

LIBERALISM AND FAMILY DEGENERATION

CONTENTS

The Origins of the Family.....	1
The Identities of the Sexes.....	3
The Supposedly Inevitable Dissolution of the Family	4
Sexual Degeneration.....	7
Anti-Natalism and Inevitable Reaction.....	9
Misogyny and Misandry	11
The ‘Equality’ of Man and Woman Under Imperialism	13
Pornography and Prostitution	16
Abortion.....	19
The Folly of Subjective Consent and the Inability of Liberals to Scientifically Justify the Suppression of Pedophilia and Rape..	20
The Phenomenon of ‘Involuntary Celibates’	24
Transgenderism, Misanthropy Towards One’s Self.....	25
Works Cited.....	30

THE ORIGINS OF THE FAMILY

The family in its various forms, even in the most primitive stages of mankind where the family unit was only in embryo, is the core of all social life. Wherever there is no family, there is no reproduction, and wherever there is no reproduction, there is nobody in general, no society and no individual. However, a growing sentiment in some countries postulates the following: with the development of mankind’s productive capacity, the family unit will ‘wither away’ and fade into history, that it will be rendered obsolete and superfluous, that the development of world economy will correspond to the end of the family as a social unit. Indeed, this is treated as something revolutionary and *liberating*.

This postulation, which has no scientific basis, is an idealistic expression of the real physical parasitism of the global labor aristocracy, the non-working “workers” who sustain themselves on the labor of the world’s actual working masses¹ – masses which would surely be repulsed by such notions of the “dissolution of the family”. The main ideological characteristics of the labor aristocracy – a hatred for creation and work, for responsibility, a loathing for cohesion and collective interests, a fondness for the dissolution and disintegration of social normality –

¹¹ For the most part, the labor aristocratic countries are located in North America and Europe, while the industrial and agricultural countries are located in Asia, South America, and Africa; this is, however, only the general rule, and there are exceptions.

permeate throughout imperialist societies in general, and so the family, of course, is not spared. It therefore lies in the particular characteristics of the national economy that we may find the key aspects to preserving the integrity of the family unit and further strengthening this age-old bond in order to bring about its fullest development. To find this, we must first understand the origins and nature of the family unit in general, and how it is bound to develop.

Marriage is not an abstract social stigma imposed on man from without. It is a specific social function which arose in order to facilitate a specific biological function: marriage arose to best arrange the reproduction of societies, and societies which did not reproduce, or which did not devise suitable marriage structures to reproduce effectively, died out.

Friedrich Engels, in his work *The Origins of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, shows the development of human marriage structures and the way in which this series of structures begins with the *consanguine* family, wherein the whole tribe is married ‘to itself’, where all society is at once the whole family, and the whole family is at once all society. There are no social stigmas or rules in this stage: it is the stage of wandering, languageless cannibals. Thus, pedophilia, incest, rape, and all forms of sexual savagery are here permissible.

It is the persistent growth of population (and the development of the means of feeding the population) that leads to the constant change in the social structure of the family. From the savage consanguine family, impulse reigns supreme; hence, with time, those impulses which fail to produce offspring die out, while those impulses that produce offspring become formalized, solidified. Through this natural selection of the most effective reproductive traits, we pass through the stigmatization of non-reproductive forms of intercourse – pedophilia, homosexuality, sodomy, and so forth – and end up at the heterosexual, adult, human-only, *monogamous* family structure.

But things are not so simple. This family structure, in its early days, is not entirely monogamous at all. Actually, the monogamy arises first as a social form *only for the woman*, while the man continues to partake in polygyny, in infidelity – indeed, in what is at this point considered “chivalry”. For the wife, monogamy is enforced in the strictest fashion – the woman must adhere to the sanctity of marriage, to monogamy, lest she be put in the “scold’s brittle”, lest she be tortured or even killed. But aside from her role in reproduction, *the woman was neglected to most extreme degree*, going untaught, unspoken to, untrained, locked in the “female wing” of the husband’s house waiting only to be impregnated. In the meantime, the husband acted with impunity, procuring ‘recreational’ sex from prostitutes, children, or even other men. With time the untaught, unlearned, and unsatisfied woman becomes, predictably, unfaithful as well – the infidelity of the woman arises out of the infidelity of the man.

On the condition that political power should be held by the working classes, Engels predicted that with the development of society the family would continue to change: there would be the rise of *true monogamy*, the strict enforcement of monogamous duties from *both sides of the*

family – that the woman should not become as unfaithful as the man, but the man should become as faithful as the woman – and that in the stages proceeding from this, these norms would become ossified, solidified, and brought to their fullest potential in direct opposition to the very old form of impulsive, free-form intercourse. Engels further argued that in decaying liberal societies, where the working classes did not hold power, and where the economy depended heavily on economic parasitism, on work done in countries abroad, there would be the degeneration of sexual and family morals (1). The theoretical conclusion of this, of course, is that if a liberal, imperialist society is given enough time, it degenerates back into the consanguine family form.

THE IDENTITIES OF THE SEXES

We also must discuss very briefly the rise of the two sexes' *identities*, their "genders", and the subsequent roles which emerge from them. In all cases, one's gender identity is tied to their physical role in reproduction.

In the early consanguine family, the woman is at the 'head of the household' – the man was not yet a part of the household at all. With the whole family being married to itself, with everyone constantly engaging in intercourse with each other on impulse, *there was no definitive way to prove the identity of the father* – only the mother of a child could be known. Hence, property could not be inherited along male lines, but only along female lines. Hence, while *communal* property – food, etc. – was under the control of the men who defended it, *personal* property – houses, etc. – belonged primarily to the women of the tribe. At the same time, the women were the communal property of the men, while the children were the personal property of the mother. As time progressed, the individual men began to realize their own possession of personal property and children through the personal "possession" of the woman herself. Similarly, the woman realized her possession of the communal property, i.e. her access to the food, through the personal "possession" of the man. In a word, men were the communal property holders linked to personal property through the wife; women were the personal property holders linked to communal property through the husband.

This here was the 'genesis' of the modern roles of the man and woman.

It is both wrong and idealistic to suggest that early humans reflected the marriage structures of modern humans, that the man was always at the head of the household, that men always possessed tremendous control over women. However, it is equally wrong and idealistic to suggest that early marriage structures are something *progressive* compared to the modern family, and not a facet of the *extremely primitive* consanguine family. Man, from the beginning, has been the creature primarily in charge of the task of physical labor; woman has been the creature primarily in charge of domestic labor (not necessarily dishwashing and clothes-ironing, but real domestic labor like teaching the children, keeping the house physically intact, gathering food, and so on). The full development of human history, and to an increasing extent during the first

stages of development into capitalism, occurs in direct proportion to the solidification of these gender roles.

Capitalism and the rise of industrial manufacturing incite a major development of the marriage relation. In its early stages, beginning with the employment of the child and woman in physical labor (and thus disruption of the whole family structure), capitalism brings the gradual economic equalization of man and woman. This itself culminates in the movement for full legal and political equality – this legal and political equality is generally implemented during the transition from free-market capitalism to imperialist and monopolist capitalism, or to state capitalism.

As capitalism enters its decadent stages, that is to say, as free-market capitalism becomes imperialist capitalism, as production becomes parasitism, the dissolution of identity and the inversion of gender roles completes itself in full. With time, women begin to even positively supplant men in imperialist countries, becoming ‘independent’ of them, despite this being a biological impossibility. This process ushers in the progressive dissatisfaction and hopelessness of men, the humiliating and decadent status of women, and the eventual coalition of these dissatisfied elements from both sexes into political and social movements contraposed to those movements promoting sexual and social degeneracy.

We will later study the limits of this, and how things should look going forwards. But that, in short, is the development of the savage family into the civilized family, with its gender roles and social intricacies. These physical developments, in turn, lead to development of the ‘traditions’ of the family, the thing we call family values, virtues, or what have you. These traditions do not exist before the family and thus create it, but rather, the family exists before these traditions and thus creates them – the traditions themselves are reflections of the biological necessities of the family.

We may now address certain “assertions” which the reader has no doubt heard coming from the hedonists, who seek to justify their own behaviors as eternal phenomenon justified by their mere existence in past human history, rather than seeing them as flaws in their own sexual psychology.

THE SUPPOSEDLY INEVITABLE DISSOLUTION OF THE FAMILY

In decadent imperialist societies, where the process of free-market trade and industrial development have become ‘moribund’, have begun to wither and crumble under the stifling yoke of global finance capital, the family and all other spheres of social life echo this decay. It is therefore becoming common in these societies, where subjectivism is all but a religion for the masses, not to resist the disintegration and decay of the family *but to embrace it*, to treat it as something ‘revolutionary’ and ‘progressive’. To them, if something is different, it must be new – in their feverishness, they do not comprehend that what they preach is nothing new and

revolutionary, but actually unfathomably outdated and reactionary. What they preach are ultimately the characteristics and form of the savage consanguine family.

Let's examine how this phenomenon unfolds in imperialist societies.

In the harsh reality of nature, loss of one's family means loss of one's material standing, loss of one's social connection, and ultimately, loss of one's life. How can one exist without their parents? They owe their whole existence to their parents, for to exist, one necessarily must have parents. It is not even something which can be reasonably argued against. Without parents, there is no child. Period. And further, without a child, the parents die, permanently – the child's life is irrevocably tied to the life of the parents, and the life of the parents is irrevocably tied to the life of the child. The child is the extension, the *living continuation* of the parents, and so without the parents living on through the child, they die completely when their own bodies cease to move.

Yet, there are people who *in complete seriousness* try to argue against this extraordinarily basic and undeniable fact of life. How can one possibly argue that a person may exist without first being born from parents?

Of course, it would be much too revealing if our subjectivist friends were to assert that life does not depend first on the parents (although, sadly, many are beginning to arrive at this point too – but we will not yet go over this). They generally agree to the following point: the parents are necessary, at least for the actual physical production of the baby, they say. But all else – the moral and psychological development of the child, the physical development of the child – these, they assert, do not depend on the parents. These, they assert, are easily replaceable functions.

How can one possibly arrive at such a conclusion that the family is unnecessary, that after birth, the family becomes irrelevant? The causes of this denial may only be found in the real physical conditions of the people who issue such denials – in the imperialist labor aristocracy who “work” as a formality, in jobs managing the distribution of commodities wrought through actual work in imperialized countries. How can someone who lives in a society which is so overripe with un-worked for gains, where the garbage cans fill with fresh bread, ever be expected to understand the basic social necessities of the family, that to lose the family means certain death? They cannot understand such a thing, because it is not true for them. In fact, they do not understand social necessities in general – they live off the labor of others, and therefore they have no real physical needs, no real physical discipline, they act on impulses and believe the world exists only as they perceive it, and therefore only as a conduit of their pleasure. As a general rule, they are dogmatically subjectivists.

Such subjectivists tell us: “Parents are not completely necessary after birth. Someone could always be adopted.” Their ideal society, in all its “progressivity”, therefore necessarily implies orphans and orphanages, ‘adoption’. They think that this *solves* the problem of parentlessness, rather than being a symptom of it. They think that to lose one's parents is something that can be easily remedied by just ‘replacing’ the parent with another.

When one is so far detached from the harsh realities of nature, they begin to develop such unnatural views. Orphanry becomes trivialized because, being petty materialists and subjectivists, labor aristocrats only understand what brings them immediate physical pleasure. They are almost universally nihilistic; this is again a reflection of their position in global commodity exchange, where they occupy a position reaping gains while producing nothing. Typically, their parents are also labor aristocrats and teach their kids such values as “the parents are merely the child’s friends”, and so forth.

Labor aristocratic youth often try to argue that the family stifles them, that it is a vestige of the past, that it is an exploitative and unnecessary structure born from man’s primitivity. From this viewpoint, they argue that the disintegration of the family is something progressive, something to be embraced. They see only family responsibilities, with no family benefit, because what benefit is the family to someone who lives not by the labor of themselves and their family, but by the labor of foreigners toiling at gunpoint? This inevitably leads to the justification of the dissolution of family responsibilities through the justification of “family abolition” altogether. It is again a projection of their subjectivist mindset, of their idea that “if something does not immediately pleasure me, it does not have the right to exist.”

It’s a fairly well known fact that almost half of all marriages in the United States end in divorce. Under imperialism, there is no sanctuary from the corruptive moral influence of parasitism, and the family is no exception. In the progressively degenerating mindset of the labor aristocrat, who is everywhere and always seeking justification for his lack of meaning, for something virtuous about his laziness and indiscipline, the family is merely yet another outlet to suck pleasure from, and as soon as it ceases to function in this capacity, it is abandoned. Engels wrote this observation of this in *Condition of the Working Class of England*:

The husband works the whole day through, perhaps the wife also and the elder children, all in different places; they meet night and morning only, all under perpetual temptation to drink; what family life is possible under such conditions? Yet the working-man cannot escape from the family, must live in the family, and the consequence is a perpetual succession of family troubles, domestic quarrels, most demoralising for parents and children alike. Neglect of all domestic duties, neglect of the children, especially, is only too common among the English working-people, and only too vigorously fostered by the existing institutions of society. And children growing up in this savage way, amidst these demoralising influences, are expected to turn out goody-goody and moral in the end! (2)

Such is the family under conditions where society dissolves the necessary tie between man and woman, and “bribes”, so to speak, the child out of its natural habitat, the family, and ensnares it in the vices of moral and social decay. The cycle of decay repeats itself through many generations.

SEXUAL DEGENERATION

The drive to produce children is inherent in all people as a result of generations of biological evolution – the lack of drive to produce children is an anomaly. Biologically, we possess sexual drives for the purpose of reproduction, and thus reproduction is the purpose of our sexual drives. It was proven by history that the lack of a drive to produce children is something anomalous and impermanent, because such a psychological trait always leads to the end of a family line. To produce children is the purpose of life and the driving force of the entire human psychology – and for that matter, of *the psychologies of all living things*, because any living thing which does not have the drive to reproduce ceases to exist in short time. Thus, to lack a reproductive drive may be rightly called a psychological anomaly, a defect.

Outside of a natural biological impulse, reproduction is at the same time a social responsibility of all people. All people were brought about through the process of reproduction, and if we were to cease, we would all die out. One should ask: do we not have the responsibility to our own kin to produce children? If not, why exist at all? Why not just kill ourselves now? If we separate all people who have children, and all people who do not have children, then the latter inevitably die off and give way to the former.

Unfortunately, these things are not only increasingly common in imperialist societies, but increasingly normalized, even celebrated. In imperialist societies, the biological function of sex has been reduced to one purpose: pleasure. All things to the subjectivist are a matter of immediate personal pleasure, and intercourse is the same. Bizarre sexual habits, ranging from the unsanitary to the morally egregious, become commonplace and implicitly normalized while tending to spread, like a disease, in a reciprocal fashion among all ranks of society. Pedophilia, for instance, is enacted upon children, sometimes multiple children, and these children are in turn psychologically traumatized and the idea of adult-child intercourse is *normalized* to them. They grow up with such warped psychologies that often, they repeat these acts. Most other fetishes and perversions spread in this fashion as well.

In imperialist societies, *love* is discarded for *eroticism*, and women are reduced to vessels of sexual gratification. One finds this correlation between imperialism and sexual degeneration expressed most clearly through the following (3):

#	Country	Rate of Rape (per 100,000 people)	GDP Per Capita
1	South Africa	132.40	\$5,444
2	Botswana	92.90	\$7,817
3	Lesotho	82.70	\$1,178
4	Eswatini	77.50	\$3,710
5	Bermuda	67.30	\$117,768

6	Sweden	63.50	\$58,977
7	Suriname	45.20	\$4,030
8	Costa Rica	36.70	\$11,806
9	Nicaragua	31.60	\$1,877
10	Grenada	30.60	\$9,171
11	Saint Kitts And Nevis	28.60	\$14,402
12	Australia	28.60	\$62,723
13	Belgium	27.90	\$50,103
14	United States	27.30	\$68,309
15	New Zealand	25.80	\$47,499
16	Saint Vincent And The Grenadines	25.60	\$7,212
17	Zimbabwe	25.60	\$1,684
18	Barbados	24.90	\$16,036
19	Iceland	24.70	\$65,273
20	Jamaica	24.40	\$5,328
21	Peru	23.50	\$6,678
22	Bahamas	22.70	\$30,070
23	Norway	19.20	\$81,995
24	Trinidad And Tobago	18.50	\$15,752
25	Israel	17.60	\$47,602
26	France	16.20	\$44,995
27	Guyana	15.50	\$9,192
38	Finland	15.20	\$54,330
29	South Korea	13.50	\$34,866
30	Chile	13.30	\$15,617

The global average GDP per capita is about \$18,000. We can see that, of the 30 most rape-filled countries, 13 of them reap profits much higher than that average.

One could say, “In richer countries, people are simply more likely to get caught,” and this is maybe true. But among these 30 countries are also considerably poorer countries which do not benefit from imperialism. Realistically, should it not be only the poorer countries where rape occurs the most frequently? Or, if reporting leads to a spike in numbers, shouldn’t all of the top 30 countries be wealthy countries?

Let’s compare this list with the list of the ten countries with the *lowest* rates of rape:

#	Country	Rate of Rape (per 100,000 people)	GDP Per Capita
1	Yemen	.80	\$787
2	Albania	.70	\$5,991
3	Serbia	.70	\$8,748
4	Turkmenistan	.60	\$9,032
5	Lebanon	.50	\$2,802
6	Tajikistan	.50	\$810
7	Armenia	.40	\$4,125
8	Azerbaijan	.20	\$4,883

9	Mozambique	.20	\$425
10	Egypt	.10	\$3,832

Rather telling, one would think.

The further prostitution of the human form continues in the most vulgar forms through media and the cultural ‘arts’, with music, films, media, and so forth normalizing the tendency to act impulsively on sexual urges. In recent times, it has becoming increasingly common for the melancholy, self-loathing women of imperialist society to partake in their own dehumanization, to reduce themselves to vessels of sex as an act of “liberation” (From what? Men? This is the ultimate submission to men), by way of justifying in their own minds the subjectivist mindset of: “sexual intercourse is a means of achieving sexual pleasure”, against the reality: “sexual pleasure is a means of motivating sexual intercourse (and therefore reproduction).”

Liberal “feminists”, for their part, attempt in extreme vanity to say: “Teach men not to rape!” as if it were possible to affect the course of social life with their words, as if the teachings of a few wise old men could halt the effects of economic parasitism, as if they could thwart the concerted effort from all angles of society to actively promote the legalization of prostitution, the normalization of sexual perversion, the distrust of man and woman, and so forth.

Sexual degeneration is a virtually universal characteristic of imperialist societies. Thus, sexual degeneration can only be truly stopped when economic parasitism no longer opens this degenerative path to all spontaneous social elements.

ANTI-NATALISM AND INEVITABLE REACTION

We said earlier that there are some who attempt in complete seriousness to argue that the parents are becoming unnecessary to the process of reproduction, that this *absolutely critical* biological and social function is now beginning to find itself replaced with “artificial insemination”.

This is an extremely dangerous ground to tread. Many in imperialist societies are attempting to dupe themselves into believing it is an inevitable scientific wonder of the future. But they must consider how it will appear to anyone who does not have the consciousness of a work-loathing philistine. Why replace the biological form of reproduction with an artificial form, just for the sake of doing it? What is the purpose of that? Why not also replace everybody’s eyes with bionic eyeballs whenever we have the money to do so, regardless of how healthy their eyes actually are?

Really, the sham of “artificial insemination” is an attempt to disrupt the *historically developed and in any case indestructible* social relation between man and woman, on which all society is

based. To remove this inseparable tie to is to undermine the entire social fabric of society, and to doom it to inevitable depopulation and collapse.

To put it bluntly: what does one *think* will happen, if all women start to attempt excluding men from the social and biological process of sexual reproduction? One can be as offended as they'd like, but the truth is that men will never allow it, and it will never happen. The men and women who attempt to go with it, to normalize and popularize this practice, will be met with a very harsh reality the moment imperialism fails to sustain the parasitic relation that justifies these perversions. Artificial insemination *will not* replace the male reproductive function *any more than babies will one day be grown in specialized incubators* and thus replace the female reproductive function. Such things would erase the very essence of what it means to be not even a human being, but a living being in general – to eat and to reproduce oneself.

To try and convince oneself otherwise is a symptom of degeneracy.

Why do we say this? Because it cannot be argued by a serious, rationally-thinking person that the development of society will correspond to people forsaking the millennia-old process of biological reproduction in favor of purchasing expensive vats to develop their babies in, or in the process of artificially impregnating themselves to avoid real impregnation and intercourse. These things are as rational as wanting to replace one's own stomach with a fuller stomach by surgery instead of just eating. It is the product of a psychology which teaches: "Find certain things which bring pleasure and do them," instead of, "Do certain things and you will find they bring pleasure."

Impregnating oneself with artificial sperm to avoid having intercourse with a man, because it is not immediately pleasurable enough; sticking one's penis in another man's anal cavity to avoid having intercourse with a woman, because it is not immediately pleasurable enough; artificially stopping the life of a half-developed fetus because one was having intercourse for fun and did not mean to begin the process of pregnancy; women prostituting themselves and liking it; men "identifying" as women to be put in the female wings of institutions so that they may rape them; *this is the fantasized "dissolution of the family"* reader! And it is merely a conglomeration of all the worst perversions. Those who attempt to normalize them will only exist in our world for a very limited time, as history has proven time and time again – both because they cannot sustain themselves by reproduction, and because, for that same reason, the world does not want them. Mankind as a general rule will never go along with its own destruction, and it is only the carefully trained psychology of the labor aristocrat that can convince itself of the longstanding invincibility of these obvious signs of degeneration, that the productive people of the world will not retaliate against them, that these things are bound to triumph. Already, imperialist societies show clear and obvious signs of revulsion, of popular resistance to these symptoms of decay: spontaneous violence persists both against the so-called "LGBT+ community", against abortion clinics, and so forth, despite all attempts from imperialist states to ward off these sentiments and erase them from the general consciousness of the people. Typically, they come from the middle

classes and some elements of the industrial working class who, for some reason or another, have not, cannot, or will not be bribed by imperialism.

Imperialist states may continue to push untruths and seek at every turn to erase these growing sentiments, but the facts are undeniable.

In conclusion, we should ask ourselves: will the family disintegrate? The answer to this is an *obvious and emphatic* 'no'. The family unit will never dissolve, for man will never allow it to dissolve; the second it dissolves, the second one is severed from the rest of humanity, they cease to be a functionary of mankind; and if this were to happen on a mass scale, mankind would be for the most part plunged again into savagery, completely isolated from one another and from general social intercourse, doomed to die off in a generation unless, by some prospect, some of these savages should once more act on sexual impulse in such a way that leads to the entire re-development of the family structure as it has already taken place.

MISOGYNY AND MISANDRY

Such sentiments as loathing one's own father and mother, and through this the general disrespect of one's own parents, are becoming increasingly normalized in imperialist societies as well. Yet, to despise one's own mother and father is, really, *completely nonsensical*; it is impossible to despise one's own creator without despising oneself.

A human being is half of his father, half of his mother; it is these two contradicting elements brought together in a synthesis which has produced their 'negation', their higher form, the child. The child may at first appear simplistic and stupid, *like a chimp*, when compared to his parents. But as with all things, it is inevitable that the child should eventually outgrow his parents and develop into what is ultimately a higher stage of them. One parent has one set of values and material conditions; the other has another set of values and material conditions. These are brought together to create the child, who has one set of values and material conditions that descend from the two sets of values and material conditions as the parents.

The process of bringing two people together to produce higher developments of themselves is the invariable pattern of history. One lives to produce life: that is the most basic truth of human existence, yet it is a instinct which the unloved subjectivists still somehow argue against.

What we wish to address, however, are the phenomena of *misandry*, that is the irrational hatred and fear of men, and *misogyny*, that is the irrational hatred and fear of women. Both of these appear to stem from the *apparently rational hatred and/or fear* of an individual's neglectful or abusive parent, or a parent which is *perceived* as such; or in some cases, with an abusive partner at a young age. This perception becomes all the more common when the physical realities become disconnected from the traditional responsibilities they gave rise to, and the family is turned on its head, becoming burdensome instead of necessary. In imperialist societies,

both the man and the woman's role – the breadwinner and caregiver – have been usurped by the state *out of the hands of the community*; the “family” becomes the whole nation, and the whole nation becomes the whole world. It is subjectivist shortsightedness.

What occurs when, understanding the superficiality of the male role in imperialist societies, men neglect the role of the father, and the child is raised without the fatherly role model? Without the model of physical labor, without the physical discipline enacted by the father on the child, they adopt entirely the psychology of their mother, and are left with a one-sided, hyper-feminine psychology of entitlement and self-righteousness. In some cases, the discipline of the father, when countered with the protest of the mother to her husband's discipline, sows discord and leads to the phenomenon of misandry, of hating one's own disciplinary agent, of hating men in general and seeing everywhere the belt-bearing father who seemed to provide nothing but bruises.

On the other end of the spectrum is the realization of the superficiality of the female role in imperialist societies, that this role is entirely the product not of women's own determined liberation, but of concessions willingly made by men in exchange for women's increased obedience, concessions which at any point might be revoked. Without the model of domestic labor, of caring and gentle comfort, a person is bound to adopt a one-sided, hyper-masculine psychology of brutishness, foolhardiness, self-servedness, and philistinism. In some cases, the mother may surpass the father as the authoritative figure, and in this way the father is seen by the child as something weak and effeminate, incapable of providing the very security that men are intended to provide in the first place. Further, the mother becomes loathed and despised, and for the child all women begin to take the form of the irrational, erratic mother who owns her husband for personal pleasure and children for personal servitude. From here is born misogyny, the hatred and general distrust of women, the application of this type of mother to all women in general.

It is the actual synthesis of these two psychological types, the masculine and feminine psychology, which in its reciprocal relation urges on the development of the child's psychology into one which is full, two-sided, instead of being heavy on one side or the other and neglecting half the physical reality of humankind. As with all things, men and women when brought together are raised into a higher form, while men and women contradicting lowers them into a degraded, half-human form.

The ultimate expression of misandry or misogyny, which together form the phenomenon of misanthropy, is homosexuality, the refusal to associate with the opposite gender, the fear of procreation in its actual biological form, the reluctance to carry on the will of the family (and oftentimes homosexuality comes with the alienation of the family). Homosexuality is the most extreme misanthropy, for it is sacrificing the prolonged existence of one's family, one's country, and even mankind altogether, entirely for personal pleasure, entirely out of personal fear or disdain for the opposite sex. It drives them to the point of denying biology altogether. It is the

mindset entirely of: “If it does not bring me immediate pleasure, it is not worth my time or effort.” Implicit in this from men is: “Women do not bring me immediate bodily pleasure, they are untrustworthy, pleasure seeking, and unsubmitive. Why should I touch their disgusting bodies?” And from women, this sentiment is: “Men do not bring me immediately bodily pleasure, they are untrustworthy, pleasure seeking, impulsive, and abusive or ‘toxic’. Why should I endanger myself by associating with them?”

Both of these descend from parental negligence, from an improper and confusing relationship with one’s parents – divorcees, a prostituted mother, an imprisoned father, etc. – though in some exceptions, the family is perfectly intact, and the child has nonetheless been won over entirely by the anti-family pseudoscience, or in very many cases (as we discussed earlier) by pornography, which ardently promotes degeneration throughout imperialist societies.

In short: the man cannot exist without the woman, the woman cannot exist without the man, and the whole course of human history inherently proves this fact.

THE ‘EQUALITY’ OF MAN AND WOMAN UNDER IMPERIALISM

One thing often touted by liberals is the “equality” brought unto women by the rise of capitalism, and more specifically, imperialism. We must address both of these:

In the case of capitalism, there is undoubtedly an ‘equalizing effect’ to be found in the employment of women and children in the factories. Since man is, by his biological evolution, the creature most adjusted for physical labor, the employment of women and children in large industrial factories severs the dependency between man and woman, between worker and parent, and converts both into worker-parents. In the early stages, the woman and child (being far cheaper than the man) outgrow the patriarchal structure and the household itself: thus begins the rise of liberal feminism, of the advocacy for women’s right to own property, hold the power of divorce, and so on.

In a word, capitalism disintegrates the old family structure and leaves it clinging by a thread, since the woman is no longer dependent on the man, and now love must find itself primarily through the *emotional* dependence between man and woman. The rise of imperialism further relegates the children to the school, away from the factory (which is progress), but for women it pushes on, achieving the *full* equality of woman when the right to own property and the ability to participate fully in the political system are granted. After this point, we embark on different courses depending on whether a country is imperialist, or imperialized.

In imperialized countries, women of course cannot find work for adequate pay; it is here already a difficulty for men to find stable and well-paying work, and so for women, it is out of the question. Despite their cheapness making them more favorable for employment, the lack of stable economic ground for women to stand upon drives them further into dependence on the

man, and thus they endure even the most abhorrent conditions for the sake of basic economic survival – it is the man, or death. Thus, in these societies, it is the utmost priority of men and women alike to fight for the economic stabilization of women and their liberation from old patriarchal castes. Since this subject is already mostly understood by most people (as analysis of this relation is still falsely applied to the conditions of present day imperialist society by liberal ‘feminists’), we will not study it in detail.

On the contrary, the situation in imperialist countries is reversed: here, the necessity of the relation between man and woman has been all but eradicated, and for this reason, so too has the distinction between man and woman found itself dissipated with each generation. Womanhood, in all its beauty, and manhood, in all its glory, are resolved into a single identity of fleshy machines programmed to satisfy immediate pleasures until childless death. Where this does not happen, the bribes offered to women – bribes which arise from the funds brought in through economic parasitism – enter an almost ludicrous form, from patronizing educational grants to the “right” of self-prostitution, so as to facilitate the dissolution of the economic dependence between men and women which in all cases drives the very identities of the man and woman.

In imperialist society, where men and woman alike approach the world from a viewpoint of subjectivism, from the viewpoint that to be human is to be a pleasure-seeking automaton with no creative drive, these “concessions” are able to hold some weight. The end result is that, as a direction opposite to the way in which imperialized societies find women driven further and further into the dependence of men, and thus see the family relation assume the most strict patriarchal form, imperialist societies find men being lowered so that women may be progressively lifted up, and since the women *in this case* are capable of being bribed by petty material offers and hold no greater ideological drive, these concessions come at the direct expense of the woman’s identity itself – the further the woman is lifted above the man, the further she and the man are plunged back into the primitive relation where the woman was the head of the house, and as a precondition to this long-dead relation, women are also the communal property of all the society’s men. Thus, as a ‘tribute’ for being *materially* lifted past the man, the woman must content herself with being *ideologically* degraded, and so begins the degenerate practices of “cat-calling”, street groping, workplace rape, voyeurism, incessant adultery, and so on. The ideological degradation in this way operates among men in direct proportion to the rate at which it grows among women; or it operates among women in direct proportion to the rate at which it grows among men. Both perspectives are generally correct, it is a reciprocal relation.

The men and women who go along with this degeneration of family relations are therefore called “degenerates”, by definition. However, those men and women who do not give into immediate material temptation, who do not content themselves with bribes wrought from the world’s working masses, but instead insist on a fervent ideological struggle against these perversions, must be understood as a unity composed of both men and women, with their own motives.

Men, to an increasingly prominent degree, will absolutely refuse to be lowered in this way, to be materially and ideologically degraded for the sake of “duping” the women. This drives them to certain ideological extremes, many of which border outright anti-imperialism, even if unintentionally. Men will be the majority of those discontented by these developments, refusing to be reduced to women. Men who refuse to acknowledge the way in which they are being lowered might really convince themselves outright that they *are* women, and that they should be proud of this, and just accept their fate.

Women, too, will refuse to be “raised” in this way, although it will be a minority of particularly principled women, whereas the male counterpart will be a majority of particularly impulsive men. Women will sense that the price of better education, favoritism in job selection, higher wages, and so on, comes in direct proportion to the reduction of women to men (we say reduction in both cases because the sexes are being brought down from their actually developed capabilities), the reduction of women to a community of machines that exist for the pleasure of men, and nothing else, not for child-rearing, not for anything. To content herself with this relation, women might tell themselves – or at least be told by men – that they are actually being liberated, that to be prostituted is something ‘progressive’, and so forth.

What is the biologically evolved purpose of men? To work, to provide for the family.

What is the biologically evolved purpose of women? To parent, to raise the family.

The man, secondarily, also must parent, and the woman, secondarily, also must work; but men work first and foremost, while women parent first and foremost.

The “equality” between the two, in an actual and true sense of the word, would entail the two sexes occupying these roles in their fullest capacity, with the woman perfectly complimenting the man, and the man perfectly complimenting the woman.

The “equality” of women in imperialist societies, however, is in all cases temporary, unsustainable, because men will never allow it; and it further entails the persistent and ever-spreading degradation of the woman, where in spite of three “waves” of feminism, one may still walk down New York to find unflattering and pornographic images of women sold at streetside vendors and taped to light posts, or sold openly in “adult stores”, commercial centers existing entirely to facilitate and encourage this moral decay.

One excellent motive force against this moral decay, against this cultural nihilism, is in fact religion, whether it comes in the form of Christianity, Islam, etc. However, religion may provide such an ideological motive against this degeneration *only insofar as the believer may be won over by subjective principles*. Thus religion, while it may be suitable for providing the personal motive and vigor necessary for the fight, is itself incapable of winning over the masses of impulsively materialistic youth who are to be faced with ‘temptations’, as it were. For them, the necessity of the family, the historical development of the family’s relations, and so on, must be

justified *scientifically*, that is, *objectively*, and not *subjectively*, that is, on the “faith”, the “piety” of the believer. Materialist science is derived not from subjective revelations, but from the real objective world which is common to everybody and deniable by no one. We must therefore not get into the unprofitable trap of using subjectivism against subjectivism, but instead use objectivism against subjectivism.

If one wishes to further study the scientific view of the development of the family, I would again recommend *The Origins of the Family, Private Property, and State*.

PORNOGRAPHY AND PROSTITUTION

There are few things more repulsive than the dehumanization wrought on women in exchange for their “equality” in imperialist societies. We have already discussed this phenomenon to some extent in the previous section, but here, will see one facet – in fact, the most critical facet – of how this phenomenon plays out.

First, we should examine prostitution, the most parasitic of “professions”, and one of the most dangerous – something like 80% of all prostitutes are at some point threatened with a weapon; 70% recognize themselves as victims of rape; 84% are at some point homeless; 70% have been left with PTSD; and 82% have been physically beaten (4). Out of every 100,000 prostitutes, 204 are murdered in the course of their slavery, 41 times higher than the United States’ general homicide rate (4.96 per 100,000).

But we should understand what prostitution actually is. In the transition from ancient polygynic marriage to monogamy, women would “purchase” their “right to chastity” – that is, women, being the sole property holders, would physically buy, with property, their right to no longer be used as a communal reproductive device, but to be “saved” for a single man in marriage. When this act is done in reverse, with the woman “selling” her “right to chastity”, it is the process of prostitution.

Prostitution is the re-surrendering of the woman’s right to self, which may be purchased by any man, at any hour, and which is even more decadent than the old communal system since it entails not only repetitive intercourse with strangers (what can rightly be called rape), but *without even the production of offspring*. In the case that a prostitute gets pregnant, she is usually murdered, or the baby is forcibly aborted, or the prostitute attempts to go through with the marriage and is thus “fired” from her “job” and ceases to be a prostitute (and in the course of this, usually starves, succumbs to drug addiction, or is murdered).

Yet, that is “progress” to the peddlers of “sex liberation”! The absolutely massive “human rights organization”, *Amnesty International*, openly advocates the legalization of the prostitution of women, though they attempt to mask this as “decriminalization”:

We recommend decriminalization of consensual sex work, including those laws that prohibit associated activities—such as bans on buying, solicitation and general organization of sex work.
(5)

Prostitution, in the 21st century, is the surrender of chastity in exchange for material comfort. It is the absolute degradation of the ‘soul’, the idea of the human, the identity, the woman, for the meager (or sometimes not so meager) benefit of material comfort. Is there anything more decadent, anything more traitorous to the cause of all working women, than for a woman to reduce herself to something that is neither woman, nor a worker? Is there anything yet more repulsive than for this lost woman to declare herself “freed” by her position as the man’s urge-reliever?

That, in brief, is the phenomenon of prostitution, a system which reaps \$186 billion a year globally – more than video games or movies, which generate about \$115 billion and \$136 billion, respectively.

But, unlike the prostitutes, the practice of prostitution itself has managed to produce offspring without being killed off. This offspring is pornography, what is essentially the propaganda arm of prostitution. Pornography is, for the most part, prostitution on film. Not much needs to be said about it other than two statistics which portray very clearly the degeneration wrought by imperialism, the way in which imperialism uses those funds it reaps from global annexation. Those statistics are first: that pornography is an “industry” worth \$97 billion globally, and second: that in, say, the United States, the average age for a person to be first exposed to pornography is about 11 years old.

Pornography breeds perversions in impressionable young children with an untold pace. The entire sexual psychology of massive amounts of youth is held, like putty, in the hands of a few shady monopolists – for instance, the pornography websites PornHub, Brazzers, RedTube, and most other sites that the reader better not be familiar with, belong to the pornography-monopoly MindGeek, which has further ties with companies like Microsoft. This MindGeek was once implicated in a massive trafficking ring, and through this, it was revealed (just this year!) that this monopoly had been secretly run for over two decades by an Austrian financier, Bernd Bergmair. The site further admitted to not reviewing videos for pedophilia (including those videos in its *inconspicuous* “teens” category), but we will not get into that here. We should say, however, that Asa Akira, the public spokesperson for the site, said:

Adulthood is knowing the difference between good rape and bad rape.

And this, really, is what pornography exists for. This is what they intend to train children to believe. Indeed, 25% of the site’s searches *by women* are for videos depicting acts of rape. And it is here that we find the possible roots of the modern LGBT movement, and how it spread so far, so unstoppably, through western societies.

Pornography is the creation of the rape fantasy: the powerful, all-controlling man, and the completely submissive, stupid, powerless object for sex – *this is the entire form*, and the “object” is *completely depersonalized* to the point where the ‘person’ *does not even have to be a woman*. The object of arousal becomes a fixation, an ideal which exists outside of the body, and the only prerequisites for arousal are no longer the woman, but the form of the “stupid, submissive, powerless object”, woman or not – and since no woman will willingly go along with this, it is inevitable that object which best suits this form is the truly submissive, actually stupid, actually powerless child, either a girl or, if one cannot be procured, *a boy in a dress*. Pedophilia becomes a seemingly unshakable compulsion, a fetish.

Still, the man may take it yet further. Realizing that the object of desire he has envisioned in his mind is *illusory*, and that it results always to pedophilia, *he decides to realize the object of desire by becoming it*. The man in secret becomes an *autogynephile*, fetishizing the ideal woman-submissive who is really an invention in his mind. He becomes a man who is, in the bedroom, a woman. To “reconcile” these contradicting identities, he rationalizes the identity of the *homosexual* – the male with the female’s sex drive (as it has been described since the days of Karl Ulrichs). In private, the “homosexual” perhaps wears women’s clothing, and certainly partakes in the “female role” of intercourse, as the “receiver” – his ideal man naturally is the exaggerated masculine brothel-patron or pornstar who “does as he wishes” with the submissive *object*. The homosexual *is the actual realization of the fake pornographic woman-object*.

In public, the homosexual really acts no different – hence, media and pornography and, really, even schools, have gone lengths to establish this “homosexual” identity as something *separate* and *biological*, when it is *no more than a pornographic fetish*. The man, having conceived himself as a “homosexual” rather than a heterosexual with an autogynephilia fetish, “develops” (really he is influenced by cultural factors) traits around this identity: the infamous “lisp”, the “flamboyance”, and a whole set of other made-up characteristics to justify his own womanliness in the bedroom. With time, these ideas manifest in their inevitable conclusion: *transgenderism*, the “spilling out” of the bedroom-autogynephile into the full social-autogynephile who partakes in his fetish constantly, wherever he goes, in public, in full view of all people, while even demanding recognition and validation for this fetish, demanding this fetish be taught to children. The transgender man-to-woman *is no more than a homosexual man who has brought his autogynephilic fetish into the full public view*.

It is no coincidence that trans-women are so often sexually promiscuous compared to biological women: transgenderism is only sensible when the woman has been reduced to the submissive position in sex and nothing more, not the definite being which grows children in her womb. How could this evoke anything but spite from biological women, from feminists, from “TERFs”?

The woman’s own degeneration occurs in reflection to this: first, she is reduced to the prostitute, the promiscuous harlot. From here, she becomes repulsed by her loss of humanity in

the bedroom, by the unshakable feeling of coercion, and so she *replaces* the impotent rapist-male (who really wants a man anyway!) with the butch lesbian, the “manly woman”, *who herself knows the coercive feeling and thus knows best what the degraded woman wants*. To complete this role, the femme lesbian psychologically pressures, even if by accident or implication, the butch lesbian into *completing* her transformation for the satisfaction of her partner – the butch lesbian becomes the transgender woman-to-man.

The “old guard” of degenerates and their newborn rabbits still insist on glorifying perversion when they prop up such figures as “Desmond is Amazing”, the adolescent boy known for dressing as a “woman” (the idealized sexual object, and not a real woman) performing erotic dances in public venues which go publicized on national television (including *big* media corporations like ABC). They further insist on promoting sexual perversion to children in schools without parental consent. Really, we do not need to go into detail about these people, their nature is already well known – they perceive the incredibly shaky ground on which they stand, and so every word they utter comes out as a scream of dire panic.

Can this all be expected to last on and not receive massive retaliation? It cannot. I will let the reader figure out why on their own.

ABORTION

We will not dwell here, because this is partially an extension of the previous section. In imperialized societies, the right to abortion is one of the foremost priorities of women, since it is also, by implication, the right to decide on the beginning of motherhood. The right to abortion here – where abortion is not even granted to the impregnated child or raped mother – is a critical necessity in attaining autonomy on women.

On the contrary, in imperialist societies, abortion far exceeds this critical necessity and crosses into the point of vulgarity and barbarism. With recreational intercourse becoming commonplace among a brain-dead and idealess (yet idealistic) population, carnal pleasures begin to result also in accidental pregnancies, born not out of malice on the woman, but of her own promiscuity and lack of self-discipline (and this applies for men as well). Abortion thus becomes a weird and exaggerated extension to the “Plan B” pill: it is not used to save the lives of women, but to squash the lives of children. Life is sacrificed for pleasure, a pleasure which was born out of mankind’s drive to create life.

Let us consider some statistics about abortions in the United States: 1,300,000 women a year receive abortions – out of 3,790,000 pregnancies! *34% of babies were aborted*. That is really something.

74% of women who receive abortions say that they received the operation because “having a child would interfere with [her] education, work or ability to care for dependents”. Of these

women, 48% said that their abortion was entirely due to “relationship problems” or “not wanting to be a single mother” (6). Is this not a clear and obvious symptom of a society wherein people are taught to gratify their immediate sexual urges and shun parenthood? It is firstly men who use women in this way and then abandon them. It is secondly the women who abort the children entirely because they are reluctant to begin parenthood. These are very telling statistics.

This transcends past the United States. According to the *Guttmacher Institute*:

Since 1987, little research in this area has been conducted in the United States, but studies done in Scandinavia and worldwide have found several recurring motivations: economic hardship, partner difficulties and unreadiness for parenting.

“Unreadiness for parenting” and “partner difficulties” are two of the largest motivations for the extermination of fetuses in imperialist societies. Is it not clear here that there is really nothing more to be fought for? That push will be made, but that overall, one can only expect this exaggerated “liberation” of women from their primary biological role to be slowly eroded with time, coinciding with the degeneration of imperialism? One can bet that many “feminists” will decry this fact as “reaction”, as “misogyny”, while promoting the childlessness of women, something which beyond words relegates women to physically nothing in society, to non-mothers and thus non-women, to mere deficient copies of men.

Abortion is an absolutely necessary and irrevocable right in the case of teenage pregnancy, of rape, of pregnancies wherein attempting to carry things to term will result in death of both the baby and the carrier, of otherwise aggravating circumstances, and so on. But abortion is not a toy by which to avoid the responsibilities that come with intercourse, with procreation. It is not at all unfathomable why the practice of clinic-bombing is so commonplace among a people who see the life of their country being killed in the name of immediate carnal pleasure for hedonists. Again, we will see these isolated and individualistic expressions grow into mass movements, as they are already beginning to do in some countries. These mass movements themselves cross into extremes, advocating the illegalization of abortion outright, but the most extreme expressions of this movement are enough to topple the most extreme expressions of the “pro-choice” (anti-life?) movement. It will be interesting to see the way in which this develops, for sure.

THE FOLLY OF SUBJECTIVE CONSENT AND THE INABILITY OF LIBERALS TO SCIENTIFICALLY JUSTIFY THE SUPPRESSION OF PEDOPHILIA AND RAPE

The parasitism that exists within the material base of imperialist societies reflects itself in the moral decay of society; out of this, new ideological superstructures arise to justify, to “mask” the constantly degrading way of life, to paint it as if a progression and not regression is taking place.

However, these utterly shameful facades break down in no more amusing fashion than in the baffling inability of liberals to accurately define what constitutes rape, what constitutes pedophilia, and why exactly we should fight these things. *They cannot do it!* They can only offer *subjective formulas*, which are unable to grasp and deal with versatile and ever-changing conditions.

The subjectivists tell us that sexual intercourse should not be socially evaluated based on its role in *reproduction*, that sex is an act primarily for *pleasure*, that pleasure is the primary function of sex and procreation is its secondary function. By that logic, then, is sex with a child not decent and acceptable so long as the child finds it pleasurable? This is of course abhorrent, so the subjectivists must devise a new formula to mask the inevitable conclusion of their previous formula: children cannot partake in intercourse, not because of their biological and social inability to produce and raise children healthily, but *because children cannot “consent”*, they say. What is consent? They cannot define this without accidentally admitting that the child, by their definition, can consent. Yet, children cannot consent, they said. Why can children not consent? Because children cannot consent. Why can children not consent? Because children cannot consent. And so on.

That is the unstoppable logic which the liberals hope will eradicate pedophilia.

It breaks down further through the following: when does a child gain the ability to consent? When he becomes an adult. How do we tell when someone becomes an adult? One develops out of childhood when they develop into sexual maturity. What is sexual maturity? To the subjectivists, one gains sexual maturity when one obtains the right to consent. But when does one gain the right to consent? When they develop into sexual maturity. And so on.

It would seem that, by the subjectivist credo, we are always stuck as children, and may never reproduce. Children cannot consent until they are not children, and people only stop being children once they can consent. Blushing and fumbling with words, the subjectivists assure us that this is nonsense, etc. They are hardly likely to even process the words I have written before attacking them.

However, the breaking down of this logic completes itself in the following argument: the subjectivists claim that children gain the ability to consent *when the law says so!*

Brilliance! We have now turned the whole thing on its head. No longer do people have children, leading to the impulse for intercourse, this impulse leading to generational experience that teaches there is great danger in intercourse with children, leading to a psychology that finds disgust in this process, with this psychology then rising to be formulated as social law. No! That would be much too simple. *That is what is really backwards*, the subjectivists tell us. To them, people sit in a lawroom and decide the age of consent; then, children grow to the law-designated age wherein the psychological capacity for consent is somehow bestowed on them by the state, and they then use this psychology to drive themselves to have sexual intercourse, and in some

cases this sexual intercourse leads to children. This is the “correct” order of things! That is the “scientific” view of the subjectivists. In their logic, the fourteen year old in Germany is not able to consent, but as soon as he takes a plane to Portugal, he psychologically develops the ability to consent², and when he returns, he again loses this psychological ability. Further, the fourteen year old with the seventy year old is justified on the basis that the fourteen year old may legally consent, and as a consequence, obvious extremes are normalized in their entirety.

Outside of pedophilia, the subjectivist conception of sexuality is left as mere dust. We have discussed consent of the child, and how they are wholly unable to explain the reason we should not rape children. But what about adult women? Here, anything is fair game, and all that has to happen is for the woman to quite literally say the phrase “Yes, I consent to sex.”

I am not joking! They have made it so simple. How kind of them. Pointing a gun at a woman and telling her to say the phrase “I consent to sex” is now consent, so long as she complies.

Obviously, that does not work, and the subjectivists must again climb the scaffold and shamle on another apparent law of nature. No, consent may not be brought about by violence, they say. The woman must say, “Yes, I consent to sex,” but it cannot be brought about by violence.

Okay! And yet still, having intercourse with an intoxicated woman who mumbles “Yes, I consent” in a drunken stupor is consent to sexual intercourse. And what of paying a woman to have sex? This is now acceptable as well. So of course, they must further tell us: the woman may not be coerced in *any* way, physical or otherwise, or this is rape. What if she is drunk? What if she is bribed? No, the man’s action coerced her into sex, and so this is rape.

Okay, good and well. We will stop pushing one way, and now go the other: what is “coercion” when it is detached from physical violence? *Literally everything*, since all things affect the eventual outcome. From this makeshift ideological rule, the subjectivists have left us a society where many barely improper *or even outright proper* actions become rape, because all social interactions which lead to intercourse (and in the case of “sexually liberated” societies, this is indeed quite often) may be rightly considered “coercive” in that the man influenced an outcome by particular social actions which influenced the woman’s own perceptions and responses. The woman may not even realize she did not want to partake in intercourse, but then realize this afterwards, and thus convince herself: “I must have been raped.”

In a society where all acts of intercourse carry an ideological stigma of defilement upon the woman, the sensation of social coercion grows all the more felt. The line between what is pornography and what is reality, what is rape and what is sex, what is prostitution and what is love, becomes blurred when the purpose of sex itself – reproduction – is ignored.

² Yes, Portugal’s age of consent is 14 years old.

That is the subjectivist conception of “consent” when taken to its logical conclusions. The problem, here, is that we must define consent, and this cannot be done, because *consent is a subjective phenomenon*, consent is a matter of the subject’s experience, and therefore what “consent” actually is *differs from person to person*, and there can be no general and objective rules about consent. It is therefore very useful for creeps to anchor the law on these subjective and ever-changing notions in societies where the rape of women is commonplace. This circular logic is unable to ever stand on its own two legs without promptly losing balance and stumbling over itself. We must give the social relation that is sexual defilement, rape, etc. a *real objectivist perspective*, a definite meaning with universal principles that are drawn from the real world rather than imposed upon the real world. How can one claim to be against rape and pedophilia when they cannot even define them? So, let us “solve” these phenomena.

What is pedophilia? It is intercourse with a child who cannot reasonably reproduce, and further, cannot reasonably be expected to raise and parent children, for they have not even completed their own psychological and biological development. The act of intercourse with children can only happen in the mind that sees sexual intercourse as a matter first and foremost of pleasure, and only secondarily for reproduction – in a word, the subjectivist conception. In the objectivist conception, where children are the extension of one’s own self, where children themselves must be fostered and raised to have children, the act of defiling children in this way evokes the most fiery rage from the heart of a decent person, for to harm children is to harm all society, to damage the reproductive life of children is to damage the reproductive life of all society.

That is why pedophilia is wrong, why those who engage in pedophilia have erred against society in an unfixable way, and must be given a punishment in proportion to the seriousness of this crime. They have committed an outrageous act of violence not only against the individual child, but through them, all of mankind.

What about the rape of adults? It is here again fairly simple. Men and women have a responsibility to one another and to all mankind to marry and produce children. If women are to shun their motherly role in reproduction, then they implicitly accept their entire sexual being *as an outlet only for sexual pleasure* (many of them now do this openly), and thus they must tolerate the fact that they will be constantly validating their own rape and dehumanization to the faces of their rapists. I say this not harshly, of course, but with sincerity. What prevents the rape of women by men? It is precisely the dependence of women on men and the dependence of men on women, which necessarily binds them, which leaves the woman with her husband, her most faithful companion that would for all intents and purposes kill any man who touched her. If one is to do away with the “stifling” bonds of marriage, then they must do away with the “stifling” protection of the husband (can we not say that many “feminists” make a show of doing this too?), and they must deal with the “liberating” dehumanization and brutalization they already face on a daily basis in every major city and town in imperialist societies.

What is “consent”, though? Is this not a real thing? Does the wish of the subject not matter? Of course it matters. There is no denying that the subjective role, though not the *absolute* basis for the justification of intercourse and marriage, is by no means negligible. People will not reproduce if they do not feel the wish to reproduce. And so it is simple as that: consent is not a matter of deciding whether or not we will have intercourse, since *all of us will and must* (and those that won’t or don’t intend to, I do not care to address, since they will die off and have nobody left to fight what I say); consent is a matter of deciding *whom we will have this inevitable intercourse with*.

And now we are left with the complete objective view of intercourse and consent: people should have the right to decide, on a subjective basis, who they partake in intercourse with, but this decision should come within the bounds of what is dictated to be objectively necessary for the biological and social process of reproduction and child-rearing for all society.

It is not one’s subjective right to “consent” as a child, because it is objectively impossible to participate meaningfully in the process of reproduction as a child; they have no business trying to subjectively choose a sexual partner, regardless of the fact that dating exists even among the middle school students of imperialist societies, with little to no stigmatization except on the part of the “old timers”. But the reverse of this must be considered too: that no one has business shunning their role in the inevitable process of reproduction anyways, that to commit oneself against marriage is also to commit some other person of the opposite sex to the same fate *even against their will*, leaving them with nothing to lose – they do not even get to see their children grow up, they do not get to have children, they do not get to experience the very purpose of life itself, it is out of their control. So what else can they do? They will be naturally impelled towards hopeless expressions of violence, likely against the opposite sex, and when this is repeated many times, it has the overpowering effect of producing an entire collective group of partnerless folks whose sole political determination is violent political action against the entire opposite sex: these folks are called ‘involuntary celibates’, or ‘incels’, and we should further look into them as a currently growing social phenomenon.

THE PHENOMENON OF ‘INVOLUNTARY CELIBATES’

“Inceldom” is quickly becoming one of the predominant social movements against the dissolution of the family structure in imperialist societies, albeit in an extremely crude and misanthropic form. Inceldom arises from the inability to find a partner, and while it often takes the form of loathing the lack of a *sexual* partner, it is a reflection of the greater inability to find a *social* partner, a spouse. Though this despair is felt in small amount through all sections of society as degeneration progresses, it is the youth in particular that turn to increasingly extreme and crude expressions of protest, ranging from the obsessive consumption of pornography, pedophilia apologia, and violent fantasies, and crossing into actual stranger-rape, mass shootings, self-harm, and suicide.

Inceldom is not, as it's often portrayed, an exclusively male phenomenon. On the contrary, the very term "incel" was coined by a woman who created an online forum to express her frustration trying to find reliable male partners. Incels may be both men and women, but they are *overwhelmingly* men. Thus, it is clearly men who are being driven to the most extreme levels of political reaction against degeneracy, likely because it is the male role which has been lowered for the sake of "raising" (eradicating) the womanly role in imperialist societies. For the most part, women who sympathize with or support the incel movement do not consider themselves incels.

It may be easy to tell oneself that the incels are not worth paying mind to. Yet, *they cannot be neglected*, because as the United States' own FBI states, *incels are one of the foremost threats to the integrity of imperialist societies*. They say:

Most domestic terrorist attacks and plots between January 1 and August 31, 2020 were committed by white supremacists, anti-government extremists from the violent far-right, and involuntary celibates (incels). (7)

This is quite an admission. Those who say the Incels must simply be censored and they will disappear are playing a dangerous game. It is more likely that the incel movement will continue to coalesce, to gain sympathizers who find the less extreme elements of the incel ideology palatable, and transform from individualistic violence into mob violence and from there, political violence. This is of course just a prediction. The only realistic alternative would be for the FBI, CIA, NSA, etc. (or whatever state security agencies, depending on the country) to violently suppress not only the *political* movement of incels, and not only the *social* movement of incels (their forums, etc.), but the *psychological development of incels*, which is *impossible without eradicating the material conditions that give rise to incels* – cultural decay and the dissolution of the family.

Thus, to eradicate incels, one must eradicate imperialism and social decay; the FBI will not do this. Incels have proven time and time again that they are willing to die fighting, but they lack any organization whatsoever, any greater ideology than a blind loathing of femininity (which often crosses into homosexuality, by the way), a loathing of adulthood (which crosses into pedophilia), and a loathing of all society in general (which crosses into adventurism, into petty terrorism). If incels should find themselves met with a movement that promises the reinforcement of family structures and the eradication of social degeneracy, and through this the security of the long-preserved bond between man and woman, they will gladly point their guns elsewhere than schoolchildren and female college dorms, and their misanthropy will be transformed into a genuine political force.

TRANSGENDERISM, SELF-MISANTHROPY

At the tail end of the dissolution of the sexes into a single pleasure-seeking sex with no greater biological purpose, we have the creation of an identity out of this very dissolution; the very idea of womanhood is usurped by men and perverted against the wishes of women themselves. We already discussed the way in which pornography fashions this movement – I assert that if pornography were eliminated, the LGBT community would shrink to 10% its current size. Still, we should view the political side of things.

Since the first “Pride Parade”, the LGBT+ community have been overwhelmingly against the participation of trans women and women in “drag”, who they declared demeaning to the very idea of womanhoodⁱ – really, they despise these people because they are the *logical conclusion of homosexuality*. For homosexuals, seeing the futile movement of the transgenders before them is like being visited by their own ghost to be warned of their own deaths.

Can it be denied that the liberals, in their usual panic, have made a whole boogeyman out of the “TERF”, the “trans-exclusionary revolutionary feminist”, the feminist who demands that women be lifted instead of being forced to accept demeaning caricatures with no biological or social relation to womanhood, representing a tiny .06% of the population, as the entire basis of their movement? It cannot. The entire *political* movement of transgenderism is based on making new “footsoldiers” out of psychologically vulnerable men (and in some cases women) to suppress and silence the *real, genuine* movement of women against their own degradation. The transgender movement, therefore, finds its political expression as the “Cossacks” of womanhood, the minority which, like mercenaries, are employed against the majority.

One cannot simultaneously advocate the rights of women while advocating the formula: “a stranger with a penis and a stranger with a vagina together in a closed, highly secluded space”, which is what they advocate when they demand we put male-to-females into women’s bathrooms. It is *thinly veiled misogyny*, it is “lifting” the woman by creating a new type of woman and lifting her at the expense of the real, biological woman.

Let us look into the psychological motivations for this transgenderism. In each case, there may be up to several factors, but generally there is one predominant factor, and this predominant factor is typically pornography or parental-inflicted trauma.

In male-to-females, there necessarily must be one shunning their role as the father, as the worker, as the man. What is wrong with being a man? There is nothing wrong with it at all. The psychology which drives someone to forsake their biological function, to tell themselves they are something which they clearly are not, must be a psychology of self-loathing, it must be a psychology of self-hatred, for how can one love themselves, but hate their body? Their body is the conduit by which they exist – no body, no person. So, the person must reflect the body, rather than the body reflecting the person. How can a person be called a woman with a man’s body? The highest development of the man is to become a father, and yet to be a male-to-female means

to artificially stifle one's own development, to refuse to transcend past the stage of childhood and into adulthood, into fatherhood.

In females-to-males, it is the same psychology at play. However, there is a different motivation: particularly, the degradation of women as inflicted by men. With the womanly and motherly role so thoroughly dissolved, what reason does there exist to remain a woman? It comes not with the protection of men, not with the guarantee of children and motherhood, but with only the stifling bondage of misogyny and sexualization, of *de-facto* prostitution. The female-to-male is the woman attempting to escape womanhood after it has been robbed of the ground on which it stands – motherhood.

Such is the motivation for transgenderism from a materialist perspective.

Let us further consider the subjectivists and their arguments. They tell us: “in primitive times, transgenderism was quite commonplace!” (They use this argument with homosexuality as well). Yes, this is true. Primitive transgenderism was the result of a society where the woman was the communal property of man, and through this were collectively valued to an extreme degree, *like a most valuable possession*; in such societies, the most honorable and virtuous men were sometimes allowed to become ‘honorary women’, if you will, women in form while men in essence. Primitive transgenderism cannot be separated also from the communal ownership of women. If one wishes for the return of transgenderism, they must want the return of the communal ownership of women that gives rise to this phenomenon.

Let us test something in order to reveal the logical impotence of the subjectivists. Let us go to a prominent LGBT+ information sharing organization; let us take what they write of transgenders; and let us apply the same arguments to someone who insists not that they are a person in the body of the wrong sex, but that they are a person in the body of the wrong *age*.

Let us take the “*Frequently Asked Questions*” page from the *Glaad* LGBT+ organization. (8) This is what they write:

Transgender is a term used to describe people whose gender identity differs from the sex they were assigned at birth. Gender identity is a person's internal, personal sense of being a man or a woman (or boy or girl.) For some people, their gender identity does not fit neatly into those two choices. For transgender people, the sex they were assigned at birth and their own internal gender identity do not match.

What is gender identity? It is a person's “internal, personal sense of being a man or woman”. From where is this sense derived? According to objectivists (that is, according to us), it is derived from the biological function of the physical body. According to the subjectivists, it is derived from... from where? From nothingness, from heaven, from the mind itself. Something of that sort.

Very well. Let us now apply the same logic with age:

Transageist is a term used to describe people whose age identity differs from the age on their birth certificate. Age identity is a person's internal, personal sense of being an adult or child. For some people, their age identity does not fit neatly into those two choices. For transageist people, the age they were assigned on their birth certificate and their own internal age identity do not match.

Is this not clear and obvious that something is *wrong* with the subject? That someone is afraid of adulthood, or something of that sort? Does this not flout reality and the objective world? Can we say that “transageism” will not one day ‘gather steam’ as a political and social movement? Perhaps it will. Look up ageplay, reader.

Can we say that *normal* people will stand by and allow it to happen? We cannot.

It is common to assert that what I have just said is a false equivalence, that we cannot compare “transageists” and transgenders because “they are different things”. How are they “different things”? Well... “they are different things”.

It would seem the subjectivists cannot even tell us how they are different. But the extent to which they will go to assure us (and themselves) that they really are indeed different concepts! Anyone who points out this basic truth will surely be labeled a bigot, and with that, receive not a single scientific explanation to clarify this glaring contradiction.

There is also the “non-binary” and the “asexual”. They argue that it is possible, while inhabiting a body, to *not be either a man or a woman*. Well then – the non-age community would have a word. “I am not any age, I just exist. Why do you care so much about my age?” They say.

We tell them: we care about your age because you have one! You cannot get rid of it, it is an objective fact, and *you must live with it*. If you are denying your own age, does that not show that you hate your own lot in life? Are you having a “midlife crisis”? What a depressing psychological state that must be!

To the asexuals – you are not a thing either. This is simply called “not being currently aroused”. Most people are in this state for 99.9% of their lives. It is difficult? You were either traumatized or you have a medical condition, this is easily fixable.

Now, for the LGBT+ movement in general, particularly the T – they are sure to allege, “It cannot be called a mental illness.” Yet *Glaad* tells us that a near majority of transgender people attempt suicide, meaning that *a near majority of trans people are at the most extreme point of mental illness*:

40% of respondents reported attempting suicide in their lifetime, nearly nine times the attempted suicide rate in the United States (4.6%).

40%! Transgenders are nine times more likely to reach the absolute zenith of mental illness than a “cisgender”! What would we say if there was a movement of people attempting to change

their “age identity”, and 40% of them attempt to kill themselves? Are we supposed to *cater* to that movement, or positively correct it? In the opinions of the LGBT+ movement, we are supposed to adjust all of society so that it caters to that bit of the population. They tell us: 40% of them attempt suicide. We must cater to them, and stop this phenomenon!

Meanwhile, 10% of those with PTSD commit suicide. And PTSD, we say without hesitation, is a mental illness. Nobody would suggest otherwise. Nobody would argue that it is the social stigmas regarding PTSD, and not the symptoms coming with PTSD, that drives its victims to suicide.

Make of that what you will.

I shall conclude with one thing: we should say to the “LGBT+ community”, particularly the transgenders: if you just *acknowledged* it as a mental illness, if you would just say, “I have a mental illness that I am trying to cure, be patient,” and really did put in the effort to do that instead of demanding all society content you, validate you, *promote your practices to children*, and cater to your every wish – if you did this, *hatred towards you would stop spreading almost entirely*.

Again, make of that what you will.

That, in conclusion, is the degeneration of family and gender structures under liberalism and imperialist capitalism.

J. VOLKER

WORKS CITED

1. **Engels, Friedrich.** Letter to Marx Regarding Karl Ulrichs. 1869.
2. —. Conditions of the Working Class in England. 1845.
3. **World Population Review.** Rape Statistics By Country 2021. 2021.
4. **Farley, M.** Prostitution, violence, and posttraumatic stress disorder. *National Library of Medicine*. 1998.
5. **Amnesty International.** Amnesty International publishes policy and research on protection of sex workers' rights. 2016.
6. **Finer, Lawrence B.** PERSPECTIVES ON SEXUAL AND REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH. *Guttmacher Institute*. 2005.
7. **Jones, Seth G.** The War Comes Home: The Evolution of Domestic Terrorism in the United States. *Center for Strategic and International Studies*. 2020.
8. **Glaad Organization.** Transgender FAQ. r. 2021.
9. **U.S. Department of Justice.** Full Report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women. 2000.

ⁱ https://ia804507.us.archive.org/8/items/lgbt_20210604/lgbt.pdf