because the lesser proportion of promiscuous girls who will give their virginity away at prom night, or even earlier, are putting *all women and girls everywhere* at risk, just as a few sightings of gold on a mountain, will have thousands of prospectors giving up their whole former careers and deserting their families and wives in a wild-eyed *hunt for gold*.

For that is what sex is in the minds of young men, and a good many not so young ones also – it is *like huge nuggets of pure gold, the greatest treasure*.

So the rumours of "gold in them ther' hills" have got to be quashed for good.

Then the "prospectors" will stay loyal to their families and accept a normal life and steady job which gives them a *realistic* means to security.

This overpowering desire of men has to be “managed”, and that way is not by supercharging it with pornography, TV sex, and a working and social environment filled with sexily dressed and provocative women, but by establishing a social system in which the vast majority of men will be guaranteed suitable female partners, and by putting sex much further down society's agenda, so that it will not constantly be on mens' minds.

This is not merely some suggestion or demand by an authoritarian puritan who wishes to frustrate anybody's fun – it is surely the *only* way to organise society so that virtually the entire population of women and girls can be safe.

Or please tell me – have our governments got some policy we have not yet heard about to *guarantee* women will not get raped?

Of course not – they are only concerned with *punishment* of offenders, for whom they daily build more prisons, but never with a sensible realistic policy of *prevention of the crime*, which *we have just given*, without a doubt.

But many women will now we know resist this – because it means *women behaving themselves and ceasing to “wind men up”* and “tease and please.”

Well, it is up to you ladies! You can either have *security* or *fun*, but not *both*.

It really is up to you!

For the only sensible policy instead of encouraging teen sex, is that young boys and girls must learn to be like *Dawson* and *Joey Potter* out of *Dawson's Creek*.

They can be best friends, learn to care about each other and enjoy each other's company, but if they even get to kissing or embracing before the time they would commit to one another as life partners, really if anything beyond the innocent holding of hands takes place, we can rest assured that *sex is on the way*.

And then we just continue this chaotic society, where relationships have little commitment in them, and women are seen as sexually available, morally loose, and hence disrespected and raped, and neither girls nor boys get the chance to *grow up* in a thousand other ways, which are really necessary for them to become properly members of adult society and mature enough to cope with *a committed relationship which includes sex*.

But again, we are in general seeing the exact opposite of this thinking, which is obsessing young mens' minds with desires which are just prematurely preoccupying them and ruining their lives, as equally do they become a threat to women and girls.

For example, in the clever movie *Pleasantville* we see a modern girl who gets caught up in a 1950s soap opera and sexually educates her onscreen mother who has never had an orgasm.

But by the next reel, we are seeing this same middle-aged mother, who was previously a highly respected and irreproachable member of her community, being cornered by a gang of teenage boys sexually desiring and menacing her, who have seen a portrait of her naked in her new lover's front shop window.

This same *tease* is *exactly* what women in their millions are now doing to boys and men of all ages, and as we have said, the abuse, disrespect and rape of women is the inevitable result, and we have seen in the news a good number of cases of even middle-aged women being gang raped by groups of young men which confirm this.

It is also interesting to note that British "Yorkshire Ripper" Peter Sutcliffe, who murdered so many women, almost all prostitutes, did not actually rape any.

His goal was not *sexual*, it was *hate* for these women whom he disapproved of in such an extreme fashion, who were *brazenly offering their bodies*.

Whilst few men are like him in his extremes, all men have experienced at least *some* of that feeling of resentment when confronted by the teasing and sexually provocative girls or women whom they can't have, and often mockingly let them know so.

Whereas if women behaved "respectably" – that is, didn't flaunt themselves in front of men, or put themselves in dangerous isolated situations - which we accept could also be dangerous in some cases, regardless of behaviour or dress - the crime of *rape* would virtually disappear overnight in the entire Western world.

This does not mean that women would have to wear the veil like Muslims or whomever, but that they could choose to dress *nicely*, without being a tease, for example, like the Indian women have done traditionally, in elegant *saris* and comfortable sandals.

Then instead of having men hungering after their bodies, like a ravenous pack of *Pavlov's dogs*, women might finally get the love, respect and loyalty from men they have so longer wished for, but seldom in this so called age of "women's liberation" ever truly had.

Chapter Seven – Choosing a mate – *finding your man*

We are not going to pretend here that we can give advice that will definitely enable every woman to find a man, but what we can do is help women decide better what it is they should be looking for, in order that their relationships may be happier and longer lasting ones.

In her autobiography Irma Kurtz, a long term writer for *Cosmopolitan* magazine, stated her agenda in this regard, which was *to look for a man to reform*.

This of course makes the assumption that men are inferior creatures who need women's guidance and support.

As we discussed earlier however, in the chapter on raising male children, there are really two distinct kinds of men out there who have been raised by women who have two very different agendas – a relatively immature type, who theoretically fits Irma Kurtz's agenda, and a relatively mature type, who will in fact likely find her agenda downright offensive, because if he is really mature he is always busy in the process of developing and reforming *himself*.

The second man is therefore our *Truman* type, who above all seeks freedom and to be his own person, and therefore does not want his life run by anybody, let alone the woman he loves and perhaps hopes someday to marry.

His definition of love is something like that described in chapter one of this work, and therefore dominating and manipulative “game playing” behaviours coming from a woman will be deeply resented by him, as they will be seen as unwanted efforts to control him and barriers upon his freedom.

This clearly makes him hard to catch, but if a woman can successfully manage to gain *his* attention and loyalty, his idealistic nature will likely give her a loyalty and security which she will never get with the more immature classes of man.

We wish to expand on this concept of “type” more, because it is necessary to be clearer about this issue of “compatibility”, as so many men and women in the West so often come quickly together, but sadly just as often are as quickly parted again.

Whatever we think of “religion” or “spirituality” it is suggested that women use a simple system of determining the inclinations and motivations of men and women, and therefore *their compatibility*, contained in the most revered Hindu scripture, *the Bhagavad-Gita*, in which four fundamental types of people are distinguished, based on three elemental qualities which may be loosely translated as *spirituality*, *desire*, and *dullness*.

If a woman does not feel any “religious” or “spiritual” inclinations it is suggested she substitute the term “idealism” for “spirituality” as we talking of *mentalities*, not of *belief systems*.

There are then mathematically speaking four types possible, as *spirituality* and *dullness* are by nature incompatible qualities:

1. *spirituality* dominates, *desire* is secondary
2. *desire* dominates, *spirituality* is secondary
3. *desire* dominates, *dullness* is secondary
4. *dullness* dominates, *desire* is secondary

These groups are obviously broad categories to place a huge spectrum of human beings into, but the point here is determining *the predominant quality*.

For example, if a *type 1* woman marries a *type 2* man, she is focussed mainly on spirituality, whereas he is focussed mainly on desire. That suggests he will wish to impose sensual desires on her against her wishes and so there will be conflict or disharmony in the relationship.

Similarly, her focus on spirituality will probably irritate him, so he will become discontent with her also, and possibly seek an extra-marital affair, which when she discovers it may terminate the relationship, especially as spirituality and therefore honesty is so important to her.

Or again, let us suppose that a *type 1* man, marries a *type 2* woman.

Equally his focus on spirituality is likely to annoy her – she will desire him to be out doing ambitious and active pursuits, when he desires solitude and meditation, and she may wish for him to be more sexually focussed, and in that respect she will be unhappy with him also.

He will be unhappy with what he may consider her needless material pursuits for the luxuries and pleasures of life, which he considers relatively valueless in his spiritual quest. In this case, it is likely that she will become the frustrated party who has the extra-marital affairs, but either way, this relationship cannot be held as satisfactory.

So these two examples show that men and women whose basic philosophical tendencies do not match, will not likely have a successful relationship, and these differences will become even more pronounced and troublesome should children appear.

So the awareness of these types we suggest can help a lady more sensible choose someone with whom she is compatible, because not only may she find herself divorced and alone if she overlooks this issue, but she may also find that if she has had children to this unsuitable partner, they will also be the victims of this situation, caught up in a needless and traumatic war between two parents who now both hate *each other*, but whom individually these children still love.

This issue of *compatibility* has been emphasized deliberation because we see that many modern women in particular, are under the kind of agenda suggested by Irma Kurtz, selecting and accepting a man who is “beneath them” in a genetic and evolutionary sense.

That is, a noble lady who is idealistic and sensitive in nature, and likely more intellectually developed than most average women, should not choose a more animalistic man as she is now under pressure to do, due to the corrupting influences coming from the media, which encourage her to worship *the animal* in man, rather than his ethical or moral qualities.

For if we explore further Irma Kurtz's agenda, we can see more clearly how this is really a damaging and futile manoeuvre that so many women are being conned into taking, which it is suggest to you can never have a happy outcome.

The basis of Irma Kurtz's agenda was, let us remind ourselves:

What a woman is really looking for, is a man to reform.

This starts out with the assumption that woman is the superior sex, and that man is an immature creature whom she has to mother and tame and civilise.

This illusion has become to a large extent true, because women – especially when no father is around – by failing to provide correct discipline, make boys into irresponsible woman-hungry and confused creatures, who in adult life are hypnotically attracted to the same kind of dominant woman to whom they then impetuously submit, at least for a while.

Shall we put it simpler?

Boys are deliberately raised by women in a spoiling manner, which ensures that they never grow to be real men. Then women complain that all men are boys, and so Irma Kurtz comes along telling them *that is how men are* and that they should be looking for one to reform.

But then there are the relatively small number of men who have actually been raised by a *truly* caring and understanding mother, who did not traumatise them, and teaches them in such a way that they will grow to be their own person, and not forever *dependent* and attached to her apron strings, and when the vast majority of women *currently* meet such a man who can stand on his own two feet, and doesn't need to cry to his "mama" they think he is some kind of aberration and reject him.

That is, women currently reject the civilised and decent men, and accept the immature types they can mother and manipulate, with whom they can carry on perpetuating Irma Kurtz's slogan, which thereby becomes a "self fulfilling prophecy" - *men are immature, and we women should in our kindness find one to teach and reform.*

For when a woman meets such a mature, emotionally controlled man, she will find that he does not easily roll over and gratefully let her tickle his tummy, like most of the other man-dogs she has well met.

She may rather find him at first sight somewhat surly and uncooperative and amongst the mass of suitors that the typical attractive and intelligent woman will find herself accosted by, she may misinterpret this behaviour as lack of interest and reject him.

This uncooperative behaviour of such men is not however because he is ill mannered by nature, it is because, like *Truman*, his goal in life is freedom, and he is thus very resistant to women's attempts to seduce and enslave him.

Again, this failure to easily manipulate him and wrap him round her little finger based on her sexual power alone, she may even possibly misinterpret as him being gay, because likely she has never met such resistance from a man before, and therefore will scarcely believe it exists.

Again, however, she would be mistaken, it is simply that this kind of man does not wish to advertise his sexuality or for that matter his *love*, on his sleeve.

Due to the fact that he also has a self-respect, which tends to be sadly lacking in most of the current male population, he also will not be happy about carrying out the typically humiliating competing and to a large degree begging, that is generally necessary to get dates with women nowadays.

Especially if his requests are rejected, after a few such experiences, even if he is an intelligent, brave and handsome man, he may well give up *permanently* trying to acquire a mate, as to him, his self-respect is more important than even having a mate.

Women in general are not aware – because the media does not tell them - that there literally millions of good looking and intelligent Western men who *currently* do not have female partners, and likely never will, such as the aforementioned *Sir Jimmy Saville*, whom though he has never explained his reasons fully, we can assume has not married due to this generally unavoidable humiliation which most modern men are obliged to endure in acquiring a mate, which of course, quite frequently also includes very serious physical threats or even attacks from other males.

Women in general should also be aware, that by the toleration of this animalistic competition amongst men, they are actually encouraging and prospering the violent types of men in society in general.

Most civilised men will hesitate to use violence, and may thereby be deterred and bullied out of relationships with women, in a society and legal justice system that no longer reliably protects them, even though such intimidation is emphatically against the law, and not the behaviour of men in a *civilised society*, which obviously this one largely is not.

So here we come to the subject of “arranged marriages”, which most modern women reject.

That is, we are telling you quite straightforwardly, the reason that like *Bridget Jones*, you have likely either got no satisfactory relationship, or have already had your fingers burned by having a relationship with the wrong man which has likely not lasted, is that you have been conned into picking the wrong kind of man, and into accepting the kind of mating and dating process which leads you to him, and not to the man whom had you been given the chance, you would have found true compatibility with and who would have loved you in a loyal and long-lasting way.

The major part of this con which has been placed upon women is that they have been persuaded during the feminist era to change their loyalty from *their family*, to *their "friends"*, just as the mother has been persuaded that her place is not with her child, but in the office or other workplace.

Many TV shows, like the ubiquitous *Friends* and of course our old "friend", *Sex in the City*, celebrate this culture of the "liberated" working and independent women, who have exchanged family for *colleagues and friends*, a theme which was perhaps first thoroughly explored in the UK by a BBC drama series in the 1960s, called *Take Three Girls*, which starred well known British actress *Joanna Lumley*, who later became famous as *Avengers* girl, *Purdie*, and more recently as the zany character, *Patsy*, in the women's comedy series, *Absolutely Fabulous*.

If we look at the *Friends* series in particular, we see portrayed this mixed bunch of men and women – or should be say *boys and girls* – who are presented to us as the modern ideal, and approximate the social life that can be found in any mixed sex office, hospital or similar workplace, which statistically is where most modern men and women are now going to find their mate, rather than by family connections as used to happen in the older, more traditional societies and cultures.

Unfortunately however, though this culture of mixed sex workplaces creates opportunities to date and mate, and therefore find a relationship, it also gives equal opportunities to have affairs, which would then tend to destroy these same relationships, as seen for example in the *Bridget Jones* movie, where Bridget hovers in her loyalties between the charming but unreliable rogue played by *Hugh Grant*, and the tolerant and idealistic lawyer played by *Colin Firth*.

We must report however, that a real life *Mr Darcy*, who came from an era when brides were expected to be virgins, would likely not accept such a betrayal as carried out by Bridget in "sleeping with the enemy", Hugh Grant, a fact that women in their growing "sexual freedom" do not seem to fully appreciate.

Again, though we accept that this movie is not really intended to be anything but an entertaining romantic comedy drama, we feel obliged to point out that real life sexual betrayals will generally lead to a resentment or even fury on the part of the "wronged party", whether it be man or woman, which will quite likely destroy that relationship *permanently* in any real sense.

For how can we have a worthwhile relationship which is not based on *trust*, which once broken, can rarely if ever be fully restored?

The psychological reality is that we feel *if he or she has done it once, he or she can do it again*.

And looking at the reality of these mixed sex workplace scenarios, as depicted in *Friends*, we have already quoted in the Dr Hook song:

When you're in love with a beautiful woman, you watch your friends.

And surely this applies to women equally so.

Will a woman's "friends" really still be her friends, if there is a man at stake whom they all want?

In the *Friends* TV series, all the women are portrayed as caring, sharing and forgiving, but do these largely principled and loving characters represent the real life "friends" and colleagues that most of you ladies have?

It is clear from the antics of celebrities alone, that this is rarely the case.

We see that despite the glamorous and glossy appearances, Hollywood is actually a super-competitive egotistical place, in which come Oscar night, one lucky winner gets to smile or cry tears and declare their undying love for humanity and all their fellow actresses and actors everywhere, whereas the *losing* lady nominees have to put on a well-practised smile, which some not so occasionally carry out with gritted teeth.

We would like very much to witness the tears and fury of some of these ladies who have been beaten to the throne and podium by others whom they believe they on merit outshine, but let us rather refrain from such voyeuristic tendencies and content ourselves with a safe guess.

Equally the reality of office life that any honest and experienced woman knows, is that there are all sorts of "bitchy" competitive games going on, which seek to lift some women's egos up, and simultaneously thereby put others down.

For example, if we look at the world of TV news presenters, we are aware that there is often a fierce egotistical competition going on, as hinted at in the opening sequence of the movie *Groundhog Day*, to become anchorman or woman, and this general newsroom rivalry and bitchiness was perhaps more clearly portrayed in the satirical award winning UK comedy series, *Drop the Dead Donkey*, though was perhaps somewhat less realistically and bitingly explored in the 1987 rather too fluffy and romantic American movie, *Broadcast News*.

Clearly, this kind of intrigue and scandal saturated workplace is the rule rather than the exception, and we put it to you that therefore, this trust you place in your *friends*, which we see women in general are being brainwashed into accepting as normal and the status quo, is very much an unsafe and misplaced one.

Any woman – though we cannot believe there are many, unless they have led a *very* sheltered life – who doubts the veracity of a man's point of view on this issue, should read some of *The Power of Beauty* by feminist authoress *Nancy Friday*, which clearly delineates the cruelty perpetrated *by woman against woman*, in the less than "sugar and spice and all things nice" inter-female world.

In this connection, but still with direct regard to the problem of finding a mate, we wish to point out a syndrome, that many times is coming between a woman and the man she might "live happily ever after" with.

Most girls and women, particularly if their "love lives" are not going well, or they are still relatively young and have not yet found a proper love, will take solace in some kind of group of friends, and especially a particular and most special *best friend*.

Because of their deeper emotionality and sensitivity, these friendships between women tend to be valued and clinged to by them much more than the equivalent “best buddy” friendships of men.

Thus, gradually a scenario can emerge in which this special relationship between the two women or girls can become central to their lives, to a large extent substituting entirely for the relationship that Nature would have them partake with men, by which they are enabled to have children and evolve and perpetuate the human species.

As forming relationships with a desired partner are not easy for either sex, a girl or woman can keep turning to this best friend who supports her, and offers her “love” and sympathy for her relationship failures and disappointments, and develop a kind of “it’s you and me against the world, babe” mentality.

Typically again, unlike *Sex in the City*, in which we see the unrealistic and improbable scenario of four beautiful or near beautiful girls all being best friends, in *real life*, we tend to see that a more attractive or even beautiful girl will tend to have as a best friend, a less glamorous and spectacular one.

Both the attractive and the less attractive girl in such relationships should both be honest and realise what is going on, for such clingy relationships can sometimes transform even into lesbianism, especially under the media encouragement, which shows girls kissing even in soap operas, and now full-blown nude sex scenes in supposedly “respectable” TV dramas like the 1999 *Tipping the Velvet*, featuring top draw actresses like British *Anna Chancellor* of *Four Weddings and a Funeral* fame, and the equally or even more beautiful *Keeley Hawes*, who amongst other things played the leading female role in the recent polished BBC spy drama series, *Spooks*.

We are deliberately pointing out that the finest, classiest and most beautiful British actresses were used in this “lesbian drama” to make this lesbian sex seem a really beautiful and wonderful experience, whereas we know that in real life, most real sex between either men or women is not a terribly nice thing to watch or witness, which if we think about it, the participants involved seldom do themselves.

Thus, we are seeing here some very powerful and persuasive images of “sisters doing it for themselves”, and we ask, is this propaganda a justifiable thing to present on national TV, which may be tempting thousands or even millions of young and not so young women and girls, many still uncertain and insecure about their sexual feelings, into lesbian relationships which they might not otherwise *naturally* ever seek?

We do not wish to condemn lesbian practices amongst those women, who for whatever reason feel *naturally* inclined to them, but is it really fair to seduce heterosexual girls into doing these things, just as some equally uncertain and inexperienced young boys are tricked, seduced or bullied into having homosexual relationships with men?

That is the *acceptance* by society of those so inclined to have *the right* to same sex relationships is one thing, but *the deliberate promotion* of these lifestyles by the national and even governmentally financed media to the vast majority of people who are heterosexual is surely quite another.

And whilst *in theory*, we “straight” men might be happy if ninety-five percent of the male population was gay, which would effectively make the rest of the world’s women into a harem for the remaining likely very worn out few percent of heterosexual males, surely the problem for the lesbian woman is that she is going to have great difficulty in accomplishing her primary biological mission of *having children*, if she follows such a sexual agenda, which incidentally, if discovered will likely make any straight man deeply suspicious of her on a permanent basis.

That is, how can a man possibly feel secure, if he believes his woman is likely to kick him out of her bed and replace him with *another woman*?

And we have to be honest in saying, in fairness to women, that the same *sinking feeling* is quite likely to happen to a wife who sooner or later discovers that her husband is gay, who therefore in fairness should never have married such a “straight” woman in the first place.

So women are free to do what they wish, but men will also be free to refuse to accept that, and should their wives or girlfriends turn to other women in such a sexual way, it is certain that many will not.

Because after all, these relationships are not merely about sex, they are about *trust, loyalty* and *intimacy*.

It is a sad but realistic fact of life that any kind of “threesome” is not going to last.

In the movie, *Basic Instinct*, we see one such “lesbian love triangle”, in which *Sharon Stone*’s lesbian lover eventually tries to kill her sexual rival, *Michael Douglas*, but dies in a car chase with him.

If we look at real life, the implications of such a lesbian relationship are much more serious and complex, as effectively there is a battle going on between a man and woman for the attention, affection and loyalty of the same woman, which obviously is going to create a very bitter and vitriolic hostility between them, partly because many lesbian women also hate men in general, as no doubt a lesser number of men despise lesbian women.

So therefore we see that lesbianism, except amongst women who have no inclinations to have a man, is a threat not only to men, but to *the traditional family*, which it seems this feministically inclined society is intent on destroying, but they do not see nor apparently care that this destruction is at the expense not only of men, but *of the child*, who typically whether boy or girl *wants a father in his or her life*, regardless of what the feminists may believe he or she should think or want.

But this is somewhat a side issue. Here we are mainly concerned not with a lesbian relationship, but with what happens when two girls or women who cling to one another for support, mutual acceptance and comfort find a man enters their life.

That is, quite likely, statistically speaking, it will be the more attractive girl who is accosted by many suitors, rather than the less attractive one.

And we put it to you, that quite often, the more attractive girl will be blocked through her loyalty from having many a relationship by the lesser one.

Because this special relationship between them has become too important, especially to the lesser girl, who basks in the reflection of the beautiful and confident girl whom she can likely never be, and will feel like nothing without.

So this really becomes a game of emotional blackmail upon the more attractive girl, who in any case may be insecure in confronting this scary relationship with a man whom she really desires, but does not know if she can actually get, and she too may cling to the lesser attractive girl, and turn to her for advice in how to handle this man.

But the advice given by the lesser girl is often poor advice, and may very likely have the hidden purpose of blocking the relationship, as she may deeply resent this man who wants to take her beautiful friend away from her, and destroy this beautiful friendship she has.

Any adult who has had relationships and friendships for long enough, knows that though sometimes intimate relationship and close friendships can seem the most liberating and wonderful thing, at other times they can be a great burden and seem like a prison, in which one party of the other feels trapped but desperately wants to break free, yet they are torn by guilt, often under the duress of these kind of subtle games of psychological blackmail.

And the dilemma for the desired girl whose Prince Charming is waiting in the wings is – should she exchange the security of her long established friendship with her beloved girlfriend, for the uncertain and scary new offer with a man, whom though she may desire, also feels to be somewhat threatening and beyond her control?

After all, she has heard all these awful stories about the beastly behaviour of men, beating women up and raping them, and so on, so surely it is better to play safe, and stick with her reliable and faithful friend, and wait for “a better opportunity.”

But brave and decent men will not wait for ever, and after a due period of time, even the most devoted and worthy of Prince Charmings will *move on*, and then she may well have lost the love of her life *permanently*.

It may not of course simply be one particular best friend, but a sensitive girl or woman may well feel herself imprisoned by this “peer pressure” and feeling of loyalty to a “sisterhood” from having a relationship with the man *she desires*, but whom the rest of her group or circle do not approve of, and due to this barrier she has placed around herself, equally the man may find *no way in*.

She may very well set Prince Charming a “labour of Hercules” that he is not big enough to overcome.

And then as we have said in quoting *Jimi Hendrix* in his beautiful and dreamy song, *The Wind Cries Mary*, we will end up with a scenario something like:

*Somewhere a queen is weeping
Somewhere a king has no wife*

We should also point out that the lesser girl in the friendship may have some other hidden motives, which the frequently naïve beautiful girl may not have noticed, or just be too trusting and *nice* to believe.

Such as, due to the fact that a very attractive or beautiful girl will be accosted by many male suitors, the lesser girl may use this as an opportunity to acquire men, and surreptitiously or even openly take the men for herself, who were originally attracted by the beautiful one, as typically the lesser girl is a lot less fussy about the amount of resistance she will put up in acquiring a man she desires.

Thus a pretty, “Snow White” type girl, can be tricked by a wicked witch type girl who is posing as her best friend, not only from getting the man of her dreams, but into actually having this Mr Wonderful stolen by her.

We have seen in real life, that these girl-girl friendships, however long they may have lasted, and however young they may have begun, can be quickly and even permanently finished, when a *Snow White* girl finally wakes up to what is being done to her, which sadly in some cases has been found to take *a very long time*.

But we are not so much trying to condemn the lesser girl who uses a prettier, more “crowd pulling” friend in this way, but to point out to her that she too is losing her chance by this means, as well as the honesty in her closest friendship.

For while she spends her life fooling around with and clinging to her glamorous best friend, she too fails to find a man who would accept her, as they are always falling for Snow White, whereas if she focussed on making the best of herself rather than resenting her relative lack of god-given conventionally good looks, she might find her prospects are far better than she imagines.

For example, should she open her eyes clearly, and stop looking at the world through a blinding and deceptive haze of resentment and envy, she may notice that a very large number of successful, attractive and intelligent men *do not* choose a beauty queen to marry or even have as a girlfriend.

Many men for instance, do not want the hassle and anxiety of having a beauty on their arm, who attracts too much attention and envy from other men, which is difficult even for the most self-controlled and secure man to sometimes endure.

Equally, if a man is sick or has had an accident, he would much rather have a woman who is a trained nurse or doctor, rather than some dizzy and curvaceous sex bomb, who though exciting in bed, may not even be able to successfully apply a sticking plaster without almost murdering her man.

For at the end of the day, when the sex is over, or a man has become blasé about the sight of even the most beautiful woman's naked body – which we assure you inevitably happens due to familiarity - he is left with a *human being* at the other side of the breakfast table, and he wants this person to be fun, entertaining, witty, intelligent, kind and a good partner and friend, and you will notice that nowhere on this list is there demanded that she necessarily be *beautiful*.

She must be reasonable *attractive*, but again, we see that “conventional attractiveness” is not at all a standardized quality and is perceived very differently by very many different types of men.

As the age old saying rightly goes:

Beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

So we now feel we have detailed sufficiently in basic fashion the kinds of mischief that are currently going on in the dating and mating game, since woman has really rejected her parental family, who generally still care about her above all others at least in a long lasting way, and exchanged them for a set of dubious colleagues and friends who may have all sorts of hidden agendas, which do not necessarily have her best interests at heart.

We have also pointed out that at the basis of much of this intrigue and deceit that goes on, is the envy of the plainer women for the more beautiful, and how that may motivate them to take various forms of revenge, some of which may result in blocking the beauty from ever getting happiness and true love, which if we consider it, is more or less what happened to Princess Diana, whose life story and psychology we shall explore later, though we are arguing that in her case, in a sense, *she mostly blocked herself*.

We are also pointing out that the more average women, mainly by undue envy of the beauty of other women - which history proves has often been more of a curse than a blessing, for example in the case of *Marilyn Monroe* - are frequently blocking themselves from having a relationship with a suitable man whom they may want.

Surely, such women could *legitimately* use a Snow White type girl who is their friend in this regard by being *honest* with her.

For could not such a more average girl say, painful as it may be:

“Listen, Gorgeous One, I want to tell you the truth – which is, though I do love and care about you, I have to confess to my shame that I have always been somewhat jealous of you.

But I feel our friendship to be real, must be based on truth, and thus I must be honest with you. I fear that as I am not as beautiful or desirable as you, I may never find a man I want.

But as you attract men so easily, will you help me please, will you let me use your beauty to draw men into our company, who may then see me for the worthwhile human being I am, yet may not otherwise ever bother to take a look?"

And if the gorgeous one is a real friend, her heart will swell with love and forgiveness, and she will say "Of course, my dear friend. That is nothing to me."

For quite likely, many men will approach the gorgeous one, who do not meet her particular specifications and likely exacting standards, whom the lesser girl however will see as *the man of her dreams*.

And then, the lesser girl can with gladness let the gorgeous one go and find her Prince Charming, and all will live as they say *happily ever after*.

But due to the difficulty of meeting a *compatible and suitable person* under the modern systems of meeting the opposite sex, we recommend that women should campaign for, or actually in some fashion themselves re-create a properly organised introduction system, somewhat like the old fashioned arranged marriages.

For this would bypass not only all these intrigues and deceitful competitive games, but would also stop women from losing the opportunity of meeting and partnering the current millions of single unattached men, who are either currently bullied out of the mating game by jealous rival and violent men, or else have stoically refused to accept any more humiliation or rejection from women, many of whom think that it is now a sport and fun thing to treat men humiliatingly and callously in the dating and courtship process, whereas these self-contained men do not, and in many cases, will not *ever* agree to having their self-respect so seriously compromised in the long term.

Such a system of organised introductions would have at its core the value system based and therefore "philosophically matched" *compatibility* issue, so that incompatible partners would not *ever* meet, and thus few or no tragedies caused by misconceived relationships between mismatched types of people would ever occur.

Equally, such a widespread system of organised mating and dating rituals between men and women would radically reduce violence against women *inside* relationships, and give women freedom to walk the streets in security and free from fear of attack, because the millions of men who are currently without a girlfriend or wife would generally have one, or else be aware of a standardized and socially accepted means of attaining one, and therefore not be so sexually frustrated nor lonely that they are forced to take desperate measure to try to acquire a sex or life partner.

This process could be partly aided and facilitated also by the re-introduction of some kind of formalised structure and system of "go betweens", who could be used to establish introductions to parties whose families or immediate circle may not know each other.

For let us just give one last example of how easily a woman's potential relationship can be destroyed by a jealous "friend."

WOMAN A TO WOMAN B at a party on in a bar: "I really like the look of that guy, you know – *Mr Wonderful* – across the room. I wonder if he likes me too?"

WOMAN B TO WOMAN A: "Oh, I know all about *him*. He is married with five children, and there are even rumours he is a bigamist with several wives who don't even know about one another. Added to that, he is flat broke, his business went bust last year, he has a serious gambling habit and worst of all is rumoured to be HIV positive. Forget all about *him*, darling."

And trusting *Woman A* thanks *Woman B* profusely for saving her from such an awful fate and mistake she was about to make, as she believes this completely fabricated pile of nonsense because it comes from *a trusted friend*.

After *Woman A* has gone home to bed, *Woman B* accosts *Mr Wonderful* as he returns from the men's room. She places her hand on his thigh and smiles seductively.

In the course of her seduction of him, she discovers he is a wealthy heart surgeon whose girlfriend has just died of cancer, and she pours out waves of sympathy to him and takes him to bed the very same night, to "comfort him for his loss" in his hour of need.

As the wedding bells ring and she is about to drive off to her honeymoon destination with him, her "best friend", *Woman A*, whom *Woman B* somehow forgot to invite, has stumbled on the wedding by accident and calls out desperately as the limousine is about to drive off "but I thought you said he was married with five kids and HIV???"

And *woman B* replies – "Oh, I am so sorry darling - that was so *silly* of me - I obviously must have got him mixed up with *someone else*. *Au revoir*."

Apart from the fact that likely we imagine that the "A" in *Woman A*, is for *angel*, and the "B" in *Woman B*, stands for *bitch*, need we say any more?

We are just saying - please ladies, wake up to the truth of your relationships, be realistic and honest with one another and your men – as of course men must be also – and then *very soon*, we can all find a true mate, friend and partner, and have as the *Free* song *Wishing Well* said, *love and a peaceful world*.

Chapter Eight – Keeping Mr Wonderful – *how to live with your man*

In the previous chapter, we addressed the problem of *selecting* and *connecting with* a suitable man, but in the current one we will investigate that far tougher problem – how to keep him and yourself happy and hang onto him, and not have this relationship hurtle headlong into yet another disastrous divorce statistic.

We have perhaps not been clear enough about the issue of whether men and women should actually *formally* marry or not.

We are well aware that millions of established couples evade this step nowadays - almost “religiously”, we might ironically observe - because they feel that things are going nicely as it stands, and to put their hopefully deep feelings and commitment for one another in terms of some kind of legal document and meaningless public ritual is to on the one hand trivialise it, and on the other hand to “tempt fate”, as once married, they can obviously again thereby become divorced.

But by *not* marrying in the formal way, what is it that they are really saying to each other?

Surely they are saying – *why spoil a good thing, which works all right for the moment, but neither of us can guarantee will last?*

i.e. let us keep our options open.

There are other subtle issues in this question also, for example, that generally women take the name of their husband, whereas if they stay unmarried they keep their own.

Because modern women are generally *working women* also, and are frequently caught up in various other legal situations which their ancestors never were, such as driving a car, owning property, having a bank account and travelling abroad, this change of name issue has become quite a sizeable one.

We also note that many famous and celebrity women understandably want to keep their own names, because these famous names are really *a commercial brand*, and even locally well known woman such as lady doctors or solicitors have a name to protect so understandably may not wish to change it to a man's.

But then, there is no definite necessity for a woman to give up her name just because she gets married, surely both parties can keep their original birth name, but the issue certainly does become problematic when children appear.

For example, when such a lady writes a sick note for her child, what is she going to sign herself as?

And who is the child going to be named after in any case, if its parents do not share a common name?

Perhaps the answer is to have a double-barrelled one, combining both parents' names, which some aristocratic people of course do, but surely that is going to get a little cumbersome, if that child meets *another* partner with a double-barrelled name in the next generation.

So we see the whole thing is ridiculous, and really not fair on the child.

Surely, major celebrities apart, it's not *what* we are called that matters, but *who and what we are*.

If a lady doctor gets married, and she is obliged to change her name from Smith to Jones, who cares? Her patients will soon get used to it.

If she is a brain surgeon with an international reputation, that is obviously another matter. But that situation really does not apply to many women or men.

In our worship and constant awareness of celebrities, we sometimes forget that they are only really an infinitesimal fraction of our whole population – just a few thousand out of *billions* - but due to this incredible television set we have in the corner of our rooms they loom large in our lives, as if they were almost our relatives or best friends, and the way such celebrities will get accosted in the street by people who in fact are total strangers *to them*, is a measure of how we all feel we somehow *own* them, a feeling which incidentally a good number of them do not welcome nor reciprocate.

The Beatles and the rest surely in some sense *do* belong to us all, because in a very real sense, collectively speaking *we made them*, and it is suggested that all celebrities and even politicians and big businessmen and women should remember the same.

Without us, they are *nothing*. They are only on their pedestals because *we put them there*.

And neither they nor we should also ever forget that since *we put them up there* we can also *knock them down again*.

Of course, the public do not necessarily have this great power they imagine, because many times they are given misinformation and false images of those in the media, which may mean we sometimes destroy those whom we once "loved" by having cleverly being conned into believing lies and accusations about them, concocted by wicked and envious people who hold adequate positions of power in order to bring them down.

In Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, we see after Caesar's brutal stabbing in the back by his "colleagues" and "friends", the outraged *Mark Anthony*, addressing the crowd as in the memorable Hollywood version in which *Marlon Brando* takes the lead role.

And he says famously "Friends, Romans, countrymen, *lend me your ears*", just as our modern media people do.

And then Brando, alias Mark Anthony, goes on a very clever mission to assassinate the motives and characters of those who have done the dastardly deed, ending each carefully phrased section of his tirade with the words “but Brutus (and the rest) *are honourable men*”, with the goal in mind that he will *turn the crowd against Brutus and his co-conspirators*.

And we see that Shakespeare's drama ultimately ends with Mark Anthony gaining victory, and all his murderous rivals ending up dead.

But though Shakespeare's play, perhaps has justice as its central theme in avenging a brutal murder, what can we say of the media assassinations we see before our eyes daily?

For example, in the UK, for many years, there was until recently a top UK entertainer, loved by millions, called *Michael Barrymore*, who cleaned up every year at every TV award ceremony.

This talented and likeable man, who though married, later confessed to being gay, was despite any homophobic feelings many men may typically have, loved by millions even of heterosexual men.

But under some never clearly proven allegations of having supplied drugs to a man found dead in his swimming pool at a party he had invited him to, he has been ruined, destroyed, and at last news, was trying to begin his shattered life and career afresh in Australia, with his reputation in the UK utterly wrecked and TV career forever lost, based not on something he was proven to have done, but on some mere *allegations*.

For do we really think this sensitive and caring man *deliberately* got some young chap he had hardly met high on drugs and invited to a party at his home, with the pre-meditated intention that he should drown in his swimming pool?

The whole idea is ridiculous, as apart from anything else, it would have permanently jeopardized his career, which clearly was the most important thing in his life, but despite no proper evidence ever being given, this scandal has now wrecked anyway.

How can we let this all go on?

This assassination of the characters of others right, left and centre, based on some unproven allegation, or some silly out of character blunder or remark they have made?

So surely, it is time to restore the concept which is supposed to be canonized into every civilised code of law, but clearly in any real way is currently not, that is – *that all men (and women) should be given the right to be presumed innocent of any allegation made against them, until and unless proven beyond reasonable doubt that they are guilty*.

And we suggest also, that women apply this same *presumption of innocence* to the men in their lives.

But as a necessary preliminary and precaution in this process of placing trust in a man and the man doing the same regarding his woman, should surely be a long period of assessment of one another, which instead of taking place via a heady whirlwind romance, as read about in the romantic novels or watched avidly in exciting movies, should definitely be done in a more sober fashion.

Because, let us look at how carefully we behave if we are engaged in some major purchase, such as that of a house or car.

We carefully check out every detail of the property, we think about whether it will be adequate for all the plans and hobbies that we have, whether there will be enough space if children arrive, whether the stairs, doors or windows are too narrow to get our grand piano or even four poster bed upstairs.

We have a surveyor check that the building is in good repair, and that no development plans are under consideration which could uproot us and thwart our plans to live a long and carefree life there.

We check out the neighbours to see if they are civilised, and maybe ask a few questions in the local pub to see if there are any criminal or gangster types living nearby, who can upset the whole community by their mere presence.

Perhaps if we are sensitive to noise, we check for the presence of airports or flight lanes, and we check out or ask our prospective neighbours about the local shopping and transport facilities and schools.

We thus do an incredibly detailed survey and analysis of this property we are contemplating buying, but in our relationships with our prospective partners, we act like four year olds in a sweet shop, and quite frankly, cannot wait to get hitched and consummate our passion in the marital bed.

Since for men it is mostly the powerful sex desire that blinds them to all reason, and for women it is the feeling of completeness and being loved and “socially empowered” in her new home and status as happily partnered woman or married wife, likely also soon to be mother of children, in the average case.

Thus we can safely say that there is an insane lack of rationality when men and women are assessing the person they may well have to spend the rest of their life with, and the success of which relationship will likely determine their future happiness or misery, again *for the rest of their life*, which negligent and undiscerning behaviour they would not remotely consider applying when judging even the purchase of a pound of meat at market, let alone quite likely a whole one hundred and eighty pound mass of it, which the average woman is going to end up with “on her plate” after the marriage contract is signed.

So we see that really, the old fashioned customs, prohibitions and restrictions upon the conduct of male-female relationships had a very specific purpose in them – that is - *to protect us from our own madness and negligence while under the spell of sexual and romantic passion.*

For in the absence of such sensible *restraints*, we want our relationship to work *immediately*, just as we want everything else in the *buy now, pay later* credit and debt driven society, which exposes the fact that most of us are so immature we can save and wait for nothing, all our desires we must satisfy *now*.

But unfortunately, relationships cannot be arranged and purchased so easily as that of a lawn mower, holiday or car, and not got "on credit."

We have to be very clear that we are in choosing our prospective partner, taking a step which will either be the greatest thing we ever have done, or if we get it wrong, the greatest disaster.

This realisation and balanced state of mind cannot be properly achieved by two people who are caught up in the whirlwind of passion and romance, like that portrayed for example in the *Wuthering Heights* novel, or for that matter, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, in which we see that, as usual, all sense is cast aside in this desperate quest for *sex and love*.

Women have *got* to see that this obsession of theirs is not sane, and not safe.

There is *never* a moment to *throw all caution to the wind*.

And when we see the fate of the real life people who follow these paths, well, they are mostly like *Jim Morrison*, or *Van Gogh*, or *Marilyn Monroe*, or for that matter *Princess Diana* – they end up somewhat crazy and usually prematurely *dead*.

All this wild behaviour in relationships is *a serious denial of reality*.

Yes, of course we can have fun, we can have romance, we can have passion – *but only when the ground rules have been soberly and safely laid*.

Otherwise, under the blinding power of so called "love" and sexual attraction *alone*, we mate with someone incompatible, children soon follow, then comes divorce, and the lives of all parties, especially and including *the children*, are then *wrecked*.

So what is our alternative?

Point one, with this date or potential mate we have been introduced to or just met, the last thing we should be thinking about is *sex*.

Yes, we certainly should decide if they are *adequately attractive to accept*, which will simply be a "yes" or a "no" on both sides, and if that fundamental point is not accepted, there had better be *no further meetings*, so that no one gets hurt.

But if our introduction and go-between system has worked properly to begin with, it should already have been established *before any meeting* that both parties are mutually interested at least *by sight*, and thus no insulting rejection should need be personally experienced by either party for that reason.

So after mutual physical acceptance is established, the prospective couple can then go on to discussion of their value systems and personal beliefs.

You see, this is really like our modern divorce system, *in reverse*.

That is, the “big argument” and “hammering out of terms” should take place *before* any relationship – i.e. living together, having sex, and children – *ever* begins.

Not afterwards as now, when the damage has been done, the disaster is well underway, and as the saying goes, “it is all over, bar *the shouting*.”

For example, can the parties agree about who will be doing the dishes, the garden, and cleaning the bathroom suite?

Do they both believe marital fidelity should be forever? Or are they prepared to tolerate carefully arranged and medically safe diversions from such a code?

That is, it may be possible some men and even some women may find themselves unable to be faithful.

But though not recommended, this need not break *trust*, if such occasional diversions have been beforehand discussed and agreed.

There can of course be all kinds of problems in this sexual area, since for example, many women may lose interest in sex after childbirth, when naturally all their energy and devotion is gong to their new born child.

Likewise, women should quiz a man *before marriage* about his feelings on these kinds of issues, because he has to know what he is getting himself into, and what she will expect of him when children arrive.

And above all, he must have a right to know – in these days of planned pregnancy and almost one hundred percent effective birth control methods, including the now famous *morning after pill* – if and when she plans to have a child, so that it is a joint decision.

Again, all these matters should be planned out as far as possible, *before a marriage*.

For example, how many children does she want? If a woman says she would be happy with two, but later decides she wants *six*, she can hardly blame a man for going crazy if this was not what he had in mind, nor ever expected or agreed.

Because, just think about it, if a couple cannot get agreement and understanding on all these major issues, *before* they get together, how on earth do they think they are going to get it *afterwards*?

But unfortunately, modern women imagine - we must regrettably say *foolishly* - that their “love” for their man will “conquer everything”, which is why they are so horrified when they are betrayed or their man deserts them for another woman, or even in some cases *for another man*.

Here, we accept we are making a very tough point for women to accept, but we make it with the full belief and admission that the same applies equally to men.

Which is, as mature human beings, we have to accept that *none of us is that special*.

President Kennedy was not that special, as neither was Princess Diana, whom as we know was betrayed by Charles for what appeared to be a far less attractive woman, and Tom Cruise and Jennifer Anniston are also not that special, because they have all in their time been rejected for someone else.

We are shocked to find that the person whom we love above all others is able to love someone else, but really this is a very childish and immature belief we all hold, and is not the right one to base our relationship upon.

Because, on the other hand we could say - *wait a moment, on the contrary* - we are *all* that special. Each one of us deserves and needs love, but then we see, so does the lady and gentleman across the way. So this admission of *special*, or *not so special*, is not really the right one.

The only real issue is - *are we special enough to that person we want to be with, and wants to be with us?*

Do they prize and cherish us as they should?

The point is, to have a lasting, secure relationship, we have to find one *mutual love*, and then limit ourselves, *commit to that one special person alone* (though remembering that *everyone* is special to *someone*).

But in the final analysis, we are all deluded if we believe that our partner could never love anyone else, nor that we could do the same.

So attraction and desire is not enough to build relationships upon, because it is too easily transferred and spread, and therefore, we have to build something special *between us* that lasts, which necessitates a long process – likely two to three years - carefully getting to know one another and thereby *developing friendship and trust*.

The author suggests to you, that a good friendship between two people of either gender is worth a thousand times more than any sexual encounter we could ever have.

Let us please not get so hung up over and so demanding of sex, which most adults know is not generally the wonderful earth-shattering, glamorous event that is portrayed in the movies, but more typically like a dinner one eats enthusiastically at the time but soon forgets.

Fidelity *is* important because we have to know, especially in the present, that as men we are fathers of our own children, or as women, we are having sex with a man we can trust, who has not gone off and bedded some women rashly, and thereby possibly made her pregnant, or exposed us to the risk of some awful sexual disease.

And this discussion and list must go on – we must know if each partner believes in some kind of a god, and therefore may be engaged in some kind of apparently strange or time consuming “spiritual practices.” We must agree on what kind of school the children will be sent to, and how they will be disciplined.

For example, some women may believe children should never be physically disciplined, and other men may believe that a slap is OK now and then.

If the couple cannot agree on that, if that is going to be an unresolvable issue between them, surely they cannot get married until or unless it is ironed out?

And does it really bother her if her man leaves the toilet seat up, or is it going to drive her crazy when he does?

And if it is, is he going to be diligent and patient enough to stop doing what to him seems trivial, yet to her seems a thoroughly annoying habit?

Of course, if one or either party is not very cooperative nor tolerant, even the longest list of terms and conditions are never going to sort the fundamental problems out.

And then we would have to say – *those two people who cannot even agree on trivial matters before a marriage, had better never get together* - no matter how much *physical attraction* they may feel for each other. Because after all, there are as they say “plenty more fish in the sea.”

Because these apparently trivial behaviours, really *are* important, for they reveal the personalities of their owners.

Some people demand to live in a very tidy and orderly environment. It's what they are used to.

Whereas many people, especially men, can live almost in what seems to a woman like a pigsty, and such a man will frankly go crazy if a woman is following him around every place with a brush and dustpan, or even worse, demanding that he reform himself and learn to tidy up.

For we are in the spirit of realism, not trying to impose or demand absolute standards of behaviour and morality here from either men or women.

We are saying – we are all imperfect people – and we must as far as possible tolerate each other's imperfections and weaknesses.

That doesn't mean we should *approve* them, but if a man and woman cannot cope with each other's petty habits and pet loves and hates, this is clearly a recipe for disaster.

Again, an insecure man whose blood boils every time his girl or woman even smiles at a stranger, is not going to be a suitable long term partner for her, unless she is going to agree to never come out of the house without a veil.

And above all, we have so far neglected perhaps the most important question of all in this agreement – *who is going to be the boss?*

Again, the issue here is of *honesty*.

Men who have been raised by bossy, dominating mothers will likely accept pretty much the same from a wife, whether they actually *should* or not.

But those who have been raised by a gentle mother, who never mocked or disrespected them, are going to throw a fit if their wife imagines that she can treat *them* in the same way as she treats the man above.

So what do we mean by “the boss”? Where is the equality?

Please, let us not insult one another's intelligence.

We put it to you most sincerely, in *no relationship* of any kind is there *ever* equality.

Just as no two people are ever exactly the same height, there is always a taller and shorter one, and in a relationship between any two people there is always one who is more a leader, and one who is more a follower.

So this question and its answer must be clearly established, long before a moment comes during the marriage when some issue or situation comes up that has inevitably never been discussed.

That is, who is going to have *the casting vote*?

For example, despite all precautions and careful upbringing, suppose their child has stolen something and is a thief.

What is to be done?

Should he (let's assume it is a *he*) be reported to the police or whomever, or made to confess his fault and apologise to and return the plunder to the person he has stolen from, or should it be covered up and denied?

This is not a simple situation – it may depend on what he has stolen, from whom, and if there are any other factors involved.

Suppose for example he has stolen from a teacher at school.

If this is discovered he may be expelled. Perhaps the teacher concerned is not reasonable and will not accept an apology.

So we are saying, at such moments, though both sides should be heard, someone must have the casting vote.

And if that has not been understood *before they get together*, there is likely going to be an unholy row.

For as we have seen, in such circumstances, men in general tend to want the child to confess and right the wrong, whereas many women in their desire to put no barriers on their child's future prospects will tend to choose to *cover up*.

So surely we have said enough now?

All the preceding is why, before ever a man and woman come together and create a new life, as well as hoping to have a long lasting and fulfilling relationship together, they should very carefully select and assess one another, so that we can have social harmony and happiness, and not the chaos and misery we have got so much of now.

So we see, in asking the original question of the title chapter, which many women's magazines have long sought to answer – *we have been deceived*.

The question – *how to keep your man* – was largely a trick one.

Because what we must now surely realise is that it is *in the preparing of the ground* that the future crop will follow, so that if we have laid the foundations for our relationship rightly by such careful preparation, the chances very much are that our relationship and family will last.

And then such a carefully prepared and crafted family will live happily ever after together in peace and harmony, without having to endure and act out the endless bickering and disharmony, that most people of the current generation have witnessed around them as they grew up at the mercy of such mismatched and unthinking parents, whose marriage likely eventually did not last.

We would add in conclusion, that when such proper foundations are laid, to protect and gain respect for this new harmonious family unit, some kind of marriage ceremony should most definitely be agreed, not only as a message to society in general that this relationship is intended to last, but also as a message to one another that we have truly taken a very serious vow, and made a promise and commitment that we intend to keep.

For then alone, we believe, based on such a sound and virtually unshakeable basis, can there truly be *love*.

Chapter Nine – *the Princess Diana syndrome* – the distortion and rejection of true love

English aristocrat *Lady Diana Spencer*, was a leading role model for modern Western women, ever since her first appearance on the world stage in 1980, and subsequent rather speedy marriage to Prince Charles in 1981, at which moment was bestowed on her the title, *Diana, Princess of Wales*.

It is incidentally, another interesting anomaly in this “sexual equality” we have all heard so much about, to note that by marrying Prince Charles, had she lived long enough *and not divorced*, Diana could, and almost certainly *would* have become queen.

Whereas when a man marries a royal princess, he becomes a “consort” with some rather non-descript title, such as the current British queen’s husband - the *Duke of Edinburgh* – who even though *he was a prince in his own right* as a royal Prince of Greece and Denmark, amazingly was obliged to renounce this title and allegiance in order to marry Princess Elizabeth, the now current queen. What such a man definitely does not become is *King*.

It appears the moral of this story is, do not marry a princess unless you are *a presiding royal prince*. Again, we see that real life is not quite like in the fairy tales.

Leaving the titles aside for a moment, *Diana Spencer’s* life was clearly a rather tragic, though privileged one, and for that reason alone, like all abused human beings she deserves our sympathy.

What follows here therefore is not so much a condemnation of the lady herself, who like all of us had her good and bad sides, but of the culture built around her which sought to deify her, and to simultaneously demonise Prince Charles, which unfortunate trend has also led to largely undeserved hostility being directed at Prince Charles’ recent new wife, divorcee *Camilla Parker-Bowles*.

The other reason to make this exploration of the life of Princess Diana is to bring into focus many of the issues concerning man-woman relationships raised in this work, in a most visible public way, so that the reader may learn from it, and in future look beneath the superficial view usually offered by the mainstream media, and also the gossip surrounding her in her own private life.

Firstly, we should note that Prince Charles showed his love for Camilla Parker-Bowles in his early youth, but this was interrupted by his royal duty to do national service, and it appears that perhaps as originally a “commoner” rather than member of the aristocracy, she was considered unsuitable and the relationship discouraged.

Yet this relationship was all known to Princess Diana long before they married, and she was aware of the continued interest in Camilla from Prince Charles even when the marriage took place.

There was a long tradition of British kings having extra marital affairs, and in fact Camilla's grandmother had been allegedly the illegitimate child of a mistress to King Edward VII.

So we have to ask ourselves, when the intelligent and aristocratic *Lady Diana Spencer* consented to marry Prince Charles, could she possibly have been naïve enough to not understand her principal role as producer of a royal heir to a Prince already in his thirties under great pressure to marry and do so?

The probability is that Princess Diana, who later showed herself to be an astute manipulator of the media once her private and public battle with Charles began in earnest, was well aware of "the other woman" in the marriage, and the implication therefore that Prince Charles with his classic admission of "in love - *whatever in love means*" was not really properly in love with her, as any woman in her right mind would demand and expect as she walked up the aisle on her wedding day.

There is yet another fascinating aspect to this marriage ceremony, which is that the then Lady Diana Spencer had *insisted* that she would not say the traditional marriage vow – she expressly refused to say the phrase *to honour and obey*. In fact, it was specifically the word *obey* that she had the problem with.

This fact is never reported in any known documentary on the life of Princess Diana, of the many hundreds which surely have been made since her marriage got into difficulties, and her subsequent premature and supposedly accidental death.

As we can see, this chaotic and "fingers crossed" coming together by both sides at once breaks all the rules for facilitating a successful marriage we have detailed in the previous chapters.

But surely a more thoughtful man than Charles would have seen what was coming based on that single act of tradition-breaking independence.

It appears however, that even if he did, he didn't care, as it seemed that this was merely an unavoidable duty being imposed upon him by the royal protocols, when he would apparently have been quite happy to have remained a single, childless man for a considerably longer time.

We might also compare the two marital partners just as human beings, regardless of their social status. Here, as we have explained we are touching on the *compatibility issue*.

And we see that Lady Diana was a precocious and vivacious star, good at sport and most other things, whereas Princes Charles was a significantly less charismatic and *winning* figure, something of a repressed personality, which is the typical unfair and unfortunate lot of so many of those forced through the British public school system, and thereby separated from family love at an early age.

So we have to very seriously ask the question whether Diana married Prince Charles for *who he was as a human being*, knowing he was not in fact even wholly in love with her, or whether she was merely enticed by the power she would get as wife to a man who *on paper* was the most eligible bachelor in the world, and become future Princess and likely Queen, who knew that her children would undoubtedly be *royal* princes and princesses of one of the most powerful countries in the Western world.

That is to say – Princess Diana's enormous and fanatical supporters club, condemn Prince Charles for *betraying the fairytale story of true love*. But it appears that quite likely she herself did not marry him for love, simply based on the probability that as a man he did not measure up to her on any objective standards, if his worldly title and status is taken out of the account.

This seemed to be confirmed, when Diana herself confessed to having an affair with a handsome, dashing cavalry officer, *Major James Hewitt*, who though theoretically a commoner, seemed to naturally possess as much breeding and aristocratic poise as any member of the Royal Family.

Though allegedly she only did this in response to Charles' renewed affair with Camilla, since Diana was aware of this "simmering old flame" from the very first day of their marriage and before, she may well have known it could have been only a matter of time before Charles' passion reignited.

Any intelligent psychologist could have seen this coming, because as an emotionally damaged and needy adult, Prince Charles was inevitably drawn back to the motherly love of his lifelong supporter and long-term lover, Camilla, which could not be supplied by the young immature, *prima donna*-like and theatrical Diana.

That is, Diana did not as we suggested, choose a mature caring man, in the sense of psychological maturity we have explained in earlier chapters, but one who as we have also explained, was seeking a mother figure, which he found in Camilla.

Though we can never know the full details amongst all the allegations and counterclaims, Diana's alleged anorexia/bulimia was a clear indicator of an insecure, unduly attention-seeking personality.

Her constant complaint against Charles and *the House of Windsor* generally speaking was - *I am unloved*.

But again, surely, anybody in their right mind with the obviously penetrating intelligence of Diana whose real motive was *love*, would not have chosen the emotionally repressed Prince Charles to marry - who in any case she knew not to be fully committed to her, due to his lifelong interest in Camilla – and the concomitant membership of the rather cold and duty driven Royal Family generally.

Why did she not choose the love of any number of eligible, mature, and understanding *alpha males*, such as James Hewitt, whom she had the affair with, and admitted in front of millions on national and international TV to have been besotted with?

After all, what man in his right mind would have turned down the beautiful, tall, talented and titled Lady Diana Spencer?

Obviously, very few.

To solve the mystery of Diana, all we need to do is look at her childhood.

She was really from a broken home – albeit an aristocratic one – and was witness to her mother and father's constant arguments, due to her highly-educated mother being drawn to the excitement and glamour of city life, whilst her father was a rather repressed country gent.

Clearly, her father was not unlike Prince Charles himself, who seems at his happiest walking in the solitude of his country estates – which theory is confirmed by his having written a children's novel, *The Old Man of Lochnagar*, about a hermit living in a Scottish mountain cave.

As ever, novels may well reveal the secret fantasies or inner selves of the author.

By age seven, Diana was deserted by her mother, who had effectively run off with a rich, glamorous man for the exciting life that brought her.

Her mother's behaviour must have been considered fairly appalling, as the court actually awarded custody of Diana to her father, but this distant, repressed man proceeded to finish the job of abuse and destruction of Diana's personality by sending her off to boarding school at age nine (utter cruelty!) and marrying a bossy self-centred woman who became Diana's step-mother and whom she hated.

So it appears Princess Diana was being hypnotically driven back to a near carbon copy of her abusive childhood, by marrying the repressed Prince Charles, who like her father, would later betray her for “a wicked stepmother”, Camilla, with a distant, undemonstrative mother-in-law, the Queen, and then as is typical, she transformed into her own party loving and social butterfly mother, who had left her to the care of nannies after the divorce from her father, and run off with a glamorous man.

It also appeared that to complete the carbon copy of her early life, in her relationship with rich playboy *Dodi Fayed*, son and heir of millionaire *Harrods* boss, *Mohammed El Fayed*, she was considering a similar course to her mother, had the tragedy in Paris not intervened.

We do not need to go into greater detail in this analysis – we just need to note that Diana had no *Virgin Mary* or *Snow White* type mother figure full of pure love and kindness, but an argumentative socially-hyperactive witchy type – one might say “liberated woman” - who created conflict in the home before this impressionable and ultra-sensitive child's eyes, and eventually deserted her for a passionate love affair, and glittering social lifestyle with a glamorous man.

So this was clearly *abuse*. Diana was an *abused, neglected child*.

Thus we see her rejecting the likely genuine and sincere love of eligible men like James Hewitt – whom she later coolly cast aside, according to his version – and *hypnotically* gravitating back to the “scene of the crime” – a similar scenario in which she can replay out the drama of her own abuse, and also take on the personality of her abuser – her mother – whom of course we find was also a distant, estranged *Snow Queen*-like figure in Diana's adult life.

We see the principle here, which must be recognised and understood by honestly reflecting on our own experience and the lives of others we have know:

by resentment of someone, they “get inside us”, and we hypnotically become them, we become the person we hate (or grew up hating)

That is, by having hated and blamed her mother, she internalized her “spirit”, allowed her to *literally* “get under her skin”, and thus reached for the same solution as her mother to being unloved.

No known mainstream psychology work explains this phenomenon, but you will find that it is a fact – many women will admit this openly, that they have “become their mothers”, including all the aspects they didn't like about them, and it horrifies them.

The reason is this same hypnotic process, being emotionally drawn back “to the scene of the crime” as occurs in any situation of abuse.

For this same reason, battered women cannot easily leave the men who abuse them, they are like a moth attracted to a candle flame, because their emotions pull them back in, even though all *logic* tells them they should leave.

They cannot understand why they cannot leave or get away from such a man, because they do not understand that by becoming angry, judgmental and emotionally upset, instead of *detached* and rational, they further strengthen the chain links to the person abusing them, which original attraction resulted from them being abused to some degree as children, and are therefore playing out hypnotically the same “psychodrama” from their childhood.

Such women should look at the meditation technique offered in the appendix to this book, so they may gradually untangle themselves from their “complexes”, though no speedy success is guaranteed in such a deeply convoluted psychology.

As with *all* psychological problems, the principle thing is *to become aware* of the mechanism of our thoughts, what our mind is really doing, rather than to become lost in conventional analysis which always ends up as futile, as it doesn't change the actual hypnotically embedded patterns of our thoughts, feelings and reactions.

For example, the excuse given by battered wives for staying – *but I still love him* – is as irrational as it is pathetic (in the *tragic* sense of the word, not the judgmental one), and obviously is one of these hypnotically embedded barriers.

These powerful hypnotically ingrained emotional ties prevent such women from seeing the sensible perspective that the man to stay with is not *one whom you love*, but rather *one who loves you*, in the true sense we have already described, which does not, we should in kindness explain to these ladies, include raping you, kicking you in the stomach or beating your brains out.

Diana's father obviously did not satisfy her mother on any number of levels, just as Charles did not satisfy Diana - whom we saw on TV beating the other kids' mothers in a school open-day foot race, and could apparently expertly play the piano for example – and that solution was to be a social butterfly, to try to attain a *group love* like any celebrity, rather than seeking it in one special relationship as relatively normal, non-traumatised and secure men and women do.

Again, this identical *modus operandum* to her mother, is confirmed by Diana hopping from man to man after the divorce from Charles.

And in her famous TV interview, when asked if she thought she would ever be queen (this was *before* the divorce), she answered negatively, but said she wanted only to be *the queen of peoples' hearts*, with her big sad eyes moistening and her eyelashes fluttering wistfully.

Again, we see this psychological manoeuvre of substituting the concept of one-to-one man-woman love, with *the love of the crowd*.

The desire to be caught up in and if possible *at the centre of* a social whirl, as a compensation for the failure to find any single satisfying love is a general strategy of the celebrity classes and the insecure, unloved woman.

It is suggested, that though not likely fully consciously aware why she had gravitated back to a loveless family life by marrying Prince Charles, she was sure that by the unparalleled opportunities it gave her as a celebrity, she could then seek attention and get the worship of crowds as a compensation, all over the world.

As she had seen her own parents' marriage deteriorate quickly into war and divorce, it is doubtful that from the outset she had any real expectation that her own would last, and seemed to deliberately pick a man whose love was in doubt, to in fact engineer that very same situation.

But she didn't care too much about this irrationality, because her solution was not the love of any one man nor even woman, but *the worship and adulation of the crowd*.

We see celebrities stand on stage blowing kisses at the public and saying "how much they love us all", and it is of course a totally fake relationship, as neither party has any real first hand knowledge of the other, especially of course, the celebrity themselves.

So really, it's an egotistical narcissistic existence, which uses the public and media as pawns in its game, just as in his own demented narcissism, the *Emperor Nero* could apparently sing songs and play his lyre while Rome burned and many of its citizens died.

Anybody who doubts this kind of at face value, illogical behaviour, should read the already mentioned book *Games People Play*, by *Eric Berne*, MD, who founded a branch of psychology, known as *transactional analysis*, which was based not on bizarre theories of motivation like Freud's, but rather *on what people actually did in their relationships*.

As explained earlier, the goal of transactional analysis is that we become *game free*, but though this therapy may well *identify the problem*, we put it to you that finding a solution is quite another thing, and would require the support of the kind of meditation technique as described in the back of this book, which is basically an *awareness exercise*.

None of this chapter therefore, as already explained, is meant to be a personal attack on the memory of Princess Diana, who clearly deserves our sympathy and if felt appropriate, our prayers, but a necessary close encounter for us of the psychological reality of someone who in actuality was a fairly typical modern woman.

If Princess Diana truly has something to offer to the whole world, surely it is the understanding of her tragic story, such that we should learn from the neglect of her in childhood caused by two warring parents who failed to demonstrate love between one another, and offer her the proper care, attention and security that would automatically follow from that, which every child wants and needs.

Had she received such a secure and sensitive upbringing, quite probably by now she would have been a contented, mature lady in her mid forties, with a handsome, loving and courageous husband like James Hewitt, watching her fine young sons and daughters growing up.

If we are observant, we will notice any number of these attention seeking *Princess Diana* clones fluttering round our society, and leaving a trail of havoc and broken hearts – including their own – wherever they go.

The key factor here for women to understand is that should they share her mentality, they will likewise reject the love of a decent man who would love and treat them well, as it is something that having never know it as a child, women cannot necessarily recognise as an adult.

Such ladies as Princess Diana however, have another card up their sleeve.

They also like to imagine themselves as *sources of love*, and go round hugging little children and picking up stray men, to shower their "love" on, sometimes even *forcing* such imagined love on others who do not in fact even desire it, or else due to having some awful incurable disease are unable to be satisfactorily helped by a kiss, cuddle and pat on the head, no matter how magnetic and famous a personage it comes from.

What they fail to realise, is that a love which is given to others to make oneself feel good, is not love at all, as it is just *a compensatory behaviour for feeling unloved* using others who are emotionally or otherwise needy for one's own ego satisfaction.

But people like to live on myths and images like that of *Florence Nightingale, the lady with the lamp* in the Crimean War, so millions willingly buy into this hypnotic cult of worship of icons and celebrities like Princess Diana, and imagine that if she even touches them with her hand they have touched greatness.

And so the madness, insecurity and lovelessness in the real sense goes on.

Jesus Christ allegedly healed the sick, made the blind see, and changed the water into wine.

Perhaps if we cannot do the same, we should not place ourselves on any great pedestal for worshipping crowds to adore.

The huge outpouring of emotion that followed Diana's death, was really not about Diana at all, whom as one can see from this analysis the public clearly did not understand hardly an iota, but rather about the seemingly callous destruction of *the fairytale fantasy romance of love*.

The truth was, that a woman none of us really knew died in a car crash, but as *Don MacLean* sang in his *American Pie*, it was really *the day the music died*.

In this frustration of the principally female public's childhood desires, Prince Charles and Camilla Parker-Bowles became the villain and villainess, repressing and abusing the supposedly helpless and naïve Diana.

Which by now we can see was very far from the truth, when in fact, Diana's complex and confused, attention seeking personality caused a whirlwind to pass through all their lives, that they neither expected, asked for, nor understood.

As far as one can see, if Prince Charles had been allowed to choose freely, he would have married Camilla in his youth, so actually both he and Camilla were sabotaged from being happy together by the royal protocols and demands.

Camilla even played a significant part in choosing Diana for Charles we are told, which would appear to be a very unselfish piece of love from her, or was she far smarter than we realise, and did she do that knowing that it would not likely last?

Who knows?

But the media who fawned all over Diana, have largely demonised Camilla, who seems to be an easy going, fun loving but practical and down-to-earth type.

She does not, unlike Princess Diana, seek out the limelight, and is happy to support her man and let him take centre stage. He is apparently extremely happy since his very long awaited – from their point of view – marriage to Camilla.

But millions of women hate her, and a sizeable sector of the media still attack her long after Princess Diana's death, and her marriage to Charles being a *fait accompli*.

One incident in particular indicated that Camilla is really the sort of more broad-minded and sensible woman we should perhaps encourage and tolerate.

When rudely asked by a scrum of reporters after the engagement was announced, "did Charles go down on one knee to propose?" she paused to look at them all briefly, and then with a triumphant smirk said "Of course!"

When what likely she was really thinking was "don't be so bloody ridiculously, we're nearly sixty years old, and we've been lovers on and off for the past thirty or forty years – do you think I would really put him through what is by now a meaningless ritual just to satisfy my vanity, when I am a mere commoner, marrying the heir to the throne of all England?"

This incident showed a great deal of humour, tact and tolerance, sorely lacking in many modern feministically inclined women.

So please, let us be more tolerant and forgiving of this lady, who has a broader and more wholesome perspective on her own status as a woman, and a sensitive understanding and consideration for her man.

For those still addicted to the fantasy of Princess Diana worship however, it is suggested that the only real way to honour this unfortunate lady, who not really believing in the concept of family and marital love, exchanged the love of the crowd for the love of any one man, is to give her what she always sought and never received during her life – *the understanding* of her personality as revealed in this chapter, which if available during her childhood and life, might have prevented her marrying the wrong man, and deteriorating into a tragic, insecure figure, forever searching for love in all the wrong places, but finding in the end only a lonely death in a foreign land with not a member of her parental or marital family in sight.

However, we have to seriously question if Diana was really the "loving person" she was made out to be.

For after her own painful experience at boarding school, might she not have tried to object to her own children undergoing the same?

But no - she was off at parties and "official engagements" while they were undergoing that process of traumatising - *just like her mother*.

Again this is not a real attack on Diana, but merely pointing out that a person who is so emotionally needy cannot truly love others in the sense referred to in this book, because they are obviously too wrapped up in their own insecurities and needs to truly deny themselves for the sake of another.

Chapter Ten – Feminism – *wicked witch or best friend?*

When women's liberation was merely about setting free women who were being abused by wife beating and forced into sex against their will, and when talented women who had a true vocation in life were denied the ability to fulfil their potential, *true women's liberation* as distinct from *feminism* was going along the right lines.

But we feel much of modern women's liberation – i.e. feminism - has now turned into some kind of man hating “female supremacist” agenda, rather than the legitimate search for equality and human rights for women which it was originally presumed to be.

Above all we feel that modern feminism is not a movement based on love, but rather upon a very deep rooted hatred and envy of men.

For example, UK TV presenter, *Richard Madeley*, of husband and wife legendary presenter team, *Richard and Judy*, who at one time or another have interviewed everyone from *Elton John* to *Bill Clinton*, and are in the UK somewhat of a national institution, once had a leading feminist author and icon on their program whom we shall not name.

Although the interview appeared to proceed perfectly normally, and she was treated with the same journalistic objectivity as any other guest, Richard later reported that when off camera, for no reason he could identify this university educated and otherwise seemingly civilised lady authoress suddenly unleashed the most vitriolic rage and hurled the most foul-mouthed abuse at him he had likely ever heard, leaving him in an utter state of shock.

We know from personal observation that whilst generally being harmless and good mannered, Mr Madeley has sometimes irritated his guests, perhaps by being a little long-winded in his questioning style, but this particular unwarranted attack on him could only be explained by a mentality that obviously had a very deep and violent hatred of men, the equivalent of which we can only draw parallels with to the Nazi persecution of the Jews.

The implication is that these “ladies”, whom we would describe as “extreme feminists” appear to regard men as some sort of aberration of nature, to be eventually extinguished altogether in some kind of feminist holocaust, or at the very least held as abused slaves without human rights, as vengeance on behalf of all women whom they believe throughout history have been the victims of men.

This philosophy, like that of the Nazis, is surely based on a barbaric, utterly intolerant and virtually genocidal mentality that cannot accept that men should even exist let alone be different than women.

Whilst we do not deny for a moment that there have been major abuses of women throughout history, just as there have been major abuses of other races, including the negro races in the slave trade, we feel that it is an unjustified illusion to think that men have lived in some kind of secure and arrogant paradise, which again the feminists seem to believe.

When for example men throughout the ages have typically been forced to go off to wars and get maimed and slaughtered in their millions, in an effort to protect their women, children and homelands, such as occurred in the two catastrophic and awful twentieth century world wars – which horrific and terrifying sacrifice right up to the present, society has *never* demanded that women must do - how can we say that men have ever had it so good?

As we have pointed out in earlier chapters, a man and boy's existence, even before the era of feminism, has for most of history been a fairly tortured and humiliating one, living mostly in fear, and hungering for a happiness with his woman that he has rarely ever achieved, and mostly has been forced to live as the slave of some "Lord of the Manor", tyrannical king or emperor, who could have him imprisoned, beaten, tortured or murdered, or take his wife and children from him as slaves and perhaps send him off to die in some kind of misguided war or crusade.

Are these women blind? What on earth do they imagine that men have *ever* had which has made their life so good?

Of course there have always been some male rulers, kings and emperors who have "lived high on the hog" with their harems and savage military conquests, when society was governed more or less wholly by brute force, but until the recent era, most of these great empires had gone – *but perhaps are now again threatening to return*.

And in this never ending quest to demonise men, the feminists also seem to overlook the many millions of kind, caring men throughout history, most notable of whom we would point out have been humanistic and spiritual leaders such as Albert Schweitzer, Mahatma Gandhi, Christ and Buddha, and even others like Abraham Lincoln who have all preached a philosophy of forgiveness and love and fought against slavery.

What these whining, hypercritical and intolerant women do not realise, is that the right to preach their hate filled philosophy as they do, has only been given to them based on the heroic sacrifices made by these great men from history, without whom we would still be leading a barbaric life, such as in the dark and middle ages, where such disobedient women were either publicly beaten or even burnt at the stake as witches, whereas now they are placed on a pedestal and given awards.

Any of these ladies who imagines it is *women* who brought these rights about they now enjoy have clearly not studied history well, because for example the basis of most modern justice systems originated in the Roman and Greek times, for example due to the views and thoughts of philosophers such as Plato.

For we are simply saying, that since men had the power to begin with, and women could not wrest it away from men by force, the only way that women can possibly have got so much power as they now have is that men have for whatever reasons *given it to them*.

These feminist women however then ask - *where are the great women?* - since their names do not seem to be recorded by history?

They ask, where are the female Beethovens and Einsteins, and Mozarts and Shakespeares?

And there have been *some* artistically and scientifically outstanding and creative women throughout history, such as Marie Curie, the Bronte's in literature, Mary Shelley who wrote "Frankenstein", Joan of Arc, and so on.

But we put it to you that when they are seeking to find *the greatness* in women, they are looking in the wrong place, because they fail to understand that most men and women are not only superficially physically unlike women, but very dramatically *biologically* different, and in particular in the structure and functioning of their brains.

That is, we are not denying the validity of women as *equally important human beings*, of just as much worth as men, but we are saying *they just have been given by Nature* – not by men – different jobs!

And principally, the greatest job in the world we believe is that of *mother* – far more important than anything men have ever done or will do - for she is really the "architect" of all human beings in her principal role as carer and educator to young children.

As we have said - *the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world*.

What the feminists in their angry state of denial of all this do not realise or contemplate, is that women were not invented by feminists a few decades or even hundreds of years ago, but were rather *designed by Nature*, perhaps approximately five hundred thousand to a million years ago in a recognisably human form.

Thus since throughout these hundreds of thousands of years, women's principle role in life has been the rearing and protection of children, inevitably the processes of evolution have designed or *naturally selected* (however one looks at it) women's bodies to be primarily oriented towards that purpose, whereas a man has had to protect his woman, fight animals, male rivals and hunt for food, and thus inevitably again, he has ended up with different evolutionarily determined abilities.

So in fact, the feminist's war is not just against men, it is *against Nature*, it is an utterly insane denial of reality!

And for those of a religious persuasion, it is certainly wholly against any kind of "god", because if such exists, he clearly made an "ungodly" and unforgivable error by creating men as the savage and aberrant beasts which these women regard them to be.

The question we would ask ourselves is – where on earth are these extremist feminist women coming from?

And when they clearly do not represent the viewpoint of the at least ninety percent of women who are only interested in what women have always been interested in – being loved and protected by a man and having children - why is it that they have now got such a loud voice?

So we are here going to look at *the genesis* of such women.

And just like the genesis of all human personalities, the answer as in the case of Princess Diana is to be found in the family.

We are going to focus on two women in particular, as they have been perhaps *the* major female players on the world stage in the past two decades – *Hilary Clinton* and *Cherie Blair*, wife of the current UK prime minister *Tony Blair*.

Both women were lawyers, and also top of their classes, and Mrs Blair is a high court judge and leading barrister in the UK with a salary perhaps roughly equivalent to a million dollars a year.

Mrs Blair originally wanted to be an MP (a British democratically elected Member of Parliament) herself, but lost the seat she originally fought, whereas Mr Blair won his.

She was therefore however clearly a super-ambitious person, so why is it that she was so motivated to become an MP herself, or failing that, to support her husband in his quest for political power, which eventually got him right to the very top, which his current lack of diplomacy for one thing suggests he would never have managed alone?

The truth was that Mrs Blair was a neglected child from a broken home, whose alcoholic and unreliable father was a disappointment and embarrassment to her.

She has therefore at minimum as a consequence, as we have earlier explained, been following Irma Kurtz's agenda of "men are useless, and need a woman to take care of them and run their lives."

Tony Blair freely admits that she is a better lawyer than he is, and surely that means she is a better arguer, a sharper thinker, and therefore, she must be the real boss in the relationship.

For unlike leader's wives such as *Raisa Gorbachev* or recently defeated UK conservative party leader's wife, *Sandra Howard*, who have taken a "back seat" and the traditional supportive role, she has apparently even without any proper mandate chaired committees in Downing Street, and made many politically motivated speeches upon a public platform, which is a totally unprecedented departure from the reticent behaviour of any previous British prime minister's wife, which only tends to confirm this strong suspicion that she is the real "power behind the throne."

She is also chancellor of a major British university, and we are not quite sure how her being a Prime Minister's wife entitles her to be that, just as we are not quite sure how she came to be a high court judge, as the appointment of senior judges in England has always been a mysterious and secret matter.

Tony Blair also has a somewhat "boyish" quality about him, and thus really we are seeing in the Blairs, the feminist oriented partnership which has the dominant guiding woman and the weaker following man.

The public in general do not appreciate all this, because they do not see nor apparently even care to imagine the kind of talk that is going on in private - in the bedroom and across the breakfast table - between Mr and Mrs Blair.

The Blairs have also been extremely careful to protect their privacy, which has resulted in them for example putting a legal "gagging order" on an ex-nanny, so that no details of their private life they do not wish revealed can ever come out.

One totally hypocritical consequence of this "media silence" was that Mr Blair adamantly refused to confess under repeated questioning whether his own children had received a vaccine, which the British public had heard bad medical research publicity about, and had been forced on their children by the government, known as the *MMR vaccine* (a combined single dose against *Measles, Mumps and Rubella*).

This policy of "one rule for you (the people) and another rule for they (the leaders and members of government)" has seemed to characterise Mr Blair's (or should we say *Mrs Blair's*) period in office, many of the members of whose government have been involved in a scandal, but somehow never seem to resign or at least permanently disappear from office, as any *honourable* politicians would.

In particular, has developed in Britain under this government, which has now been in power since 1997, a phenomenon known as "the nanny state."

This means in practice that there has been a historically unprecedented intrusion into the public's lives by not only a never before seen level of surveillance, but by a never ending stream of interfering "do's" and "don'ts" and new "initiatives" and laws, such as continually advising us on what we should and should not eat, a progressive ban on smoking, making "zero tolerance" laws on dropping litter and other fairly trivial matters, as well as banning fox hunting to the dismay of hundreds of thousands if not millions of British nationals who live in the countryside, and have had their livelihoods damaged or even destroyed by this arguably unnecessary law.

But mysteriously, on other matters, such as *gambling laws*, they are surprisingly silent, allowing "the children" to cope for themselves, which by their negligence is destroying the desperate principally male millions of the population who get caught up in these sort of pursuits.

And not only are men under fire, though this relaxing and effectively encouragement of gambling - perhaps the worst and most damaging addiction of all - since via the "national lottery" and the evil "scratch cards" women are also getting sucked in, particularly the poorer, working class kinds, so that therefore all this is really a "stealth tax" on the poor.

This so called "New Labour" government, which has got little or nothing to do with the traditional British *Labour Party*, has taken over the traditional *Conservative Party* policies mixed with women's issues, which has thereby made the entire UK more or less into a one-party state and dictatorship, and has in general showed an undue favourableness in supporting all kinds of minorities *against the majority view*, whether this is on a racial, gay rights front or anything else.

For example, in November 2000, Mr and Mrs Blair's government invoked what is known as "the Parliament Act" to overrule the British "upper house" or "House of Lords" to reduce the age of homosexual consent to sixteen, which use was viewed by many as a thorough breach of the democratic process.

This appeared to put young boys *and girls* at risk of molestation and rape from older and more experience gay women and men, as for example, we have had reports of lesbian women lecturers on American campuses trying to force themselves on their female students - and no doubt the same has been happening on British ones - but again, because all that Mrs Blair can see is "a minority is being abused" she supports or causes her husband to push such a policy through, that results in *the exact opposite* of what she intended, that is *the abuse of young girls and boys*.

As we have said, we are not *wholly* trying to debate the issue of whether these issues are "right or wrong", but what we are saying is that, is this not supposed to be a *democracy*? And doesn't that mean that the government should generally speaking support the majority view?

And as the majority of people in Britain are neither animal rights activist, nor lesbians nor members of non-British races, what on earth is going on?

The reality is that the true effective leadership of the British government is coming from a feminist mentality, embodied in Mrs Blair, who clearly is sending Mr Blair out daily to "the factory" with her orders.

Or do we really think a powerful financially successful career woman like Mrs Blair, is keeping *stumm* while her husband runs Britain, and in alliance with America dominates and influences half of the world, is missing the chance to put in *a few ideas of her own* now and then?

The truth is almost certainly that Mrs Blair is attempting to put into place as much as the feminist agenda as possible, which includes in particular encouraging as many women as she can to like herself become working ones, and place their children *just as soon as they can walk* into the care of nurseries and the state.

So Americans and well informed non-Americans will now recognise that her agenda is very much the same as Mrs Clinton's, who also was a successful lawyer, with a weaker husband whom she "administrates" and made the first move to in courting, and we see is also putting herself continually on the public speaking platform as Senator to promote her feministic causes.

So why did not these two intellectually able and reasonably attractive ladies, who both have children, just marry a local guy and live a quiet life?

What drove them into being in the front line of politics in their respective countries, and stage managing the careers of their husbands to get to the top, where clearly they had the maximum chance for influence and political power via these two rather weak and puppet-like men? (that is, *weak* in terms of the definition of masculinity given in this work, that is of someone who is *an independent thinker, his own boss*)

And as we have said, the answer as with all of us, is in their childhood.

Though we have already established a clear case of *neglect or abuse* in terms of Mrs Blair's father, what limited data which appears to exist on Mrs Clinton's appears to be that he was a rather callous bully, an ex-military man, who told her when she came home from school one day after being beaten up by a bullying female classmate that "there was no room in the house for cowards" and more or less forced her to go back and face and fight this girl to "overcome her cowardice."

Is this the way for a father to raise a young girl?

Of course not – the good father takes her firmly by the hand, marches down to that school, and tells the teacher what is going on and demands that the bully be punished, or if that does not work, he takes it up with the parents of the misbehaving child, and if they threaten him, he either stands up to them himself, or if he is not big or strong enough he takes it up with the police.

Then when the bad girl (or boy, had it been a boy) has been punished and corrected, he takes his little girl to a martial arts class, and has her learn some self-defence, so next time something like that happens she can *defend* herself.

And you see, if this little girl Hilary had been shown love and understanding to begin with, she would probably have had the self-confidence which would have deterred the bully so this "accident" would likely never have happened.

We see this many times with fathers who bully their male children. They think this will make them tough, but all it does is make them cowards also. Bravery and self-respect is found *in those who are loved*.

So we are detailing this to show the contrast between the actions of a loving father and those of an ignorant, brutal and therefore *abusive* one.

Because, we do not need any complex theories of psychology or psychoanalysis to see what is going on in these ladies' psyches, based on their sufficiently common childhood experiences and upbringings.

They are both victims of *abusive men*, and thus their common agenda is a burning desire *to right the wrong that has been done against them*.

Thus their seeking of power is not based on a "love" or true spirit of justice, because they are still internally burning with rage from these awful childhood abuses and cruelties which were perpetrated on them by their bad fathers, and therefore they act not *for the good of all* as any political figure should, but rather from *their own limited private and personal agenda*.

That is why they do not simply settle down in suburbia with a loving man, and live happily ever after down some leafy lane with their children playing in the garden.

They are driven by a burning desire to correct the injustice that was done to *them*.

Thus we see law is a natural choice for them as career, as they see it as a likely means of power to correct all that has been done to them, and though they cannot go back and change history they can *make damn sure it never happens to any other little girl*, at least, *so they imagine*.

So we see all these laws that are passed against men, *the enemy*, making it difficult or impossible to gain access to their children in a divorce. Because surely if there is a divorce, is it bound to be *the man's fault*, because they have *already seen the evidence with their own eyes* as a thoroughly traumatised little child of men's badness and cruelty.

Thus, Hilary Clinton quite happily picks and accepts a man who betrays and abuses her as partner, like husband Bill, as it is no more nor less than she is used to, just as we saw Princess Diana picking Charles, knowing he did not really truly love her either.

For again, Mrs Clinton could like Mrs Blair have otherwise just been a happy wife and mother, living in some sweet and quiet little town, instead of forever seeking out the glare of publicity and fighting and campaigning year after year *to make them understand* (imagine the fury that must be locked inside her, to keep campaigning relentlessly about these issues).

So as a lawyer, it is no surprise from what we have said, that we find she specialised in *children's law*, and has throughout her career constantly tried to address children's issues, recently having written a best selling book on this inevitably same subject, entitled *It Takes a Village To Raise a Child, and Other Lessons Children Teach Us*.

For we see even in the title this undying agenda she has. That is, isn't this wrong - *lessons children teach US* - aren't we as adults suppose to be giving the lessons to *them*?

But *no*.

For what Mrs Clinton is really saying with that title is – *we are not listening to the child, letting her speak her mind* – that is – she is saying, *she was not listened to as a child*, and she is trying to set this wrong right for them all.

Also in using the phrase in this same title - *It Takes a Village To Raise a Child* - what she really means is – we have to see to it that *the community* raises our children, rather than *the family*, because as *she personally* has experienced that *the family isn't safe*, there is this “monster” in there, they don't know about, *this man*, despite the vast majority of people growing up without monsters as fathers, who have been *relatively* happy with that situation.

But *that abuse* is her experience, so she thus forces her private and personal agenda *on all of us*, and clearly Mrs Blair's childhood experiences must be sufficiently similar with her alcoholic, negligent and frightening father to motivate her to do the very same.

So it is no surprise when these two ladies meet that they easily become *friends*, because they are fighting the same fight, they are coming from the same place – *an abusive childhood*.

Something has got to be done! – they assure one another - *about these abusive men*.

So they are themselves using the power of the state to be “mother” to all children everywhere, to make sure this abuse can never happen to anyone else, which in theory we see, is a worthy goal.

But the problem is they have started with a *wrong* conclusion, indelibly ingrained into their minds – i.e. *all men are abusive and useless and cannot be trusted*

And so they then put through using their husbands, as many policies as they can get away with to take power away from fathers, and *even from mothers* - who after all you see, didn't protect them from these abusive men - and to take children out of the home as quickly as possible into nurseries, where Mrs B and C imagine *they are safe*.

It takes a village, therefore you see, to *safely* raise a child.

They further send armies of mainly female social workers out to poke their noses into every family nook and cranny everywhere, trying to identify and stop these abusive men, and of course we therefore see this obsession everywhere with what in actuality is a relatively small number – *outside of the family* – of paedophiles, whom if these childrens' mothers were present and watchful instead of being encouraged also by Mrs B and C to go out working, would never get *the opportunity* to molest them.

But they *empower* women to work, even really force them to, since so many are unwilling - because women have got to understand you see, that they must work and earn money so they can be independent from men, win the power from men, because *those children have got to be protected from HIM, protected from the beast*.

But by these means, they alas do not see, that rather than *preventing* abuse, they are in fact *perpetuating it*.

Because the close bond we have discussed between mother and child, and young child of either gender and protective and caring father must not be broken, it is the most precious thing in any child's life and which *alone* can give security.

And as we have just said, the only real security young children can have is an ever present mother, available to their children on twenty-four hour guard duty, and also *supported by a caring man.*

But alas, Mrs Blair and Mrs Clinton, and all their female allies, whom you see all link up together and recognise one another, as all having had this same common experience of being abused, and therefore reinforce each other's belief that all men are like that everywhere, *do not see this.*

So is it clear now why we have "the nanny state?"

In that Mrs Blair and Mrs Clinton, and their kind – since countless other similar women are also in power for these same reasons, mainly in politics or law, or exercising it through their male partners - are attempting to be "mother" and "nanny" to us all?

They are saying – though they don't dare say it in so many words – *dads are no good, they aren't needed in the family, men in general aren't suited to be in primary school teaching or anywhere near children, and except for fixing your car or the plumbing, men are hardly of any value at all.*

So naturally Mrs Clinton and Mrs Blair's bleeding hearts are not only trying to protect children, but all downtrodden people everywhere, but again, because they are driven by outrage and desperation, and not by an understanding and sensible kind of love, they force upon us all manner of resented and unworkable solutions.

We are not saying that Mrs Blair and Clinton are evil people. We genuinely believe they think they are doing the right thing, their intentions are basically good, but because of this giant log of *abuse* that has been cast into their eyes as young children, they cannot see what they do.

And the truth is, that we have traumatised people like Mrs Blair and Clinton running and ruling society, people who have sad to say *never been properly loved.*

So we thus have people ruling the world, who don't know what *real love* is, as defined throughout this work, and then we wonder why we don't have *love and a peaceful world???*

We wonder why we have chaos and crime?

They are doing their best, but it is not good enough, because *they are not wise.*

If these feministic women would start taking a realistic look at the psychological malaise which sadly started in abuse or neglect of them in childhood, they would see that to perpetrate and perpetuate this tragic and destructive war between men and women is surely not in their best interests either, as it can never lead to peace.

Chapter Eleven – Women and Business – *dealing with Mr Scrooge*

When in *Charles Dickens'* most famous story, *A Christmas Carol*, the miserly Victorian businessman, *Ebenezer Scrooge*, is bid “merry Christmas” he mutters “bah humbug!”, and when asked for charity for the poor he replies angrily “Are there no workhouses? Are there no prisons?”

He only grudgingly gives his sole underpaid and overworked employee, *Bob Cratchit*, Christmas Day off, on which day Scrooge's lowly clerk tries with his paltry means to provide a traditional meal for his slum dwelling family, which includes his ailing little boy, *Tiny Tim*.

The point for us to note here, is that though Mr Scrooge is mean-spirited, he is a “respectable” *businessman*, he is *approved of* by society at large, even though his wealth is got at another man's expense.

Bob Cratchit and his barely surviving family live huddled together for warmth in a tiny crowded house in a squalid back street, but Mr Scrooge lives *alone* in a big house, with a brass door knocker and a *respectable* address, yet even carefully preserves the oil in his lamp out of miserliness, whose cost he can well afford to spend and replace.

Bob Cratchit and his family are obliged to live in fear, poverty and humiliation, whereas Mr Scrooge lives in dignity, believing he is a respected member of society.

But as we do not see this kind of poverty anymore in Western society, where even the so called “poor people” now have cars, computers, DVD players and take holidays abroad, how need this now centuries old tale concern women today?

Is the author proposing some kind of communist agenda, where everybody is made “equal” and forced into a regimentation which is completely controlled by the state?

Even if he was, he does not realistically believe it could happen within any relevant timescale, so that is certainly not the goal of the current work, and in any case, the kind of “communism” which we have seen so far put into practice that destroys individuality and freedom cannot be said to be a desirable goal in any respect.

The author is neither recommending communism, capitalism nor any other “ism”, which all tend to be divisive in society, creating an “us and them” mentality, but rather perhaps only *humanism* – in the sense of putting the happiness and needs of *human beings* at the basis of our society, rather than worshipping the dollar, the yen or the pound.

The thing for every woman in business to realise is that few people in the West are poor in the Victorian sense of the word, but rather, we are living in a global community in which *the real poor* are now out of sight in the poorer countries and *Third World*.

That is, whilst we drive around in our luxury cars, eat and drink ourselves into obesity, and lose ourselves in the latest celebrity gossip, new fashion or movie release, around twenty percent of the world is living on the breadline or starving, and an even larger percentage, mostly in Asia and South America, but now in Africa also, are working like slaves so that we can easily afford to live our luxurious lives.

We in the wealthy West are collectively *Mr Scrooge*, and *they* in the poorer countries and Third World are the *Cratchits* and *Tiny Tim* and his little sisters.

The recent disastrous tsunami in Indonesia received the most enormous charitable support in the history of any world disaster to date. This unprecedented dipping into the purses and wallets of the wealthy West produced millions of dollars and pounds within even hours of the appeal, which embarrassed the national governments into parting with a lot more of *our money* than they would usually assign to these far away disasters in foreign lands.

And it seems not too cynical to wonder if this unprecedented outpouring of financial support was not due to at least in part, a lot of wealthy white Westerner holidaymakers being caught up in this disaster, in a way that had seldom previously happened.

Simply, we are saying, none of us think we are racists, but somehow when things happen to some dark or yellow skinned peoples in a faraway land, it doesn't seem to cut to the heart of the white Westerner in the same way as it would if these other races looked exactly like their own kind.

But we should not be too cynical, because there is no question that all the Westerners who donated this huge amount of money knew that their cash was going almost entirely to non-white people, so it appears that for perhaps the first time in the history of the West, there was a truly unprecedented genuine outpouring of compassion at this massive tragedy.

But though this response to the fate of the dispossessed poor, brought about by the way this particular disaster gripped the West's imagination is a welcome sign, we fear it is not half enough.

The author feels justified in pressing this point somewhat, because we are saying the Western consumer society is really like a beautiful store front, which has behind it *unseen*, a giant sweatshop, which is peopled almost entirely by Asian and Third World peoples.

"Made in Hong Kong" or "Empire Made" seen upon an item have been jokes to mock a product for decades in Britain, though the manufactured goods currently coming from Asia are now often superior to many or most of the equivalents that are made in any Western country.

We are the "Roman citizens" and the poor countries of the world *should we even bother to feed them* are our slaves.

But why cannot they feed themselves we might well ask?

Well perhaps they could before we started invading and taking over their countries – largely via the British Empire – and destroying their natural ways of life.

There was a very interesting story written by American author *Ray Bradbury* of *Fahrenheit 451*, *Something Wicked This Way Comes* and *The Illustrated Man* fame, amongst other things he has done, all of which were subsequently made into classic movies.

This story from *the Illustrated Man* was called *The Other Foot* and was about a white astronaut who landed on a planet where the black people were the ruling majority and the white minority were the slaves, and forced to shine the black people's shoes instead of how it has been in the West, hence the title, about *the shoe being on the other foot*.

If we want to think of ourselves as being truly civilised, we principally white Westerners have got to start seeing things from the point of view of the other non-white races.

Would we tolerate it if there were a country of blonde, brunette and red-haired white women in their tens of thousands or even millions, starving, almost naked, babies futilely trying to suckle their empty breasts, and dying on the ground with skeletal arms and swollen bellies and heads, whilst the flies crawl over their waiting-to-die bodies, as they stare forlornly into the camera with their hopeless, dead eyes?

Of course we would not.

But we are *used* to Asians and Africans dying in all kinds of disasters, and we perhaps are often tempted to feel that it surely is not really our business or fault anyway?

It is a psychological and biological fact of life, that we do not identify so closely with those who do not strongly resemble us, speak or behave like us, and belong to a far away land we likely would never know of or see except for looking in an encyclopaedia or at our TV screen.

For instance somebody recently commented – “if my child dies in an accident, I am heartbroken, if my neighbour's child dies, I am quite upset, if someone dies in my country a hundred miles away it is sad, but if someone dies in another continent several thousand miles away whom I have never known or seen, it is really just a statistic to me.”

We cannot pretend we can really care about those whom we will never know or did not even know existed until we saw them on our TV screen.

But we have to realise that those in political power and in the higher echelons of our Western business world – and those leaders in their own countries – do *know* about these people, and are busy enslaving them on our behalf.

They are the modern *Mr Scrooges* whom we all respect, they are multi-million or billionaires, and just having so much money guarantees them such respect.

They have mansions, they have huge estates, they have yachts, they have Rolls Royces, they have private planes, and all this *we admire, we respect*.

They are busy flying over the world enlisting slaves for us, most recently in Africa, where the TV media tells us “progress is being made for the African peoples”, and then we are buying the produce and products they pick and make on our supermarket and hypermarket shelves, and we are both delighted and amazed that we can get all these fantastical and luxurious foods and products *so cheap*.

So ladies, let us be honest, in many, many cases, whether you are a customer service clerk or salesperson in a call service centre, a manager somewhere in a major corporation, or one of the army of professionals such as lawyers and accountants - these are the guys – since it mostly *is* still guys we confess – whom you are really working for.

Hang on – some might say – these corporations are *responsible*, they have fair pay and fair working conditions for these people in these foreign lands.

Well, we aren't going to argue details, but a broad survey suggests that their conditions and pay are not generally what would be acknowledged as fair in any Western country, and hence, the manufacturing and labour has been transferred *there*, and is not longer done *here*.

In any case, we do not, you see, really want these ugly factories and industrial estates cluttering up our wealthy European and American havens and playgrounds.

For example, just imagine if someone suggested building some awful chemical plant in *Monaco* or the *Cote d'Azur* or in Berkshire in England where the famous *Ascot* racing track is, at which annually *Royal Ascot* is held and attended by the Queen.

What a blot on the landscape such a thing would be! It can't be allowed!

But apparently it's OK to build one in Bhopal, India, even if thousands of innocent local people get caught up in and mutilated by and suffocated to death in a cloud of poisonous gas when the inevitably inadequate safety systems finally break down.

So we have been obliged to make this hopefully not too tiresome introduction to the subject of how women and business are interacting, as it is necessary to first establish that most of the wealth of the modern West is effectively built on the slave labour and natural resources of non-Western countries, which quite frankly may be the reason that so many of these foreign nations seem to be so upset with us in one way or another.

For not only are we enslaving these countries, we are doing something even worse, which is *destroying their cultures and natural ways of life*.

We wealthy Westerners think it is fabulous to travel the world now in our cruise liners and tourist jets, and we feel that being a travel agent or a member of airline staff – we will resist the term *air hostess* – is a glamorous and respectable career.

But we do not see the indignity and abuse we inflict on countries and cultures all over the world, by making their lands and peoples into playgrounds and tourist centres for our Wealthy western population.

For example, a native Greek gentleman cynically explained how the wealthy tourists all came to his country in their millions in pursuit of *the four S's* – sea, sand, sun and *sex*.

It was evident from his manner that he deeply resented all these overpaid holidaymakers transforming his homeland into a hedonistic playground, without any respect for the native people or culture already living there, but instead transforming them into servants, waitresses and tourist guides.

The feeling was not unlike that of many British people towards the American “GIs” who were based there during the second world war, and were “stealing” many of the British native mens’ girlfriends and wives by impressing them with offers of cigarettes and nylons and other such bribes – causing these American “invaders” to be described by the British men as “overpaid, oversexed and *over here*.”

Returning to the present tourist invasions, a less civilised Spanish man was seen using a monkey as a means to make money out of the foreign holidaymakers who came. He was however also abusing this monkey, stubbing cigarettes out on it to the righteous indignation of animal rights activists everywhere.

What was in this man’s mind?

The answer was a four letter word – *hate*.

For do not the mainly European and American travellers to these less developed and consequently cheap countries realise, that because they come loaded with money which they flaunt in front of these poor peoples’ eyes who have been persuaded to give up their natural ways of life in the quest for the tourist dollar or pound, they have placed these people into a state of servitude and dependency, and therefore the principle emotion in the minds of these once proud native citizens of Greece, India, Spain or any other major tourist centre is one of resentment and hate of them?

It is little surprise that many women tourists are attacked, raped and murdered in these countries, for little excuse. Because what they do not see is that there are huge masses of indigenous peoples’ forced to beg for these tourist crumbs, that fall off the wealthy West’s table, and therefore *hate* this luxury loving and arrogant master or mistress they have been conned into serving.

For even within a Western country, the poor generally hate the privileged and rich, so how do we imagine these foreign natives will feel, when the dichotomy between even averagely wealthy Western people, and the poor in these countries they visit is so huge?

For example, let us take the “wicked” Spanish guy who tortured his own monkey.

What was he before he took up this tourist pleasing way of life – he didn't abuse the monkey whilst the tourists were watching, understand - or rather what would he have been, if the tourists had never come?

He would have been perhaps a farmer or fisherman, a blacksmith, a baker, or any number of other things which would have given him a trade, and thus dignity and a respected position in his society and local community.

But now the tourists have come, he is three-quarters beggar, likely has no real skills or occupation, but rather an empty, idle mind that is filled only with jealousy and hate at the well dressed, glamorous and wealthy passers by who come from better off faraway lands.

So do you ladies now think that being a travel agent or an air cabin crew member is really such a great thing, when that is the kind of consequence on foreign nations of the arrival of all these millions of wealthy Western travellers whom you cosset, ferry about and deliver upon these nations?

Why is it that we are all so intent on visiting exotic far away lands anyway? Do we really dislike *our own country* so much?

In religious times, people would go on pilgrimages, but you see, this involved showing *respect* for the local peoples, and being treated as *guests*, rather than arriving like visiting royalty, taking over the local environment and treating the native people as servants and slaves.

For we do not see in practice that this mass tourism has increased *respect* between nations. Rather, there seems to be more than ever, what only can be described as *race hate*.

For example, the British are not terribly keen on the French, and the French feel pretty much the same, and this suspicion and dislike applies more or less to every neighbouring country of any race. We have all grown up with "hate names" for foreign races, and this goes far beyond the "black against white" racism which is focussed on almost exclusively in the media and therefore in a very negligent way.

So equally, in business, the globalisation policies of likewise "invading" every foreign nation - for example *Macdonalds* has restaurant chains or outlets in almost every major country in the world - are working in a similar fashion in destroying local cultures, and producing more depersonalisation of the foreign nations, and therefore inevitably sowing the seeds of hate against us.

But almost equally bad, we are seeing tens of thousands of *job*, even *womens' jobs*, shipped out of *our countries* to these far away lands in services which seem crazy, for example when banking and telephone enquiries call centres are set up in places like India, for a mystified UK population, who then call to enquire about people and places these Indian ladies and gentlemen have almost certainly never heard of nor ever seen.

For behind almost all the decisions that are taken in high places is some kind of financial saving or gain – back to *Mr Scrooge again* - and in this version of capitalism that we are having imposed upon us all, again we feel that the environment and the peoples of all nations, including our own, seem to be largely victims of this regime, except perhaps those elite who appear weekly in *OK, Hello* and similar magazines.

So thus, in entering the business world, even as a woman, we find ourselves somewhat like *Spartacus*, who on being taken away from the salt mines he had been sold into slavery in even before his birth, has been placed in a gladiatorial training school, in which he is told if he “kills” enough people in the arena, and thereby pleases enough powerful and influential people, he might even be made “free.”

That is, we enter the average corporation on the bottom rung. Those who have worked in such places know that most of the kind people never rise above the bottom rung.

That is, because as the *Des'ree* song says “you’ve gotta be bad, you’ve gotta be tough” etc., to make it in *this* world, as Hilary Clinton’s father also explained to her at an early age by forcing her to go out and fight the bully saying “there’s no room for cowards in this house” when she arrived home in tears one day.

Rather, the person who gets into power is the one willing to crack the whip, to enforce even the most stupid and unreasonable orders onto the slaves below.

We just cannot build pyramids without lots of slaves, you see, and because the people in the Western countries are demanding too many human rights now, our leaders feel perhaps it is best to find some far away land where the people are used to being abused, like India or Africa or Asia, and so therefore don’t complain and whinge so much when the whip needs to be applied.

Just as traditionally in many schools, a head master or mistress would frequently appoint a tough “deputy” to take all the flak for enforcing the rules, yet leave him or herself looking good, a clever business owner or manager will likewise appoint some kind of eager-for-advancement despot as deputy for the same reason, while he or she takes all the glory for the “results” produced by the hounding and bullying of those further down the ladder that this “henchperson” has carried out.

It matters not whether this bullying “ringmaster” or “mistress” is actually competent at the details of the work that is being done generally speaking, it only matters whether *those who actually carry out the work* are competent, and generally as we have said, these are the *Indians* and not the *Chiefs*.

So a corporate Mr or even Ms Scrooge will likely only rise higher by showing absolute obedience to follow orders, and consequently therefore will likely be fully capable of unquestioningly enforcing on others *the very same*, and thus we see the kind of corporate culture that the average woman is getting into if she enters the business world in that way.

We are all surely familiar with this kind of boss of either gender who is nice as pie and bootlicking to his or her superior, and tough, mean and ruthless in regard to those on a lower rung.

Unfortunately this model of “pyramid building” style organisation applies not only to businesses but also government departments and local authorities.

In the UK, for example, many government departments are so organised that it is difficult for managers to fire incompetent staff, largely because as the lower ranks of civil servants are now so poorly paid in comparison to their equivalents in the commercial and industrial sectors, it is hard to recruit competent people to do what are in fact very responsible jobs.

But these poorly paid jobs are truly vital, as their performance can either help the country to run fairly and smoothly, or on the other hand, frustrate and drive the nation's citizens crazy due to a petty bureaucratic and incompetent mentality, which everyone in any developed Western nation must have experienced at least a little of.

So that is, instead of promoting the conscientious and principled people into positions of authority, who would see that the public are rendered the *true service* which their organisational titles would suggest, the less competent but more obedient and authoritarian are promoted.

And in fact, due to the difficulty of sacking incompetent people in these government bodies, in many cases, the only way a manager can get rid of incompetent staff is astonishingly *by promoting them*, because not only does this get them off his or her patch, it enables him or her to hang onto the truly competent staff, which as we see can only be achieved by a deliberate policy by such a manager of *not promoting* the more competent members of staff, without whom the whole system would come tumbling down and the public services would grind to a halt.

So are those ladies who have never worked in a public service department now still surprised at the incompetence and stupidity they have all likely experienced while dealing with it in any major Western country?

For we are seeing in general, that the people who hold the fabric of our society together, such as teachers, hospital doctors and other public service workers or “civil servants”, are being disrespected and debased in any case, in comparison to the financial rewards and respect those of equivalent ability and intelligence receive if they choose to work in the business world or *private sector*.

But to be good in business generally requires one to either have a bullying Mr Scrooge mentality, or else a seductive *Ms Scrooge in disguise* persona.

For we have already mentioned Gavin Kennedy's influential work, *Everything is Negotiable*, which basically explains that the only way to succeed in any kind of business deal is by finding clever means to deceive the other party.

If we keep negotiating deals biased in *our* favour, we become *a business success*. If not, we likely fail.

The issue we are always confronted with in any kind of business situation is however – *what is a fair price?*

The unanswerable question is – *what is something worth?*

How much is any particular product worth? How much is a man or woman's labour worth?

In the competitive business world we have only one answer to that – not whether there is any *intrinsic* worth to anything, but merely *whatever we can get for it*.

So the man or woman in the jungle works sixteen hours a day cutting sugar cane with a knife or collecting coconuts, but gets only a few dollars for a week's work, but the man or woman who owns our local megastore, maybe shoots or plays golf at the country club or sits by the swimming pool while his or her employees sell it to us, and receives maybe a dollar for a single coconut or bag of sugar of thousands that may be sold in any week.

So we do not wish to be an anti-capitalist bore, because we are not against business as such, in the sense that surely no society or world is possible without some form of *trade*.

But what we are pointing out is that any decent woman who is enmeshing herself in the *corporate* business world is really almost inevitably involving herself in some kind of exploitation and deceit, unless she is working for a company that has a very strong ethical policy, *which it actually carries out*.

And as we have already said, this “service to corruption” creates a dichotomy between her private and public life which will trouble her, and force her into some kind of escape, which we see is so easily offered to her now in modern society in all kinds of ways, including wild partying and drinking, sexual adventuring, dream holidays abroad, or other frantic social life that keeps her mind off the little manipulations and suppression of qualms she is obliged to carry out by her superiors each day.

For example because the capitalistic structure of business can succeed only on *sales*, the sales person is one of the highest paid members of the business and corporate world, which comes to a grinding halt without him or her.

Again, it does not matter if what we sell is the best of its kind, or even at a fair price, all that matters is that we are able to promote and sell *our* line or product or range better than the next woman or man.

And for this, if successful, we shall be handsomely paid.

For example, let us look at estate agency, or as they say in America *real estate*.

That sounds like another decent and “respectable” job for a lady, and we know this is a field favoured by many women, as the money is usually good, it is almost wholly about presentation and there is little need to get one's hands dirty.

But the truth is that in the UK for example, we have seen house prices rise enormously, doubling in only a short matter of years, so that even young professional people such as newly qualified teachers or doctors find great difficulty buying a home of their own in what has been for centuries a principally property owning nation.

The underlying strategy here has been simple. Due to the “women’s liberation” which has taken place, it is expected that a couple who buy a house will be *both* working, thus enabling estate agents to artificially inflate the prices of property over the last decade or two by sometimes even several hundred percent.

Other sneaky and subtle policies have been employed by some firms of estate agents, such as prompting the buyer to lie about their salary in order to obtain a mortgage loan from a bank or “building society” larger than they would otherwise receive by honestly stating their earnings.

These kinds of policies have of course enslaved millions of women into having to work hard just to keep up the payments on their homes, and as usual, Western governments have stood by and done little or nothing about this, while all these women get enslaved and separated from their families for most of their waking hours, for reasons we have already explained.

So we see again, that women have been tricked into working when there was no need by the wicked witch of feminism who was posing as their friend, whereas as *wives and mothers* women could have as in the past been supported by a *suitable* man, and thus they have not become “liberated” as promised, but *enslaved*.

Therefore we now have the “superwoman” with her career, her family and her cordon bleu cookery and hostess skills, forced to be not only a “career woman” but to also be a wonderful mother, and a slim and sexually adventurous “sex goddess” for her husband or male partner.

This all looks like “success”, but the reality is that most women are killing themselves quickly or slowly, and resorting to tablets and binge drinking to try to fight off the stress of such a hyperactive and hyper-stressed more or less workaholic lifestyle.

We also know however that many women are being forced into work and cannot escape it, especially if they have no other financial support, as they would have had from the right kind of man.

But oftentimes even with the wrong man, they might have got more support, had his job also not been transferred to the Third World, which has happened to millions of British men, especially the non-professional classes, just as has happened no doubt to millions of men in other Western nations.

Thus we are saying, if women must work, it would be best to do so in the most scrupulous kind of job they can find.

It would be better for women *psychologically* to take *less* pay and do more honest work, than be in the manipulative sales and business world in a major way, which as we have seen is largely just a game of exploitation of the poor and weak, and an unfair effort to get more money than products or services naturally merit, likely in competition with others for the very same customers, so that a woman can easily find herself caught up unwillingly in a very aggressive, deceitful and cunning war.

For because the war is being conducted along the lines of Gavin Kennedy's tough negotiation strategies, however much Mr Kennedy might argue it, *success* will be defined by men or women getting as much benefit for themselves and giving as little as possible benefit to the other party in the deal.

If a woman has real talent however, she may be able to run a small business, such as a shop or even a home-based business, the latter of which has the added side-benefit of her being enabled to spend more time with her children.

But all such businesses, even for the cleverest lady, tend to be mentally stressful, because no self-employed person has the feeling of security that an employee generally gets from a constant salary, and so again, a woman may find this is a hard task if she is dependent entirely on her own income without a partner.

Clearly, such an alternative form of work however may be suitable for a woman who does have a partner, who may not for example be very well paid, so that any money she produces from such a home business effort would be greatly beneficial.

However, any person in business faces this same difficulty of - *how much should I charge, how much is fair?*

But unfortunately people are forced to calculate what they charge based on *what they need*.

Thus, let us for example say, that a woman selling flowers who needs \$500 per week to cope with her expenditure, sells only twenty bunches. She is clearly going to have to charge at least \$25 a bunch, whereas if she were able to sell fifty bunches she would need only \$10 each for them.

But what if she is in competition with another person – man or woman – who is somehow able to sell more bunches and therefore charge less?

Perhaps she should like in the well known comedy sketch hike up her skirt and show some leg to get the passers by to stop and *buy from her*. Or maybe that is what her competitor is already doing, and that is why she is outdoing her already?

So the competition begins.

Perhaps one lady who sees her sales threatened will get into her car and deliberately drive by into a big puddle to splash the other lady's flower displays and arrangements with mud, to discourage others from buying at her now dirty stall, and thus giving "shop soiled" a whole new and literal meaning.

Or perhaps whichever of the ladies has more money in the bank will *sell at a loss*, thereby driving the other lady's prices down until she goes out of business, and then when she is gone, and there is no competition on her "patch" she will put them back up.

There again we see, that so called "free market competition" does *not* necessarily benefit the public as is so often claimed.

Perhaps again, should the first lady realise that this is what is being done to her – that is, a deliberate loss-taking ploy to drive the newcomer out of business – she will in fury at being frustrated from earning money to feed her children and pay her rent, go and "scratch her competitor's eyes out."

So welcome to the business world of men, ladies - *ain't it grand?*

For men will sometimes physically threaten or fight each other, even over a window cleaning round, when that means one man or the other stays in business and supports himself and his family, and the other man goes down and out.

Or even sometimes a nice friendly ice cream van man has been known to take a wheel spanner to a rival, to make sure he too stays off "his patch."

Of course, most people will avoid trying to be in direct competition with others if possible, but it isn't always easy, there is always competition in every field, and when you get customers, the odds are you are taking someone else's away.

So because more than just pride is at stake – that is, people's actual livelihoods and ability to support their families - business competition can without difficulty descend into an animalistic rivalry, and thus by the way business is currently carried out, we are creating an animalistic world.

We only have to watch a few episodes of the shenanigans of the Ewing boys in *Dallas* to get an idea of the constant betrayal, subterfuge and savagery that goes on.

Even the man or woman who wins the battle for rights to operate on a certain "patch", realises that though they may have beaten off the current rival for the present, perhaps another day will come when another tougher and meaner new rival will appear.

So we are saying, that unless one has something very extraordinary and rare to offer, like being a great singer like Pavarotti, or some incredible designer of aeroplanes like *Howard Hughes* – who was therefore much more than just a *businessman* we see - there is little *security* in the business world, small or large.

Knowing this animalistic battle that is always going on in business however, mostly out of sight of the public *behind the scenes*, most women will not choose to go into "the front line" alone, but will ally themselves with something *big* that they feel protected by.

Which as we have explained, means being some kind of corporate servant, such as the lady who works in sales for a large pharmaceutical company, or in the financial services sector, which because of the general presence of high security as in banks, and the general perception of money-centred businesses as having an air of respectability, many women find to be ideal places for their particular talents.

If they can sell loans, advertising space, or insurance, even across the telephone, that seems to be a very safe way for women to do business on behalf of their bosses.

But as we have said, when we look at what women are really representing in doing these jobs, a decent woman when she thinks about it is going to have to struggle with her principles.

For example, if she works for a bank, she may well have pressure placed upon her to telephone sell loans to another woman who might agree under equal pressure to take on a debt for a loan she cannot in reality afford to service.

Millions of Western women have got into fairly serious debt due to this easy availability of credit, and as we have mentioned, a significant number are discovering that the only way they can get out of their financial straits is by turning to some form of prostitution or similar work in the so called "sex industry."

Respectable looking women appear on TV from time to time, confessing to having followed this route, in order to feed their children and support their "lifestyle", even though it might mean that they sooner or later meet some kind of beastly "client" who may rape, beat or even murder them.

But most of these same women overlook this terrifying threat to their safety and life, due to the huge amounts of money that you see *the wealthy businessmen* are able to give them to purchase their bodies, and as we have said, these ladies do this often under the duress of this awful spiralling out of control debt they have unwittingly been persuaded to taken on board by some silver tongued salesman or sales lady.

As our "friend" *Mr Scrooge* might say if women complain about their indebted lot - *are there no debtors' prisons, are there no whorehouses?*

As to "silver tongued ladies" the public is now generally aware for example of these "pyramid selling" schemes which have been around, and exploit all those who are further down the chain for the benefit only of those at the top.

For example in the UK there was a scheme several years back which used "empowering women" as a slogan and functioned by each woman lower in the chain putting several thousand pounds in, and then setting up a little operation of her own, where again using the excuse of "female empowerment" persuaded another bunch of naïve women to donate their money also, under the same promise that they could get another set of women to "join" this "wonderful" scheme, which was "empowering women everywhere."

Please note, this ludicrous scheme, was carried out *entirely* by well-dressed and *persuasive ladies*, who sold their plan enthusiastically, and cared little or naught about those at the bottom who had been foolish enough to make their huge donations, but not willing to trick another group of women *below them* with the same scheme, when they finally realised what had been done to them.

So we are really saying that business *as it currently is*, is *no place for a lady*, or for that matter a true *gentleman*.

For example, let us take the “respectable” *antiques trade*, as portrayed somewhat realistically in the much loved BBC comedy series, *Lovejoy*, in which underused movie actor, *Ian McShane*, played a roguish antiques dealer who lived on his wits and barely within the fringes of the law.

In this entertaining series watched by millions of British people almost religiously for well over a decade, antiques dealer *Lovejoy* waded through almost every scam in the book, some being played by others around him and others played out by himself.

For basically, the goal of “successful” antique dealing is to deceive the seller about the likely *market value* of their goods, and then after purchase of the “stock”, to pump up the selling price to your own customers as much as one possibly can.

Again, there is little place for soft-hearted and kind people in these worlds, as they would always be giving the other party the benefit of the doubt.

That is, a woman or man who *makes* furniture or paints a picture and sells it to someone else for a price the customer can well afford is performing *fair business*.

But a man or woman who fleeces some old granny, giving her a hundred pounds for some works of craftsmanship or art which he knows he can sell for thousands, surely cannot be considered to be engaged in *fair trade*.

That is, we must surely have *trade* – a baker must be able to sell the bread and cakes he or she makes for a fair sum of money, but again, what is fair?

We might suggest the government sets a price, but suppose one little baker's shop is in village of only a hundred people, and another is in one of two hundred.

How is the first one going to survive selling produce at the same price, when the latter has clearly got twice as many potential customers?

We cannot of course answer all the question of business in a short book, but what we can say, is that some kind of code of practice must be put in place for each industry and trade which limits these things.

There must be fairness in business, and there must be *proper means and “watchdogs” with teeth* to protect the buyer of goods or services on some kind of common code.

But until that kind of structure is made firm, we will see only that as Richard Dawkins' famous book said, *nice girls and guys finish last*.

However, in a later edition of Professor Dawkins' *The Selfish Gene*, he added a new chapter called *Nice Guys Finish First*.

This was based upon a piece of research he did into "game theory", but we do not exactly mean the same kind of *psychological* Game Theory as in Eric Berne's book, *Games People Play*.

That is, Dawkins introduced to us a game called *Prisoner's Dilemma*, which is played by two people separated by a screen who both make a move in the game by simultaneously marking down on a piece of paper either a capital letter C for *Cooperate* or a D for *Defect*.

The object of the game is - *as in business* - to stack up as many points as possible, and certainly of course more than your opponent.

If both parties choose to mark a D for *Defect*, each score zero points.

If either party choose to mark a C for *Cooperate* whilst the other marks a D for *Defect*, the party who defect gains 3 points and the one who cooperates gets zero points.

Again, this is like a real life business situation, where quite likely a party who "cheats" or plays "unfair" does very well at the expense of the other, who gains little or nothing in the deal.

Finally, if both parties cooperate, each scores only 1 point.

So we see that the person who cheats or "defects" can if they can persuade the person who cooperates to keep cooperating, win the game far and away, by stacking up points three at a time, and for example in four moves could gain 12 points, which would take a pair of constantly cooperative players *twelve moves*, i.e. three times longer, to accumulate.

The trouble however for the defector or "cheat" is that if a cooperative type of player finds the other person keeps defecting on him or her, they will usually stop cooperating, and then both players in the game will get nothing.

But then, a "sneaky" player, who prefers to defect, will from time to time, throw in a cooperative move, which will persuade the normally cooperative player to start cooperating again, but as soon as he or she does this, the habitual defector starts cheating again to gain the three points back at the expense of the co-operator going back to scoring zero once more.

Again, we are familiar with such strategies in our own personal and business life, of others who having already let us down on some occasion making fresh *promises* to get out cooperation back and then start cheating on us all over again.

Women in particular must be well aware that this mentality is found in many men, and really, to make promises one frequently fails to keep, which are of a significant nature, must surely be considered as some form of betrayal or abuse.

But psychological issues aside, keeping to the simple points game, we can see this is a rather tricky game to play, and thus Professor Dawkins threw out a challenge to the academic community and general public to submit some kind of strategy that they thought was the best in the form of a simple computer program.

He then held a “tournament” of these computer programs – that is, simple forms of artificial intelligence programmed with these strategies – to see which strategy of playing this game was the most successful.

And to his great surprise, he found that the strategy in the game that beat all others was called *tit for tat*.

That is, suppose we have two players, A and B, the first move played by A should be cooperative, and A continues to play cooperative moves as long as B does, but *immediately* B plays a defecting move, A *never* cooperates again until B plays a further cooperative move.

If B returns to playing cooperative moves, A then cooperates again, but again, if B goes back to defecting, A does likewise.

So this may seem somewhat trivial, but it really is not.

It is really about how we treat other people, not only in business, but even in our personal lives.

The point this tournament of strategies proved, especially in the context of business, which we need to take note of, is that it proved that the cooperative guy or girl *need not finish last*, though rather was in fact *the biggest winner*; but the vital point here was that this outstanding victory was achieved *if and only if* the cooperative player of the game played *only with other cooperative players*.

Hence, Richard Dawkins' new chapter title:

Nice Guys (and Girls) Finish First.

So that is, applied to a business context, we *can* be a business success as “nice people”, but if and only if we deal *only* with other fair minded people.

Obviously this is not an absolute, there must be a little leeway, but we must have some means of identifying the relatively “fair players” from those who are mostly cheats, or else we will just fall victims to the unscrupulous *players*, who will cheat us out of the fair reward we deserve for the services or goods we have supplied to them.

Again, the point here is that the “defector” or “cheat” in business has got to learn that their *short-termism* - that is a short term gain, for a long term loss of trust and therefore likely *income* - is not the way to be a genuine success either in business or as a human being.

A good business relationship, as a personal one, should - *Professor Dawkins has proven* - be based on integrity and trust.

But the cheats will only learn that lesson *if we teach them it*, both by reporting their unfair practices to “the town crier”, and also by refusing to deal with them, and therefore kicking them out of the game.

In some business and trades however, it is easier for these cheats to operate than others, such as the “fly by night” type of trader, like one of the well known “cowboy builders”, who may charge us some horrendous fee for a job, but then travels some distance where he (let's again assume it is a *he* in this case, as is statistically most likely) is not known, and thus can hoodwink another unsuspecting customer.

This latter example tells us something important.

Which is that when we have the situation of businesses – small or large - whose market covers a wide geographical area, we do not know who they are, and therefore they are a threat to this culture of *fairness and trust* we would wish to build, unlike local businesses or services who are known within a community to operate in a fair and trustworthy manner.

Thus as the saying goes, we should always be suspicious of *strangers from faraway places bearing gifts*.

This of course has broad implications for the advertising industry, which seeks to inform us about the otherwise “stranger” and unknown business entities we are dealing with, in a way that purports to be *honest, fair, legal and decent*, as per the UK Advertising Standards Authority code.

But in reality, we know that claims made for products and services are typically exaggerated, and frequently at least partially or wholly dishonest.

All this was perhaps first highlighted in the modern era of history in a famous British legal case, *Carlill v Carbolic Smoke Ball Company (1893)*.

This case concerned a company that promised to pay £100 – an awful lot of money in 1893 you will appreciate – to anyone who contracted influenza after using their smoke balls for a due time.

So upon refusal to pay, the company was taken to court, after someone predictably caught influenza and tried to take them up on their offer.

This is typical of the misleading or spurious claims made by business in general.

This case was important, because though denying outright false claims such as this “quack cure”, it did *not* outlaw what it described as “sales puff”, which we might call in modern jargon “hype.”

As a door-to-door salesman enthusiastically once told the author when describing his art – “you have got to make them believe that their decision to buy your product is the best and greatest bloomin' thing they have ever done in their entire life.”

You know - even if it's a humdrum set of encyclopaedias, a new kind of waste bin, or a floor safe or whatever.

This "build up" is the part and parcel of every entertainer's weaponry – they introduce the often mediocre act on stage as "the *wonderful*, the *amazing*, the *incredible*, the *spectacular*, etc. etc."

That is, the efforts to sell us goods we probably don't need, or sometimes even want, is all made into some kind of "circus", with a ringmaster or ringmistress of some kind whipping up the frenzy that makes us want to *buy*.

But sometimes we are satisfied with the model of car, TV or whatever we have already got, the hype won't work on us in such a case, and then Mr Scrooge enforces upon us what is known as *planned obsolescence*.

Principally, the technique here is to make us feel cheap, mean or "unfashionable" to make us buy a new substitute for the already satisfactory product we have.

For example, new shapes of cars or styles of clothes are dreamed up, to make our "old ones" look odd, "dated" and even laughed at.

Women have got to become aware these are the strategies of the modern day *Mr Scrooge* and *Ms Scrooge* who is busy joining him, which not only are environmentally damaging and wasteful of our rapidly diminishing natural resources, but are often forcing her into enslaving work, beyond the desires of her mental and physical resources, and also forcing her unwillingly in many cases to neglect her husband or male partner and children.

As we have said however, we are not advocating an unkempt, unhygienic or hippy type lifestyle, freed from all modern technology, as we do not feel this to be realistic or sensible in a world packed with billions of people who could never be fed and clothed any longer without the machinery and transport of our modern world.

But what we are saying, is that all modern women should be aware of Mr and Ms Scrooges attempts to enslave her, and fleece her of whatever capital she has got, by objecting to these unfair demands and negotiating strategies which force her into a too stressful working and personal life needlessly, by making too many demands on her limited time, energy and financial resources.

For example, there is a very widely used strategy now of what Gavin Kennedy calls *Death By a Thousand Cuts*.

That is, we find as time goes by that more and more agencies and businesses want "a piece of us", they want us to sign an agreement which involves us paying *so much a month*, and then instead of just having a few monthly or quarterly bills to worry about, we see that we have built up a huge number of these little "monthly charges", which when added together can frequently come to a staggering amount, which we are then forced to work ourselves to exhaustion to finance.

That is, we bleed to a *death from a thousand cuts*.

Then another industry even arises from the ashes of this chaos to “save us”, which offers to “consolidate” our many debts into just one “easy” (laughs) payment, which will typically have a heavy interest rate attached to it, and will sometimes have us paying off this mountain of debts for quite likely *the rest of our lives*.

So a lady in her right mind has go to say “no” to all these efforts to “help her” with easy credit and such like, and try to carefully live within her budget and means – even with the help of a computer spreadsheet if necessary!

Or for example again, to frustrate and defeat Mr Scrooge a lady can for example choose to dress in *classic* clothes instead of being a fashion slave. Any averagely attractive woman will look good just in a pair of jeans and blouse or t-shirt and simple jacket and shoes as we have already said as long as they are all well-washed and clean.

She may need a few other outfits and pairs of shoes to cover the various occasions, but all this need only be a fraction of the amount of clothes and shoes which the average Western woman now owns.

For if she panders to every new fashion that comes out, she will become strangled by this over-materialistic lifestyle, which demands she works her nerves and fingers to the bone for things that she doesn't really need.

Likewise, a woman should consider if it worth killing herself to finance that special holiday abroad that costs thousands of dollars or pounds, when it is so easy now for anyone to see all these exotic far away lands on TV, and there are anyway still nice local places to go which are far cheaper.

Of course, we know that so called “package holidays” have made holidays abroad sometimes far cheaper than even local ones.

But let us not forget also that as we have said, we are often thereby destroying the native cultures, *true* economies, and environments of those countries we subject to mass invasion thereby, so we have to ask ourselves the question, is our imposition on these foreign lands and peoples really fair?

And of course, if the frequently neglected local holiday resorts were again well subscribed, their prices would drop anyway, so that we also see that holidays abroad are almost certainly at the expense of our own country and our own people.

Of course we cannot deny that it is a far more satisfying experience being in the Grand Canyon or Paris or Venice than watching even the best TV documentary film about such places, but really how many of these locations can any of us ever visit even in a lifetime, so what about all the ones we must inevitably miss?

That is, we have to ask the question – what is really of value in life? – we again ask the question – when on your death bed, are you going to say – “ah, that trip to Paris or the Pyramids was so wonderful – for that my life has all been worthwhile”?

But we know that women do not come to such a conclusion and observation at such a serious time, as neither do men.

Apart from concerns about whether there is some kind of hereafter, which surely none of us can really say for certain one way or the other until our time comes, as usual, we are going to think of our human connections to other people, about *our relationships*.

Mr Scrooge and his modern growing relative, *Ms Scrooge*, you see, have made a decision about their whole life.

They have put material needs and gain above *human relationships*.

So that is the question we must all ask ourselves either as sellers or buyers of business products or services – are we going to put *human beings* first, or are we going to put the pursuit of profit and the acquisition of thrills and dead inanimate things first?

Because if we do the latter ourselves, how can we complain when Mr and Ms Scrooge and the rest of the world do it to us?

But it is not enough for a fair-minded woman to be good, kind and honest whilst the rest of the world is not.

She must be able to see all the tricks of Mr Scrooge and all his disciples of either gender, and be a wiser buyer or even campaigner against these out-of-control forces of materialism and capitalism.

And when she sells her own property or labour she must decide what for her is a fair price and *stick to it*. And if she cannot get a good deal from one business or person, she must strike that person or business forever off her list, unless she has very strong and reliable evidence to suggest that person or business has learned to play fair.

Likewise in employee jobs, she should seek out the most ethical and fair companies to work for, perhaps those who have signed up to various fair trade policies and so on, but bearing in mind, that some of the very worst will even try to acquire such a “badge of honour”, to pretend that they are ethical when in truth they are really quite the opposite.

In the current society, in which a woman may be forced to run some kind of business, or do some kind of job which is not perfectly satisfactory to her conscience, she should at least try to choose *the lesser of the evils* or options available to her, so that she may feel as little mental and moral conflict in the carrying out of her duties - such as a principled woman attempting to work in the sex or gambling industries would inevitably experience - and so thus she is enabled to maintain the best quality of freedom, happiness and financial, mental and physical health and wealth.

Chapter Twelve – Meeting Doctor Frankenstein – *saving women's body and soul*

Though healthcare would not immediately seem to be an issue of liberating women from the negative aspect of the power and influence of men, we see on closer inspection that most of modern medicine has been created and designed by men, in particular the vast spectrum of drugs that women are now confronted with which are offered to them as cures, palliatives or panaceas of various kinds.

The vast majority of surgeons, both cosmetic and of other varieties are also men, as are still the majority of doctors in general, and thus this particular issue of women's healthcare is legitimately an issue of how women are being treated by men.

However, it is not only the diagnoses and treatments emanating from the traditionally trained practitioner we wish to address here, but also those coming from the "alternative" one.

The main purpose here is to point out a number of *commonsense* matters, which every women should consider, rather than bowing down to the so called "experts" who sometimes have the knowledge and understanding they claim, but many times also do not.

However, we wish to also make women aware of some important research findings, particularly as regards the function of sleep, of which they are likely unaware to date.

Immediately we should point out that despite every doctor's *Hippocratic Oath*, which is a promise to carry out his or her healing art faithfully, and without harming others or abusing the position of trust in any way, unfortunately the modern doctor of either gender has been placed in a somewhat unholy alliance with the forces of capitalism and big business, by being not only a genuine alleviator of suffering and where possible healer, but also in a sense a "salesperson" for the drugs and equipment the modern technological world supplies.

We are not *blaming* doctors for this predicament they have been placed in, since we know they are doing their best generally speaking.

But for example, women should be aware that it has been a long established practice to court doctors with gifts, "free lunches" (which as we know, there is no such thing as in the *capitalist society*) and other incentives to persuade them to use a particular drug or piece of equipment to treat their patients with, out of a variety of competing products which will typically be available.

The average general practitioner, under great stress to begin with, simply does not have the time to check out all the latest research on ever treatment and drug, out of the vast volumes of this material which appear daily.

Thus her or she can only give us what they deem to be the best advice currently available to them, and so therefore to some extent are forever *testing* all but the most long established treatments upon us, watching for signs of success or failure to guide them in their future decisions.

Clearly the more experimental treatments are much more likely to come from hospital specialists rather than the general practitioner, and women should be fully aware of when they are thus putting themselves at risk, due to some not thoroughly tested treatment or drug, and demand that they get as good an explanation as is currently available of any risky treatment they are considering undergoing.

But equally, we all need to be realistic and acknowledge the fact that all doctors and branches of medical science have their limitations, and it is not fair on the medical profession in general to imagine that it can cure all our ills without doubt.

There is a tendency however for many women to run to doctors and hospitals far more than men ever do - many of whom cannot generally be got near a hospital or doctor's surgery unless so incapacitated they have to be carried there on a stretcher. This is partly because of women's more complex bodies, particularly as regarding their reproductive systems.

But we are urging that it is largely for *this very reason* of more frequent attendance at the doctor's surgery, that modern women should be much more careful in seeking treatment than men.

A woman's body and brain is generally speaking clearly less robust, more finely tuned and sensitively balanced than a man's.

Though women do have certain health advantages, such as they fare better in terms of longevity and surviving exposure to cold, women must acknowledge the fact of their generally greater physical fragility and sensitivity and act accordingly.

Of course, we know that there are some very robust women, as there are equally some fragile and weak men, but as usual we are not talking of these exceptions, but of the general case and rule.

Women as it appears far more prone to mental health problems than men, also due to their greater emotional sensitivity and more finely balanced personalities and physiology, remembering that mind and body are interrelated, and imbalance in one will tend to more easily imbalance the other.

Though modern statistics seem to indicate that men and women are now almost equally prone to mental illness, we believe this is a gross distortion of the true figures for *naturally predisposed mental health problems*.

That is, we find that many men who have been drug addicts or showing criminal or "antisocial behaviours" are now being *medicalized* and falling within the parameters of mental health care, whereas only a few decades back the incidence of *genuine* mental health problems was accepted to be several times the number for women as compared to men.

Similarly, this appears to be proven and reflected in the amount of prescription of drugs such as tranquilisers like Valium (*diazepam*) and alleged “mood enhancers” or anti-depressants like Prozac and its equivalents which are given to women far more so in comparison to men.

There seems to be some effort on the part of the medical community to cover up this comparative mental fragility of women as demonstrated by these prescription statistics, blaming it on the fact women are more responsible and have more family responsibilities and so on than men, but this would seek to overlook the *reality* that for example women are generally far more emotional than men, more likely to *easily* get into weepy or enraged states and so on, so there seems to be some denial of reality going on in the medical community, which seeks to cover up the idea that women have got any weaknesses at all medically speaking.

But ultimately this is not fair upon women themselves, because their more finely balanced and sensitive bodies and nervous systems need more protection and rest, and thus the “superwoman” role that so many women are being cast in nowadays, would be discouraged and to a large extent *disbanded* if this *biological truth* were allowed to be openly acknowledged and accepted.

That is, we are openly saying and accusing the medical community of not clearly acknowledging the *average* woman's more delicate constitution and therefore *protecting her* from the undue stress and pressure that the modern society now places upon her, in her role as “superwoman.”

So again, we have to distrust not so much any individual doctor, but a kind of medical consensus that is coming from “the authorities” which may not actually be caring about women as it really should.

For example, whilst Prozac has been presented to women as a safe drug, free from any major side effects, we should recall that drugs such as barbiturates were also once prescribed for pregnant women, and amphetamines as anti-depressants or weight loss pills, neither of which drugs would any longer be prescribed for very sound medical reasons, which were not clearly understood at those times only a few short decades ago.

That is, no woman would ever be prescribed an amphetamine now due to its addictive qualities, and no pregnant woman would ever be prescribed a barbiturate due to the possible effects on the unborn child, just as we now realise that a mother addicted to crack cocaine during pregnancy will produce a so called “crack baby.”

So the question is whether our current doctors know any better than those of that generation about what is safe for your body and what is not?

What we are saying, is that women should certainly use doctors to check out any genuine health concern, and have themselves tested for the presence of any serious or life-threatening problem such as breast cancer, but perhaps they should not be so keen to run to the doctor for *treatments* all the time, and pills which may actually not be sought out for a genuine *medical* problem, but merely to alleviate an unhappy mental or emotional state.

It is well known that women have more mood swings and a generally deeper emotional life than men, whom as we have explained are mostly more simple and straightforward creatures in both the psychological and sexual sense.

Some artistically inclined men, who are more sensitive, may well experience a very similar routine psyche to the average woman, but we rarely see such men running to the doctor to cope with their negative emotional states, as do we see women.

Rather most such men will tend to use some “non-medical” treatment of their state of mind, such as alcohol, tobacco or other drugs, as increasingly so will many women.

In that regard, we wish to explain the biological effects of alcohol use which many women may not be aware of to the extent we are about to explain.

The central part of what we are about to reveal, is that any doctor will tell you that aside from conditions that can be cured by surgery, or treated conclusively with specific drugs, such as quinine being used to treat malaria, the general cure for all ills is not anything a doctor can actually *do*, but to allow the body to heal itself via *rest*.

Thus, many times, when we have a problem, all the doctor can really do is to give us a painkiller, and tell us to go and take some rest, and *let our own body do the healing*.

This advice and recommendation is of course an important function of the doctor, because armed with the knowledge we do not have anything life-threatening such as cancer or a brain tumour, we can with that *assurance* then submit to taking it easy for a few hours, days or weeks as required, and thus let our own body do its amazing healing work to optimum effect.

The doctor is especially important in the modern world, because he or she gives us *permission* to take this much needed rest, which left to our own guilty conscience, or the tender mercies of our employers, we might not be sensible and legitimised in otherwise taking.

The very fact that *someone cares* is also a healing force in itself, partly because many people in the current society, who are without partners or children and disconnected from their birth family and other relatives, may have nobody else whatsoever in the world who clearly fits that description of *carer*.

So we are not knocking or devaluing doctors here, we are saying, let us be sensible about how we use them and the drugs they sometimes – often under considerable pressure of time and circumstance – so freely make available to us.

That is, many people run to the pharmacy every time they have even a minor headache and pop pills because they just don't feel so good.

We have as a society all become rather mollicoddled and squeamish as compared to our ancestors, who often had to endure things like childbirth or the extraction of teeth without any modern drugs or anaesthetics whatsoever to salve their pain, the former of which admittedly many mothers still do.

So there are two aspects here – we somehow expect to always *feel good*, but that is not how nature works in us.

Rather, the pain coming from Nature in our bodies is always some kind of *a message*.

We all get little twinges now and then, which we cannot interpret, but as long as they do not persist, they are surely of little or no consequence.

But if we run to the medicine cupboard every time we get some relatively minor pain, we risk short-circuiting the body's natural coping mechanisms.

The other aspect is if we keep dulling our body's capacity to register sensations, we cannot in fact actually be certain that we are not blocking its reports to us of a genuine underlying problem.

For example, any unexplained pain that persists, should certainly be taken to a doctor to have checked out. But if we routinely dull our nerve endings with pain killers, how will we know if we no longer are able to sensitively observe and feel our bodily condition any more?

Part of this problem is that we use painkillers and also non-prescription drugs to rescue ourselves from a too stressful and exciting modern way of life.

That is, suppose we go on a drinking bout and wake up next morning with a fat head and hangover. Then we reach for a painkiller to blot out the pain, and something else to settle our stomach, and so it goes on.

Then we may eat a greasy meal, but not feel its damaging consequences any more, due to these same palliatives.

Finally, we perhaps finish off our meal with a cigarette and some strong coffee which zaps some life back into the overworked and tired brain cells and depleted nervous resources.

By the time we recover our balance and all the chemicals wear off, it may be evening time, and then we are again looking for some excitement and drinks once more.

Thus we are trapped on a chemical roundabout, none of which in centuries gone by was part of a natural life.

The drinker in Victorian, Elizabethan times or the Middle Ages simply had to suffer the consequences of the night before, with only fresh water and the passage of time as the cure.

So we need to become aware that pain is not always our enemy but our friend, in informing us that we are making the wrong choices in life, and therefore storing up trouble for the future, and thus our body rightly protests to save us while it still may.

For the person who lives the above lifestyle for some years, may easily for example develop an ulcer, which were he or she to heed the warning signs and not dull the nerve endings with pain killers, might have been prevented by staying aware of our bodily signals and taking the appropriate measures in good time.

This avoidance of non-prescription drugs and prescribed or non-prescribed over-the-counter painkillers can therefore be seen as a general strategy to maintain good health.

We should really put as few unknown chemicals into our bodies as possible, unless there is some definitely established curative effect to a specific problem we have.

The art of preventative medicine must surely be to deal with all health problems *in their earliest stages* so that they may not develop into something worse, but be cut down in their infancy.

As we are saying, this can only be achieved with a sensitive, alert body and mind free of the continual assault of drugs, of either prescriptive or non-prescriptive varieties.

For example, it is necessary, as we have said, to dwell on the effects of alcohol as this has become so much in use by women in particular in the last few decades.

Firstly, as regards "normal" alcohol use, many women are not even aware that to protect the stomach lining, it is necessary to have eaten some preferably solid foods such as bread or even cake - though milk and cream will also put a lining on the stomach - *before* any significant amount of alcohol is consumed.

Equally, such a strategy, as well as preventing ulcers and stomach pain, will prevent the alcohol being absorbed quickly, and therefore stop a man or woman getting so drunk, and also will delay the rapid onset of the intoxicated state.

For surely the *legitimate* use of alcohol is to become *relaxed and merry* and able to enjoy the social occasion without getting so intoxicated one is a danger to oneself, and possibly others, by being physically incapacitated or mentally confused.

This is of course fairly common knowledge to many adults, but what is not commonly understood by either men or women is *the effect of alcohol on sleep*.

What must be understood here is that we basically have two distinct varieties of sleep.

Firstly, the deep, dreamless sleep, and secondly what is known as *REM* or "rapid eye movement" *sleep*, which is the dreaming sleep. It is called this as the eyeballs of the person experiencing it can be seen moving rapidly under the lids, as many of us will have observed when watching a dreaming person.

Scientists and psychologists have done research on these sleep patterns which has revealed that these two varieties of sleep alternate and repeat in cycles during the course of the night.

The best guess is that the dreaming sleep is some kind of a psychological balancing mechanism, and this is confirmed by experiments which have found that when deprived of this dreaming sleep for a number of days, people will become anxious and uneven tempered, and if this deprivation is carried on for long enough they will exhibit all sorts of aberrant and frightening mental states such as paranoia, uncontrollable fits of weeping or anger, threatening and sometimes violent behaviour, and possibly even hallucinations as we see in the case of alcoholics who are “drying out”, known as *delirium tremens*.

The deep sleep phase, on the other hand, is thought to carry out the general reparative operations on body and brain caused by the general wear and tear throughout the day.

Thus we are saying that these two kinds of sleep are both necessary in adequate quantities to balance both body and brain.

In particular, we are saying that the dreaming or REM sleep is a psychological balancing mechanism.

We can observe this is probably true, as we find after some very stressful experience we may have recurring dreams or nightmares about it.

Some experiences may be so deeply traumatic, that they cause such nightmares for the rest of our lives, such as those experienced by soldiers in war who have endured some harrowing events.

However, most of our normal everyday stresses will be dissolved by this restorative activity of the brain, given enough time and *sufficient sleep*.

But we can see also therefore, that for example a woman who is burning the candle at both ends, and possibly using some alcohol or sedative as a prop, may very well not get this much needed psychologically balancing sleep, and therefore get ratty and bad tempered for reasons she cannot clearly pinpoint.

She does not appreciate that this is not necessarily her “natural personality”, or really anything she can definitely consciously control, but basically a deteriorated state of her brain functioning caused by inadequate rest and sleep.

The issue here with alcohol, is that it has been found to inhibit this *psychologically balancing* dreaming sleep.

Thus, we find that if we sleep-in late after drinking a significant amount the previous night, we awaked with tired eyes, because what is called “the dream debt” causes us to dream continuously when the alcohol wears off, which was unable to happen in the earlier hours of the sleep whilst the chemical effects of the alcohol on the nervous system and brain persisted in a major way, and thus our eyes are heavy from the continuous swivelling about of the eyeballs which happens in the dreaming state.

We may also feel generally worn out due to the emotional reaction to what may often be troubling dreams, which we will tend to have when a lot of stress is “processed” or “output” at once, as can occur if we get a sudden long deep rest period after missing regular sleep for some time, or on the first night’s sleep clear of alcohol we get after drinking for several or more successive nights.

This stress release and balancing mechanism also explains generally the withdrawal symptoms experience by alcoholics and drugs users and addicts of various kinds, including those who have *suddenly* come off such drugs as Valium, or other sedatives which you see therefore again, have interfered with the ability to have dreaming sleep.

Equally, it can be seen that for this reason, those coming off these drugs, should only do so *slowly*, as all good doctors recommend.

It also suggests that whilst these drugs will *mask* such symptoms as depression and anxiety, their continued use will prevent or drastically hinder *a cure*, as they are blocking the natural ability of the brain to balance itself, by inhibiting this dreaming sleep.

What we wish to emphasize above all here, is that women (and men) must realise that *their mental state is basically a chemically controlled one, it is a physiological and biochemical state of the nervous system and brain.*

It is useful to consider the concept of *elasticity* here. We find in physics we can stretch a material, for example a metal guitar string, and if we only stretch it to a certain distance, when released it will spring back to more or less exactly its original length.

However, if we stretch it beyond what is known as its *elastic limit*, it loses this property of recovering its original length and becomes *plastic* in nature and permanently deformed.

Thus the structures of the brain, just as the lens of the eye, may experience the same tendency to lose their ability to restore themselves if *stretched beyond their limit*.

The term in cell physiology is called *sclerosis*, as in *multiple sclerosis*.

We see on the surface of our skin that some wounds will heal completely, whereas others will leave visible scars.

So we are suggesting the very same must surely be true of the brain, as it is likewise a mass of cell tissue, though many of its finer structures may still be far too deeply hidden and subtle for our modern science to see and investigate.

So we can only use a broad model at this stage of our knowledge of the brain, but perhaps this can be helpful in understanding our mental condition.

That is, we have those who are mongoloid or retarded at an early age, and who never develop to the normal level of intelligence, which would suggest they either have failed to develop certain brain structures or else those partially developed structures have prematurely *schlerozed*.

It appears in older children or adults, we can also cause stress damage to our systems by *psychological traumas* of various kinds, and we should observe in particular, that these are *always* brought about by powerful emotional responses, such as great fear, anxiety or rage.

(we do not of course discount that there may be *physically caused* damage also, such as that induced by a blow to the head or due to some chemical imbalance in the brain, but that is outside of our scope here, and in any case, the *consequence* is the same)

This would suggest to the thinking person, that these powerful emotional states which so many modern humans, and many women in particular so frequently indulge in, are likely not good for our bodies and brains, which has already been proven in the case of the “fight-flight response” leading to circulatory problems, heart disease and stomach ulcers, and may in time be proven to further the onset of mental problems, which as we can now hopefully see, are really somewhat schlerozed conditions of *brain physiology* which are reflected as psychological states.

So in terms of our everyday moods, most of the time we will “come out of” some state of anxiety, anger or depression – our system will balance itself – but clearly we must see that routinely indulging in powerful emotions appears to be a dangerous imposition on our sensitive bodies and brains, especially if we are women.

But even men, must beware of these states, as we note for example that many men have died of a heart attack at sporting events such as soccer matches, clearly due to a powerful *emotional response* to the occasion, which has resulted in an intolerable physiological stress.

So then we get the deeper stresses caused by what we call a *traumatic event*, such as a soldier experiences in war time, or a woman may experience in rape or violent physical assault upon her, or alternatively as some awful emotional trauma like the break up of an important relationship which may leave her devastated, just as such an event also devastates many men.

And we find in practise that such *deeper cutting* events may take week, months or even years to “get out of our system”, and in some cases, such a deep cut may *never* heal.

But can we now see please, that if we are able to view such events *objectively* looking above the narrow confines of our subjective emotional state, that what we have done via our powerful emotional reaction is caused a serious *physiological stress damage* to the tissue of the brain, which therefore *no therapy, nor counselling* will properly heal in a short time period, as mere words cannot quickly balance the brain chemistry and physiology, which only long term *rest* and peace can, this truly “empowering” knowledge should enable us to act in a different light.

That is, firstly, we will see the wisdom as explained in the earlier chapter on finding a suitable partner of avoiding these needless “doomed loves” which our society now takes to be “normal”, by having a carefully arranged system of introductions between suitable men and women, thus resulting in more stable relationships, which is surely the only sensible and rational way to deal with this otherwise potentially traumatic and rejection laden problem of *love*.

Secondly, we should realise that though counselling or preferably support from those who truly love us may help recover our sanity and balance following such crises, that really only *time* will do the healing, as we must permit Nature via our *brains* to repair the *physical damage*.

And equally, now we see that drugs, alcohol and also smoking, which by unduly stimulating the nervous system provokes a state of physical anxiety which is not conducive to good sleep, are all ways which though they seem like solace at the time, will if heavily indulged in drastically increase the time taken to *properly* recovery our physiological and therefore *psychological* balance.

Thus put simply, like any wound, the healing of a mood will *take time*.

If someone has got into a deep persistent depression, this cannot be got out of in an instant or day, because it has become a long term state of the brain.

It can only be escaped slowly and gradually by adequate sleep and likely moderate activity, whether drugs are used or not.

But we see that the actual *use* of some of these drugs, such as Valium, which interfere with the brain's own natural stabilizing processes, as does someone who drinks more than a very moderate amount every night of the week, can actually *cause* these debilitating mental states.

What a powerful drug can do to the brain such as Ecstasy, LSD or other powerful hallucinogenic, we do not currently know, but there must surely be some considerable risk.

Again, we would suggest that women are going to be likely worse affected by these drugs due to their more sensitive and more finely balanced systems, and surely therefore should never take the risk of playing with these dangerous chemicals, not knowing what the long term effect could be on their body and brain.

We have heard of a significant number of young girls dying after taking these kinds of drugs, which seems to be a far rarer event with boys, thus confirming our theory at least in a basic way.

Commonsense therefore suggests we should resist the “pro drugs” lobby who want to make out that all these mind-altering chemicals are just “recreational drugs” and *safe*, whereas the reality is that the “pro drugs” lobbyists definitely do not know the truth on this safety issue.

Doctors and medical researchers are not conclusively agreed on who can safely take even prescribed medical drugs *without doubt*, so how can these “amateur” drug advocates be so certain?

If their girlfriend, wife or daughter dropped dead after taking one, we imagine their “libertarian” opinions on these chemicals *they do not fully understand* would likely very suddenly and diametrically change.

Part of the problem here is the very simplistic logic that says person X, Y or Z has had this drug a thousand times, and it has done *them* no harm.

Well, so it appears, but in any case this does *not* mean that the same drug will not do great harm to person A, B or C, who may have a very different physiology – for instance, even in regard to their allergic reactions – and therefore respond in an entirely different and possibly very health or life-threatening way.

For even in the former case, how easily can we actually judge whether any drug has done harm to another person or not?

For generally speaking, what we see with habitual drug users is a *withdrawn* state – they do not wish to participate so actively in society, particularly in any fashion which involves taking any serious *responsibility*.

They sit around knocking society, which is quite easy to do, given its many real faults, but they do little to try and improve it, except complain to their own four walls and equally withdrawn buddies, again, as we have said, *of either gender*.

Admittedly society is not fair, and beats many good people down, and then some of these turn to drugs, who might otherwise have been very socially valuable people, such as doctors, nurses, teachers or even honest and responsible police officers.

Once the drug is propping up their lifestyle, drug users then defend it to the hilt, and recommend it to everybody. No words of ours will persuade them that they are wrong.

But they do not know whether it has caused some subtle deterioration of the brain, and therefore psyche, such that they are not so clear, sharp or responsible any more, just as the drunken person deludedly believes he or she can walk a straight line or juggle balls *until they try*.

But the trouble with users of these other drugs is that the effects are very hard to quantify and identify.

What is clear is that all such drugs *sap the will*. That is, if we are sober and drug free, we see our life as it really is, whether we like it or not.

And then if we *do not* like what we see we have two options.

We can either make an effort to change our life, which generally is not easy, and requires long term effort and planning, and therefore struggle and pain. Or else we can refuse to face the pain and go have another shot of our favourite drug to put our troubled mind and soul back to sleep again.

We must say however, that we cannot necessarily blame the drug user who chooses the latter route, because society has been made so difficult for the average person to succeed in and maintain his or her sanity, health and self-respect, sometimes all efforts will prove to be futile, and just drive someone who tries to escape into an even deeper depression, requiring even possibly a more powerful drug to “remedy.”

To that person however, and to women in general who are dissatisfied with their lot in life, we would wish to give an alternative view.

That is, the major error of those who fall prey to depression is *to judge their life by society's current standards*.

If for example we take the celebrity world to heart, allow its riches, decadence and glamour to intimidate us and make us feel envious, worthless and small, we will certainly fall prey to the self-disgust which may culminate in drug use, or other forms of destructive behaviours which can only really be regarded as *self-abusive*.

Whilst this destruction of the individual's happiness and self-respect is largely society's fault, we are all of us going to have to be big and grown up about it, and rise above these negative influences.

For example, we are painted a life of “the successful person” who “has it all.”

If a woman, you are supposed to be beautiful, slim, educated, fashionable, have a good career, friends, wonderful talented children, a beautiful home and a desirable man.

But there are countless women – even some major celebrities - who cannot find anyone who loves them, so if that is your state, you are very far from being alone in the broader sense, just as millions of men are undergoing the same fate.

We have tried to give suggestions early in this work to *permanently* remedy this situation of loneliness, but we accept it is not all going to change overnight.

Equally, few people of either gender have all or even some of the other badges of “success” on the above list.

In essence we are all just frightened little human beings in a very big world and universe trying to make the best of it, trying to get by.

That applies just as much to our leaders, as to ourselves. They are not supermen or superwomen; when they are cut they bleed just the same as you and I.

They too awaken in the night in fear, and wonder who they are, and feel some strange twinge in their body which they worry may be the onset of some awful disease, and bring their death ever nearer, the death that will inevitably one day happen to us all.

And thus they too hanker after some kind of religious or spiritual idea to save them from their fear, or those who have no faith simply find some comforting drug, pursuit or lifestyle with which to try to most pleasantly pass the time.

Why do mountaineers risk their lives to climb up to the mountain top?

They obviously aren't happy as they are, living out a *normal* life, in a little house in a leafy lane somewhere.

But this idea of what is *normal* cannot be ever properly defined, so neither should any of us fall to the idea that we are inadequate because we cannot meet *somebody else's definition of it*.

And this also is the principle that modern medicine, psychology and psychiatry tends to overlook.

It is obvious from a study of history and modern life that there are really a very wide variety of human beings who have lived, and are currently alive, whose natures are so different, they are almost as different creatures as are animals in the jungle or countryside.

That there are systems of astrology such as the Chinese, which identify a person with a different land animal, fish or bird, seems to suggest there is something very significant about this point.

Steering clear of astrology, which of course most modern scientific minds currently think is nonsense and merely a joke, let us however consider the ancient system of *Ayurvedic medicine* created and practiced by the ancient and not so ancient Indian civilisations.

We will not debate the effectiveness of this system of medicine here, except to point out that it was based on identifying different *types* of humans, as indicated by a whole variety of basic observable mental and physical qualities, such as tendency to be fat or thin, have thick or fine hair, light or heavy bones, be slow or quick in our thinking and so on.

Western science for example defines three body types – the *mesomorph* (the muscular type), the *endomorph* (the corpulent type) and the *ectomorph* (the thin type), which tend to approximate the three basic types found in the Indian Ayurvedic system.

But beyond that simple classification, in Ayurvedic medicine are identified many common characteristics of each type, such as sleep patterns, voice and manner of walking, and a number of other indicators which have important consequences from the medical perspective.

That is, after identifying someone's type – which would you see be along a wide spectrum of combinations of the three basic types, just as every colour of light is a combination of the three basic colours - *red*, *blue* and *green* – appropriate diet, exercise regimes, daily routines and medical treatments would be giving *specifically for each type*.

This failure to determine *type* seems to be the downfall of the Western system of medicine, particularly in its preventative aspect.

For example, the principally *cerebral* type of man or woman – often found for example as a teacher or professor - according to Ayurvedic medicine needs to take far more care over rest and sleep than the more rugged, principally physical type, who is naturally found perhaps as a builder or a farmer.

We cannot state in a relatively short work what is actually a very detailed matter, but those ladies who are interested might consider reading Deepak Chopra's *Perfect Health*, which is a good general guide to Ayurvedic medicine.

We are not however *recommending* Ayurvedic medicine or any other specific “alternative therapy”, as neither are we dismissing them.

That is for each individual to decide for themselves.

But what we are saying is that surely we can only consider the suitability of any medicine or treatment programs we may take, in the light of our own understanding or hopefully that of the doctor, of our individual unique characteristics, which may not only predispose us to certain kinds of physical and mental problems or diseases, but also to certain kinds of remedies and preventative behaviours being suitable for our specific brand and model of human being.

Moreover, we are saying, aside from “check-ups” to detect the presence of any particular condition or disease which we are aware that medical science can treat, that we should look to using the natural healing power of the body, by allying ourselves with a more stress-free, moderate and *restful* way of life, as the principal means to deal with all our medical ills, aches and pains.

That is, if we are in a severe depression or anxiety state, the answer may not at all be to try and suddenly lift ourselves out of it with some powerful injections or orally taken drugs, or even a barbaric dose of ECT (“electro-convulsive therapy”, sometimes used on mentally ill patients, particularly in the not too distant past).

If someone is feeling *desperate* however, we would not advise against seeking such help at least in a temporary fashion, with a long term view to becoming drug free once again.

But for the lesser extremities of mental malaise, we are rather saying, what we have here is a state of the brain which has become unbalanced. The tragedy is that sometimes the brain can become *quickly* unbalanced, but takes a long time to rebalance, just as we can in an instant smash a priceless vase, but it may take many hours or days to carefully put the broken pieces back together again.

What we should not do generally speaking is say “this person has mental problems”, this person is in some kind of way “mentally ill.”

They may indeed - like for example billionaire Howard Hughes, whose story was told somewhat realistically in *Martin Scorsese's* recent movie, *The Aviator* - have *genuine* mental problems.

But we are saying – the cause is generally *an unbalanced brain physiology and nervous system*, which may - if the damage is not “structural”, such as that in the case of a mongoloid or severely mentally retarded person whose condition appears to be congenital - be redeemable and curable.

A person in a severe anxiety state may need some drugs to calm them down of course, but the drugs can never be viewed as a cure, as this can surely only come from the restorative powers within the person's own body and brain, unless some clearly discernible cause and effect is causing the problem, such as a specific hormone deficiency or whatever.

And because the functioning of the nervous system and brain, not just on the psychological level, but on the level of “motor ability”, co-ordinating and marshalling all the bodily processes such as the activity of the heart, lungs, and the other organs, is that which governs the whole health and repair of the body, this general strategy of adequate rest must be applied to all health problems generally, which we see the doctor therefore recommends.

But then in other difficult phases of life, due to the research of the drug companies, the doctor may also recommend for women the use of HRT or *hormone replacement therapy*, which again, the mid or long term effects of which cannot be yet known, bearing in mind again, that due to this lack of consideration or understanding of *body types*, the effects this treatment has on any *particular* woman, may be quite different than what is experienced by another.

Without wishing to be unkind, let us suppose that as either man or woman, we compare ourselves to a vehicle whose suspension has become a little creaky and unsafe, and whose engine has become a little rusty and unreliable.

If in such a state we decide to “supercharge “ ourselves with some kind of powerful drug therapy *such as HRT*, or in the case of an ageing man, start using *Viagra* to support a flagging sexual potency, surely we are really throttling this “vintage model” in a way that it seems sensible to assume that Nature never intended.

And if we persist in one of these “rejuvenating” drug treatment programmes, might it not also be logical to assume that by such preternatural imposition upon our ageing body, we may unwittingly promote its premature degeneration or even end?

So we are not giving any *definite* scientific proof here, but what we are certainly saying is that these treatments, which were not available as far as we know in the history of the animal or human world ever before, are a sudden and potentially dangerous *experiment* which cannot possibly have had the time to be properly tested and researched.

Likewise we will point out in passing that apart from breast implants exploding at high altitudes for example in jet planes, the effect of the sudden use of massively widespread cosmetic surgery is not yet known.

Perhaps, for example, for all we know, the implants may produce a chemical diffusion or seepage into the main breast tissue, which may result in a mother's milk later being contaminated, or again possibly the implant will irritate *a particular* woman's inner tissue in some way, that could lead to other serious complications.

Another issue is that those who are not knowledgeable in art do not understand the very small subtle differences in physical features, which may escape the plastic surgeon's skill - as he is after all principally doctor, *not artist* - and thus, especially where the face is concerned, he may unwittingly destroy a beautiful face, such as happened to British *Men Behaving Badly* actress, *Leslie Ash*, who also unfortunately later tragically caught the debilitating "dirty hospital" disease, *MRSA*, from which gladly she is now recovering.

But then conventional medicine aside, surely women should also be aware of any New Age possibly illusory and ineffectual treatments, and whilst not ignoring their potential value, be discerning and careful about considering their use.

Above all, once again, the point we wish to make is, that many of these "therapies", "remedies" and "cures" are being sought out by women who may well have brought the health problems - whether of a physical or mental nature - on themselves by a too stressful, exciting and self-destructive lifestyle, which the current capitalist system and feminist agenda has directed them to carry out and regard as "normal."

For example most drug abuse and overeating is carried out not out of a genuine positive desire, but out of a low emotional state, and like all addictions is principally motivated by a *desire to escape*.

So we must not look for problems for such conditions as "anorexia nervosa" merely in some kind of chemical factory, forever trying to play with our brain chemistry to enforce on us an unnatural adaptation to a hostile environment and lifestyle, but rather look at our society which is causing the development of so many unhappy and unbalanced people.

Because the society as a whole is currently too reluctant and misinformed to look for the answers on this societal scale, which we see is really encouraging a state of blind dependence upon a number of so called "expert" scientists and academicians who in alliance with government are leading and directing almost everybody else, we therefore must do this for ourselves *as individuals*.

If we say for example – I will not allow myself as a woman to be forced into working until my child is at least seven or ten years old, even if that means taking a severe drop in my living standards, and maybe even teaching my child at home rather than having to take it to school safely in a car - which I may no longer be able to afford - *then so be it.*

For we will find - once we are mentally balanced again, not having our energy stolen by the unnatural demands of the current society that we purchase so many things we don't need, and work unduly hard to finance them - we will have a mental power which will be able to solve all kinds of problems that currently frustrate or baffle us, but when we are willing to truly *empower* ourselves with *freedom from undue stress*, we will find we can then surmount and defeat.

For this is where *Mary Shelley's* fictional creation *Dr Frankenstein* went wrong.

He too imagined he could tinker around with Nature by sticking together a dead body with a dead man's brain and so on, but all he created was a monster, and should we meddle around using our still very immature scientific knowledge with the powers of Nature, by firstly living a life too far away from what millions of years of evolution have prepared us for, and secondly by genetically altering man and other species of animal and plant life on our fragile planet, then likely so will we too create and become monsters also.

For of all the mere *reassurances* the scientists and doctors are giving us so far, how can they say that they know for sure, just as they have been wrong in the past about such issues as the safety of barbiturates, amphetamines and *thalidomide*, where is the *proof* that all these new drugs and genetically modified plants and animals are safe?

Of course there is *none*, but only persuasive arguments which support the activities of these huge capitalistic industries, and therefore we must say to you, Doctor Frankenstein and his monster are on the loose, and therefore, all women and children must *beware*.

Chapter Thirteen – Defeating the Evil weed – *women and smoking*

Again, many women may not see at first sight that smoking is an issue about “liberation from men”, but we intend to prove that is it, and not only because it was *Sir Walter Raleigh* who first brought this evil weed to the shores of England, so British women at least may blame him for that, though it appears smoking of some kind has been widespread throughout history in other hotter areas of the world, where the tobacco leaf has naturally grown.

Unfortunately it is only in the last few decades that it has been clearly seen and admitted that smoking can and almost probably certainly *is* damaging to any regular user or this dangerous drug, which the governments of the world have until now deemed far too widespread in use to consider banning the manufacture and sale of, which arguably *they progressively should*.

Of course, unfortunately Western governments are also in somewhat of a dilemma on this issue, because they are getting such enormous amounts of tax revenue from it, which would in a sense tend to cast them into the role of the most enormous drug dealers in global history, as likewise they benefit similarly from the massive proportion of tax which comprises the cost of any alcoholic drink.

So really, we are all to some degree suffering for this “conflict of interests”, without which smoking would have been discouraged as a recreational drug in society a whole lot sooner.

The trouble is that the warnings on the packets of cigarettes, which now even have changed from saying *Smoking MAY damage your health* to *Smoking KILLS*, have not seriously deterred the millions of regular smokers, an alarming number of whom are women.

Unlike some other drug addiction, smoking seems to have no regard for class barriers, and rich, powerful and intellectually high women are also found to be addicted just as helplessly to this evil weed, though many times *illicitly*, well out of public view.

Basically, we see that smoking is used by women as a means of coping with stress.

But does this general information help us cure the problem, or enable the women who know very well they are putting their health at risk to give it up?

Of course it does not.

Because it is one thing *talking about* stress, and quite another matter *dealing with it*.

For as we have indicated in the previous chapter, stress is really a generalised “omnibus term” to as one might say “cover up a multitude of sins.”

That is, to put it in non-religious parlance, we have been programmed since the womb with a lot of experiences and stresses, to which we now as adults produce various kinds of *conditioned responses*.

That is, let us compare our minds to a computer, such as a modern PC.

We have an *operating system* on board such as *Windows*, and upon that basis, we are able to install various programs such as *Word*, or *Excel* or *Adobe Photoshop* or whatever else takes our fancy.

As a moderately skilled computer operator we find we can easily install such programs, and if we don't like them we can *uninstall* them.

But the *operating system*, *Windows*, once installed we do not touch. We *can* uninstall it, but then our computer does not work for us any more, and we meddle with its operation and working files at our peril.

So in life, we may decide to learn a new skill such as driving, playing the piano, or ballet dancing.

We find it difficult at first, because most things in life we do *routinely* are virtually automatic processes. Few adults regularly grapple with tough learning processes, once they have established a regular "working life", but just go through the same set of old established routines over and over again, like some concert pianist who can play a piece with his or her eyes shut, having rattled it off so many times.

The reason learning new skills is so difficult is that we are dealing with the deeper layers of the mind, we are to some degree playing round with *the operating system*.

It is at this level that our habits become formed, and we find that *once formed*, that like the *Windows* computer operating system, we do not then afterwards have easy access to them, we find we are largely stuck with the habits, and as they say in psychology *conditioned responses* we have got.

Sayings such as "you can't teach an old dog new tricks" confirm this rigid, largely unalterable state of mind which the average adult has got.

So we find that many of the habits we have, such as compulsive behaviours of any kind tend to be a nuisance to us, and we can definitely regard *thinking* as the most compulsive habit all humans have, which may or may not be then translated into writing or more likely *speech*, which we find many women are very fond of doing, much more so than most men.

Or for example, those who live with another person for any length of time – as we all have done as children – will start to observe their many habits, some of which no doubt we will find irritating.

That is, we see that people go through all these "automated routines", frequently for no good reasons, that they have developed *long ago*.

If we complain to them about some particular habit, they will generally be very resistant at our efforts to change them, even if the habit has little or no sense in it, because *resisting change* is what habit is all about.

That is, would we like it if we forgot how to *walk* or *talk* – as some people suffering strokes one sees effectively do – which are complex procedures we learned with only the greatest difficulty, which we have all long forgotten the enormous pain and struggle of, so very long ago?

Of course not.

If would be disastrous for our everyday life if we were to lose this “circuitry” and ability to carry out these routine tasks *without a thought*, which again we see from the awful struggle which stroke victims have to go through to get their speech and mobility back, which efforts do not always fully succeed.

It is clear from the stroke damage which starves nourishment to part of the brain, causing those cells to die, that our memories and powers of physical control are all locked in the brain cells somewhere.

In the fascinating movie, *The Eternal Sunshine of the Spotless Mind*, a doctor purports to offer this service of erasing *specific* memories, but modern science is light years away from offering such a service, and given the current sinister activities of some government agencies, it is surely just as well.

So those ladies who are reaching for a cigarette with anxiety at this point, might well ask – what on earth has all this to do with giving up cigarettes?

Well, we hope that we have not too long-windedly established the point that smoking has for all long-term smokers become one of these *conditioned responses*, a reflex action triggered by certain events, which is likely almost wholly beyond their conscious control.

There are some virtually hard wired *circuits* within the brain someplace that medicine cannot find, which are causing women smokers to “run this program” over and over again, and because it is then on the level of the “operating system”, just like the now fluent but once awkward movements with which she drives a car, this *reflex action* is likely almost entirely outside of the control of her conscious mind.

So many sophisticated therapies have been devised to “treat” this addiction, such as identifying a woman’s “triggers”, that is, those events which initiate her reaching into her bag for another cigarette, but again, it is clear this kind of knowledge is not enough, as it has not provided the millions of women who have this problem with a cure.

So we have to look deeper, at the issue of how do we get to these deeper levels which are currently beyond a woman’s conscious control.

Perhaps hypnotherapy would be worth a try, but we do not recommend it, as we feel that it is not a true solution to this kind of addiction, because at best the hypnotist's suggestions would merely *mask* the underlying problems which cause not only this particular addiction, but addictions in general.

There is even the argument that smoking is some kind of comforting throwback to suckling at the breast, but then we find that virtually all adults have given up sucking their thumbs, so if that is all that is beneath it, why should for *millions* of adult women who have long ago given up most of their childish obsessions this problem with cigarettes still persist?

The truth may be a hard one for many women to stomach, but the fact is that smoking is generally the pursuit of a *damaged personality*, as are all other kinds of serious addiction and drug taking.

This is not meant to be judgmental nor condemnatory. We are saying, bad things were once done to you, and that is the reason you have got the problem you have now got.

How can we say that? How can we possibly know your past life?

Well, of course we do not, in detail, but human psychology is really not that different from person to person, the same patterns of behaviour are found in almost every human being *to some degree*, and therefore it is just "elementary, my dear Watson", just simple deduction, and hey presto, the case is solved.

But we know that you will take some convincing, so we must further explain.

Any person who is reaching for a drug is clearly discontent.

We reach for food and water because it is a natural desire, without which we would die, just as without some sex activity we would not reproduce.

But Nature never placed in any animal the desire to smoke *Benson & Hedges* or *Marlboro*, or for that matter to drink *Jack Daniels*, so we have to concede that such desires are wholly "man-made" or even "woman-made."

And then we have to ask *why* some people smoke and others do not.

Is it mere chance?

So let us not ask the "experts" and "scientists" from whom we will get a dozen conflicting opinions, and thousands of pages of useless and unreadable theses – *because they are inconclusive, please understand* – but let us use our own brains and commonsense to puzzle this mystery out.

We have for example observed in the playground that the "naughty" girls and boys all pick a corner of the playground and get their packets out and pass their contents round.

Equally, liberated women in offices and workplaces get the cigarettes out and sound off angrily about men.

Again, groups of rebellious teenagers, wearing the most ridiculous fashions, to hack their parents off and all the rest of the “squares”, resort easily to cigarettes and other drugs.

It is a badge of identity, it is a badge of rebellion.

We see in general that *the good boys and girls* do not smoke, they even despise it.

But the *naughty* boys and girls of whatever age, simply cannot wait to light up and huddle up in their rebellious groups.

So we keep saying this word *rebellious* or *rebellion*, and despite the futile academic efforts of thousands of “mad scientists” we are saying that this is simply what these addictions, and smoking in particular are all about.

But the question is – rebellion against what?

As Marlon Brandon, playing the biker gang leader in *The Wild One* movie replied, when asked what he was rebelling against by some puzzled adult:

What have you got?

This is the trouble with all rebels everywhere. They no longer know even whom or what it is they are rebelling against. The only safe bet is *authority*.

Yet the same boy or girl who rebels against the class teacher, does not rebel against the pop culture leader or fashion icon who with *equal or greater authority* says “rings through your nose are *cool*, drugs and *Ecstasy* and all night raves are *cool*.”

Little does this rebel realise that he or she is just being mugged by *a different form of conformism*, whose main goal is to take his or her money, and likely lure him or her into some sort of degrading pleasures, as “bad boy pop bands” lure thousands of rebellious young girls into sleeping with them, and then likely after they have got what they want they say “ditch the bitch.”

You want respect? (laughs).

You won't get it from these kind of people, any more than you got it from whoever you started your rebellion against to begin with.

When we say *you*, we mean, *the rebellious woman or girl*, which of course, we sincerely hope our civilised lady reader not to be.

But even our “civilised” lady reader who perhaps works in a bank or in some professional career may not realise how much of this *rebellion* she has got locked up inside her, so we are going to be far more specific now in identifying exactly *what* is still bugging her, and causing those cigarettes to somehow appear in her hand, and somehow also to come alight and *smoking*.

It is of course the same old story, just as in the case of Princess Diana and all the rest.

So being “well brought up” (so it appears) or posh, does very much *not* protect you from this fate, rather more likely enhances the risk, as we see by the smoking habits of many Royal and aristocratic figures, such as for example the British Queen’s sister, now prematurely deceased, *Princess Margaret*, who had a forty-a-day habit, and it is said almost certainly died of smoking which caused her to have circulatory problems and a stroke.

And she is not alone, as it appears a long line of recent British monarch, mostly kings, have died as a result of this smoking habit.

So it is all very simple despite the academician’s blindness and continual denials.

Some of us as children feel we have *on the whole* been accepted, and loved, and some of us feel that we have not.

We all like to *pretend* that our parents’ loved us “in their own way”, but sadly the truth is that they loved us *in the wrong way*, for example by implanting their own restless, ambitious and anxious mentalities into us, at this terribly delicate and impressionable early age.

People do not see what monsters they really are, *emotionally speaking*, because to hurt children and other sensitive people is so easy, and can be done so casually, as a habit one hardly notices any more.

Many of these parents who have thoroughly messed up their children have got no idea whatsoever what they have done – we would suggest *the vast majority*.

It is not typically intentional in a conscious sense.

For example, in the case of Princess Diana, if we asked her father why he sent her to boarding school at age nine, he might likely say something like – “it’s the done thing, all gals from our family have gone to boarding school, it’s a family tradition – it’ll do the gal good, teach her about the world” etc. etc.

But such people fail to realise there are both *bad* and *good* traditions, and it is time for us as a civilised society to sack the *bad ones*, and retain only *the good*.

Let us make it personal and real with an example.

A little girl says to her father at age three or six. “Come play with me by the pond, daddy, please stay with me and hold my hand.”

And if the father is a bit scared of little girls, doesn't know how to relate to them like he does little boys, with whom he can do his "rough and tumble" act, he may say – "oh, I'm busy, go and see your mother."

And though this seems trivial to him at the time, it could be an enormous disappointment to a little girl, who may after a series of such disappointments start to get the feeling she is unwanted and unloved, especially when confronted with the sight of him playing rough boys games with her older or smaller brothers.

In seeing this, of course some girls then transform themselves into "tomboys" trying to get the appreciation of their fathers that way, but you see, *please listen carefully*, that little manoeuvre has been carried out at the expense of a girl's own true identity, and *she will hate him for having forced her to do that for the rest of her life*.

That is, such a manoeuvre has set a pattern of her doing all her life a similar manoeuvre of *trying to be what she is not in order to please or gain approval*.

Now, do we not see, that this is a denial of a girl and woman's own self at the most basic level?

So then the "tomboy" girl gets to go to school, and she meets her other discontent "tomboy" girlfriends, who were also unaccepted by their fathers, and so then they get the cigarettes out and complain about "dad" in the guise of boys and men, to whom you see they have transferred their hate.

The point is, once we have deserted our true selves, and learned to *hate* one person, we can then easily transfer that hate onto someone else who vaguely resembles them, which in the case of hating a father, therefore easily transfers itself onto all boys and men.

As we have explained, Hilary Clinton's bullying father rejected her *natural feminine self* and demanded that she go out and fight like a boy, which likewise catapulted her into a lifelong protest about the behaviour of men, campaigning for children's rights.

So we are saying that any woman who is a smoker is therefore *angry*.

With Hilary Clinton her anger transmuted into *co-ordinated protest and action*, so she did not feel so futile and repressed in fighting back, that she had to take her self-destructive inward-turned hate out on herself by burning some cigarettes in her own mouth.

Think about it – a woman smoker is paying for and *burning an object in her own mouth*. What kind of bizarre satisfaction is that? A self-destructive kind, clearly.

But we are not trying to be a judge here of any woman. Just a *detective*.

We are trying to find a way for a woman to get out of this mess, which most women smokers will have failed to do for most of their lives, just as will most men.

So the *real* issue we see, is not giving up *smoking*. It is giving up *anger*.

And which one of us can do that, and certainly not in a day?

Because *the triggers* we have mentioned all have one underlying trigger – it is *anger*.

It may seem like it is anxiety, or “stress” at the burdensome life a woman is leading, for example having to stay patient all day long taking a whole load of annoying calls from idiots in a service centre, and as soon as she gets on her break she lets out an enormous *sigh* at all this punishment she has been obliged to take, and then lights up and draws in an enormous puff to get some relief.

And then she thinks about when she gets home, and all the meals she will have to make, and noisy kids and demanding husband to take care of and “administrated” – she is never off duty!

So just how on earth do we think a woman is *ever* going to stop taking that relieving puff on her cigarette, when her whole life otherwise is nearly a torture, as long as she puts herself under all this massive and needless stress.

Ah – but she *must* do this work she cries.

Oh, no - *she need not!*

You see, it is part of this *anger* she feels, due to her having accepted demands and behaviour she *never* should have done, that has brought her to this state, just as she should never have made herself into a tomboy just to please her inadequate dad.

It *was* all his fault originally of course – he screwed up – he failed to nurture and accept her as the *real woman* she wanted to be, he didn't know any better, didn't understand and either bullied her to be something she wasn't like *Mrs Clinton's dad*, or else just walked away.

So we are saying – likely the smoking woman is locked into a pattern of compulsively trying to please others which she should never have done.

She may think she is, but she is not really her own person, and that is also the source of the anger, stated in a different way.

For she does not feel *accepted*, she does not feel *loved*. For example, some women take to compulsive cleaning trying to gain approval and other such mad compulsive behaviours, which nobody really cares about nor wants.

We cannot believe any woman has read this chapter without having her emotions somewhat stirred up – and if she sees even a little of that anger, that is a good thing, that is *the key*.

For example, we talk about people who are on “a short fuse.”

What does that mean?

It means *they are angry already, before ever we meet them*.

But when we are unfortunate enough to encounter one of these discontented people, they are already “wound up” ready to take their frustrations out on us.

And if no one else is around *they will take their frustrations out on even themselves.*

They will do something self-destructive like getting drunk, cutting themselves, or lighting up a cigarette.

Because the nerves are still raw, even from a source that may be decades ago.

So here is the secret, which though it will not likely cure a woman's addictive smoking behaviour overnight – though in some cases *it could* – will in time enable her to overcome this problem and likely almost any other psychological problem she has got.

There is no easy “trick” which can help someone give smoking up. The answer is as we have said not to give up smoking, but to give up *anger.*

For example, has a woman not found that she reaches more for those cigarettes when things seem tough, and therefore *less* when things are going well?

Of course - and there again is the answer, the key.

It is all in one's mental state, one's general happiness or lack of it, one's sense of anxiety or peace.

Those with stressful, anxious lives in general are driven to escape through some kind of addictive process, whether it is compulsive smoking, or sex, drugs or drink.

Of course, some *very clever* people manage to do *all four.*

But those who have more peaceful, less stressful and more balanced lives are not thus driven and compelled to beat their brains out with all these powerful sensual experiences, we see.

Thus there is no way to properly quit any addictive habit such as smoking until *we take back control over our life*, which primarily is *on the mental level.*

For example, there are some overly kind women who go around doing favours and so on for their friends and whomever else, but get little thanks.

Then they get frustrated at this lack of reciprocity, and angrily *light up.*

That is *not* the answer.

The answer is *what on earth is a woman doing all these favours for undeserving people for anyway?*

Let the lazy, ungrateful so and so's do it for themselves. We are not talking of course, of neglecting her children here, or even her husband, provided he in general is acting responsibly towards her.

This is not being *selfish*, as we explained in the chapter on *Mr Scrooge*. It is playing fair with *others who play fair*, and show respect and don't take undue advantage of us.

If you don't *know* anybody like that, which is likely if you are such a habitual mug, then *get rid of those you know* and you will find in the empty space you have cleared of the "riff raff" and exploiters – whom we warn you may make desperate efforts to cling on to you to keep you in *their service* – sooner or later the worthwhile and deserving ones will appear.

But we must be honest with ourselves, we must see – on a moment to moment basis – this anger in us.

For example, the inconsiderate motorist pulls out in front of us, due to bad road-sense and planning and does not even give us an apologetic wave.

Here is the moment – for example – to *watch it*.

Watch that fury in your mind and all the names you want to call them and what you would like to do to them.

Don't *condemn* yourself for feeling that way – just *be aware* that you are seeing what is in the automated levels of your mind. Because when you see these levels, you rise above them, and they gradually disappear, and you then have *Eric Berne's* "game free" mentality, and *Chapter One's* truly loving mind.

Maybe you are a considerate and tolerant driver, and bad driving on the part of others doesn't "push your buttons" and get you fired up, but rest assured, if you are a smoker something else certainly will.

It may be the bad behaviour of men for instance, which is again likely for any woman who is very into smoking, some of these women having compulsively even taken the habit up in some kind of unwitting backfired rebellion against their father who also smokes.

We have of course left the mother figure out of this discussion so far, but she can equally screw a daughter up, as Princess Diana's mother surely also did.

But the point is, we are not playing "analyst's couch" any longer, it is too late. We are concerned *only with the present*, though if your parents are still living it may be a very therapeutic exercise, if armed with this new understanding of your early childhood you take up their behaviour with them *in a gentle way*.

But be realistic. They are likely just sad and old and pathetic now, so this is not suggested as any opportunity for vengeance, but rather *to understand and unveil* your own feelings towards them which you may not have realised.

There is nothing you can do now in the *combative sense*.

You can't murder them, or beat them senseless, though be careful, because we cannot say for certain when you realise what was done to you – which you see, quite likely they will not even see, and did not even realise they were doing - that you might not trigger off unexpectedly some very deep rooted fury or “case of explosives” in yourself.

For example, what do you think Hilary Clinton would have done to her bullying father if he were not such a big monster in front of her, and she had been able to fight back, after all the abuse and humiliation he had heaped upon her?

Don't go into denial and say *but I love my dad*.

If you hate him, admit it, say so – but *to yourself*.

Because there is *nothing* now he can do, now he is an irrelevant old fool, having long forgotten the mess he made of you, which likely he will *never* understand.

So again, we are saying that you really thereby have got locked a *poison* of hatred in your heart from these early experiences.

But you cannot take them out one by one and resolves all these things, partly because you cannot even recall them. The way to do it is to *live* and resolve these anxieties *in the present*, with you see *the very next person you meet*, and the one after that.

Notice how you may have up until this point been like a nag or a viper to these largely *innocent* people around you, as you are taking out the frustrations on them, which you were unable to do with your mother or dad.

We *know* from personal experience this is no fiction. We have *seen* how many adult women are still even obviously angry with their dads, and thus taking it out on everyone else.

And only when this anger is gone, will you find that your smoking will gradually or even quickly disappear. The author cannot say how long it will take for any particular woman or man, but it truly can happen, this can be done.

We shall in the final chapter and appendix amplify a little and expand upon this concept of how to handle your own mind in resolving these long forgotten but *currently active* inner conflicts, and therefore how to be a liberated woman *in the true sense*.

Chapter Fourteen – Women and *The Teacher* – *don't stand so close to me*

In the British rock group, *The Police's* 1980s hit, *Don't Stand So Close to Me*, Gordon Sumner alias *Sting* tells us about the dilemma of a male teacher who is confronted by the infatuation of one of his girl pupils who is only half the teacher's age.

Our subject here however is not actually the genuine concerns about molestation of young girls by teachers, which we hope does not disappoint our more liberated women readers too much.

The point we wish to draw on from this song, is that as we mentioned in *Chapter One*, regarding the schoolboy's crush on his girl classmate, young girls are generally more interested in someone who is rather more "sophisticated" and "grown up", which to her the teacher appears to be, and even sometimes actually is.

We will recall many other real life and fictional examples of these teen crushes held by girls on older men, including teachers, as for example the one the girl in the first *Indiana Jones* movie had on her lecturer played by *Harrison Ford*, who noticed her eyelids said "I love you" when she flashed them up and down.

As with all men in such a "compromised" situation, this otherwise heroic archaeology lecturer got all flustered in coping with this very threatening discomfort, mixed perhaps with a little forbidden desire when confronted with this attractive young lady who was idolising him.

But since those relatively innocent days depicted in the *Indiana Jones* movie, and even the more historically recent *Sting* take on the same topic, the stakes have moved on – the girl in the front row making eyes at the teacher or lecturer no longer wants merely to seduce him anymore – *she wants his job!*

Let us look at some more "art" to broaden our view on this issue, which was the inspired recent movie, *Wonder Boys*, with *Michael Douglas* brilliantly playing a professor of English who has written a best-selling novel, but is now suffering writer's block whilst trying to come up with a sequel.

Whilst he fends off his desperate agent, played by equally brilliant *Chaplin* actor, *Robert Downey Junior*, he has two students vying for his attention; one a girl who has a crush on him played by *Katie Holmes*, and the other, an eccentric boy played by *Tobey Maguire*, whose bizarre character eventually turns out to be an outstanding young author, hence *a wonder boy*, or as they say in German, *wunderkind*.

We wish to draw out a few points from this very intelligent and entertaining movie.

Firstly, that although *Tobey Maguire's* character, *James Leer*, turns out to be the one with the real talent, he is not a very likeable character, and actually irritates *Douglas's* lecturer character to the extent that he almost completely deserts him.

In *Jacob Bronowski's* classic book and TV series, *The Ascent of Man*, first shown in the 1970s, Bronowski pointed out that most of the people who had been critical to the ascent of mankind, certainly in the scientific and technological sense, had typically been rather eccentric and lonely figures who did not really fit in with their time, or even really with the mainstream culture of any era.

For example, let us take the British mathematician, *Alan Turing*, who was fundamental to the development of modern computer science, and who arguably was the key intelligence figure in winning the second world war for the Allies, due to the fact he was able to crack the codes the German military were using, and therefore enabled the armed force to anticipate their movements and thwart them.

Yet as a social being, one lady on the “code cracking” team he led, reported that he recoiled from her in horror one day, merely when she asked him if he would like a cup of tea in her room.

This has tended to be the pattern of those who have advanced human knowledge in a major way.

For those who have had the “good fortune” to be inside universities for any length of time, the kind of academics they may have met there – particularly in some of the sciences – will have confirmed this picture of strangeness, social effeteness and incompatibility with the normal human world outside their ivory towers.

Since for every Jacob Bronowski who is a good communicator, and able to gain warm acceptance from the public, there are a hundred others, who frequently seem more like refugees from some kind of mental institution rather than the normal run of human beings with whom we are familiar.

But as Bronowski says, it is these kind of strange solitary beings, who have tended to advance our science and technology and sometimes art most dramatically.

Do we really think *Professor Indiana Jones* who heroically flees from voodoo warriors and their poisoned darts with some ancient golden icon he has just perilously thieved, and escapes off on some flying boat conveniently waiting in the river, is real?

He is of course, nothing of the kind.

The man who bravely explores strange new worlds and the man who lives and lectures in academia are ninety-nine percent very different beings – quite simply because the first is *a man of action*, whereas the second is *a man of thought, of ideas*.

Occasionally we find a rare being who is a man of action *and ideas*, such as the aforementioned aviator and billionaire, *Howard Hughes*, but it is no surprise to find he also turns out to be somewhat of an eccentric, and sometimes not too far from being categorized as clinically insane.

Then let us talk about *Van Gogh* and *Tchaikovsky*, or *Salvador Dali* and *Mozart*, and for that matter *Beethoven*, who all in various ways showed a great deal of eccentricity, and most of whom came to a somewhat premature or sticky end.

We could go on with that list, but what we are trying to say to those women who ask – *where are the great women throughout history?* – barring a few like say *Marie Curie* and *Joan of Arc* – is that, do you really want to be half-crazy – as seems par for the course – do you really want to be like *them*?

Not forgetting you see, that though *hindsight* now calls these figures and household names *great*, that *in their own era* many, if not the vast majority, were ridiculed and persecuted and downtrodden for trying to somehow improve or uplift the lot of humanity, which effort in their own lifetime was generally not often understood.

Let us take *Vincent Van Gogh* for example, who apparently went insane and shot himself at age thirty-seven, *yet never sold a painting in his entire life*, but now his works are sold for tens of millions of dollars or pounds.

Would you really want to have led a life like him, which we would surely have to call unenviable to say the least?

Or we have figures such as *Nicolas Copernicus* who first publicly posed the theory that the earth travelled round the sun, but was threatened with torture by *the Inquisition* if he did not renounce his anti-establishment views.

Let us not get carried away with condemning the Church, but let us rather just imagine what it was *really* like to be Copernicus himself, or one of these other “great men” of history whom we imagine we envy or “admire.”

Thus bringing us back to *Wonder Boys*, in which we equally see Michael Douglas's English professor being admired and envied by his two young protégés, Tobey Maguire and Katie Holmes.

And the movie finished by Michael Douglas finally giving up on writing his sequel, the loose pages of which somehow got blown away in the wind. But what Michael Douglas's character then did was very interesting.

Because after fending off the immature and scary attentions of Katie Holmes's obsessed student, he decided that getting married to a mature woman chancellor at the university, whom he loved, and helping her bring up their baby was the best thing he could do with his life, thus letting the glory for the “next bright young thing” in the novel world go to Tobey Maguire's eccentric “wonder boy”, *James Leer*.

We are here trying to warn the lady or young girl who wants to be an academic success or star, that being an egghead, is not as it were, all it's cracked up to be.

And to take this analogy a little further, we discover that when the egghead finally cracks up, such as did Howard Hughes or the mathematician, *John Nash*, played by *Russell Crowe* in the movie *A Beautiful Mind*, likely all the king's horses and all the king's men won't be able to put him (or her) back together again.

Apparently, according to the earlier mentioned movie, when Howard Hughes was young he told his mother that he wanted to be the richest man in the world, and make the greatest movies and build the greatest planes ever built.

We don't need to check out if this was total reality or just a little Hollywood license.

The point is, why would anyone so small want to have such *big* ambitions?

We are not going to delve too deeply into the sad but interesting life of Howard Hughes, but we will simply say, based on what obvious evidence that is available he was another one who was in one way or another *unloved*.

The evidence is that we saw no stable lasting relationships in his adult life. He was like a Princess Diana in reverse – with a string of celebrity girlfriends, all leading Hollywood actresses, but not able to properly relate to any one person, just like Diana.

His only real love was his ambition and his aeroplanes, which explained the movie's suitable title, *The Aviator*.

We are saying, these “geniuses” rarely if ever lead admirable and enjoyable lives – though it is great fun to watch from a distance, as we enjoyed so much watching the Beatles - but would we really want to *be* any of these people?

Take even British soccer legend, George Best, who whilst perhaps being the most talented soccer player ever seen, has also been an alcoholic and serial womanizer, who again has proven himself unable to long hold a relationship with any one woman or be around much even for the upbringing of his son.

When we see genius, we are seeing tortured souls, we are seeing stars that shine brightly for a time, but all too soon burn out and fade, and become mere worthless shadows *most of all to themselves* of the glittering icons they used to be.

So are we trying to say, women should not aspire to be like these male geniuses, these “greats”?

Well, firstly, if a woman *truly* has greatness in her, no man is going to stop her, if indeed she has a genuine burning passion for some subject or field of endeavour, like for example modern singer-songwriter, *Joni Mitchell*.

Moreover, it is entirely up to women themselves what they choose to do with their lives, *unless they have responsibilities to their children*, but we are just painting a picture for you, to know what it is you are really getting yourself into, if you think being part of academia is a fun sounding idea, or being a “genius” type is fulfilling, when the first is mostly dreary, and the second is mostly dangerous to your sanity, as a long line of such people have fairly conclusively proven, and *not all of them* male.

Take for example, *Jodie Foster*, who allegedly has a genius level IQ, and played an astronomer in the movie, *Contact*.

She played her part well, but *in real life*, we find she uses that stellar IQ not for some kind of academic or scientific career, but to be *an actress*.

Above all however, the question we are asking is, what is really of most value in life?

Is it to have someone you love and who loves you, which may not of course necessarily be only a *man*, but also a *child*; or rather is it to discover some new law of electrodynamics or solve some obscure mathematical puzzle?

Remember, that often this is another either/or choice, and not both, because we see that great scientists like *Newton* and painter *Van Gogh*, never married or had children, and even life-loving composers such as *Tchaikovsky* had a relatively short and tragic personal life, which is the general consequence of an obsessive personality that creates these achievements left to posterity.

For this obsessive devotion to one subject, which these genius types such as even *Howard Hughes* have *always* showed, is typically carried out *at the expense of human relationships*.

We see their wives and sometimes even children are severely neglected or sidelined, that is - *if they ever marry or have a relationship at all* - since their obsessive, eccentric and exacting personalities tend to make most women run a mile.

But many modern women do not have that agenda in any case.

Rather, they seek to join the "elite of society" whom they imagine all have a university degree.

It is therefore mainly to them a badge of status, a matter of social standing and pride.

We can appreciate if a woman or man wants to be a teacher of art, history or English Literature they are going to have to specialise in that subject in a major way which necessitates a university course and degree.

But for the millions who are just *interested* in a subject such as art or literature, there are huge free libraries in every major Western city with which they can satisfy their hunger for this knowledge and slake their thirst, or even easy going day or night classes, where they can meet others or like mind, and get tuition from experts and professionals in these fields, so why the need to formalize their interest into a long and often tortuous university degree?

For example, famous British astronomy expert *Patrick Moore*, does not have any degree, but has become internationally acclaimed and written numerous successful books on the subject.

Similarly English bestselling cookery authoress and TV personality, *Delia Smith*, left school without any qualifications whatsoever, and is now a multimillionaires who is a part owner and director of a British football club.

So why all this clamour to get the cap and gown and certificate which purports to say "I have a brain"?

For how many with these certificates will ever equal what the above celebrities have achieved without any, or countless other successful people in life of all varieties?

So why does everything we want to do now seem to need to have this *BA* or *B Sc* attached to it, which means a fairly long and tough chunk of our young lives devoted to hard study, without which we are not considered fully paid-up members of society any more?

For example again, the richest man in the world, *Bill Gates*, allegedly now worth over \$90 billion, does not have a degree, as neither do many other very big and famous businessmen and women, and also as we have mentioned, many celebrities and artists of all kinds.

Need we say more?

Jobs in the UK which once required only a few "O levels" or their modern equivalents *GCSEs*, are now taken by people with degrees.

So wait a moment – let us figure this out.

That is, it appears that in decades gone by, we could leave school at sixteen with a few O levels to get the same job we now seem to have to wait till we are twenty-one to get and need to do painful and hard study to get a degree to obtain?

Is this really to our benefit?

Or have we just been conned into doing a load of extra academic study and typically now getting ourselves into a whole lot of unwanted debt, just to get this feather in our cap and gown, which in real life we may not ever actually use or need?

And then the more sinister aspect of all this, is that the possession of a degree is now being used so that a person feels they are somehow superior to "the common run of men and women" who do not bear such a title.

When in fact, these degreeless men and women may have vastly more natural understanding of life and intelligence, than someone who has merely just gone through a course of academic study, and thereby cleverly stuffed a lot of information into their brain which they have largely parroted back faithfully to some lecturer's satisfaction, and thereby gained a certificate.

Is for example a psychology degree or even a Ph D, any sign that the person possessing it has got true understanding of the human condition, and can therefore pontificate upon all our problems with wisdom, and tell us how we should all live our lives?

Do we not tire of young ladies in their twenties who appear on TV telling us all what to do, who may not have really had any significant life experience – for example experienced a long lasting marriage, or raised a family, or worked for decades in a job or career – yet still imagines she knows better than we?

Not that we would feel any differently about a young male who tried to do the same, merely on the basis of some academic badge of status.

For whom should we respect?

A lady who studies some books and gets an exam pass, or a lady who can fix a car, or is a good gardener like TV's *Charlie Dimmock* or a self-taught property developer, such as *Sarah Beeny*, who either do not have or did not require any serious formal academic qualifications to successfully develop their careers, i.e. *degrees*?

For why should we respect any academic, except as *teacher*, unless they have done something as remarkable as a great inventor like Edison or pure scientist like Einstein, if such a man or woman does little or nothing which is relevant or meaningful to mainstream society?

So thus we would suggest that women do not blindly go into academic environments seeking qualifications which may be wholly wasteful and unnecessary to what they wish to achieve in life, and neither should they respect others or their opinions who hold them, merely based on some "degree" whose true meaning may not be clear, and whose knowledge may very well be limited to an isolated area of specialism, and not therefore confer any right on them to speak authoritatively on other issues, as we frequently see in the media and political life both men and women are now doing *at the general public's expense*.

Chapter Fifteen – The Ultimate Women's Liberation – *liberating your mind*

In the 1960s and 1970s modern psychology went into something of a transformation.

Instead of the emphasis being on *interpersonal psychology*, as even with Eric Berne's *Transactional Analysis*, some leading psychologists switched to what they called *transpersonal psychology*.

That is, the psychology of the person in their own right, without regard to others.

But we put it to you that, this in itself was something of a dead end, because we find in practice that we can only discover ourselves in relationship with something or someone else as Krishnamurti explained.

As we explained in Chapter One, on *the true meaning of love*, the objective in life is really to rise above our preconceptions and automated responses and arrive at an *innocent state* in which our mind is unblemished by prejudice or desire, and can then see reality reflected like a mirror, as it really is.

Such a state ultimately enables us to see beyond all life's superficial problems, and to find a solution to each problem as it arises in each individual moment.

In the appendix we shall offer a short description of a meditation technique which any women can carry out but is not likely of the kind you may be familiar with.

However, first we wish to point out a few facts which may assist you in your goal of inner peace and harmony, and therefore outer peace in your relationships.

Many conventional meditation techniques such as *transcendental meditation*, are designed to relieve stress.

The trouble is, meditation used in this way is something of a "sticking plaster" solution.

That is, by living the frantic Western lifestyle, a sensitive man or woman is placing an enormous stress upon him or herself that was never there in most of recorded history before.

Most of us live in cramped, crowded and noisy cities, and do work that takes up most of our waking hours, and then women in particular are busy playing out some kind of "superwoman" role, burning the candle at both ends to satisfy all the demands of society that they take care of their children, go on exciting holidays, and live a hectic social life, and so on.

So we are suggesting the answer is not ultimately to find some kind of a meditation technique performed twenty minutes a day or whatever, or even worse, some kind of drug to keep us from falling apart, but to re-order our lifestyle so that it is less frantic and more peaceful.

Those who can for example, should try to move away from large cities, and live in some smaller place which offers more tranquillity, but only that, if they are not also going to kill themselves commuting in heavy traffic for even more hours a day to cover the extra distance, which would tend to blot out such a move's positive benefits.

Right now, the whole world, which is threatened by terrorism amongst many other problems such as pollution, disease and many women running up vast amounts of personal debt - which some in desperation are now having to turn even to prostitution to pay off - is being forced to undergo a major rethink, and as individuals it is suggested to women that they also do this.

We have all made the error of thinking in terms of greed rather than *need*.

We may need a smallish car, but we surely don't need a Jaguar, and by giving up as many luxuries as possible and living as simple a way of life as we can, we can help to allow Nature to restore the balance in our bodies and minds, that only plenty of sleep, and freedom from too much excitement and stimulation can bring.

We are not objecting to such practices as *Tai Chi*, but we are saying, if a man or woman is using these practices to "supercharge" themselves into coping with an excessively stressful and hyperactive lifestyle, we assure them with confidence, they are going to sooner or later come to a sticky end.

We have got to stop responding to the never ending demands of the capitalist society, which is unfortunately forever hell bent on selling us things that we don't originally need, but then later seem to somehow become a necessity.

Chapter Sixteen – The Lady and the Guru - a rational take on religion and new age spirituality

The very rapid explosion of the so called New Age culture, which was arguably born in the hippy era of the Beatles, when they first brought *the Maharishi* to global public attention in 1967, cannot have escaped the notice of the intelligent woman.

Again, as most of these gurus and religious leaders of all eras have been male, it is clearly another “gender issue” which we need to investigate as part-and-parcel of women’s journey to be liberated from the negative aspects of their relationships with men.

Most feminists are against a male “paternal” or “patriarchal” “god”, who in their mindset sits like a gnarled old, out of touch, bearded figure on some remote throne and has little understanding of or relevance to their daily lives.

His main functions are seen to be *judgement* and *punishment*.

He is a condemner of women, and has heaped this unfair imposition of submission and slavery to men upon women, of which the feminists and other “women’s liberators” have now had more than enough.

He is the Old Testament’s *Moses* who says *thou shalt not* do this, that and the other, which it seems that virtually every modern woman now wants to do.

While the New Testament’s Christ seems to have a few good ideas, especially about not abusing children, he doesn’t really have a lot to say about “women’s rights” and the feminists are seriously concerned about the total lack of *female apostles*.

In fact, it seemed the best that Christ could do for women was to reform a “lady of ill repute”, *Mary Magdalene*, who was so grateful that she then washed his feet, which most women know is not a terribly pleasant thing to do for the average man.

But we put it to you ladies of all political and moral persuasions that this kind of image of a “god” and his functioning and motives, still currently held incredibly by so many millions of Western women and men in this modern scientific age is immature and thoughtless beyond belief, and is high time that women “made over” their views on this issue in the most radical way.

That is, surely the least intelligent of women still must have some curiosity about why she is here, and where the human species came from, and what its destiny might be?

But then, probably due to *most* women’s powerful desire to have children, the average woman does not dwell too much on these issues, for if she did, as many men do, she might likely not succeed in her biological mission to continue the race at all.

Except for this overpowering sexual desire that men have, most if they thought about it, particularly in the current world, would choose not to reproduce either, as many are now doing, and finding less troublesome ways to relieve their sexual tension instead.

But as the majority of the composition of current church congregations now, as likely throughout most of history has been women, this seems to be an issue of importance to the majority of the female gender.

As we have said, most women's number one motivation is *to be loved*, and surely the reliable love of an all knowing and all powerful "god" is the only indubitably dependable love that a woman in her right mind could ever conceive.

But we are now living in a scientific world, which is dominated by "gods" like Newton, Einstein, Stephen Hawking, Freud, Jung, Crick and Watson who first cracked the code of DNA, and Charles Darwin with his evolutionary theories, who have for many satisfactorily explained the human origin and condition.

It is by riding on the backs of the discoveries and *theories* of these *men*, that we now have got a *secular* society, in which the only real function of the Church for most people is to conduct christenings, marriages and funerals, and mostly *the latter*.

For at the end of our lives, when faced with the inescapable, we then start to see if there is perhaps some way for us to continue our selfish plans and egos into eternity, and whether there is truly some "watcher in the skies" who allegedly loves us all, but most of us have long decided has got a pretty funny way of showing it.

Randy Newman's *God's Song* summed up this cynical sentiment pretty well, consider for example the following verse:

*I burn down your cities
How blind you must be
I take from you your children
And you say how blessed are we
You all must be crazy
To put your faith in me
That's why I love mankind*

But we are here suggesting if there is a god, he, she or it, is not at all what we have thus imagined so far, and it is high time for us all to have a more mature, rational and grown up perspective on this issue.

That is to say, let us start with facts and logic and not *faith* nor *blind belief* which the modern scientific mind must surely reject as irrational.

For there *is* undeniably a universe, and there *is* life, however we define that, which is not always easy, especially in the case of lower species of animals or plants which may somewhat blur the definition between animate and inanimate such as *viruses*.

There are also laws of Nature, many of which have been identified by scientists, such as Newton's laws of motion and gravitation, and the laws of electricity and magnetism such as *Ohm's Law* which states the directly proportional or *linear* relationship between voltage and current when electricity is passed through a wire of constant resistance.

Likewise there are known “laws of physics” governing light, magnetism, and the general behaviour of liquids, gases and solids, such as Einstein’s famous $E = mc^2$ as well as more numerous laws which distinguish the behaviour of organic substances - which make up life-forms - from inorganic substances, which we regard as inanimate or “dead” matter.

But we know in fact that nothing is “dead” in the sense of ever being totally static and motionless, as except at a theoretical temperature of *absolute zero*, which is -273 degrees Centigrade, and is not known to exist in reality, everything in the universe is “alive” in the sense that it is *vibrating* to some extent, it is possessed of an *energy* which makes it vibrate.

The traditional model however with which every child at school has been made familiar since the middle decades of the twentieth century is that everything is constructed of atoms, which are imagined to be like solid and indivisible billiard balls, but later experiment has found atoms to be nothing of the kind, but rather mostly made up of absolutely *nothing* with a few “electrons”, “protons” or other particles orbiting inside them, whose nature is not now either necessarily considered to be “solid.”

Equally light has been considered to be not necessarily either made of waves or particles, neither of which model you see would explain its behaviour fully, and this kind of thinking has culminated in the “quantum physics” model, which has suggested that matter is not “solid” as we initially think at all, but rather more like a ghost, an idea, rather than something we can actually quantify, physically count or touch.

In particular, has come forth this idea that there is no *certainty* in the universe, or inside the matter, and everything that exists is really functioning on some kind of “probability” or “random factor”, which on the one hand has fathered the modern and we might say “avant garde” science known as *Chaos Theory*, and on the other hand, led Einstein to say in disagreement and disgust at the breakdown of the concept of a “scientifically predictable universe” that *God does not play dice*.

Incidentally, it must be observed that many great scientists such as Einstein “believed” in a god of some kind, though not necessarily the “Old Testament” or even New Testament version of him.

So what does such a scientist mean when he talks of “God”, and equally what does the scientist who talks of “random chance” mean, which according to many evolutionists is the reason we human beings have appeared on this planet?

What a scientist such as Einstein is really saying, when he talks about “God” is that *there is clearly an order in the universe* which it is logical to assume is caused by some kind of intelligent, organising power.

That is, many atheistic scientists are now saying, we have laws in the universe, sometimes extremely complicated and subtle ones when expressed mathematically, but these laws simply *exist*. We do not need to ask the question if there is “a being” or “intelligence” which has “created them” or is “responsible” for them.

The laws of physics are just *there* they claim, and there is no reason to assume that this means there is any kind of “divine being” behind them whom we have to bow down to or worship, since we are just the accidental products of “the laws of nature” in this vast, but ultimately *meaningless* universe.

This is a kind of existentialist viewpoint, and firstly we are going to point out that it defies *rationality*, and then we are going to explain *why* this viewpoint is held, which you will appreciate is not for the reasons these scientists claim it is.

That is, the existence of a clock implies a *clockmaker*. The existence of a building implies a *builder*.

But the scientists then ask to us take (laughs) *a leap of faith* and accept as fact the *idea* that the existence of the entire universe takes place without a “universe maker.”

For instance, the very currently influential evolutionist we have already mentioned with his *The Selfish Gene*, *Richard Dawkins*, says in his later book *The Blind Watchmaker*, that there is no design in the universe, and therefore no “god” and “the only watchmaker in nature is *the blind forces of physics*.”

So firstly, let us note here, that again, we have a *zoologist* (or biologist, take your pick) *speaking outside his own field*, who is telling us there is no god, whereas we have Albert Einstein, a physicist, who is concerned with the fundamental existence of not just *animal life*, but the entire universe, is suggesting that there is, based on the inescapably conclusion of his own physical theories, which was that the universe had *a beginning*.

But Einstein's version of “god” in his own words was:

I believe in Spinoza's God who reveals himself in the orderly harmony of what exists, not in a God who concerns himself with fates and actions of human beings.

But for a “god” to merely administrate the laws of nature like an unconcerned, uncaring and unemotive robot, is surely little better than Dawkins' “blind watchmaker” with his equally “blind forces of physics” which carry out all the motions of the particles or waves that comprise the physical universe, that are within and without us, which we see and feel.

In terms of Dawkins' version, of *the blind forces of physics*, we are a little puzzled why he even wishes to bring in the concept of a “watchmaker” at all, even a *blind* one, as this surely suggests the idea of some sort of a sentient being?

But surely *all* of this seems to defy rationality, and is a cop out.

For example, we are saying that the incredible seemingly unlimited universe, ever tiny little atom, particle and wave, is all administrated by some kind of “blind force” or “blind being”, when our own personal experience is that if we as a blind person drive out in our car we will soon mow about ten pedestrians down and crash into a lamp post.

Let us put it differently, and perhaps more satisfactorily to the scientific mind, if that piece of “commonsense” does not impress them, which we doubt it will.

We are really saying, is there any *intelligence* or *consciousness* in these so called “blind” forces of nature, or is there not?

Clearly, when we speak of *intelligence* or *consciousness*, we can only mean that as something related to our own concepts of those things, that is, what we regard as *our own* consciousness or intelligence.

And we see, that the conclusion we have come to about those two rather vague concepts is that they surely only exist to a significant degree in creatures who seems to resemble *ourselves*.

That is, animals whom we can relate to by seeing our own characteristics and behaviour in them, such as cats, dolphins or chimpanzees we judge as “intelligent” and possessing a “consciousness”, but stones, trees or flowers we do not.

So we do not for example know if there are other life forms around us which we may not be able to perceive with our senses, but because we cannot see or detect them, we say *they do not exist*.

So surely that is also to say that the planets or stars or galaxies which could not be detected by humans before the invention of telescopes also were deemed not to exist, just as the bacteria and tiny creatures we can see in any drop of tap water were also deemed not to exist before the invention of the microscope.

So such a presumption that there are no intelligences or life-forms which exist apart from *those we have already detected* is clearly an unsafe one.

But scientists arrogantly make these statements, when it is clearly not logical to do so, which has been proven several times over by history.

They cannot cure the common cold, AIDS, or cancer, and do not know how far the universe extends, or when or if it began, but they say there are no “hidden intelligences or life forms” which we have not yet discovered, and can admit only the possibility that there might be some “little green men” somewhere out there, that is, beings much like us, who have originated from the primeval pool of slime in much the same random way.

We might call these scientists *human chauvinist pigs* who imagine that their kind is “the only game in town”, and the model of man is the only possible advanced life form in the universe, with some small variations as we see these aliens with strange skin and bumps on their head depicted in the various sci-fi movies such as *Star Wars* or *Star Trek*.

Really, we are just saying not only do we reject the idea of far superior beings to us, who may not remotely have similar kinds of bodies, but we reject, equally without any evidence whatsoever, that there is a supreme intelligence that is running the show, just as we run a program on our computer screens, like a snooker or pool game simulation.

Moreover, we deny the possibility that there is any “intelligence” or “consciousness” if it does not come in a two or four legged package like our own or our close animal relatives.

But let us in one stroke sweep all these objections aside.

The fact is, that there is *an omnipresent organising power* in the universe, because we see that what processes of its action *we are able to observe*, which is surely in many respects no more than the superficial functioning not far below the atomic level, the laws of nature are functioning in *precisely the same way* at every point in our observable and known world and universe.

So we are dealing with one phenomenon – *the changing universe* – which *we*, with our human intellect then separate out into *limited aspects* which we can find a pattern in and we then call *laws*.

For example, we observe that if we throw an object into the air it comes back down again, which tendency we call *gravity*. Then we get a little more sophisticated about it, and we discover that it is actually a force of *attraction* between two “bodies” or masses of atoms, and that we can calculate that force from the masses and distance apart and determine with what speed these two masses come together.

But in all this pride at our skill, and feeling that we are now gaining “power over nature”, we overlook the fact that we still do not know what an atom *is*, or *how* it came to be in the first place, but we do not worry about that too much, but instead use this kind of information to build catapults and eventually fire missiles at one another.

And our arrogance grows further when we eventually learn to “split the atom” and create explosions which place as *Spiderman* villain, *Doctor Octopus*, said “the power of the sun in the palm of my hand” and we learn to tinker around with genes and create tomatoes the size of grapefruits and so on.

But as *Joyce Kilmer* said in her poem “Trees”

Only God can make a tree.

We are not prejudging the case here as to the existence or non-existence of god, but we are just pointing out the limitations of man’s science.

For we note that these “great achievements” of science overlook one thing.

We can do really impressive things like vaporise a city or an island with an atom bomb, or we can create poisons of which a single vial could kill millions if let loose on a big city, or we can make strange creatures in the genetics laboratory which did not ever exist in history before.

But we cannot cure the common cold, we cannot cure AIDS, we cannot travel to a star beyond our own, or we would surely die in the process, we cannot see far enough with our telescopes to see if or where the universe ends, or figure out when it might have begun.

We are masters of *destruction*, we are clever manipulators of what is already there, but we are not ever *creators*.

The geneticists may say – “ah, but we are creating *new* life forms.”

Well, that would depend on how one classifies the term “new” – for we have long been able to breed for example dogs, to create new untried before “mongrel breeds” some of which may be pleasing, and most of which are probably not.

But what we certainly have not achieved is how to build *one single life form*, from “the ground up”, starting with say ninety-two bottles containing the ninety-two well known elements which should be more than enough to create any living organism *if we truly had such power*.

So we come back to this idea, that these “blind forces” of nature created these incredible sophisticated life forms *just by chance*.

But to separate out this power – just using our own limited minds, which we see have been unable to create *one single life form* from the elements we have discovered which we know make up everything – into its characteristics, and saying it is only the sum of those we have discovered, and will yet discover, is no explanation whatsoever.

It is a pure cop out, which is like saying – we see person X has red hair, two eyes, a nose and a mouth, they play the guitar well, they have two long feet and longer legs, and that is plenty we know about them, and we really thus know sufficient now to make one ourselves.

Let us get out some modelling clay and coloured pencils and make one.

That might seem insulting to modern science and technology, but let a scientist for example make a mouse from scratch – just form the first ninety-two chemical elements that have been know for decades, which are the constituents of all forms of life.

Or shall we make it easier. Let's just have *a leaf*, or even *one single biological cell*.

And again, we find that science is *light years away* from being able to achieve such things.

But find new powerful ways to destroy thousands of trees, *that* it can do.

Of course, we do not denigrate at all the great technological achievements of modern science, in for example being able to achieve such “miracles” as “making the blind see” by removing cataracts or correcting lenses with laser or other eye surgery.

We do not deny the impressiveness of science having successfully landed rockets on the moon or made the fabulous modern computers which can calculate billions of arithmetical computations in seconds that no human brain could ever do.

But let us not forget, it was the brain that made the computer, and not the other way round.

For example, it is said that the possible number of interconnections between any human being's brain cells is greater than the number of atoms in the known universe.

So how is any scientist ever going to be able to count them all, and work out all the possibilities?

This achievement of Nature or these so called “blind laws of physics” in conducting the growth and functioning of our brain is so staggering, it puts all human scientific achievement into the faintest trace of a shadow

Though it may seem ridiculous, we wish to quote a line from *The Sound of Music*, which appears to be a statement of simple logic severely lacking in the modern scientist's brain:

Nothing comes from nothing – nothing ever could.

The idea that there is no “supreme consciousness” or “supreme intelligence” governing the functioning and design of the universe is based on the childish supposition that a god that thinks as we do, could not possibly have created all this human tragedy.

Thus Einstein says, an intelligent power clearly governs and animates everything, but it has little concern for the fate of humans.

But it is true – clearly, a God that thinks *like we do*, would not have created what we see before us, but as there is clearly a universal power there which is working through or even is comprised of the functioning of all these laws of natures, only some of which no doubt we are currently aware of, then it must be such a staggering intelligence, power and force, in that it makes planets, stars, and animals without any difficulty that we cannot possibly imagine it in human terms.

As limited beings, who take several years to get to grips with 2 and 2 equals 4, after a decade or two goes by, we then imagine that we are in a position to assess whatever power has created the entire universe, and clearly also even *ourselves*.

Clearly, the only sensible explanation of the workings of this god is that it is like our own intelligence, but multiplied a hundred times, or better still a million times, or better still multiplied to the degree where our ideas of intelligence have no parallel to its own whatsoever.

That is, rather than being blind as Dawkins suggests, this intelligence must be aware of every tiny particle and wave that is going round Mr Dawkins' brain, and all of the rest of the visible universe.

How then, does Professor Dawkins imagine, he is in any position to judge such a power and intelligence, which not only is entirely responsible for every thought in his own brain, but without which he would not even have been caused to exist?

That is, we can make the Empire State Building out of a lot of pieces of concrete, glass and steel, but this "god" can whenever it pleases, make a tree, a star or a galaxy.

It is clearly further above us than we are above some microscopic creature we see in the tap water.

But even this is wrong. Because we cannot ultimately if it is all encompassing be separate from *it*.

We must also be part of *it*, some tiny aspect of its being, just as we see a human body is composed of billions of cells, which all cooperate with one another, without us being consciously aware of hardly any of them, nor any individual cell being conscious of the aggregate being which, like a god to it, we feel ourselves to be.

Likewise, we are not conscious of a universal "god", because all we are is a drop in the ocean, a tiny cell in comparison to the billions of human "cells" on this planet, and our small planet is just another cell in the galaxy, which in itself is just one of countless galaxies in the universe whose end we cannot even ever see.

So in summary, all we are saying is that we all, including the scientists, stand in awe, in the face of the apparently boundless universe, and an apparently timeless eternity, yet we feel able to say down here in our only slightly advanced beyond caveman status, that we can say "there is a god" or "there is no god." Or "these laws of nature are blind" as is the "watchmaker" who made them.

It is clear that only the "spiritual" or yoga type theories of our existence seem to point the way to a sensible analysis of these questions.

That is, according to the yoga theories, whether Buddhist, Taoist or whatever, this underlying power in Nature cannot be understood with limited rational logic, which cannot cope with ideas such as "nothingness" or "infinity", but only when the mind is still, can there be an intuitive understanding of what is going on, which the saints and so called "religious" people have reported throughout history.

And according to yoga theory *in its true form*, as for example explained by modern kundalini guru, Gopi Krishna, these saints and prophets always come out with the same "script" such as "love thy neighbour", and the Ten Commandments, etc. because there is a path of nature for human evolution, which demands that we behave in certain ways, to smooth this path and bring simultaneously peace and harmony to the society and the individual.

And when these beings get into this advanced state, beyond ordinary rational thought called “Samadhi” in the Hindu tradition, or “satori” in the Zen Buddhist, or various other names in different traditions, they all see and say the same thing.

Which is the underlying plan of nature, and the underlying nature of the universe, which they describe as *a universal intelligence*, and not a dead universe made of lumps of rock that somehow according to some “random” process start to walk, talk and think.

So now let us look at what the New Age so called “spirituality” is saying to us.

It is saying let us chant our mantras, and close our eyes and do our meditations, and feel advanced and holy.

So we are not going to criticise that, but what we are going to criticise is that much of these modern efforts focus on *techniques*.

But if we look at what the beings who actually *had* these incredibly experiences of union said, most of whom are clearly not alive now, such as Buddha, Christ, Mohammed and even the recent Gopi Krishna whom we have mentioned, they are saying the way to gain this higher state, this “kingdom of heaven” is not merely through sophisticated techniques of meditation, but rather through *being pure of heart and mind*.

That is, if we put it in Eric Berne's terms, as we have said in our Chapter One, we have to learn to love *actually*, to be game free, and rediscover and maintain an innocence in us which alone will allow this spirit to grow within us, and maybe one day enable us to get a peek into the “kingdom” through the “narrow gate.”

We have a choice.

We can either wallow in orgies and riotous living, and destroy ourselves with addictive habits, which include psychological ones like enjoying getting into bad tempers and judging and condemning others, or we can learn to be kind, decent, emotionally controlled, and just have a moderate sex life, a moderate material life, possess moderate wealth and do moderate work, and so on.

Then we go not to some elusive or imaginary “kingdom of heaven” in the sky, but take ever more regular and enlightening glimpses into the higher dimensions of consciousness *in the here and now*, which increasingly once we get beyond our long animalistic evolutionary heritage, will become the possession and privilege of every human woman and man.

But the prophets and saints and gurus have all said the same thing – that this cannot be achieved merely by chanting mantras, breathing exercises, or secret yoga techniques, but by learning to compassionately and tolerantly live with our fellow woman and man, whomever and wherever they may be, whether our husband, wife or neighbour, or some person whom we may never see, in some far away land.

Chapter Seventeen - Lies are a feminine issue - *defeating* “the killer answer”

In chapter fifteen, we pointed out that the real liberation is the liberation of the mind, whether for men or women, and in this chapter we are going to justify that proposition comprehensively.

The reasoning behind that claim is that we are about to explain the details of how words can imprison us, that is - take control of our minds - and in some instances even finish our lives.

For example, according to the TV movie, *The Karen Carpenter Story*, which detailed the life of the famous 1970s pop singer with the beautiful voice, we see how in fact mere words became the start of a downward spiral in this young lady's life, which ultimately ended in her death, dating from the time she read a review by a critic which described her as “chubby”.

Whether this story is wholly accurate is not the issue, but certainly illustrates the point that when a *false idea* of sufficient importance to an individual takes over their mind, it puts a block on all sensible thinking, and can lead to self-destructive behaviours as in the Karen Carpenter case.

We know that many girls and women are still suffering from this anorexia/bulimia syndrome, falsely imagining they are fat, when in fact they are just in possession of a normal female shaped body that naturally has more fatty tissue on certain areas, such as the breasts, legs and bottom, which are in fact arguably evolutionary assets.

For example, a woman's generally fatter bottom than the average man, is a positive advantage in being able to sit more comfortably, such as she would wish to do if taking care of a child for long periods or even driving a car over some distance.

The women who denigrate this natural asset they have, might wish to consider that a man with his firmer, more muscular hind quarters typically goes through a great deal of undesired discomfort if forced to sit in the same place for any length of time, especially if it is not extremely well cushioned.

Equally, the generally more soft and curvy shape of women is welcomed by babies and young children, and seen as desirable by most men, the vast majority of whom find a curvaceous Rubenesque lady infinitely more desirable than the anorexic ironing board type women who tend to appear in the modern magazines and high fashion catwalks.

So here again, we have a lie that so many young ladies and girls have bought into – i.e. that a curvy woman is a *fat woman* and therefore undesirable to men - which if believed and taken to heart will surely make her life a total misery, fighting a war against her own body and natural feminine shape that need never be.

Women models in former eras to the 1960s era had *curves*, like actresses Marilyn Monroe, Sophia Loren or Gina Lollobrigida, as has indeed modern pop icon *Madonna*, and the imposition of this awful fashion of the “Twiggy” 1960s models who all had somewhat androgynous pencil thin and typically flat-chested “boyish” figures, which trend has unfortunately continued into the present with undernourished models like Kate Moss, has been one of the greatest crimes upon women and girls, the vast majority of whom do not naturally have such skinny, angular bodies.

Though fashion and clothes designers in defence of this practice of using wafer-thin models make the continual claim that clothes look better on these virtually anorexic girls we hasten to disagree. Such a statement is what we might call *a killer answer*.

For we have all by now heard of the “killer question”, which perhaps when used in a courtroom traps us into giving a response that we somehow maybe don't feel is fair and properly representative of the broader view of the situation, but this “killer answer” is equally something which can lead to us going to a kind of prison.

For example, in this case, we are being fed the killer answer to the question – why must our models be so skinny? – *because clothes look better on painfully thin models*.

But if that is so, why did not the artists of the past such as *Manet*, *Da Vinci*, the sculptor of *the Venus De Milo* and any number of other classical artists throughout the millennia depict the curvaceous woman as the most attractive ideal and not the woman, who if stripped naked looks like she is a recent refugee from some kind of famine zone.

When perhaps only a generation ago, girls who didn't develop averaged sized breasts felt fearful and cheated out of their femininity, and many modern girls feel so motivated that they are willing to pay whatever it takes to have their breasts cosmetically enhanced, this thought and action of *real life girls and women* surely says something very different than what the fashion designers are advocating.

If these women believed they looked better as boyish waifs, they would surely not be seeking breast enhancement, and so it is clearly the fashion designing community alone who seem to believe in this image of woman as virtually skeletal clothes horse as ideal, which at least ninety percent of men reject, and seventy-five percent of women likely cannot ever be.

So this “killer answer” has led to the enslavement of women to diet plans and paranoid anxiety which can transform into addictive behaviours such as anorexia nervosa.

But let us look at the *real life* case for example of genuinely funny British comedienne, *Jo Brand*, to see the truth of this matter, who wrote a very witty and intelligent book on men called *A Load of Old Balls*.

We also note in passing that even the originally pencil slim former model turned actress, *Twiggy*, later developed into a far more attractive and curvaceous *woman*, only a decade or so after her originally appearance on the world stage as a teenage slip of a girl.

At heart, the concept we seem to have in this deification of boy-like waif as ideal of woman, is *the denial of woman to be woman*.

So that pretty much takes care of *all women*, doesn't it, as it imposes on all women everywhere this negative body image, when compared to what is put before them as a fashion icon and ideal to emulate, but is actually totally contrary to what at least seventy-five percent of womens' bodies are naturally like or ever can be.

Of course there are issues here such as women's use of food for emotional comfort which clearly leads to many problems of excess body fat in women and young girls, and a good number of men also use food in this way with similar results.

But as we have explained, eating and therefore weight gain for this reason, could be cured within a generation by raising children without cruelty – which for example, we saw plenty of in Princess Diana's upbringing, such as *sending her to boarding school at age nine* - and seeing to it by a carefully arranged system of introductions and the proper education of young males that virtually every girl and woman finds a mate, and therefore *is assured of being loved*.

So our message here to women is *do not accept the lie that being a little overweight is a crime, or that being pencil thin is a desirable state of affairs to be in any way emulated*.

Do not either accept the lie that clothes look best on skinny models, which might be a reality on a trendy fashion designer's sketch pad, but not in real life on real women, as most men confirm in their choices of girlfriend and wife.

An objective observer might almost be forgiven for concluding that this image of women as waif has the motive of *ensuring* if she emulates it she never gets a sane boyfriend or male partner, who typically likes his women to look different than young boys or men - that is *with plenty of curves*.

So this lie of - *thin is good, curvy is bad* - can certainly kill or frustrate your life.

For it can "kill" the interest and therefore eventual *love* of a man and the unborn children whom you otherwise might have had, if you had accepted the natural body shape of a woman, that is, the physical form like *the Venus de Milo* which for countless millennia before the feminist era ever was, *Nature* had given to you.

Jo Brand is significantly overweight, and in her comedy act, after pausing to build up a tension, self-mockingly makes remarks to her silent audience such as "I'm a fat cow", which though normally we would expect such a statement to produce waves of pathos at her seemingly tragic status, actually produces roars of laughter, due to her unashamed and frank confession of this fact, from which she does not try to escape.

She is probably the best loved British comedienne of her generation, because unlike most female comedians she can actually do a stand up comedy act which makes millions of *men* laugh, not only women, and at least partly thereby she has won awards to confirm her status as number one amongst British women in her art.

When recently having agreed to take part in some sort of charity “fun run” or suchlike, she was asked what kind of training she had been doing in preparation, and replied “I’ve had the odd stroll to the chippy.” (i.e. *the fish and chips shop*, a typically somewhat greasy and fatty traditional British meal, for the benefit of non-British readers), which reply brought the house down, when most of the other participants had been conscientiously jogging and working out like all “good little boys and girls” should.

Although we are not suggesting that the situation of a woman who is seriously overweight is a desirable state of affairs, particularly from the health point of view, what we are identifying is that the real point around these fat issues is not about weight *per se* so much as about *self-acceptance*.

And of course, as we have said, the image of *woman as beanpole* depicted in the vast majority of fashion magazines and on catwalks worldwide, is clearly playing havoc with this anxiety women inevitably have about how their body should look and feel.

We might add in conclusion, that though Jo Brand is very definitely overweight, and not conventionally attractive, she is as we have said well loved by the British public, and also now married with young children, so her overweight status has not affected her ability to have a full life as a woman.

And we would like to point out *why*.

The *why* in her case, is that she has such a good sense of humour and a kind heart, that she is *an attractive human being*, which overcomes the objections we may have had as to the superficial deficiencies in her appearance.

If we look into history we find that such outstanding female personalities as the Russian authoress, *Helena Petrova Blavatsky*, who wrote *The Secret Doctrine* and *Isis Unveiled*, were also significantly overweight, but their *personalities* overcame this “defect”, and they were accepted *for who they were*.

Again, this is a lesson to women that *personality* is the area to focus on, not body.

This does not of course mean we are saying *being fat is OK*, but what we are saying is being overweight as assessed by modern medicine or “fashion” is not a crime, and if someone has personality which is valuable, most people are going to overlook not only a few extra pounds, but a few extra stone, as long as that person takes good care of their personal cleanliness and hygiene.

For then we have not “a fat cow”, but a nice lady who is “pleasantly plump.”

Further examples of women who are at least two stone over their “recommended weight”, yet nonetheless *accepted, loved* and successful are British comedy actress *Dawn French* and the American actress *Roseanne Barr*.

As explained in the ancient Indian “Vedic” health care system and science of *Ayurveda*, there are different body types *naturally* occurring, so it is unquestionable that some people are going to be more naturally fat, thin or muscular than others, and *beyond a certain point* to fight this situation with diet or exercise is contrary to Nature’s intrinsic design, or as scientists would say, one’s inherited genetic makeup.

Next, let us return to the education and discipline of our children, or indeed even of ourselves.

We constantly here in the media, the *killer answer* and lie of *it's no good denying children things because they only want them all the more*.

So by acceptance of this killer answer, we are submissively accepting *children can have anything they want, and there is no point trying to stop them*.

And thus they do – they have teen or even pre-teen sex, they steal from their own parents, they bully other children, and as soon as they are big enough they start to bully and threaten other adults too.

Yet in the feminist thinking there seems to be a huge contradiction here, because as to rape allegations, men *must accept that no means no*.

So that is, we teach a young child (including a male) that there is no such thing as “no” to his or her desires, and then we expect that same child when grown into an adult to understand that “*no means no*.”

There do not seem to be any adjectives or expletives adequate to describe the magnitude of the insanity of this thinking and *killer answer*, and thus it is hoped sober *understatement* will make the point more clearly.

On the contrary – and please feel the greatest liberation you may ever have felt in your entire life, especially if a mother – you *can* say *no*, to the wants of children and pestering adults alike.

The reason that children do not accept *no*, in answer to their desires is *because they think that you don't mean it*.

As John McEnroe used to say when he was questioning the umpire’s authority over a tennis decision he believed had been misjudged against him - “*You cannot be serious!*”

But the person who *believes* in what they say, and shows it to these children of all ages, that is, for example the mother who says *no more cookies today*, and *means* it, the children then accept the authority of.

All you have to do with such children is *give not one inch*, and then you will be the boss, you will be accepted and believed.

But if they think there is even one single chink in your armour they can work on, you are lost, as are they.

As we have said, either you are going to rule over your children – that is, with a *just* and *fair* rule - or *they are going to rule you*. And if they rule over you, rest assured, it is not going to be either just or fair, it is going to be an unending list of tyrannical demands which you will be constantly blamed for if you fail to deliver upon.

So which is it to be?

Are you going to be a *respected* mother, or an abused and cowering *slave* before your children?

So let us take sex education for example, which is an extremely serious issue, especially in the UK now, since *under the current system* we have had an explosion of teen pregnancies unequalled throughout the entire continent of Europe.

The schools now teach sex education to young children and the natural consequence of this information so young is that *they want to try it out*.

Likewise, they constantly see images of sex in the media, for no matter how hard parents try to keep them away from this material they may get it on a computer disk in the playground, or see it on the home PC of a friend in their friend's house far away from the concerned and prying eyes of their mother or father.

A sane woman's instincts tell her that it is not good for her boy especially to become experimenting with and hooked on sex at such an early age as a ten or eleven years old.

But the *killer answer* here is "children have got rights, they need information to make *informed choices*."

You see, the thing about the *killer answer* is that it creates a subdued *silence* in its audience of victims. It is designed to *put an end to all thinking*, so that we obediently conform to and *accept* the regime which must follow from such submissive acceptance.

But let us not in this instance stop thinking, nor obediently conform nor submissively accept *this unjustifiable interference in our freedom*.

That is, these "liberators of children" are demanding children have the right to *information* to make *choices*.

But the trouble is, that we need not only *information* to make "choices", but we also need *wisdom* and *maturity*. And you will note that neither of these qualities *by definition* are possessed by the vast majority of *children* in abundance.

And of course, laughably the governments of our Western nations take a very different policy when it comes to affairs of state, and national security.

Then suddenly we so called *adults* are not given *information* nor *choices*. We are generally rather given *misinformation* and *no choices*. Such as the British public being lied to over the issue of weapons of mass destruction in the Iraq war, which means that regardless of whether the war was ultimately right or wrong, we *did not* have the information we required, and we did not therefore have genuine *choices*.

But as to sex education, let us propose a new simple and sensible strategy, which we are quite certain the current authorities would never suggest nor agree in a million years, if they had so long in office, which we sincerely believe they will not, as even another decade of this nonsense would be too much and likely cause “the end of the world” as we know it.

Really, the educators in *some schools* had it almost right about thirty to forty years ago.

The strategy they adopted was to *discreetly tell the girls* a little before or as soon as they were old enough to conceive – i.e. at around age eleven – but didn't bother about “educating” the boys, whose unending curiosity would naturally ensure that *some way* they would find out the truth anyway.

All that boys needed to know was *don't go off with strangers*.

Because what is it we are trying to do?

The main things we are trying to achieve are to surely:

a) stop boys and girls having sex until they are out of school at the very earliest – that is at least sixteen.

b) stop girls getting pregnant or diseased or abused.

So it is *the girls* who need protecting the most, and at that age, mostly they have the relative *maturity* to cope with the information, whereas the boys likely don't.

The best thing to do with boys is *to keep them away from the girls and the knowledge of sex* just as long as is humanly possible.

So sad to say, for we now addicted Western nations, that means it is time to return to TV and movie dramas in which sex happens only behind a closed bedroom door.

Or otherwise, we will continue to get all these teenage pregnancies, and rapes of young girls – like the teenage boy who raped four *pre-teen* girls in the UK recently – and also of older women, even of the grandmother age group.

There are no depths of fantasies in pornography which are not being plumbed, and sold to the public, and once this material has infected and thus *hypnotised* the minds of millions of men, male children and some women and girls, a small but significant percentage are going to start putting what they see into reality, just as in the case of *Bhutan* where Mr Murdoch installed his satellite dishes and destroyed a centuries old culture and peaceful kingdom in a few short years, who emulated the bad behaviour they saw for the first time on TV.

In all situations in life we have to be aware that everyone is growing in mental understanding and maturity, and each one of us is only ready to “handle information” of various kinds after due preparation, which may take years, or in some cases never.

Few of us are truly “mature adults”, few of us are as broad-minded, big-hearted, understanding, self-controlled or brave as we think.

So we need *protecting from ourselves*.

And the way government and society must go about that is not by giving *choices*, and *information* which most of us are going to abuse and destroy ourselves with if it is given too soon, or even *at all*.

For example, also in the Karen Carpenter movie we see her talented brother Richard having sleep problems and being given *one single* sleeping tablet by his mother, which led to years of him being addicted to drugs.

Once someone gives us *the information*, we are done, we discover we can't necessarily handle the consequences.

Or we meet someone who says to us – “hey, I know this place you walk in and put \$10 on the table, and maybe you walk out with over \$300. Want to give it a go?”

It would have been better surely for us when we later became a gambling addict, that we had never met such a person, and never had that information.

But then comes *the killer answer*.

They say “ah, you can't go banning these things – pornography, gambling and hard drugs - because *you will just drive them underground*.”

And so we all say “duh – he (or just as likely *she*) has got a point.”

But *no* – don't fall for this knock out *sucker punch* killer answer any more, which in reality only confirms and effectively *enforces* the status quo of a corrupted and diseased world that it's not safe for any of us to live in any more.

Don't stop thinking, but *carry on*.

Rather say – “Ok. Drive it underground. At least then it will only be an underground problem, and only those addicts desperate enough to *earnestly seek it out* will be driven to get the drug or make the bet or seek out the pornographic material.”

We are not being unrealistic.

We know it can't be done over night, but just as we have been addicted and corrupted *stage by stage*, we can equally be *uncorrupted* just the same way, as it appears is gradually being done with smoking, as it is being progressively prohibited *successfully* from more and more public places, and especially important, the *advertising* of it has been mostly prohibited.

For example, let us take porn and swearing on TV, which is currently allowed in Europe, but not so in much of the still somewhat religious influenced United States.

Twenty years ago this soft porn and swearing was not allowed on British TV, people didn't want or need it then, so why do they now?

The truth is of course, *most* people still *don't* want or need it.

However empowering modern women think swearing is by rebelliously saying those naughty "f-words" and thus proving women can be as foul-mouthed as any man, millions of people are constantly offended by what they feel to be the language of the gutter assaulting them via their TV screens in the privacy of their living rooms.

For example, supposing we had a button on our TV which would censor all swearing, like the partially successful filters on Internet content.

How many people do we think would use it?

Millions, without question.

But the governments no longer protect us from the imposition of this corrupting and threatening material upon us.

So why is it that a very huge minority, if not majority of the people are having this swearing and "in yer face" sex imposed on them on TV, when it seems that in life in general we are not allowed even "to say boo to a goose"?

For the TV companies to assault us with swearing in particular, is it appears a liberty they have taken without our consent, as is to inflict sex advertising upon us, such as that for chatlines, amidst programs that do not have that kind of content.

For example, explicit sex is always a somewhat shocking and hypnotic sight to us, and if it ceases to be so, then we should not celebrate this as some kind of "experienced maturity" but rather a frightening loss of sensitivity, just as certain groups of soldiers were reportedly made to watch horrible scenes of mutilation and similar savage acts, so that they would become insensitive to them, and thus *able to carry out these atrocities themselves without a qualm*.

We imagine this *toughness* or *hardness* is a good thing, but many a doctor and surgeon who are actually one of the few classes of persons who needs to develop such an *objectivity* rather than *insensitivity* about the sight of cut open bodies and blood, is frequently found to be coping only with alcohol from the horror of what they see and they daily have to make life and death decisions about.

Neither should women be forced by some kind of guilt to educate their own male children about sex, who *do not wish to hear about or discuss such information with their mothers*.

After all, if a mother *rightly* does not like the idea of a boy child becoming witness to or aware of her own sexual activity, what on earth makes her think that her boy child will be at ease if she becomes any kind of spectator or inquisitor of his?

Such intrusion in a growing boy's "private life" is a likely catastrophic and deeply embarrassing event, and is not remotely part of the true *respect based love* which we defined near the beginning of this book, and likewise will not ever earn her any reciprocal respect or love in return.

On the contrary, this overstepping of boundaries into people's private space, is likely to produce all kinds of shocking behaviour such as incest, or in the extreme case even rape of a mother by her son.

For when we fail to show respect for any other human being, we cannot be too surprised if their respect diminishes for us also, with wholly unpredictable results.

Whilst denying us the right to know what is going on in various places in our own country, such as the infamous *area fifty-two* in America, which some allege has got evidence of alien visitors tucked away in it, the governments however say with regard to these powerful corrupting forces of gambling, pornography and tobacco, that as "mature adults" *we must have choices*.

But we have seen time and time over what happens to other races, such as the native Eskimos when we give them these "choices." Within a generation their culture and age old civilisation is destroyed, and they become mostly lazy, addicted consumers of tobacco, alcohol, other drugs and Western culture in general.

They grow idle, dissatisfied, fat and unhealthy, and their relationships with their families, friends and neighbours decline.

But let us now turn our attention to the arena of business and employment, which is second only in importance to the acquisition of a mate and maintaining good health.

Most Western countries now have huge employment problems, mostly though not only for formerly "working class men" who used to work in the trades and industries which have now mostly been transferred to the Third World where labour is cheaper, and scrutiny of a business's activities is less stringent.

The “official figures” are however cleverly doctored in many ways, so this situation is not clearly brought into the open, such as millions of men who used to work are now in some kind of semi-permanent or permanent state of “incapacity for work” either on grounds of physical or mental ill health.

But the truth is largely that *suitable* work has been taken away from these men by the relocation of the work they were suited for, and when asked *why* these millions of men and many times women also have been *betrayed* by the political and governmental leaders in the Western countries, the *killer answer* given is that this or that company or factory or industry, which had been part of our national heritage for decades or even centuries *is no longer competitive*.

So now the unions in most Western countries are so weak, mostly the sacked workers just grumble and put up a few futile protests, but then meekly lay down and, as it were, *die*.

They may live physically, but their heart and pride which came from the feeling of having the dignity of supporting themselves via *honest work* is removed and cut out.

Then they sink into depression and unhealthy lifestyles, or are forced or tempted into some kind of corrupting service industry such as operating sex chatlines or being a croupier in the gambling industry, or even some kind of lackey who works in a hotel for the wealthy visitors and travellers who come to be treated like kings and queens in their town.

So we let them get away with this by accept *the killer answer* of *you are not competitive*.

Whereas, we should say – *just hold on one minute buddy*.

We are *not* going to give up in one second, the work that has taken us years or even decades of our lives to learn and master, and gave us a secure place in our society, simply because some globalising business owner decides that he can buy himself ten extra Rolls Royces by relocating his workshops to some slave continent in a far away land, where the people do not complain so much when they are abused.

Because it is against *our* human rights, *and* those of the exploited peoples’ in the far away land.

Likewise we are not going to buy *the killer answer* of, *ah, we are helping the natives of these Third World countries to progress*.

Oh no, you are not!

You are just making slave camps out of them, taking away their natural ways of life and making them dependent on a whimsical Western trade agreement, which may not only be unfair against them in terms of the relative rewards they receive, but may at short notice decide to further relocate elsewhere, leaving them totally stranded and without any means to support themselves.

So will all you ladies please give a darn good telling off to your “sisters” who are in political power who support and praise these *enslaving* policies, which not only destroy foreign cultures but take away millions of jobs from your native men and women, and perhaps even *yourselves* under some lame excuse that even a properly educated four year old could figure out was a fraud?

Do not accept their *killer answers* designed to silence your legitimate objections, and understand that most of these ladies in power, just as with most men in power, are concerned only with their own feeling of ego importance, due to their fame and positions of power.

They are so infatuated with their job titles and their reflections in the mirror, that they are ignoring and misunderstanding grave human realities, which are destroying the lives of both foreign nations and countless millions of their own countrymen and women in all the Western nations.

For we all know in our hearts there is only one proper means to self-respect for nations, just as there is for individuals – that they should be as *independent* as possible, and as capable as possible of supporting themselves.

Just as with our children, our goal as parents is that *our children should become independent and self-supporting*, likewise that must be our goal with other less developed nations.

For let us look at history, and let us recall how countries like China, India, Persia, Mexico and Greece had great civilisations and cultures, when there was little contact with other nations, and the possibility of huge importing and exporting of goods was only slight, so each nation existed almost entirely on *its own natural resources*.

Look again, at for example how the Indians and the Eskimos built up entire ways of life based entirely on the limited resources at hand, or how the African races and aboriginal tribes of Australia all formed their own independent ways of life, by gaining a deep understanding and wise use of their natural environments, and such ways of life were mostly dignified and peaceful, and lasted for centuries.

We are not for destroying all the positive benefits of technology or healthcare or trade, but we are for a better balance of taking the natural resources we need for food, clothing, shelter and healthcare, in a way that is responsible with regard to all other nations and races and the environment in general.

We simply cannot *responsibly* take a country that had a natural way of life without us, and make it totally dependent on exporting for example peanuts, and then if the peanut market collapses, or they are cheaper some place else, we pull out of that country and leave them without any means of existence at all, *as has been done*.

Like our children, each country must have as far as possible a totally self-supporting economy, so that imports and exports are done out of *free choice* and mutual benefit, instead of *dependence* and therefore a no choice state of *fear*.

But the killer answer shows itself in almost every field, for example in *religion and spirituality*.

We hear such statements as *there is no life after death, because nobody has ever been back from the dead*.

But the New Testament for example says differently, but then they say *ah, that's not history and fact, but only myth*.

Which may or may not be truth, but *the killer answer* is not the truth, as few such answers are.

The only *honest* answer to such mysteries is that *they do not know*.

Or let us take the efforts of the politicians to smooth the path for the creation of a "Las Vegas" style gambling resort in the North of England.

The local people say "we don't want a load of gambling casinos here."

But then comes *the killer answer*.

The politicians says "ah, but this is an economically depressed area (because the tourists who once used to flock there, have been lured to other countries, which they are destroying and wrecking the local cultures of also). We must have these casinos *to create jobs*."

Ah, we are so kind to you – we are only thinking of *creating jobs*.

We are not thinking about how many new gambling addicts this will create, thereby destroying families and lives, or just foolish people who will lose their money with which they could have done something far better, or the general "greed is good", "money for nothing" culture which is luring so many people into *false hope*.

Women in particular need to watch out for another kind of strategy which is in fact really a whole separate *class* of the species of *killer answer*.

We might call it *death by emotion*.

That is, by arousing a powerful emotion about some issue, we can overpower all reason, and as we have said, thereby *put an end to all further thinking*.

For example, as we have mentioned, in the Afghan war, *womens' rights* were brought out as a key issue, and women had to be protected from the supposedly evil *Taliban*, though as we have also said, British journalist Yvonne Ridley, who was "captured" by them, said she was well treated and not whipped, raped, enslaved and so on, as the propaganda might have led us to imagine.

So the killer answer here was *women are being abused*, to the question of, *do you mind if we go to war and maybe kill a few thousand foreigners and some of our own boys in the process?*

So whatever the motives of the West in Afghanistan or Iraq, are you really going to believe it is to *protect womens' rights* that all these *men* have been sent to war?

But they insist *this is a womens' rights issue*, and you cannot argue against that, can you?

And thus you are struck dumb.

The game of emotional manipulation is of placing an image before you, with which you cannot possibly argue, such is its emotional impact, but may be very different than the reality of it.

For example, let us take a relatively recent UK campaign promoting the concept of *zero tolerance of violence against women*.

In this was shown a very respectable, attractive looking, middle-class British white woman, whose husband when he got her alone began intimidating and humiliating her and threatening physical attack, for apparently *no excuse whatsoever*.

One – that is either a man or a woman – could not fail to be charged up with outrage at this scene.

How dare he!!! Beast! Etc, etc.

But we question, in the light of the knowledge of the psychological “*games people play*” based on Eric Berne’s work which we introduced in chapter one, if this in any way typical of the actual abuse which *British women* endure.

That is - does this really happen much to attractive, educated, middle-class white women, for no apparent motive, as this advertising campaign portrayed?

We don’t think so. Middle class British women pick their husbands more carefully, and are mostly able to use the power of the law to protect themselves if they made a mistake, or get the support of their typically numerous friends.

We are fairly confident that seventy-five percent to ninety-percent of this “wife beating” is a lower class phenomenon, as it has been for centuries.

Also, we are fairly confident that the more attractive women are less likely to get beaten, *unless they have been playing* a game like “*Hit Me*” from chapter one, or driven a man crazy with nagging or desire, as immortalized in Tom Jones’ famous sixties hit song *Delilah*, where a passionate man is driven to murder by his woman’s infidelity and mockery of him.

We are not going to debate exact figures, but the major point we are making about the *unreal* and *unrepresentative* nature of this campaign, was that few violent attacks apart from those whose motive is robbery are *ever* carried out upon *anyone*, where some kind of a clear and identifiable *motive* is not present.

So whilst of course we do not approve of any violence against women, we are saying this is an unjustified use of imagery, which not only misleads as to who the likely victim of male violence is, but also fails to address the issue of motive and the psychodynamics of the relationship – as defined for example by Eric Berne's game theory – which would permit a *thorough analysis* of what is going on in these abusive relationships, and therefore *a proper and permanent solution*.

Which may be for example, *these two people are simply incompatible and intolerant of one another*, and therefore *should not ever consider living together*.

But where we have *death by emotion*, our overpowering feelings whipped up into outrage by some misleading images *put an end to our thinking*, and just incline us to resort to blanket and unperceptive methods of dealing with what are actually subtle problems requiring careful, thoughtful and honest investigation and wise resolution.

Or let us reconsider the problem of discipline in the class room.

The advertising agency is given the brief “make us some images to stop child abuse” and they perhaps come up with some little drama where a cowering child is weeping, tied to a railing while some evil ogre of a man is loosening his belt buckle ready to give the child a savage and *it appears* wholly undeserved and motiveless beating.

And again, our thought it put to *death by emotion*, and all we can think is “evil brute!” and come up with responses that “children should never, ever be hit under any circumstances!”

But the image we seldom see – which *was* actually shown on British TV recently - is that of some poor helpless teacher in a classroom with a mass of unruly children creating havoc, hurling abuse at him or her, maybe even attacking him or her, whilst the few “good children” stand silently, contemplating this havoc, in which the teacher is totally unable to teach some decent lady's children, and likely the only thing that would restore order is a quick swish of a cane or strap on a desk.

We are not saying a teacher has got to *use* a strap or cane or whatever.

We are saying that the children have got to think that he or she *might* and *can*, or someone else in authority can do so on his or her behalf.

But then someone says “ah, we had this wicked teacher who used to take the girls off to his private room and beat them for his sick desires”, and there is our *death by emotion*, our *killer answer*, and thus corporal punishment must *never* be used, because we cannot risk any beastly thing like that to happen to girls or boys ever again.

But as we have said elsewhere, if the job of disciplining children correctly has been done in the home, and also we have smaller classes and more civilised school environments, the need for physical disciplining of children above the age of seven or ten – that is, when they are old enough to remember it – should be either very rare, or else wholly unnecessary.

But that is - *only when order in the home and classroom has been re-established, and the battle to restore it has long been won.*

Or again, let us take the issue of *women and debt.*

A woman in doubt about whether she should accept the offer of yet another store or charge card that is being offered her in such an enticing way, might say – “but I am not sure all this credit is a good idea”

And while she is musing, the sales person offers her *the killer answer*, which is “but *everybody* is doing it, millions of people are in debt, so *don't worry, it's normal.*”

So the advice put differently is – *take the darn card and stop whinging.*

(we'll put you on a lifelong instalment plan, and there's always Prozac or prostitution if the stress of being in tens of thousand of debt gets too much).

So we feel that we have given enough examples such that the intelligent reader has by now well got the idea.

Therefore, let us watch out for these *killer answers* and appeals to *our emotions* rather than *our reason*, wherever they may be found, knowing that their purpose is to control and limit our thinking and our actions, and not *ever* as their originators claim to improve our lives, “empower us” and set us free.

Chapter Eighteen – Desperately seeking Ally McBeal - women and the law

Top rated TV legal drama series such as *LA Law*, *Ally McBeal* and *Boston Legal* in America, and their less watched and shorter longevity UK equivalents such as *This Life* and *North Square*, have depicted a glamorous, exciting and very highly paid vision of the legal profession, which has attracted many women to seek out the law as a career.

As we have discussed, two of the most influential and powerful women in the world for the last two decades – Mrs Clinton and Mrs Blair, whom we may recall are now close friends – have both been lawyers as were their husbands, ex US president, Bill Clinton, and current British prime minister, Tony Blair.

Under all this encouragement, and in particular the huge proportion of marriages which end in divorce, the law has become part of all our lives as never before.

For example we all know someone who has had a little or not so little accident, and has become a fair bit wealthier thereby, and some have even become rich depending on the seriousness of their injuries.

But then to be rich in a wheelchair is perhaps not ever real compensation, and so this burgeoning personal injury claims market is not our main concern here.

What we are particularly concerned with is that the law is now being used *as a weapon*, rather than as merely the instrument of maintaining social order and administering justice which surely it was meant to be.

Of course, we should be clear where laws originated from, and we are not going to state this as would the average university or college course, but rather in a simple way that any of us fools can understand.

That is, communities of humans living together began in what we might call a modern “civilised” form perhaps five to ten thousand years ago, and as always, there were those who dominated and ruled those communities and those who followed and submitted to the orders of those typically *self-appointed* rulers “on high.”

So, as we have observed, the rulers – i.e. *those who make rules* - of any society would generally seek to form an elite group around themselves, and create rules and regulations to impose on the mass of people, and such rules must surely be the origin of *the law* as we know it.

That is, throughout most of human history, the law has been mainly an instrument to maintain the status quo of the elite minority over the rest.

And it is no surprise that is almost exactly what is happening today.

Of course there are different branches of the law which we shall quickly outline, noting as we have said, that the main purpose has been to protect the assets and rights of the rich and powerful against the "have nots" who would seek to contest those rights.

For instance, we have *commercial law*, which all of us as consumers are up to our necks in, little do we realise it most of the time, as business owners seek to protect their right to use the rest of us to make themselves wealthy, without being too threatened by our complaints.

Of course commercial law is also used to protect one business from another, for instance copyright law, which was somewhat summed up by *J Jonah Jameson* in the *Spiderman* movie, when having stolen the idea from one of his employees of naming the new six-armed and two-legged villain, *Doctor Octopus*, ordered that his idea should be registered under copyright, and he should get a buck every time somebody said it.

But is it right that for example a lady like J K Rowling, when protected by such copyright law, can become a dollar billionaire (and soon likely a *sterling* one too) for writing a few lengthy and entertaining children's stories, when most people have to work their fingers to the bone all their lives just to make ends meet?

Or is it right that Bill Gates gets to be the richest man in the world because he can do the same, that is, use copyright to protect his right to receive money from nearly every computer user in the world for something that can be copied in seconds at the touch of a button for virtually no cost, while ordinary mortals work all their lives in a burger bar or office for a few dollars or pounds an hour?

But *the law* is not asking about what is *right*, it is just as we have said *the law*. And as we have explained, that means it is mostly a set of rules which protects the rights of those who *have* from those who have not.

And so, are we really so surprised when some awful natural catastrophe happens, like the recent Hurricane Katrina, that all the "have nots" go on a crazy orgy of looting, taking maybe the only opportunity they will ever have to have some of what "the haves" have always had and got?

And then what does *the law* do? It sends in the troops to start shooting *the have nots*, confirming as we might have long suspected, that *the law* sees *the protection of private property* as far above in importance *the protection and preservation of human life*.

We see this also reflected in that a man or woman can get severely beaten and even lose maybe an eye, and perhaps the attacker gets a couple of years.

But if someone commits some kind of fraud that upsets the structure of ownership of property, like the famous and somewhat unfortunate *Nick Leeson* who single-handedly brought down the esteemed centuries old British *Barings Bank*, which had *the Queen* amongst its customers, he gets clapped in irons so to speak, for *a long, long time*, getting in Leeson's case, *six and a half-years* in a not so gentle Singapore jail.

Leeson's case and story, immortalized in the *Ewan McGregor* movie, *Rogue Trader*, is interesting, as he was really someone who was more or less a cockney barrow boy type who found himself in a position to control the entire funds of a major bank, and therefore a servant of the rich, who was supposed to be guarding the funds of the rich.

And this is of course the *killer answer* we are given to the question of – *can this enormously unequal division of income and property really be fair?*

That is we are told – this is a *wonderful society*. Just look at ex-secretary *J K Rowling* who is now virtually a dollar billionaire. *You too* can be like her in this “free society”, so get typing now on that word processor, or don't you want the right to be rich?

And if you are not so bright, well – there's always the national lottery by which as we have seen *any fool* can get rich.

So really, we see that Leeson was not punished for hurting anybody or really deliberately intending to do wrong.

He was given a responsibility he was inadequate to hold, by greedy people who deludedly assumed he was making them money by his elaborate speculative “gambling transactions”, and rewarded him for it by showering him with money and praise, so he was therefore punished by “the law” *for failing the rich in his duty to protect their wealth*.

And as we have mentioned, millions of Westerners are now drawn into legally orchestrated “get rich quick” schemes under the personal injury laws, the main recipients of the benefits from which are generally *the lawyers*.

We are not of course denying the right of those with serious injuries to be financially supported in some way, but the current legal system does not necessarily seem to be the best way of going about that.

For let us give the example of someone who loses a leg in a car accident. Is the right solution to this situation to award them a lump sum of half a million dollars or pounds?

To begin with, to award an ordinary individual such a sum all at once, is to place upon them a burden and responsibility they are not experienced in coping with.

Would it not be better merely to ensure that they have a good *income* and any extra funds required for whatever medical equipment or other aids which will guarantee them as good a quality of life as possible?

Just why should those who make these “easy pickings” as lawyers earn such huge salaries, as we see depicted in *LA Law* and all the similar legal dramas, which indeed do depict real life?

For one thing, we cannot say that they deserve it on merit as human beings, can we, more than the next man or woman in the street?

The common factor in all the legal drama series we have so far mentioned is that most of the lawyers portrayed are sex mad, corrupt and badly behaved.

But this is not surprising, because it is the typical behaviour of most people who have earned lots of money without too great difficulty, if we compare the work of one of these big money lawsuit type lawyers to a more sober profession such as a doctor or dentist.

If we suddenly give the average person wads of money, such as occurs with a lottery winner, though they all say "this will not change me", within weeks their former life is virtually gone, and they are dead set on a course of acquiring everything money can buy, including new "friends" and "lovers", and usually deserting all their old friend, colleagues and *family* at the drop of a hat.

We see the same behaviour in the lives of suddenly wealthy sports stars, such as British soccer players, and no doubt their American equivalents, the extravagant excesses of which have been fairly accurately portrayed in the UK TV drama series *Footballers' Wives*.

And again, we see that in terms of tax and accountancy law, the wealthy again successfully use their "legal experts" to find the "loopholes" in the system - *somehow left by every national government* - to pay the minimum tax, which often forces a tax inspector under pressure to increase his or her quota of tax recovered to focus their attention on extracting as much as they possibly can from the smaller and struggling businessmen and women, who likely as not do not deserve to pay so much, cannot afford to pay it, and also we see cannot afford the legal protection of the tax lawyers available to the more wealthy, thus making the small traders *easy targets*.

The government tax authorities have a vast array of powers which in any other field would be considered totally disproportionate to their roles, and as we have seen, even the likes of 1920s and 30s gangster, *Al Capone*, can be brought down using tax laws, if the authorities set their mind for some reason on destroying somebody.

Then let us turn our attention to *defamation law*.

What this branch of law really means is that those wealthy enough to afford it, can have their names and reputations protected by clever lawyers who will sue newspapers and individuals for any amount of money, or threaten them in various ways, such as imposing "gagging orders" which for example the aforementioned Mrs Cherie Blair resorted to, in order to stop an ex-nanny saying anything about her private life to the newspapers.

We are not saying such a nanny was right to be able to expose the private lives of her ex-employees to the public gaze in a newspaper, but the point is *the Blairs* and other elite and privileged people are thus protected, but *the mass of ordinary people are not*.

So are we surely seeing by now, what a great job the law is for you fair ladies to enter?

For thereby you largely become merely a servant to the rich, the greedy and the privileged.

But wait a moment, you may say - surely there are heroic campaigning and crusading lawyers, who are *fighting for justice* like perhaps the fictional Perry Mason or his female equivalents?

Well, of course if you are one of *those*, or wish to become one, we sincerely wish you the best of luck, and commend you.

For example, Hilary Clinton as we have said, specialized in Children's Law, and served as a staff attorney for the Children's Defense Fund, which would appear to make her one of these crusading and caring lawyers.

But there is a problem here – for surely a woman cannot both serve the cause of underprivileged and minority children who come from poor families, and simultaneously support the privileged far too unequal wealthy society which she effectively did as president's wife?

That is, she lived in a very big *white* house, whilst all the little black children lived in a very small and not so white one.

Equally Mr and Mrs Blair have not long since bought a property for several million pounds in England, which would be enough money to buy most of the poorer children in the UK a couple of *streets* of *their* accommodation.

And then let us turn our attention to *criminal law*.

We constantly hear for the need to get *a good lawyer* in any criminal case we are defending.

Again, it appears that even in this arena of crime, in which we may be sent to prison for perhaps the rest of our lives, or in America, even legally killed, that the wealthy and rich still stand a much better chance of getting home free.

Though we do not wish to personally adjudicate on the recent Michael Jackson trial, though are inclined to suspect him as rightly found innocent, we fear for the fate of a poor man who had no such celebrity status if accused of the same.

Above all, what we are observant of in the case of the criminal trial, is that when our lives are in the hands of the lawyers representing and prosecuting us, surely they should be outside of the temptation of monetary concerns?

That is, we are suggesting that in criminal matters in particular, where not mere property, but actually *liberty and life* is at stake, surely this cannot rightly be a commercially driven and conducted affair?

Why should not criminal prosecuting and defending lawyers be paid a standard fee by the state, as civil servants, and therefore not having to egotistically display themselves in theatrical efforts to make a name for themselves, as their success or failure when functioning as a private lawyer therefore *in business* must depend on a reputation for victory in the court room?

This would seem to be the only sure way to equalize the rights of the rich and poor to criminal justice, and also ensure a certain impartiality in the lawyers themselves, as their intent can then fully be to *serve justice* rather than “victory” regardless of their client's innocence or guilt.

We have had two notable fictional examples of these kind of crusading lawyers who are more motivated by justice than fame or gain, in two excellent UK TV series.

Firstly, in the late 1970s to mid 90s, *Rumpole of the Bailey*, starring well known character actor, sadly now deceased, *Leo McKern*, who portrayed a poetry quoting, sherry drinking, *defending counsel* in a series of witty and brilliant performances, scripted by real life barrister and playwright, *John Mortimer*, *QC*, who also dramatised such classic series as *Brideshead Revisited*.

Secondly we have a wonderful current BBC legal drama series, *Judge John Deed*, with British actor *Martin Shaw* playing the title role, which also features a campaigning and noble minded lady lawyer played by stage and big screen actress, *Jenny Seagrove*.

Then there is the issue in criminal law of *juries* and their selection.

Though the selection of juries in America is an exhaustive process, with detailed challenging on the views of jurors allowed, in the UK, it is a far more hit and miss affair, with the dismissal of jurors only likely if there is some clear well known fact which would render a juror unsuitable, such as being personally known to anyone participating in the trial.

This surely amounts to making the future life of someone on trial into something of a lottery, who might find him or herself having a jury who are made up of a majority of people who have some personal dislike of him or her, for example who hold some kind of racist or sexist (either against *women* or *men*) tendencies.

There is also the probability that a random selection of jurors as is normally carried out in the UK, will include a number who are perhaps not experienced or intelligent enough to properly understand the case before them.

Surely, again, the only sensible solution to this situation is to compile a sizeable panel of professional jurors in every town, possessing high ideals and humanity, who are objective and favouring neither side, but properly experienced and informed about assessing the kinds of cases before them, with the right for an accused person to have at least a limited ability to choose those who will ultimately pass judgement on his or her guilt.

Such jurors should certainly have the right if desired to question those on trial in at least a limited way, or have such questions put on their behalf by the judge, to resolve any doubts they have which may not have been covered by the defending or prosecuting counsel.

For surely otherwise, a man or woman's life hangs in the balance, whilst being unwillingly and resentfully judged by perhaps a minor actress who wants to get back on set, a labourer who is still recovering from a night of excess drinking, a drug addict who has not been picked up by the jury system and is secretly craving for the drug, or has had their judgement seriously affected by its current or long term use, and so on.

Next we come to *Family Law*, which includes both the topics most relevant to the vast majority of women - *child custody* and *divorce*.

Here of course we find *emotions run high*, which really makes these areas of law perhaps the most controversial of all.

We will not dwell long on this area, except to say that perhaps it is time to consider that issue of child custody as *a gender issue*.

That is, if law was to create a new precedent of giving *the presumption* of custody of *female children* to the mother, and *where desired*, that of *male children* to the father, perhaps there would be a lot less disagreement.

For here we would have a woman ask herself the question - will her male child really grow up adequately without a male role model?

If the mother is a far better *human being* than the father, we would still advise the mother should have at least prime custody.

However, the mere fact a man's relationship may have broken down with his wife, does not of itself necessarily mean he will not do a good job at raising a male child, and women must acknowledge this, and not damage their male child's chances of properly forming a male identity by being blinded by their disappointment with the boy's father.

Equally, there surely cannot be too many cases where a young girl child is best looked after by a male, unless like Princess Diana's mother, she herself has no real interest in her own daughter, which apparently may not be such a rare phenomenon as we might have formerly been led to believe.

As to split of property, we feel that if a man has *knowingly* fathered children, rather than having that situation brought upon him without his open consent – in these days of virtually guaranteed contraception, morning after pills, etc. – he should certainly be willing to support that child, and its mother whilst she raises it.

However, if a woman can try to keep her understandably powerful emotions out of the negotiations, she may find she is better served by negotiating directly with her partner – possibly by the less confrontational means of *correspondence*, or using some kind of an independent arbitrator and avoiding lawyers where possible.

On the other hand, women should not hesitate to use lawyers if confronted by a truly despicable man who can well afford to pay her adequate support but simply seeks to avoid his responsibilities out of spite.

But generally speaking, we should appreciate that the lawyers are in vogue in such great numbers now, because *our social structure has broken down*.

As *Joni Mitchell* said on her 1994 *Travelogue* album on the track *Sex Kills*:

*Doctors' pills give you brand new ills
And the bills bury you like an avalanche
And lawyers haven't been this popular
Since Robespierre slaughtered half of France!*

Though lawyers have their legitimate use in *promoting justice*, there is a huge army of lawyers who are merely like vultures feeding on the carrion of our social malaise.

We are too intolerant of one another and selfish, and instead of talking things out and negotiating mutually acceptable agreements, we threaten legal action, we threaten to sue the other party *for every penny they have got*.

Our husband or boyfriend upsets us or maybe even hits us while he is enraged or drunk and we say “I will call the police and get you arrested.”

When maybe the answer is really *we picked the wrong partner* and we are taking our frustrations out on him, punishing him for not being the man we wanted him to be, but he never was nor could have been, and in his growing awareness of his inadequacy and shame he hits us, maybe blaming us for ever accepting him to begin with.

We are not of course saying he is *right*, or should be tolerated, we are saying *obviously you should not be living together, and you never should have done so in the first place and especially not had any children to him*.

But if a woman has innocently made such a blunder, and has a violent man on her hands, then yes, of course she should protect herself by legal means if necessary, though if possible allowing a man to withdraw from a failed relationship with some dignity would be preferred to taking an action which will just utterly humiliate him in his already degraded state.

The message is, when we have disputes with others, perhaps sometimes intervention with the law may be the only way, but like resorting to war, surely we should try negotiating first and making sure that way is fruitless, without giving up such an effort too easily?

As we have said – physical proximity is the most confrontational, the telephone less, a letter or email less so, and so on.

Then we have perhaps the most contentious issue of all in law – that of accusations of rape.

Whilst we fully appreciate the difficulty for women in reporting rape and having to deal with a court trial regarding it, we have to point out that this process has been made far more difficult for the honest women who have thus been brutalised, by the unfortunately growing band of women who are willing to make false accusations against men out of jealousy, rejection or spite.

There is for example a case of a frighteningly normal, relatively attractive and intelligent looking young lady who actually tore off a man's testicle when he refused to have sex with her.

This kind of incident which is by no means unique, for example, let us recall the *Bobbitt* case, is of course, not mentioned amongst the kind of emotive “zero tolerance of men” propaganda that women are getting from the feminist camp.

But a man accused of rape has really the most serious crime imaginable levelled against him, excepting possible murder itself, which if found guilty of, will surely ruin his life permanently, so because of the element of doubt and the gravity, it cannot ever be justified to not allow an *alleged* rape victim to be questioned by the defence counsel, in what in the final analysis is a crime which has likely occurred totally in a private situation without witnesses, and is therefore sadly just a *your word against his* scenario.

If a woman is genuinely being abused, we advise her to record such a scenario with a hidden camera, which can therefore provide *conclusive evidence* against such a *genuinely* beastly man.

But if there is apparently *any* degree of consent shown, a woman must realise that is going to go against her, because of the nature of the sex act, and the element of domination and submission that often is part of it, it is not a clear issue for any court or jury to decide.

That is, *some women* like “rough sex” and if you allow sex at all, how even with video evidence can you prove that you are not such a one?

So the most rational and sensible course for women would seem to be to *avoid all compromising situations* which could ever lead to a rape.

For as every lawyer and police officer knows, the essential element in the commission of any crime is *opportunity*, and if women carefully forbid any suspect men from ever having such an opportunity, this awful intrusion on her body and private space will most likely never occur.

It should also be pointed out that it seems to be an utter inconsistency in the British legal system that men alleged of rape and people of both genders accused of various crimes are not automatically allowed anonymity until a case is proven, which when the media get the story places such a man or woman already into a dangerous position of likely self-imprisonment within their own homes.

Why is this not done?

It seems again, that the rich can protect themselves behind high gates and security fences, but the poor person is left defenceless, forced to walk the streets of his or her local neighbourhood, perhaps with vigilante gangs ready to take justice into their own hands merely on the basis of the suspicion of a yet unproven allegation.

But we now have even a new form of "law" which has spread rapidly in the global Western media almost everywhere – which is *trial by TV*.

Surely no sane woman need be told that by the lure of appearing on television she may expose many details of her private life which can be used by all kinds of criminals, and if only she could see the kind of depraved and dangerous people who may be watching her unveiling all her private thoughts and feelings, as well as jealous people who know her in her neighbourhood, working or personal life, she would not ever consider participating in such a degrading exhibitionistic spectacle?

Finally we should point out that our original statement that law was made by powerful self-serving rulers has not been wholly true.

For we would like to point out that the law has been very significantly influenced by so called "religious" or "spiritual leaders" such as Moses and his *Ten Commandments*, as well as Mohammed, Buddha, Christ, Lord Krishna, Confucius and all the rest.

Without these noble spirited men, and in some cases women, who demanded justice *for all*, not merely for the strong, the degree of legal justice currently available to all men and women would likely not exist.

Appendix – a meditation technique which may help us gain control over our mind

As pointed out earlier in this work, we are all to a lesser or greater degree “brainwashed” or “hypnotised.”

Like *Mel Gibson's* character in the movie *Conspiracy Theory*, we are likely at least ninety-percent unaware of our programming, in terms of what was done, by whom, and when, and thus the answer does not lie in the analysis of the psychiatrist's couch which probes only our accessible memories.

Why? Because, there are just too many, and they are too widely scattered and deeply planted to be resolved with “a session a week”, and an expensive one at that.

The meditation suggested here is not of the closed eyes, mantra chanting kind or of focusing on some object, idea or candle flame. That is not to deny the validity of some of those methods for some people at some times, but here is outlined something which we can use in our daily life at any time.

To be liberated, we need to be freed of the hypnotic influences in our mind, planted there by years of indoctrination and traumatic experience of one kind or another, most of which we can no longer recall.

We need a twenty-four hours a day method of ordering and unclogging our minds, which is simple enough to do anyplace at any time.

The method is just to practise a form of *awareness* of our feelings and thoughts, and is distilled from Krishnamurti's sometimes inscrutably difficult to follow philosophy, in a form that hopefully most readers can understand.

Krishnamurti explains that we cannot know ourselves in isolation. This is why probably lone meditation techniques cannot be completely successfully for re-ordering and liberating our minds.

We learn about ourselves *in relationship* and that is why we cannot know ourselves truly by hiding out in some little room alone.

We may think we know ourselves until someone does something, or some situation arises, which unearths submerged parts of our personality that we didn't know were there. We find this especially in our close relationships with the opposite sex, as they are accessing the earlier responses and characteristics we have gathered in our formative years.

That is, we see really mature and admirable men and women becoming like frightened or infuriated children after some encounter with their girl or boyfriend, or husband or wife. They suddenly exhibit all the tantrums and lack of control of a three or four year old, which shocks us to the core, if we have never witnessed adults behaving in this way before.

Thus, life challenges us in various ways, and it draws out what is inside of us, good and bad.

So we run to a therapist or self-help book to tell us what to do, how to deal with these powerful and confusing feelings and thoughts, or hope that our mantra meditation will calm our minds down and enable us to rise above these uncontrolled thoughts and feelings.

But those solutions rarely work comprehensively, as anyone who has tried them at length eventually knows.

We must learn as Krishnamurti puts it, to live each moment anew, seeing each new problem with a mind that has no complexes and problems of its own.

That can only be achieved by becoming fully aware of and accepting the contents of one's mind, *on a moment to moment basis*, and then seeing beyond that.

That is, for example – suppose we are out walking, minding our own business when unexpectedly some stranger for no reason we can gather suddenly slaps our face.

What will we be? Angry, furious? Demand an apology? Until it happens *we do not know*.

So that is life, full of the unexpected – and the “meditation” here is – when that moment happens, which as we can see, is *each significant moment of our lives*, that is the moment to *watch the mind*.

We must watch the activities of our thoughts as if they were not our own – which you see, they really are not, just fragments of our past “conditioning” – and see what is there.

We may for example want to kill that woman or man who slapped us, so we see that. We watch that scene of vengeance in our mind.

We must learn to watch every moment of the day our automatic responses and then *rise above them*.

Many times, they can churn on for hours after some traumatic incident, and we are helpless to stop them, we just have to watch patiently until they subside.

The point is, we imagine we can egotistically *think* our way out of any problem. Technical problems we can. And sometimes human problems are a game of chess that we can plan and win.

But often there is no solution to our feelings, we are powerless before some situation, we are faced with problems we can do nothing about it seems. Then we have to watch the mind's endless efforts to solve problems it cannot.

(that is, the *intellectual mind* cannot solve our problems, but possibly when that vain intellect has become silent, our *intuitive mind* can).

But our restless intellectual mind says we are going to give that person a good telling off, or whatever, we are going to put tacks under their car tyres, or cyanide in their mail – none of which we can do in the real world of course, without bringing greater harm to ourselves.

And as the days and weeks and months go by, we find by this process of watching without analysis, that we have a calmer, more peaceful mind.

The goal is never to find a technique, or discover a fact, or learn words of wisdom by heart, which when a situation comes up, we are unable to apply, but to create *a state of mind* - a contented, calm, lucid, quietly aware state of mind, that can see reality as it is.

As Krishnamurti says – and *here is the secret* – we cannot know that we are aware.

All we can be is suddenly *aware that we were unaware*.

Such as, we may be waiting at the traffic lights in a car, and thinking a thousand other things, and not even notice the lights change. But we do not beat ourselves up, we say “ah, I was unaware.”

And that awareness of our unawareness, that coming to, is *all* we can do.

It may seem like nothing, but it is *everything*, because *awareness* is all that we have.

Equally if we are aware we are in some powerful emotional state, maybe rage, maybe playing out some fantasy of vengeance in our minds, maybe even some wild sex fantasy, we just *see it - ah*, we think, *just look at what our mind is doing!*

And hey presto, it stops, at least for the moment, and then our mind moves to something else and again, without ceasing our activity, we watch, we are aware.

But we are always detective, not *judge*, for such a judgement process only intensifies our conflict. But if we see that we do judge, we watch *that* process also, we follow like a shadow wherever the mind goes - not however by any struggle, but just by a quiet watchful mind.

Then in time, we see we are becoming calmer, less emotional, more patient, and the mental thunderstorms happen less often, and in time, almost die down altogether.

We find our inner world is somehow richer. We can smile just at our own bright inner awareness and the joy and pleasure of our own existence and being.

But never get too excited, for this is not balance. If we get excited we watch that *too*.

Then we are not hungering so much for what is in the outer world, we are not running so much for emotional support and seeking of “highs” and “kicks.”

And likewise, one sees, the growing *sensitivity* of our minds, may *demand* that we change our lives. We say one day – *I am not tolerating this waste of my time and energy any more*

Not that we become intolerant or uncaring of the world, but we refuse to be seduced or bullied by it any more, we take merely what we need, and give others merely what we decide *they need* also.

But there is no goal except awareness, no place to reach, except clarity, understanding and peace.

We do not become irresponsible or indolent.

We just do what must be done in life in the most efficient and frictionless way – we are as physics might say – following the path of least action – or as Taoism or Buddhism might say – *following the path of moderate activity and wisdom, the middle Way*.

This is but a brief explanation of such a process, which is a lifelong pursuit - read some Krishnamurti and you will understand this some more.