

Pook's Mill

ARCHIVE

www.TheRedArchive.com

ABOUT THIS ARCHIVE

An archive of the blog **Pook's Mill**, as held by TheRedArchive: 127 posts published between July 2006 and June 2008.

About Pook's Mill. Pook's Mill collects the writings of "Pook," an influential early seduction-community author from the mid-2000s. His essays focus on masculinity, self-mastery, purpose, and philosophy, and were an early influence on what later became the manosphere.

About TheRedArchive. TheRedArchive is a free, public archive of the Red Pill community, built so that none of this writing can quietly disappear. It holds **1,686,402 posts** and **38,839,914 comments** from 45 subreddits and 56 blogs. Much of it survives nowhere else — the accounts deleted, the subreddits banned, the websites long offline. All of it is free to read, search and download, and always will be, at www.TheRedArchive.com.

Support the mission. This Red Pill archive is free — no paywall, no account — but keeping it online isn't. I pay for the servers, the storage and the bandwidth myself, so that this valuable knowledge stays online. If you want to support the mission and archive, become one of the people who help keep it online at www.TheRedArchive.com/#help.

Share this file freely, and keep a copy of your own. What sits on one server can be taken down; what sits on a thousand hard drives cannot.


Best regards,

[/u/dream-hunter](#)

Founder of TheRedArchive
July 28, 2026

The Musician

Pook · 24 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



One of the benefits of no comments is that what does come in is well written and fleshed out.

For your reading pleasure:

Italics = The emailer

Bold = My emphasis

Regular text = El Pookius Master-Of-Universias

Here is the email:

My name is *****[Pook Note: I'm withholding names from these emails of course], and I have read some of your posts on Sosuave. I haven't made a single post there in my life, so I never existed there in a sense. I have urges of registering at times, but never see the point in it (or it's either I'm too lazy). Anyway, I'm a 19 year old college student in California who first majored in music composition but switched to civil engineering recently (You are right when you say feminism has gotten into our humanities, I'll share my experiences with that in this e-mail).

I have to say that so far your writings have made a huge difference in my life already. What is so special is that you seem so down-to-earth, which is something I feel that is lacking a lot in the world these days.

Obviously, there must be another Pook running around. I refer to myself in third person, give Pook magical powers, and grant myself the most arrogant titles such as 'Pookus Extroadinarius'. That doesn't seem down-to-earth to me, but let us move on...

I really want to share some of my thoughts about music because they seem to be consistent with a lot of your values.

I've been playing piano all through HS and had dreams of being able to compose like Mozart (seriously hehe). I was

perceived by my peers as the sort of geeky and weird kid who spent his time doing nothing but music. This led to me being terrible with the ladies in HS (since it really wasn't the 'popular' music).

What struck me and surprised me when I was reading your writing was that you often will mention Mozart and Chopin. They are my two favorite composers! To me, both composers are the most down-to-earth and follow the natural style (which is composing in the melodic style of music by imitating the human voice). Kind of like how your writing is so down-to-earth and seeks only the natural!

I must make a confession: I am insanely jealous of music composers. It is the musician, not the poet, the painter, or orator, who has direct control influencing people's souls. No wonder Plato banned them from his Republic. With anything written or speaking, there is always the language barrier. But music has no such barrier.

Music truly is the perfect union of math and art. I have heard that the best programmers are also musicians. You never realize how important music is until it isn't there or done badly.

I can't imagine putting together a symphony. It is hard enough to write for one instrument, let alone all of them. Also, I know you just can't throw stuff in there. Everything has to be in tone with everything else. And the music has to have such a sense that it melts into motion.

My music education began (and ended) around a few instruments (trombone, euphonium, tuba which all have a very similiar element). I know so little about music that I definately plan to dive into it more one day. Musicians are like the chosen 'Pookish people'.

Anyway, so I attend University after HS all enthusiastic about learning how to compose in this natural style. In HS, I studied Mozart's style thoroughly and I even had a copy of his simple thoroughbass method (It's amazing, he simplifies things in a way so unique). But now I was in college and this was a sad year in my life. Not only did I receive so much criticism for majoring in music, my problems that I ignored only grew. I was still pretty anti-social and my urge to be with the ladies grew much stronger. This is when I discovered David Deangelo, Sosuave, and others. These problems were still bearable at the time, what was unbearable was the craft I put all my cards in during HS. Music.

I realized the whole University system for music was in a way corrupt! The whole "Art can be anything" philosophy ran amuck. Making it worse, the professors kept trying to make me compose away from this natural style I was pursuing! They would say I'm talented, but always criticize the style I used. I'm not sure how much you know about music, but the universities seem to hate tonal music, which is the music system that uses the tonal scale. I believe it was developed by Pythagoras and is very closely related to the laws of nature (So many classics came from this system).

Readers, picture a professor annoyed that his music student is studying Mozart and the classics from Pythagoras (A music student studying Mozart! How radical! Who else is he to study to learn music? A feminist?)

In my days in the university, I caught the professors' eye for trying to mimic the blank verse and any other form of verse (as well as the elizabethan sonnet and spenserian sonnet forms). They seemed 'annoyed' at what I was doing. I just shrugged and said, "How else am I supposed to learn?" I later learned that these professors weren't doers. Their job literally was the paralysis of analysis. They could write articles and papers about all these pointed hat theories on Shakespeare, but they couldn't write a single sonnet. This confused me. Isn't the best way to understand the great

masters is to attempt to duplicate them?

I know with painting this used to be the way. Painters would take their canvas to the museum and try to paint alongside the masters. The teachings of painting techniques got passed from one generation to the next with each generation refining on the techniques of the past. For some reason, in the beginning of the twentieth century, this tradition got lost. Some blame the invention of the photograph. But this occurred with literature as well (music and theater are still mysteries to me).

I got tired of the music program and eventually quit. The program seemed to have one philosophy for composing, which is "You must compose radically different from the classics, any resemblance will be criticized upon and not tolerated". Art is always changing and you can't define it so it must be radically different! This whole craze of becoming radically different was also in the performance program of our universities. I heard that this one student in a recital or something had a vase near the piano, and at the end of a piece he shoved the vase off so it would shatter on the floor and that was supposed to symbolize something. My take on it was that the music had no substance so the student had to rely on theatrics like that. What's worse is the audience buys into it and says it's so 'deep'. This is the kind of stuff I had to deal with in music and to me is an example of your saying that the humanities have been corrupted. (If you want another example, look up John Cage's 4'33", you'll get a laugh out of that!)

I'm speechless. I can't add anything to what the musician has said.

I **looked up** John Cage's 4'33", and I'm shaking my head. I'd like to rip these 'BRILLIANT' thinkers (oh, so brilliant that who are we peasants to question?), but I'll save that for another post (and give the musician the spotlight he deserves).

The highlight of my time in the program though was a time where a professional composer came to talk in our theory class (Counterpoint theory I believe). The first thing she made known to the class was that she was a feminist. Then, we had to hear her whole life story of how she had to go through life as a feminist and trying to make it as a composer. Listening to her was torture. To her, she struggled because she couldn't find any other women to have as idols who made it as music composers. Boohoo hahaha. This was also before I even knew much about feminist and before I read your writings on sosuave, so it wasn't that she was a feminist that bothered me, it was that she spent all her time talking about things other than music! I was interested in pure music, not her identity crisis. What was sad though was to see my fellow peers and professor eat the stuff up and feeling sorry for her and even praising her (especially the professor).

I gather that they weren't praising her for her music, they were praising her that she was a 'woman'? This is ridiculous.

So now I'm starting my third year of college but in the Engineering program. I have lots of hope for the future, but I believe engineering isn't my passion. I have been reading a lot on financial stuff and real estate, and am striving to reach financial freedom in the future. I also continue to read your writings from sosuave and now your blog :) Sadly I am still struggling on the lady front even though I have made massive improvements on myself and am generally happier than I was a year ago. For example, a year ago I was 130 pounds, and now I am almost 150 and I play a lot of basketball.

The musician ends his email asking for my mentoring. I'm struck dumb because what else could I say that he hasn't?

He knows what his passion is in life (it isn't engineering so he wants to go back to music. I say: do it. Life is incredibly short. Spend it on what you love.)

He knows that he needs to work towards obtaining financial freedom (and he is in college! Most people don't get a hint of this until they are in their late thirties or forties! And many people don't get it at all).

And he knows about changing and altering his body.

What more could I say? He sounds like he's getting the Big Stuff correct. I'm posting his email here in hopes that an older professional musician would like to give him any pointers (heaven knows my ignorance on the music field).

The only thing I could say is focus on how audiences respond to your music (real audiences, not professors and academic no-nuts) and always improve that link it has with audiences. Hopefully, you'd want to get fabulously wealthy from your music, and the best way is to also study audience's reactions.

"But Pook!" someone might say, "how could he make money when everyone else is going the opposite way? How can you make money going against the current?"

In business, they call this a 'disruption strategy'. Consider all these people trying to please their professors and only end up having their lives producing rubbish. This musician will have little to no competition because everyone else will be making the same nonsense. You'll feel like a demigod because you will be walking through empty rooms in this talent vacuum.

As for women, they tend to have a soft spot for musicians (so I don't think his passion will end up interfering with the girls but, rather, attracting them). After 25, the tables turn and men increasingly obtain more options and leverage (whereas in high school, women seemed to have goddess like powers). This is what is so wonderful about being a man. Time is on our side. And we routinely marry younger women. Women have a shelf life- men don't.

The Way

Pook · 25 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original

Before Marriage



During Marriage



End of Marriage



You are not a god

Pook · 25 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Aristotle said that man is a social animal. (In other words, man creates families, cities, concerts and other fabulous things.)

But what if one becomes extremely individualized? By individualization, I mean cutting off one's family, mocking Nature, and marching to the drums of rhetoric from quacks. Aristotle answered that such highly individualized beings are either gods or beasts. (Keep in mind that in Aristotle's time, the Greek gods were the religion.)

Arrogance of the soul is the cause of disasters such as feminism. Many women literally believe they are 'goddesses'. Like an ancient Greek god, they believe they are above Nature itself. "I will do all these wonderful things!" she says, which the 'wonderful' usually means a new pair of shoes, a bigger house, and a more glitzy car. She believes she is 'beyond' the gender known as 'female'. "I am a strong woman," she proclaims. "I write worthless poetry and dream of an empty glamorous life." (OK, she doesn't say 'worthless' and 'empty', I couldn't resist typing that in). She literally lives her a life in the World of Image, trapped within Maya.

Men, trapped in the Matriarchy (i.e. the Maya), fall under a similiar spell. As their soul becomes arrogant, they become more deluded, more easily fooled by the images. They imagine themselves gods with their notches to their bedpost, working a grand career, or some other materialistic trapping.

I tell them, "You are not a god." This, they protest. "I too am a god," they proclaim. "See how wonderful I am?" They may or may not have worshippers. This may explain why many people (especially women) worship celebrities as, to them, they appear like gods. They are the center of the swirling storm, the spinning disc of Maya (the illusion).

And no, I am not trying to be funny. People literally think they are gods and goddesses. If a religion is not what they desire, they can easily re-write it so they become god-like in it (one of the reasons why people, especially women, love the occult and trash like the Da Vinci Code).

But if Aristotle is correct, then the other swing is the beast. These self-seen gods and goddesses are, actually, nothing more than beasts. You think you have a 'grand career'? No, your purpose is to make the owners rich. You think you are the star of the world just because you have a 'wife'? Or have you actually become a beast of burden?

We work hard and then play harder.

All manipulators are armed with descendant fruit of the Tree of Good and Evil. Get **that** girl or **that** career and you will have paradise on Earth. Whenever we see ourselves as invincible and god-like, we have a veil so tight around our eyes that we cannot see the truth... that we were acting like beasts.

The only way to be free from being Human is to become a god or to become a beast. Let this be a reality check, you will never become a god. People will often attempt to trick you into thinking of how 'wonderful' you are, but this is so they can use you as a beast of burden.

The Matriarchy is about one promise: freeing us from being Human. To females, it promises them freedom from being a woman. To men, it promises freedom from being a man. To glorify this promise, there are exciting images to see from movies and television, many dumbed down books and universities to let people have the image of being smart, and the ever present image of materialism promised by an endless parade of commercials.

To ask your soul to become free of being a Human is like asking a fish to become free of water. You might as well ask the birds to be free from the air or squirrels to be free from trees.

Freedom is only found in embracing your humanity. For a matriarchial female, she will find happiness and a content soul only in becoming a woman. For a feminized male, he will find happiness and content only in becoming a man.

So this is a friendly post from your neighborly Pook to remind you that, "Yes Virginia! I am not a god! I am, instead, like an actor on a stage of Nature. So farewell folly-filled pompousness that had me thought I would become god-like in image, influence, and intelligence." You nod to the stage director, "His name is Time, and he, alone, determines when the play will end. But what I do on this stage is up to me."

'But Pook! Where are those arrogant ones on the stage?' Friend, they are TOO CHICKEN to come onto the stage of Nature, Life's Play, and act. They live out their narcissism in their bizzaro-world of illusions and never become who they are. So no matter how much you stumble up there on that stage, you are taking real steps in life while the fools take false ones.

Counterfeit Pook?

Pook · 26 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original

[image]Whispers swirl that I am a False Pook.

I get this email from Giovanni (who was, and might still be, a moderator on the Sosuave forum) that in order to extinguish the whispers I am to either post this blog in my profile or in my username on Sosuave. Keep in mind I haven't been to Sosuave in around two years. I suppose my profile linking to Mirror of the Soul and it linking here isn't enough to sway minds.

But I'm not going to do something so simple. First, I am too lazy to go to Sosuave ("But you are on the internet! Type in the URL!!!" Fool! I'm not going to go somewhere I don't want because others demand it.) Second, there is a bigger lesson to learn from all this.

Anyone can make a blog and proclaim themselves a Pook. But don't you think I've dealt with this before? I've encountered many forum posts (on other non-sosuave forums) where someone says, "Look what I wrote!" and, behold, there is the 'Be a Man' post! Don't you think the Pook on Sosuave knew about false Pooks and doesn't care about them?

"Why wouldn't Pook care about False Pooks? They are destroying the great name of Pook!"

The great name of Pook! The glory of Pook! The 'honor' of the Pook! Don't you see the irony of someone saying the 'great name' of Pook (which is the most absurd name ever)?

You will know the tree by its fruit. If this is a false Pook, then I will be uncovered by saying things that don't remotely sound Pookish. But if I am a true Pook, then wouldn't the words ring true now or eventually?

"You are not making this easy!" Of course not. That wouldn't be any fun.

The Questioner

Pook · 26 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



As I go through the emails, this guy had so many questions that I'd thought I'd answer here (in case others have similiar questions!).

For your reading pleasure:

Regular text = Pooky Wooky

Bold text = The Questioner

OK to the point. I feel that all your posts are very... seperate, a whirlwind of ideas which don't fall into place and form some sort of context or "reality map" (I hate saying that). At least for me it hasn't.

You are correct! When this blog started, I didn't know what the heck I was doing. I just threw stuff up there.

"But you can throw stuff on Sosuave just as well, Mr. Pook." Now, now, Sosuave is a 'how to get girls' forum. I already paid my dues there. Besides, I'd rather talk about other things then 'how to get girls' which, on Sosuave, I'd have little choice.

So I fashioned the Mill to be the point of this blog. The Mill is that maelstrom, that starry wheel, of the ancients. From the Mill, all astronomy, religion, art, and science revolved around. It is a union of Math and Art. It is the astral plane.

With all the anti-feminist pages out there, I chose a different path of waging war on Feminism through the Humanities. Imagine a well of wisdom that, from whoever drinks of it, becomes wise. Now imagine a source of that well, some mill trickling water into it. This is a wisdom blog.

Am I looking for a "philosophy" from your writings?

Should I stop looking to find some truth or answers from the collection of your sosuave posts?

Should I just take them as singular pieces of advice?

The puzzle is not Pook or his posts. The puzzle is Nature. All of the sosuave posts were ideas on the Puzzle of Nature. Some of the posts came up with only theories. Other posts identified laws (such as testosterone as the Secret

of the Jerk).

For advice, follow the Pookish Commandments that I am putting out. They seem so trivial and 'common sensical', but they are the greatest regrets of old men. Take the first commandment: Be who you are. Most people don't live like that. They care so much what other people think that they never do what they desire. What does it matter if you have a high paying job in a distinguished profession but you don't desire it? WOMEN and OUTSIDERS might think you are a success but if you aren't happy doing it, what the hell is the bloody point? As for the Second Pookish Commandment: Fight the Negativism, it sounds trivial but so many people retard their lives by their attitudes. I have found pessimists and chicken littles to be the grand losers in life. Besides, who wants to around a defeatist anyway?

"Self improvement" as I'm still not quite sure what you mean by self improvement. Improve myself for what? A better bench press can be measured, memory can be improved, but what can I improve in my "self"? Aren't I a constant? Isn't my personality set from my experiences? Am I just evolving my outer self? What is "self improvement"?

Self-improvement is exactly how it sounds. It is not evolving your outer shell. It is growing a pearl inside the shell. Self-improvement is just self-actualization. You are becoming who you are! You are unleashing your soul. You are not bottling your soul so you pretend to be an image.

You don't work out to turn your flesh into a masculine dress. You work out because you love it and because you have goals. I LOVE working out. I love how it makes me feel. I love the testosterone surging through my veins. It makes me happier, smarter, more action oriented, and just all around a more pleasant person to be around. The LOSER is someone who works out for the appearance alone (in other words, most women and idiotic males).

I hammered self-improvement on Sosuave because improving YOURSELF gave greater rewards than improving your GAME. With so much focus on manipulation strategies, you'd have a much more satisfying life and an automatic way to get women by improving yourself.

Self-improvement was a way of saying: "Invest time in yourself rather than investing time in girls." Why? It is because girls come and go, but YOU are forever!

And finally "Nature".

You always talk about "Nature" but what do you mean by nature? Am I right in saying... Women are attracted to testosterone, (any fool knows this) this is nature at work? Right?

What else is Nature? Are we all completely "Nature" or is that what women are? Where does Nature work and apply?

Have you ever tried sailing a boat? You know that the sail must be adjusted to the wind. By harnessing Nature, you harness the wind to propel the boat. A sailor is working within the rules of Nature which is why he is a successful sailor. If a sailor decided to buck Nature, his boat wouldn't be moving anywhere.

Some people believe they are so god-like in intelligence and wonder that the world ought to be manipulated into whatever shape they want. Xerxes believed this. He went to the beach, stared at the ocean, and said to the waves, "Thus far shall you come and no further!" The waves had no concern for Xerxes' orders and moved in. If Xerxes didn't suck in his pride and retreat from the waves, he would have drowned.

All science and humanity is based on unraveling the laws of Nature and using them how we see fit. We couldn't have airplanes flying through the sky unless we uncovered many of the principals involved such as uplift and aerodynamics. We couldn't have the Green Revolution unless we understood hybrid technologies and the principals of irrigation and fertilizer.

Our life standards improve when we harness Nature's laws for own benefit like the sailor applying the sail to move the boat. My goal was never to tell you HOW to live but only reveal the laws operating under the process. WHY do girls go for jerks? I investigated until I found a satisfactory answr. WHY do married men routinely become fat, bald, and look like your ran them over with a steam-roller? There are reasons for things.

So what is 'unnatural'? Feminism is unnatural, that much is certain. Women trying to be manly and men trying to be womanly is unnatural. What is unnatural is the mockery and breaking of these laws. The result is always the same: unhappiness and despair.

The Nice Guy is an unnatural male. So there is no wonder that he is filled with unhappiness and despair. He is not obeying the laws of nature.

While Biology is about the laws concerning life (which genetics has now dominated), Physics being about the laws concerning motion, the Humanities are about the laws concerning Human Nature. History, Law, Language, and many other things hold the Humanities as their root. If the Humanities becomes corrupted, the rest will become corrupted as well.

When the U.S. Constitution was being written, the Constitutional Debate was essentially a debate about Human Nature. The U.S. Government has three branches because, the framers knew, that no one should hold all the power nor should it be split into two. I am told by a reliable source that present day Senators (each and every one of them) feel that they ought to be President (the House is more humble). So why is there only one President? It is because the framers knew there should only be one Commander-In-Chief, not a hundred. There must be one voice to command the troops. After all, Human Nature says there can only be one general, not a hundred. By obeying the laws of Human Nature, the U.S. Government has relatively endured. The point is that it is still around. If there was something seriously flawed, such a government would have collapsed such as the Soviet Union.

Like a building, our lives can collapse when we don't obey the laws of Nature. "But I desire FREEDOM! I want to be FREE from these laws of Nature!" some might say. This is a major mistake. Life, liberty, and property do not exist because people made laws. It is the fact that life, liberty, and property existed beforehand (as laws of Nature) that caused people to form laws in the first place.

The essence of freedom is obedience to Nature's laws. This is why, in the Declaration of Independence, the British colonies cite Nature (and Nature's God) as the authority for the dissolving of those political bands. I'm citing a political example because its well known and shows how this context is applied everywhere. Contrast this to those forums where there was a whole galaxy of 'systems' and 'philosophies' with no constants established, no revelations of reality, except which poster had the biggest ego... which revolved around those who believed they best manipulated the world.

What is WoW? (the bizzare world of Jeopardy)

Pook · 26 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original

[image]

This story is just all too hilarious. Ken Jennings, a 94 game streak winning champ, makes fun of Jeopardy. A quote:

Finally, Alex. I know, I know, the old folks love him. Nobody knows he died in that fiery truck crash a few years back and was immediately replaced with the Trebektron 4000 (I see your engineers still can't get the mustache right, by the way.) But that's beside the point: "Alex" is the franchise. You can't just bring in Ryan Seacrest without warning, more's the pity.

His blog post is [here](#).

Real Seduction Versus Wimp Seduction

Pook · 27 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original

[image]It is time for a pop quiz. What, sirs, is the definition of the term 'Wimp'? What does it stand for?

"One who doesn't score with women."

"Someone who isn't macho."

"The lack of coolness."

All these are good, gentlemen, yes. Yet, they are all wrong. I will give you a better explanation of the word 'Wimp'.

Woman

Influenced

Male

Person

A wimp is a male who has no soul. In fact, he looks to others, especially women, to influence how he acts. Wimps can easily 'score' with women because anyone can re-write themselves to be what women want. Anyone can paraphrase a woman's thoughts back to herself. And anyone can read from a script. Being so influenced shows you have no BALLS.

The big problem of Speed Seduction (or should I call it 'Nerd Seduction?') is that it is Wimp Seduction. You seduce not in a matter of strength, of who you are, but of painting yourself in woman's eyes to be what she wants. You paraphrase her thoughts back to her. You analyze what she does and write lengthy internet reports on it. Or worse, you try to *connect* and pretty much do whatever to please her. The difference between the Nice Guy and the Wimp Seducer is that of tactics. Both are just as female influenced. "But what does it matter, Pook? The Wimp Seduction gets us girls. That is all that matters." Yeah, but keep that up and you'll be driven to despair and near suicide, as many of such 'seducers' have illustrated. If you have to trade your soul for sex, then you are doing anything BUT 'scoring'.

Real Seduction is just going up to her and doing it YOUR way. She says, "No, no..." but her eyes are saying, "Yes, yes..." You assume she wants it because you know Nature wants her to want it. In the end, you'll get her. You don't pretend to be a clown. You don't read from a script. You don't wear make-up. Women are attracted to male desire.

"But I thought having desire was bad." No, being pussy whipped is bad. Most guys' desire turns them into a wimp. Look them in the eye. They know what you want. They can *feel* it. Don't be chicken about it.

"But she might reject me! Boo hoo!" Stop sobbing as I don't want to mop up this post with all your womanly tears. The question is not whether she will reject you or not. The question is whether YOU want her or not. If she says no and you still want her, try it again. Why give her so much power over who you should desire? Women LOVE being desired. But they DETEST wimps.

Let me give you an example from literature (groans come out from everywhere). Silence fools! Nothing art wise endures for centuries unless it reflects Nature somehow. Here is my chosen example:

In the second scene of the first Act of Shakespeare's King Richard III, Richard III (at his gloucester status) has arranged the killing of King Henry VI. He interrupts his funeral procession to woo his widow, the Lady Anne. So aside from Richard being an ugly hunchback, he killed the King, her husband. This, obviously, is going to be an uphill battle for his seduction.

She screams at him, "Blush, blush, thou lump of foul deformity!" Most guys would take the hint. She goes on to call Richard a devil, a toad, a diffused infection of a man, a hedgehog, a homicide, and a dissembler, and then spits in his face and tells him to hang himself. Yes, the signs of disinterest are hard to miss.


Richard doesn't run away or make posts on the internet how 'hurt' he was. He ignores all the foul stuff she says and pours on the the sweet-talk. Eventually, she becomes his wife. This scene is very electric, makes for very good theater, and is a challenge to act it (I've tried it on stage). But the real challenge is for the girl who plays Lady Anne who must be disgusted but yet interested. A very entertaining scene to watch as well.

"But Richard is a foul villian, Pook!" Of course. But so are many seducers. You can have a crappy car and be homeless yet be a master of women. You can be ugly, be a toad, and still be able to get the girl. The point is that you act on your desires, rather than react to hers. You be who you are. You improve yourself, yes, but only towards your vision and goal of yourself. You don't improve yourself so you become more of an ornament to attract women. That is the female influenced way. That is the Wimp Way.

Seduction from your influence, rather than manipulating yourself to fit her influence, is not only more satisfactory seduction, it is mentally healthier. You won't be driven to suicide because you'll be acting on your soul rather than denying it for female affection.

Mass Reincarnation of Neville Chamberlain

Pook · 27 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



"Why won't you stop harping about the 'be who you are' stuff?"

Because it is the most important lesson I ever learned. Our lives seem so powerless because we actually GIVE power to others to define us, to shape us. For example, on Sosuave and life, you've certainly seen guys give women so much power to define the guy in question, to judge the guy, to determine the guy's worth. Instead, why don't we have the girl prove HER worth to us!?

It is time for you to define the rules for your life. If you give up those rules to anyone else, then YOU are to be blamed for where you are in life. Don't blame women, corporations, politics, or anything else. You define your life.

"We demand more business information from you Pook!"

Then consider this the first lesson of becoming a CEO. CEOs I've met in real life do share one quality: they don't care what anyone else thinks of them. It takes a hefty set of balls and confidence to direct a business. The CEO is the captain. Now, they certainly do care what the consumers, shareholders, and employees think, of course. But they only care within a set of strategy. Why would a CEO ask his employee advice on how to run the business?

If you can't define rules for your own life, how the hell are you going to define rules for your business?

In fact, this Pookish First Commandment even applies on a far greater scale. You, from sosuave, know about the dilemma of the Nice Guy. But what about Nice Guy Nations? What about Nice Guy Military? Act like a wimp on the world's stage, terrorists will smell weakness and bomb you. No nation has ever been attacked for being too strong.

For our personal direction, we always hear, "We need to obey the opinion of society." What is society and why let it define how your life is? And for the national direction, we always hear, "We need to obey the opinion of the world." What exactly is this 'opinion' of the world and why would a nation let itself be defined by other nations? Isn't the point of being independent country is for the country to define itself?

It is my hope that America tries to be America, the UK tries to be the UK, France tries to be France, and so on. Why should America try to be like France or France try to be like Algeria? It is like the entire world is infected with feminization. There have been too many reincarnations of Neville Chamberlains (picture above) and not


enough Churchills. Worrying about what everyone else thinks, the world is caged in fighting minimalist wars. By not allowing the full might of power to be unleashed, the problem just grows. I hear with the battles in Lebanon that terrorists wear civilian clothing and fire their rockets from houses. They are using the West's virtue as their primary weapon. They know no one is going to bomb those houses.

I believe most addictions and disorders are due to people not being who they are and giving the rules of their life to someone else. Eventually... they crack.

Imitation is suicide. There is nothing I find more disappointing than someone trying to be someone else. There is nothing more depressing than living your life to someone else's vision. You have a soul for a reason.

The Manipulated Man

Pook · 27 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Esther Vilar wrote a book called "The Manipulated Man". What she does is describe, in detail, how women manipulate men all their lives. This is a must read.

When Vilar went on the Tonight Show (with Carson) to talk about the book, the studio recieved such a backlash. Bookstores pulled the book. Women were not happy at all with it. Even today, a copy of the Manipulated Man will tend to disapear as when women find it, they destroy it. I, myself, need to buy another copy as I suspect a certain woman has removed my copy.

Most Men's Movement books tend to copy Vilar's contents and rewrite/add on to her work. So you might as well get the original source.

Here are some quotes from the book:

"If a young man gets married, starts a family, and spends the rest of his life working at a soul-destroying job, he is held up as an example of virtue and responsibility. The other type of man, living only for himself, working only for himself, doing first one thing and then another simply because he enjoys it and because he has to keep only himself, sleeping where and when he wants, and facing woman when he meets her, on equal terms and not as one of a million slaves, is rejected by society. The free, unshackled man has no place in its midst."

"Men have been trained and conditioned by women, not unlike the way Pavlov conditioned his dogs, into becoming their slaves. As compensation for their labours men are given periodic use of a woman's vagina."

"If praise is applied in the correct dosage a woman will never need to scold. Any man who is accustomed to a regular and conditional dosage of praise will interpret its absence as displeasure."

"Someday it will dawn on man that woman does not read the wonderful books with which he has filled his libraries, and though she may well admire his marvelous works of art in museums she herself will rarely create, only copy."

Law doesn't care about your karma

Pook · 27 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Due to posting the Esther Vilar book, I saw an interesting reviewer say that he had to 'let go' of the book whereas on the first review on the UK Amazon site, he praised it.

Here is his first review:

The Truth Hurts, 16 Nov 2003

Reviewer:	M. Maguire (Madrid, Spain) -
-----------	------------------------------

This book by Vilar is deadly serious. It is not a tongue-in-cheek satire at all, and it pulls no punches in its brutally honest assessment of "Woman". Back in the 70's Vilar herself was vilified by women everywhere and crucified by the feminist establishment after daring to break the unwritten rule, the Female Omerta, to speak out and expose her gender for the "lazy manipulative scheming parasitic prostitutes" that most men learn painfully by the age of 30-40 they are, always were, and always will be. Along with the great Otto Weininger's "Sex and Character", also available from this site (I'm still amazed these two books are even in print in this warped feminist age!), there is no deeper or more honest exposé of the utter soullessness of woman and how she is, on all inner Spiritual and metaphysical levels, diametrically opposed to Man. Literally at the opposite end of the Spiritual spectrum. And this volume is all the more forceful in that it was written by a woman. It should be read by all men everywhere. It should be required reading by all pre-pubescent boys, handed down from Father to Son.

And this is his second review, three years later:

Letting go of Vilar, July 21, 2006

Reviewer:	M. Maguire (Madrid, Spain) -
-----------	------------------------------

I posted a review of this book on the Amazon.co.uk site quite some time ago, and since it won't let me post twice I must post here instead. This review is to detract everything I said in that first idiotic post. For the longest time I thought low of women and with each unpleasant miserable experience my conviction became stronger. Holding such attitudes, which I now know to be false, I then sought out material such as this book and books like Sex and Character by Otto Weininger. I now realize that far from reading this material for knowledge I was seeking it out to simply confirm my existing misconceptions. Recently I have undergone something of an inner realization, a complete change in my understanding of other people and especially of women. I have realized that your own thoughts and habitual mental states create your experiences in this "reality". If you think low of women your thoughts will come true and you will have nothing but terrible experiences with them. Each experience will confirm

in your deluded mind that you were correct in your assumptions and only increase your conviction that they are low, and thus the vicious cycle started by your own mind will continue, getting worse and worse as the years and decades pass - until one day you awaken and realize the problem lies not with the opposite sex but with your own mind and delusional thought patterns. A woman will experience exactly the same if she clings to similar attitudes about men. I totally reject and detract every stupid word I said in my previous post on the UK site, and I apologize to my Sisters for any hurt or anger those foolish words caused them. Women and Men are equal. There are good men and good women, unpleasant men and unpleasant women, kind men and kind women, selfish men and selfish women. If you hold the attitude that ALL women are this way or that way, then those are the ones you will meet in your life since your thoughts create your reality. Realize that this is not true and instead think highly of them and your experiences with them will change for the positive.

I am all for fighting negativism, and I'm well aware the pessimistic outlook Weiniger had on women, but this second review just makes me laugh. I think part of the problem is that he is from Spain which may (or may not) have been feminized. Esther Vilar's book is describing, mostly, North America and the UK (feminization is highest in English speaking countries).

I might have said the same thing he did several years ago. My biggest criticism for the so-called 'Men's Movement' is their rampant pessimism and gloom and doom. This always repelled me from them (and probably others). Two things showed me there was something very serious going on.

I knew a little law, not much, so I investigated that. I found that it was true that decent men were being screwed over in family courts and divorce. You have widescale paternity fraud. You have absurd sexual harassment laws and rape claims. I saw the double standards of teacher sexual abuse: slap for the woman but decades long imprisonment and stigma attached the guy. Also, men have no reproduction rights. Even if you are a sperm donor, you may still have to pay child support.

But the second thing was the breaking point. I was trying to understand why people stay in the rat race their entire lives. If you try to tell a girl you want to become financially independent, she will run for the hills! This baffled me as didn't women want ambitious men who desired to become rich?

I made two financial statements. One for man. One for woman. I realized that women placed their husbands in the 'asset' column. Women don't look for husbands, they are actually shopping for assets. The bigger your income, the more likely they will cling to you. This was the reason why most people remained wage slaves. The woman would usually work temporarily. Then she would retire "for love and family". The man was stuck being a wage slave his entire life.

This sounds all nice and wonderful with the 'think positive and you'll get positive' stuff. But anyone in North America or UK (at least) need to know that the reality is that there is a legal noose around your neck. The harsh legal situation isn't something people want to talk about but you better understand it fast. I don't want any of you to become a statistic of stupid laws.

What the reviewer is describing is 'karma' which I can understand. But he is ignoring the legal and financial leveraging against men entirely (which may be due to him being in Spain for all I know).

Here is a question: why did feminists sneak into the Violence Against Women's Act penalizing legal action against foreign brides? If a gentlemen want to marry a Russian or Brazilian, who does that matter? It is a free nation, is it not? Consider how rampant illegal immigration is yet the state will act on FOREIGN brides? The double standard is a female one and leads me to believe that mexican illegal immigration is allowed because it saved feminism (who else would be the nannies?).

I'm looking at these highly penalizing (and secret) laws, and I cannot deny that there has to be a Men's Movement to correct and educate on this matter. While I don't like the Men's Movement pessimism and doomsdayism, they are correct about the penalizing nature of these laws. You can be the world's most wonderful husband and still be raped by the Family Court. As a man, the State believes you are to be given duties, not rights. And the precedent law these penalizing laws are based on is very brittle and flimsy. It is ripe (and proper!) to be challenged.

Power corrupts. It is not that women are evil. It is that there is no social restraint on their behavior, no stigma, and that women have been given massive power by certain laws (which to my foreign readers, may not include you). I cannot recommend marriage to any man with these types of laws in place without the tightest pre-nuptials. And perhaps, not even then. The state has decided that marriage grants, legally, only duties on the men and only benefits on the women.

Law and finances are not what you 'think'. No wonder everyone is poor and require lawyers.

Matriarchy and the Churches

Pook · 27 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Someone emailed this to me:

I adore Christianity; it is a core part of who and what I am. I don't go to church anymore. The reason? I do not feel welcome or wanted and that is completely because I am male.

Yes, yes, I know ... most of the leaders are men. So what? The dominant "alpha" man who leads hates lesser men as much, if not more, than the feminists. I get more than enough hate just living my day to day life: I do not want to go to church to get more.

I have no problem with any person wearing what they want to church: Show up in a bikini for all I care. I have no problem with everyone running around "helping" at the service: It makes for a good leg stretch. I have no problem with female pastors: One of the best ministers I have ever known happened to be a woman and a physician. I could go on and on and on and on a...

*Mother's day ... flowers for the women and a sermon on the greatness of the mother
Father's day ... a long lecture on the failings of all men*

THAT, that is a part of what upsets me. It is only a part.

The church as it now is upsets me. I do not feel welcome, wanted or cared for.

I've tried to explain this to my wife, mother and mother-in-law. They cannot understand it, or refuse to understand ... I'm not sure which.

There's a church in our area which is violently anti-female. Woman must walk behind her husband, not speak in

church, wear VERY conservative dress, wear a hat in church yada yada yada. I tried to get my wife to think how SHE would feel going there. She just said anyone trying to make me go there would find a shotgun up their nose. She couldn't get as far as the feeling. I doubt I'll ever get them to see the point ...

I think this emailer is asking more as to why his wife and mother-in-law don't SEE what is going on.

Consider financial independence. Most people think working for someone else and having your business defined by someone else is the way how life is. Most people never question it. If you were making a great income, why should you wonder about financial independence? But if you get fired, get heavily leveraged, then of course you begin to reconsider.

Consider Nice Guys. Most of us would have remained Nice Guys if it worked. When you kept slamming into the wall for being a Nice Guy, a light bulb eventually went off, "Hey, I need to do something different."

That is the only way how I can guess why your wife and mother-in-law don't see it. To them, it is all The Way. They haven't been stung so why care? Most people's historical perspective begins the day they were born. If they haven't seen anything different in the past, then they don't reconsider what is going on today.

As the husband, they also might not take what you say seriously. I've noticed most women don't believe men have anything worthwhile to say or think. This is why they paint us a bunch of 'horn dogs' or 'sloths' because they can't percieve anything differntly. You could be in a room thinking the secret of the universe but the woman will only think that the room needs to be cleaned and that YOU are wasting time.

Women also percieve God differently then men. To men, God is the pinnacle. God is the ultimate. God, to man, is the source of all wisdom, love, and everything else. But to women, God is just another man who'll work for them.

Plato's Warning About Writing

Pook · 28 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Our vision of history comes from past writings. But what about the time before writing was invented? And if writing was invented beforehand, could it have been possible for civilizations to ignore writing because they saw it as a vice?

Plato, one of the last who knew the pre-writing civilizations (and, hence, the Mill), wrote this in the end of *Phaedrus*. In the book, Socrates refers to a story that the Egyptian Thamus tell the god Theuth that writing, far from being a benefit, will plant forgetfulness in men's souls, that it will only seem to be wisdom and will tell men of things without really teaching them; they will thus seem to know much but in fact know nothing. They will have the conceit of wisdom, not genuine wisdom.

The response of civilizations after to this goes as follows: "Haha, Socrates was such a DORK!!! Plato was such a fuddy duddy! Writing was a proper invention the helped the world. It is like the fool who thinks computers will harm us, or the automobile will destroy us."

However tempting it is to think this way, Socrates was anything but a dork, and Plato was no fool. We're not talking about some nerd in history. This is PLATO, the guy who invented philosophy for us. So let us give him benifet of the doubt.

It is common to find people out there who have read a great deal of many books and believe this gives them the key to wisdom. Does it? And we know writers with many blogs where the template is always the same: Humanity is stupid, the blogger is super-intelligent, and the blog performs as an arena where our intellectual Columbus spews his 'revealing' comments.

"You, yourself, do this very thing, Mr. Pook."

Perhaps. But would others post a blog post like this? I'm trying to point out is that it is possible to read too much. Of all the books I have read, I wonder: would it have been more illuminating if I were fishing instead?

Most ancient literature was composed not by ink and parchment (or tablet) but rather through oral poetry and chants. Homer's Illiad and Odyssey was crafted from oral tradition, not writings. The Muhabarata, the great work of India, was also from oral tradition. So was the Finnish epic known as the Kaleva. Even the Old Testament probably originated from oral traditions.

As I'll explain in a future post (probably tomorrow), I do not believe in the word 'culture'. Culture, the word, was invented by Kant and hasn't obtained widespread use until after World War 2. "This is controversial. You are a radical Pook." All Pooks are radical. Some are just more radical than others!

It is known that Finland, Esthonia, and Lapland are a cultural island. Ethnically, they are related to the Hungarians and other Asian people (Siryenians, Votyaks, Cheremisians, etc.) They speak languages which belong to the Ugro-Finnish family whose languages are described as "agglutinative" and often characterized by vowel harmonization. This tradition has remained seperate from most of the world until fairly recently. Yet, the parrallels of the Kaleva and the Norse and Celtic mythologies are striking. There was no contact yet the transmission was oral.

But this would better put Plato's warning into perspective. Dieterlen's introduction to Marcel Griaule's Conversations with Ogotemmeli deals with Dogon education and with the personal experience of waiting sixteen years before the sage old men of the tribe decided to "open the door". Behold:

In African societies which have preserved their traditional organization the number of persons who are trained in this knowledge is quite considerable. This they call "deep knowledge" in contrast with "simple knowledge" which is regarded as "only a beginning in the understanding of beliefs and customs" that people who are not fully instructed in the cosmogony possess. There are various reasons for the silence that is generally observed on this subject.

Now, I could quote the full text, but the point can be easily made. In this African society in the year 1941, this tribe had a few elders who had the "deep knowledge". These Westerners had to wait over a decade before being entrusted of obtaining this "deep knowledge" which was transmitted orally. This "deep knowledge" is, of course, the astral plane, philosophy, great legends, and everything else... in other words, the Mill. Not only did this African society hold such traditions about keeping the knowledge of the Mill to the elders, almost every ancient society was like this. Even with the invention of writing, Christianity kept knowledge within its Latin clergy not because of aristocratic temptations but because this 'circle of elders transmitting knowledge orally' has been the standard of all ancient civilizations. Today, we have no familiarity with Greek and Latin which has cut us off from those traditions (these traditions of those Greeks were, of course, the Pythagorean, Orphic, and Neart East traditions).

Was Plato right about writing? I think he was, at least in making it impossible for us to understand the ancients and the traditions of all civilizations concerning the Mill. "The mind has lost its cutting ege, we hardly understand the Ancients," wrote Gregoire de Tours back in 600 A.D.

But the very error might be our reliance on writing itself. Writers are well aware that practically every plot possible has been told (plot as in matter of form such as 'revenge plot' ad nauseum). But there is one interesting difference I find in the ancient stories and politics to today's stories and politics. Today, we believe in the Linear. Much of politics is debated around what is progressive. Evolution is, itself, a type of linear mode of thinking. As for plot, one thing the ancients did not have was time travel. Today, we have no problem thinking Marty McFly can go back in time and change history. But to the ancients, they would be unable to comprehend that because, for them, there was no linear time line. There was only cycles, only a circle. Odysseus could not travel through time like Marty McFly, but he could visit the Land of the Dead as well as those other strange islands of the living.

Writing is linear. The sentence has its beginning and its end. But the oral transmission, while also linear, depends entirely on memory. The "deep knowledge", the Mill, is a pure structure of numbers bounded by times and rhythms... like music (as oral transmission, given through poetry, often became). Archaic thought is cosmological first and last and must be considered as a whole and not as a sum of parts whether it be astrology, forces, gods, numbers, planetary powers, Platonic Forms, Aristotelian Essences or Stoic Substances. The Mill cannot be analyzed in the usual sense. I can talk about seen objects but how to explain motions, change, and rhythm? Think of physics as that is seen primarily as numbers. How do you understand this ancient context of an irresistible circle of time if you consider time to be linear and think through writing?

Plato's warning about writing was that it destined us to think in linear terms for everything and broke off any possibility of tapping into that ancient knowledge. "So what, Pook? We are better today than yesterday. We are healthier, have better technology, and live better in every way."

True. But Mankind's high state of living comes that we have more minds living today. With six billion alive, we can focus on the most specialized tasks. This was impossible when Mankind numbered four million, lived in ditches, and hunted rabbits. The Mill gave us Plato, gave us Science, gave us the Humanities, and may arguably have given us the religions.

How can universities, full of bookworms, be able to piece together wisdom that was transmitted orally? How can a linear mind grasp the ancient cyclical mind?

These are good questions (with no clear answers). It is a far cry from the conclusion we began with of Socrates being a fuddy duddy about new techniques. It shows that the Mill must be not be read but heard.

Bachelorism: An Epidemic?

Pook · 28 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



I am tired of online ads for these matching services. Usually, it is a woman lying down almost nude with a huge command of "MATE" on the picture.

So how do these online matching services get the females? Do they have men showing their chest with a huge command on it of "MATE"? No, they get this *instead*.

Apparently, Bachelorism is a *disease*.


The world's number one dating and relationship company, Match.com, is taking a stand against bachelorism, a disturbing epidemic that affects more than 41 million men nationwide(1). Match.com has thrown its support behind a new campaign, <http://www.bachelorism.org>, to raise awareness for the causes and cure for this devastating syndrome.

Single men are painted as babies that must be 'rescued' from oblivion. This is how many bachelors are seen... as losers simply because they don't have some girl. What intrigues me is what if someone did the same for single females? What if someone made an ad campaign that made single women to be hysterical and unrational but only a man could 'save' them from self-destruction? Do you think that would go over well?

Since no one else will do it, here, at Pook's Mill, I'll come up with an ad campaign similiar to bachelorism. This could be fun...

Friday Cat Blogging!!!

Pook · 29 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



You missed it! Yesterday was apparently 'Friday Cat Blogging Day'.

"Oh no, Pook!"

Yes, OH NOES!!! I know you're thinking, "Gosh darn, how dare I miss the Friday Cat Blogging Day on Feminist Sites. What could have come over me?"

Fear not, for I have applied my Pookish talent to acquire some links just for you. Yes, I'm not making this up. On Friday, it is apparently tradition for feminists to post pictures of their cats.

Why?

I haven't the slightest clue.

One example of a previous Cat Blogging Day.

Here is another one with bad poetry mixed in.

Another example.

And yet another example.

This woman posts pictures of all **FOUR** of her cats...

And this woman has **MOVIES** of her cats.

If you look around feminist blogs, you'll usually find that they, the feminist, hold themselves Master of Everything Art, Poetry, and Music and consider themselves Expert of Culture. There you will find bad poetry, poor art, and the crucifying of Shakespeare (link above is named 'Shakespeare's Sister!'). They are so vulnerable on the Humanities front.

Anyway, while most normal people were out having fun, these feminists took pictures of their cats and posted them on their blogs. Next trend I suspect will be Cat Pageants.

Spinsterhood: The LOUD Epidemic

Pook · 29 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Millions of women are suffering and thousands come to us looking for a cure. Single men, the cure is you. Won't you please help them before it's too late?

Symptoms of Spinsterhood

Single women frequently display the first symptoms of spinsterhood within a day or two of experiencing the end of a relationship or simply from spending too much time without a significant other. They include, but are not limited to:

- * Declarations of "strong woman" appear immediately
- * Celebrity/movie/horse infatuation
- * Consumption of *special* coffee more than one time a day
- * Constant sneer on her face
- * Generally unmodest appearance

Spinsterhood is not limited to just the average Jane. More information about this affliction can be found in Pook's Mill's advertisement on the Internet. Unlike stupid magazines, this advertisement is available today!



Risk of Infection

If warning signs are detected early enough, spinsterhood can be prevented before it spreads to other unsuspecting females. Women in relationships should not engage in any activities that might increase their risk. This includes:

- * Attempting to control their boyfriend through sex and praise
- * Not letting their man do his important masculine hobbies
- * Generally acting like a bitch

Any of these or other more minor actions may cause the relationship to deteriorate and can eventually lead to spinsterhood.



Finding a Cure for Spinsterhood

Gentlemen, this cannot continue! The greater spinsterhood spreads, the louder and more shrill women become. Think of civilization's ears! Spinsters tend to become hysterical and form political movements assaulting men. Their faces shrivel up with hate and begin to become deluded that men are nothing more than brutish beasts. You don't want your country to become infested with these spinsters, do you?

Don't let your nation enter a tax downfall! Those retirement programs need fuel to burn through the next few decades! Cure spinsterhood and have as many children as possible! Our governments need more tax revenue! What are you waiting for? Marry a spinster today!



Do It For the
Felines!

Frequent spinsterhood has become an increasingly troubling national problem afflicting millions of females and threatening the Government, the Arts, and even Society itself.

What's that you say? You don't WANT to marry these broads? You think they are too skanky, fat, and ugly for you!? Well then...

Therefore, I, being the stupendous Pook, Master of Everything Pookish, have decided that effective today, this blog will devote itself to helping others overcome this problem. Remember that the most frequent symptom of Spinsterhood is owning multiple cats. Don't forget that many poor cats are in jeopardy of being owned by those gleeting knotty-pated boar pigs! So the next time you find a spinster (such as a single mother with children from different men) having Machiavellian advances at you, and you find yourself revolting at her skankiness/fatness/ugliness, just come to this post. These wholesome images of cute little kitties will have you thinking pure thoughts at saving these cats from miserable lives if these women become spinsters and remind you of what's really at stake.

Remember, think of the kittens...





What should the Men's Movement do?

Pook · 30 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Disclaimer

Keep in mind that this is meant for the politically engaged and public part of the Men's Movement. When I mean 'Men's Movement', I am referring to the political motion, not the websites, blogs, message boards, and those things.

In politics, you must pick your battles. In other words, you pick the battles worth fighting over and don't waste time on unobtainable objectives.

The battles I think are worth fighting over (and winnable) for the Men's Movement are...

- Calling attention to and re-organizing the Family Law and its courts
- Make Paternity Testing mandatory for birth certificates and especially for child support.
- Have legislatures re-examine the laws concerning rape.
- Have legislatures re-examine the laws concerning sexual harassment.
- Have Congress amend and/or gut the Violence Against Women's Act.
- Fight for changing Divorce Law

This, already, will be an uphill battle. All of this is possible however. Paternity Testing is winnable because it is not that expensive to do DNA checks. It is very difficult to argue against paternity testing for child support to the mainstream populace (why should a man who isn't the father have to pay child support? Only a hateful feminist could support such an evil idea). Yes, I know they are using weird legal precedents currently. Expose it! Most of society just isn't aware of what is going on. It is the Men's Movement job to educate the vast population on these issues. Also, Paternity Testing can be argued for medical purposes. Having the father known allows a proper medical history for the child.

In order to change the current laws, attention must be called to them. It is doubtful the current legal system in place for Family Law would be abolished. However, it can be altered. A good example is the money for child support being looked at BOTH the father and mother's income rather than just the father's. Georgia and Australia both changed the child support to examine both parents' incomes much to the anger of feminists. Whenever the Men's Movement is successful, it ought to examine why so it can replicate the success later on.

Many of the legal battles can be fought under the banner of equality. Should men and women be treated equally

under the law? This makes sense but is rarely done (such as the divorce laws and even sexual harassment laws). Why should a woman walk away with a slap on her wrist when the same action could send a man to prison? And what protections do men have against self-interested women who throw rape and harassment charges knowing they are not true? These are all issues that will get politicians to consider.

When you contact your representative, handwrite your letter. Do not type it or email it. These representatives are sent tons of spam and mail from politically interested organizations. People say representatives do not listen to their constituents, but this is not true in America (at least). They do listen especially the letters that are handwritten.

And most important of all, the Men's Movement should educate, educate, and educate. Those who have been on the bad side of Family Law (those unfortunate divorced men whose lives got shattered), tell your stories. However, do not tell it with seething anger as no one will listen to that.

I know this is controversial in the Men's Movement, but I believe the only key to political victory is getting some women on board. Once women come on board, there is no stopping the movement. I am not talking about all or most women, only a few. Many women know what is going around and may be sympathetic enough to participate (if we give them the chance). It is important for the Men's Movement to keep the door open for women to come aboard if they wish. Politically, this will make the Men's Movement impossible to be pegged as "angry male losers" if a few women are strategically placed as spokesmen.

Another big thing that could be pushed is teaching fertility in the already present government sex-ed classes in schools. While fertility is not much of an issue for men, it is extremely important for females. Women need to be taught that the height of their fertility is from 18-25 and goes downhill from there. The Government will be supportive of this idea since all Western Governments want to increase the fertility rate. Feminists will hate it because once women become educated about their fertility, they will most likely not pursue a career.

So what should the Men's Movement NOT do?

Obviously, the Men's Movement should not fight the wrong battles. These are battles that aren't related to the movement and/or have a high probability of never occurring. When the first Congress was debating the Declaration of Independence, irrelevant topics appeared such as the issues of slavery and off shore fishing rights. The only battle was Independence. The political issue of slavery was too divisive even back then. The political issue of off shore fishing rights was too irrelevant. I've seen such issues appear in the Men's Movement which need to be dropped ASAP:

-Libertarianism (Libertarianism is fine and good, but what point is there for the Men's Movement to fight this battle when Libertarian groups already exist?)

-Medical Marijuana (What does this have to do with the Men's Movement?)

-Anything dealing with gays (While homosexuals fall under the Family Law, fighting the Gay Movement as well as removing these penalizing anti-men laws is not prudent. Pick your battles. Fighting the Gay Movement isn't going to bring the Men's Movement closer to reforming divorce and family law.)

-Kicking Women (Rampant "woman bashing" not only insures that no women will join but that many men will be turned away by such negativity even when justified. Think tactics. If the Men's Movement is interested in success, it will have to refrain from being perceived as 'kicking' all women [for substitute, kick the feminists.]

-Giving up on young men (We all were brainwashed once. Going around and calling any male who doesn't

immediately agree with you names is not going to influence them. With all the young males born to single females, thinking they are 'dead' and giving up on them would also be a mistake. In fact, the Men's Movement could serve as a guidance for these young males who never had a real father.)

-Trying to get women to change their behavior and their attitude (This is pointless and a waste of time. Focus on the laws, not the women as it is the laws that put us in jail. You can avoid the women and their attitudes for the most part. But you cannot avoid the law. We do not want women to love us, we only want women to be unable to hang us.)

-Be filled with hostility and rage (Rage never inspires anyone to join a movement. Others like you may agree, but that vast mainstream will just conclude you are an angry loon. Optimism and explanations of how things would be better with our proposed changes will persuade people. Anger and thinking the world is going to end will not.)


Women and their behavior/attitude should not be the focus of the Men's Movement. Rather, the focus should be on reforming the law. Politically and in the open, attack the law, but going after the women (who have used these laws to their advantage) is going to push away the politicians and mainstream we need to persuade.

A man is not entitled to love and good responses from women. But a man ought to be entitled to be immune to a woman having the legal power to destroy his life when innocent of no crime.

I believe the probability for victory vastly increases if the Men's Movement focuses on smaller battlefields rather than large, epic ones. Men's lives would improve considerably if divorce, family courts, and child support were reformed. Make that the first target and save the other issues for another day.

Status on the Emails

Pook · 30 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



If you haven't recieved a reply from me, don't worry. I probably haven't got to your email yet.

"Why does it take you so long, Pook!?"

First, there are many emails. Second, many require a detailed response (think of a page or two). I get questions ranging to asking about girls to the rise and fall of civilizations.

"But you update the blog without replying to my email yet!?"

This is because a blog post is easy and is seen by a hundreds. But an email and its response is seen by one and very personal (making it extremely difficult at times).

Don't worry. You WILL get a reply back. It'll be days later, but you'll get a reply!

Has Feminism Always Been Around?

Pook · 30 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



An emailer asks a series of very important questions:

You heavily concentrate on feminism as the root of the problem, but weren't men like this before feminism? I have a hard time believing the way I naturally am (AFC) is because of the cultural influence of feminism. It seems like i'm just "hardwired" to be completely clueless and inept regarding females. It seems more like i've been playing a predestined role in society, just like an ant would, but luckily I have a higher consciousness that has allowed me to escape AFCism. Don't we see over and over again in pre-feminist literature, the story of the AFC that secretly loves a prize woman and never professes his affection, while she is attracted to the alpha-male character who isn't deserving of her?

Haven't men always been like this for thousands and thousand of years? What about the concept of chivalry that originated from ancient germanic tribes who paid great reverence to women and their chastity in pre-christian times?

When I refer to 'feminization' or to 'Matriarchy', I do it for reasons of simplicity. Everyone knows what I mean if I say 'feminization of society'. I don't believe Feminism is the mother of all evils. It is a tentacle attached to some other beast entirely (though I'm not sure what this creature is).

Chivalry was an aristocratic notion from the Middle Ages that has long since died out. Today, women demand chivalry without a clue of the origins of the word and what it means. When woman demand chivalry, they are actually demanding noble status. This is why chivalry must be opposed because it percieves one sex for being "noble" while another sex to be "peasant".

I tell women, "Chivalry only existed because of courtly love." Women DESPISE courtly love today. Also, back then there was actually stigma and restraints on woman's behavior. Today, before a date with you a woman could be giving a BJ to a guy at Jack-In-The-Box. This is why they do not deserve 'chivalry' anymore.

And you bring up an excellent point with the pre-feminist literature. Dicken's "Great Expectations" is a guy who is practically living his life to obtain some girl (and even then people despised Dicken's original and more accurate ending). Jane Austen novels also show the jerk and nice guy issues as well. It is safe to say that males have always

struggled to become men.

But there are two definite changes: one soulful and the other economic that ushered in feminization of society.

Castration of the Soul Allowing Feminization

Today, there is much talk about people being more 'tolerant' and 'getting along' with each other. With all these religions and ethnicities mixed together, only a century or two ago those differences would have us at each others' throats in war. People back then, at least the non-peasants, actually had a soul. They would be willing to fight for something. Today, people have no fight in them. The typical 'Day of Culture' shows where some ethnicity has a carnival to show off their food and clothing. This is a joke because these things tell us nothing about their beliefs. Food and clothing do not make cultures, beliefs do. The wars between men have been a difference of the idea of Good and Evil, not these superficial differences of appearances or foods.

Why do Democracies never war with one another except with dictators (and terrorists)? The answer is because of different ideas of good and evil. Peace as defined to a Democracy is very different than peace defined as a dictator. Peace to a dictator is "no resistance" and "absolute rule". This is why war breaks out between dictators, democracies, terrorists, and communists. All have different definitions of what peace is. It is the height of stupidity for people to claim that war breaks out because of superficial differences between clothing and food.

Look at today's politicians versus those of fifty years ago. Notice how politicians even used to be passionate and manly? Today's politicians seem like wimps looking for approval from everyone. With the collapse of the Humanities, there is now no longer a cultivation of the soul. We have all become the castrati. This allowed a vacuum which feminists could largely expand in.

Economic Origins of Feminism

There is one undeniable great change in history: the Industrial Revolution. Before the Industrial Revolution, most people lived and died on their farms. Even the shopkeepers managed their own businesses. What I found shocking was that before the Industrial Revolution, everyone had a sense of business and had more financial sense than we do today (after the Industrial Revolution, we were all taught to work for someone else).

The home was vastly changed with the Industrial Revolution. Before, the home was the farm or the shop. Everyone produced: the husband, the wife, and the children. No one was expected to become idle. The family could see how hard the father worked since he was right there. Afterward, the father went to the factory and wealth built within the nation so children and wife didn't have to work. No one knew or cared what the father did. He simply brought home the money.

The home went from a producing area into a consumption area. Advertisers and merchants pounced on this opportunity. It became that the husband would make money which the wife would spend.

It is in Human Nature to want to matter, we have urges to produce as a life of consumption gets old. Before, women would manage and work the farm. Now, they honestly had little to nothing to do. (Some women love being nothing which Vilar warns to avoid.) So after the 1950s, the Home buckled to the economic pressure. Women sought careers to fulfill their 'production' urge.

So we end up with two types of Matriarchs. One is the woman who wants to stay home to do and become nothing. Her mind will rot. Her talk will become more dull. Her idea is the husband works while she puts her feet up (as housework is done now in seconds). The other is the woman who is ambitious for a grand career because she

doesn't want to become 'nothing' (but most of the time it is youthful narcissism propelling her).

We are currently in the midst of a third great economic revolution (the first is agriculture and second is industrial). This is the Internet or digital revolution. With this revolution I'm noticing that the clock is being turned back to the way things were. It is no coincidence that the Men's Movement was born with the Net savvy men but the second wave Feminist movement was born in the industrial age universities.

The ultimate solution may be having women working at a home based business. This wave of people seeking financial freedom and independence will soon change the home from being an area of consumption to an area of production once again.

I think that is a key to preventing a woman to become feminist is have her producing by her own designs (rather than some 'job'). One happy marriage I know is that the wife makes pottery at home and sells it. Simple, and it does provide some extra money for the household. I have also noticed that women who work (at a real job, not a job where they can paint their nails) resist the brainwashing of feminists.

With the Industrial Revolution, women began to define being a 'woman' as not working. As Vilar points out, in woman's eyes the definition of a man is someone who works while the definition of a woman is someone who DOES NOT work.

There is a natural desire in people to want to be producers, to be merchants of a sort. When women were left idle, they began to use love in a bourgeois fashion. Today, Western Women believe their love, beauty, and presence is 'produced' by them and sold. Virginity, to them, is now seen in a bourgeois mindset that is increasing their market value. The only reason a woman does not become a slut today is because it would decrease their market value. Women see love entirely in a business sense (which is why men must think of marriage and relationships as a business transaction today).

Western Women's financial education seems to be little more than either a career or to manipulate a wealthy man to provide for them. If women were educated in the financial freedom sense, they might realize that they could become producers at home and create their own industry (as opposed to the career or prostitute type lifestyle).

Keep in mind that Woman's Industry, of sewing things, painting little things, and so on was absolutely destroyed by the Industrial Revolution (now we buy those things in the store). A vacuum was created. So now women either chase careers or believe they are producers of love selling at the highest giving price. Once this vacuum is filled again with a proper woman's industry (some digital incarnation of the old sewing and such), I think we'll see a restoration towards what was the old producing home and an utter collapse of modern feminism.

This explains why foreign women become corrupted in America. They begin to think of love through a bourgeois mindset. This means rationing sex and always looking for the 'bigger, better, deal'. If woman's bourgeois urges were set to a real industry (like in the old days of farming and sewing), they would not and could not apply it to love.

Sunday Reading: Voice of the Neuter

Pook · 30 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



I have decided I am no longer going to post anything significant on this blog on Sunday. Sunday will become a day of rest for me. So, instead, I will link to someone else's excellent essay and say, "Here is your Sunday reading!"

For this week: [The Voice of the Neuter](#)

Quote:

Above all, it is a sexless voice. Not, I hasten to add, a "gay" voice. Not that at all. It is neither that gentle nor that musical. Nor is it that old shabby lisping stereotype best consigned to the dustbin of popular culture. No, this is a new old voice of a generation of ostensible men and women who have been educated and acculturated out of, or say rather, to the far side of any gender at all. It is, as I have indicated above, the voice of the neutered. And in this I mean that of the transitive verb: To castrate or spay. The voice and the kids that carry it is the triumphant achievement of our halls of secondary and higher education. These children did not speak this way naturally, they were taught. And like good children seeking only to please their teachers and then their employers, they learned.

This is not to say that the new American **Castrati** of all genders live sexless lives. On the contrary, if reports are to be credited, they seem to have a good deal of sex, most often without the burden of love or the threat of children, and in this they are condemned to the sex life of children.

The Richard II Disease

Pook · 31 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



There is something I call the "Richard II Disease". In Shakespeare's play, Richard II, the king (Richard II) was a weak man who, also, became a weak king. His throne was taken which began the War of the Roses (Shakespeare uses this play to begin a type of 'trilogy' with Henry IV Part I and Part II coming after and Henry V completing the full tale).

Richard II did not *grasp* poetry. Rather, it grasped him. Being so overawed by poetry, he was lost in it and, indeed, romanticized by it. In fact, practically everything overawed Richard II in the play. To him, he was 'over-awed' by the crown. Any king who remains 'over-awed' by his own throne is going to become a weak king.

This 'Richard II Disease' is exactly what creates the Nice Guy or rather the "Sappy Guy". Not understanding women or having any experience with them, Nice Guys become "overawed" by the females. They find females "majestic" and a spectacular "wonder". This is nonsense. Only children would find such wonder as they are new to this world. This is why Nice Guys are seen as incredibly weak by women and men. And this is why Nice Guys are still seen as "children" even if they have grown male bodies.

The 'Richard II Disease' is probably the chief culprit afflicting Christianity and the force behind this so-called "feminization" of religion. Real men look at religion with attempts to understand and rationalize it. The Richard IIs look at religion with only one purpose: to be overawed by it. So the focus becomes on a fantastical display of flowery language, a potpourri of feelings, and a bouquet of feminine contexts. Christianity used to be presented as "The Truth" which, today, it no longer does and keeps attempting to rely on 'awe' (but awe of Truth and the awe of Richard II is very different)

Can we be 'over-awed' on other things and create a type of 'unhealthy Nice Guy addiction'? Certainly! The intense feelings of sex can over-awe people and have people literally worshipping copulation itself (and lose total control of themselves to it). Likewise, the intense feelings of alcohol, drugs, and even food also can 'over-awe' people and keep them addicted to this 'awed' state.

My favorite example is ancient artifacts. People know the Stonehenge is great, but there is little reason as to why. The same goes with the Pyramids. Completely over-awed by them, many people insist that space aliens came and made them (!).

The worst culprit is the modern notion of "love". Love is seen as something you submit to, something to "over-awe" you. This definition of "love" keeps the Nice Guy in a state of continued cycle no matter how many times he gets burned. Does this mean one cannot be 'awed' by a woman? You fall in and out of awe over the course of any long relationship. But you certainly don't 'submit' to this awe. Nice Guys see themselves as Romantics. Vain women see the Nice Guy as submitting to their WONDERFUL selves (which every woman thinks herself wonderful). The truth is in the middle. Nice Guys are submitting to their misplaced awe (usually placed upon some hard to obtain woman).

Don't let feelings of awe have you lose control of yourself. And certainly, never submit to it.

E3 is dead

Pook · 31 July 2006 · Archived copy · Original



It's over.

Return of the Big N?

Pook · 25 August 2006 · Archived copy · Original



In 2003, it was common to hear this:

Nintendo's weakness doesn't just lie on the console front. Sony's announcement of the PSP sent the company's stock tumbling as investors saw it as a major threat to the successful Game Boy line. The Game Boy has seen its fair share of competition from other companies vying for a slice of the portable market, but not from Sony. The Playstation has ruled the console market for two solid generations and its first handheld product could do the same for the portable market.

The company's flaccid attitude towards the PSP is a bit alarming and disconcerting. Nintendo president Satoru Iwata has said that the PSP will not have a big impact on their business. The public might be subject to believe him, except that this is far from the truth. The Game Boy Advance is the large reason for the company's \$95 million net profit in April to June. With its uncertainty of success in the home console market, Nintendo has shown no plan of attack against the PSP other than a new game product announcement that may or may not be a successor to the GBA. What's more alarming is that the new product is described as "unique and surprising". If it's as unique and surprising as the Pac-Man for GameCube demonstrated at E3, count consumers out.

While it's understandable that Nintendo can't divulge important details of a new GBA for strategic reasons, the company is no longer in the position to be the stubborn playmaker it once was. If it can't control market conditions, it has to react to them. The nonchalant attitude and vague company outlook only raises more doubt to the company's brand, image, and sales.

How times have changed. Apple is now recalling all of their laptops that use Sony batteries along with Dell (ouch!). Investors are literally holding their breath since Sony is betting their company on the PS3 due out in a couple of months. Sony's stock is slowly being hit.

But what of Nintendo's? Remember the movie of Terminator 2 how the evil terminator, when shattered, took a long time for the first drops of liquid to cling back together? No one knew the figure was re-appearing until all the liquid was together and the machine fast reappeared to its previous formidable strength.

Imagine a shattered Nintendo, throughout the past few years, its droplets were slowly forming together and no one noticed. Now, the entire beast is reappearing before the industry's eyes:

August 23rd - Yahoo Finance

The link has expired but I've copied it here:

Quote:

Nintendo's Run Not Over Yet

Wednesday August 23, 8:48 am ET

Steven Towns submits: Nintendo's ADRs have gained 83% in the past 52-weeks as its ordinary shares have gained 96% -- a difference in the yen/usd exchange; no real arbitrage opportunity here at this point. **FISCO news of Japan reports the Daiwa Institute of Research sees even more potential upside between approximately 10% to 33% ahead of its new game console launch this November. And don't forget the impact of foreign exchange profits!**

Nintendo's ordinary shares closed today up 0.85% at 22,470 yen (ADR equivalent of \$24.28). Its ADRs closed yesterday at \$23.95 -- remember they are traded as pink sheets at a 1:0.125 ratio.

Daiwa said that the more information Nintendo makes available about its Wii console launch the higher its share price could go as anticipation builds. Based on the launches of previous consoles, Daiwa sees Nintendo's ordinary shares theoretically trading up to between 25,000 (\$27 ADR equiv.) and 30,000 yen (\$32.40 ADR equiv.). The first amount is based on the Nintendo 64 launch and the second is based on the Super Nintendo...

July 25th - Bloomberg

Quote:

Nintendo Shares Gain as Rising DS Sales Boost Profit

July 25 (Bloomberg) -- **Shares of Nintendo Co., the world's biggest maker of handheld video game players, climbed to a 4 1/2- year high after the company raised its forecast for earnings as sales of the touch-screen DS device jumped.**

The stock jumped 5.6 percent to 22,000 yen as of 1:04 p.m. on the Osaka Securities Exchange, its highest since Jan. 21, 2002. Net income will probably be 83 billion yen in the year started April 1, the Kyoto-based company said yesterday, raising its forecast from 65 billion yen.

Nintendo raised its outlook for sales of DS hardware and software as "New Super Mario Bros" became the top-selling U.S. title in June and "Brain Age" took the No. 3 spot. The company will be able to introduce more innovative games in the fourth quarter, when it releases the Wii home console that features a motion-sensitive controller.

"Nintendo DS sales are strong in Japan and Europe and have turned up in the U.S. market, which had been a cause for concern," Atsuko Kaneko, an analyst at UBS Securities Japan Ltd., wrote in a report dated yesterday. "The upswing in DS sales in the U.S. could also be a positive for sales of the Wii, which features a unique input device." She rates the shares "buy."...

July 6th - Yahoo Asia News from Reuters

Quote:

TOKYO, July 6 (Reuters) - The following stocks are on the move on Thursday:

****NINTENDO AT HIGHEST SINCE 2002, CS UPS TARGET****

Nintendo Co. Ltd. rises 5.8 percent to 20,760 yen after rising as high as 21,000 yen, its highest since March 2002.

Credit Suisse in a report on Wednesday raised its target price for the stock to 19,000 yen from 18,000 yen while maintaining its "neutral" rating.

Credit Suisse said it now expects the company to post a 36.7 percent rise in consolidated operating profit in the year to March to 123.5 billion yen (\$1.07 billion), up from its previous estimate of 116.3 billion yen in profit.

The upward revision reflected an assumed weaker yen and continued strong sales in Japan of Nintendo DS hardware and software, Credit Suisse analyst Jay Defibaugh said...

May 15th - Yahoo Asia News from Reuters

Quote:

TOKYO, May 15 (Reuters) - The following stocks are on the move on Monday:

****NINTENDO AT 4-YEAR HIGH ON Wii EXPECTATIONS****

Nintendo Co. Ltd. rises 6.2 percent to 19,710 yen after earlier climbing to as high as 19,890 yen, the highest level since April 2002.

The stock has gained since last Tuesday when the company said its next-generation video game console, Wii, will be available in the fourth quarter.

The console stole the spotlight at last week's Electronic Entertainment Expo (E3) show in the United States from Sony Corp.'s PlayStation 3, raising expectations for profit growth at Nintendo.

Shares of Sony are down 2.1 percent at 5,220 yen...

Planned Parenthood Exposed

Pook · 25 August 2006 · Archived copy · Original

On the Cause and Origins of Political Perversion

Pook · 27 August 2006 · Archived copy · Original



In museums, one can see the remains of barbarian type people. These ancient barbarians believed that the Human Form can be molded by Human tools consisting of rings, hooks, and cords. One said: "This child will never smell the perfume of a peace-pipe unless I stretch his nostrils." Another said: "He will never be able to hear unless I draw his ear-lobes down to his shoulders." A third said: "He will never see the sunshine unless I slant his eyes." Another said: "He will never stand upright unless I bend his legs." A fifth said: "He will never learn to think unless I flatten his skull."

In stunned horror, we look at these artifacts and this sad condition of Human conceit and stupidity as to believe the Human Form was not natural and had to be improved or progressed using crude tools.

Today, there is another type of perversion, a type of abstract barbarism manifesting itself into a type of Neo-Barbarism. Those ancient barbarians did not believe the Human Form was natural. Today's neo-barbarians do not believe the Social Form is natural. Like their predecessors, the neo-barbarians, these politicians who desire to rule over others, utilize tools to progress and uplift the Social Form. Instead of rings, hooks, cords, and pincers of their predecessors, they use tariffs, regulations, government schools, taxation, restrictions, and a host of pious moralizations.

These people see society as clay, and they seem themselves as the potters. Or, in another fashion, they see society as a garden and they are the gardeners. Just as a gardener has his tools of scissors, rakes, knives, so too do politicians see the law, taxes, regulations as a way to 'shape' and 'mold' society.

This must be said: there are too many "great" men in the world- legislators, organizers, do-gooders, leaders of the people, fathers of nations, and so on, and so on. Too many persons place themselves above mankind; they make a career of organizing it, patronizing it, and ruling it. They look upon people as Vancauson looked upon his automaton.

Let me use a historical example of Georgia (of all things!) to illustrate this issue. The following has been taken from the book called: "The Mainspring of Human Progress"

The early story of Georgia is the story of just one man. He was James Edward Oglethorpe, a most fascinating,,

intriguing, imaginative, and lovable personality. Indeed, it would put a strain on the thesaurus to find adjectives that would do him full justice. He was handsome, curly-haired, fastidiously clad, dashing, gallant, debonair, born to the aristocracy, a man of wealth, a fearless and distinguished soldier, an able strategist- and along with all this he was the most unselfish, generous, and noble-minded person to play an important role in colonizing America.

[skipping sections to get to the heart of the matter. The author continues how 'great' Oglethorpe was.]

A man of great energy and action, Oglethorpe worked day and night- making speeches, writing letters, and publishing tracts at his own expense. He also found time to keep himself posted on colonial affairs and was quite disturbed at the slipshod way in which the colonies were being run.

England's foothold on the American continent was none too secure. Unfriendly Spain was strongly entrenched to the south, and the Frnch were to the west and north. In order for England to hold her own against encroachment, there had to be a better coordination of defensive strategy.

Ingenious Plan

It was Oglethorpe's interest in this latter problem which led to a most ingenious and appealing plan- a plan that would not only provide broad opportunities for social reform, but would greatly strengthen the Empire from a military and economic standpoint. His comprehensive proposal added up about as follows:

1. It was not only unjust, but it was also economically wasteful to keep people in prison for small debts. Why not set them up in the New World and at the same time provide a haven for the oppressed Protestants of Europe?
2. There was a vast area of desirable land lying between the Altamaha and Savannah rivers, south of the Carolinas and north of Spanish Florida.
3. Its latitudinal position corresponded to that of China, Persia, Palestine, and the Madeiras, upon whom England was dependent for such important products as silk, hemp, wine, olive oil, spices, and drugs.
4. With proper supervision, such things could doubtlessly be produced in the proposed new colony, thus making England independent of foreign sources.
5. By concentrating on such products, the new colony would not in any way conflict with the activities of other colonies.
6. From a military standpoint, it would serve as a buffer between the Carolinas and Spanish Florida. To insure a strong army, special concessions would be made to soldiers- only able-bodied fighting men would be permitted to own land.
7. In the interest of the common good, everything would be beneficently administered under a well-balanced plan. This would not only provide for the necessities of military regimentation, but it would also eliminate the disorders, maladjustments, and wastes of competition.
8. The social aspects would also be carefully supervised. Slaves, rum, and Roman Catholics would be strictly prohibited.
9. The new colony would be named for King George II; and it would be an honor and a credit to him- something to which he could point with pride as an example worthy of emulation by all the other colonies.

10. First, last, and always, Georgia would be a strictly eleemosynary proposition. To avoid dissension and to insure adherence to the high objectives, no one would be allowed to vote. Oglethorpe would look after everything personally, and his motto would be 'Non Sibi, Sed Aliis'- Not for Self, but for Others.

Without Argument

This comprehensive proposal was accepted without argument. Not only was the charter granted, but also the English government departed from its usual policy and made a cash contribution of 10,000 pounds to help get things started. Oglethorpe put up some of his own money; and overwhelmed by his logic and persuasiveness, benevolent societies and right-thinking citizens made liberal donations.

With his carefully selected band of settlers, Oglethorpe came to the New World and founded the city of Savannah in the year 1733. From a military standpoint, the project was a success. With a handful of well-trained troops, Oglethorpe not only licked the invading Spaniards, but also took advantage of the opportunity to extend the border of Georgia considerably southward.

You can read about it in the history books, and it's a most thrilling story. But as I said before, the historians are inclined to stress the war aspects and overlook the lessons that might be learned as bearing on the problems of peace and progress.

Reasons for Failure

In spite of his self-sacrifice and high motives, Oglethorpe's venture was a miserable failure from an economic and sociological standpoint. He failed to recognize that military regimentation always works at cross-purposes to creative profess- that human initiative doesn't operate according to the pattern of a beehive. And incidentally, he overlooked the fact that variations in climate and soil are not wholly dependent on latitude; that regardless of the needs of man-made empires, the Almighty never intended that Georgia should be a substitute for the Orient.

During 20 years of futile effort, the population never exceeded 6,000, and when it dwindled back down to around 500, Oglethorpe gave up in despair and returned to England.

A few years later, all the bans and prohibitions were lifted. The pendulum swung the other way. Things were thrown wide open. "Refugees" who had fled to the Carolinas came back and brought their friends with them, and there was an influx of new blood from Virginia- including the Cavalier Talbots. The last of the 13 colonies grew by leaps and bounds; and by the end of the century, its population had passed the 160,000 mark.

Oglethorpe's effort to set up a Utopia was one of the more extreme attempts at regimentation; but it is typical, in many respects, of the type of thing that laid the groundwork for the [American] revolution that was to come.

One mystery has baffled observers of politics: why do many politicians, including those in the media, literally FAWN over dictators like Castro, find interest in butchers like Stalin, and even secretly "respect" demi-devils like Hitler? The answer is that these people (politicians and media) believe they ought to be in power to reshape and mold society as a potter does his clay. They admire these thugs because they admire power and the ability to shape. They will say, "Look at the wonders this person has done for their society!" as if the thug had uplifted their nation single handedly. These people ignore the killings this 'leader' does and how people are fleeing the nation in the first place (such as people fleeing Cuba rather than everyone fighting to get into Castro's supposed 'utopia').

If the reader has the patience to grant me one more example, I shall make it worthwhile. Frederic Bastiat, trapped in 19th century France, grew tired of the constant revolutions his country kept entering. In a desperate attempt to

change the minds of his countrymen on their path to the next revolution, he wrote in his infamous essay on "The State" that...

And it is this great chimera which the French nation, for example, placed in 1848, for the edification of the people, as a frontispiece to its Constitution. The following is the beginning of the preamble to this Constitution: -

"France has constituted itself a republic for the purpose of raising all the citizens to an ever-increasing degree of morality, enlightenment, and well-being."

Thus it is France, or an abstraction, which is to raise the French to morality, well-being, &c. Is it not by yielding to this strange delusion that we are led to expect everything from an energy not our own? Is it not giving out that there is, independently of the French, a virtuous, enlightened, and rich being, who can and will bestow upon them its benefits? Is not this supposing, and certainly very gratuitously, that there are between France and the French - between the simple, abridged, and abstract denomination of all the individualities, and these individualities themselves - relations as of father to son, tutor to his pupil, professor to his scholar? I know it is often said, metaphorically, "the country is a tender mother." But to show the inanity of such a constitutional proposition, it is only needed to show that it may be reversed, not only without inconvenience, but even with advantage. Would it be less exact to say:

"The French have constituted themselves a Republic to raise France to an ever-increasing degree of morality, enlightenment, and well being."

Now, where is the value of an axiom where the subject and the attribute could change places without inconvenience? Everybody understands what is meant by this: "The mother will feed the child." But it would be ridiculous to say, "The child will feed the mother."

The Americans formed another idea of the relations of the citizens with the Government when they placed these simple words at the head of their constitution: -

"We, the people of the United States, for the purpose of forming a more perfect union, of establishing justice, of securing interior tranquillity, of providing for our common defense, of increasing the general well-being, and of securing the benefits of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity, decree," &c.

Here there is no chimerical creation, no abstraction, from which the citizens may demand everything. They expect nothing except from themselves and their own energy.

If I may be permitted to criticise the first words of the French Constitution of 1848, I would remark, that what I complain of is something more than a mere metaphysical subtlety, as might seem at first sight.

I contend that this personification of Government has been, in past times, and will be hereafter, a fertile source of calamities and revolutions.

Bastiat's complaint is that French Consitution was constructed as the source, the fountainhead, for all society. He points out that the Americans did not construct their government that way. As we know through history, French would have considerable more political upheaval (which probably continues still to this day) while the American political system still remains stable.

The first lines of Thomas Paine's essay, Common Sense, is: "Some people have so confused government and society as to think they are the same, but they are different and have different origins..." and his essay explores those differences. It is that essay that established the mindset of the American Revolution that the colonists could snap the political connections to England since they no longer saw society and politics (i.e. law) as one of the same.



Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence:

WHEN, in the Course of human Events, it becomes necessary for one People to dissolve the Political Bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the Powers of the Earth, the separate and equal Station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's GOD entitle them...

Jefferson and the signers certainly did not think the Law and Society were the same. Further down in the declaration, we read this:

NOR have we been wanting in Attentions to our British Brethren. We have warned them, from Time to Time, of Attempts by their Legislature to extend an unwarrantable Jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the Circumstances of our Emigration and Settlement here. We have appealed to their native Justice and Magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the Ties of our common Kindred to disavow these Usurpations, which would inevitably interrupt our Connexions and Correspondence. They too have been deaf to the Voice of Justice and of Consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the Necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the Rest of Mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.

Again, we find Jefferson referring to the difference of law and society. In the above paragraph, the Declaration is referring to the British people as friends in society, but due to current legal conflict, at war.

When the U.S. Constitution was crafted, the emphasis was a Rule of Law as opposed to a Rule of One (Monarchy), Rule of Few (Oligarchy), or Rule of Many (Democracy). Madison and the rest placed the federal government into three branches within a series of checks and balances. The Law, the Constitution, would rule over those three branches.

What I am trying to point out is that the craftsmen of the U.S. Constitution did use Law as a tool, as a source of punishment and regulation, but instead of aiming it at society, they aimed it at the government itself. Hence, the Constitution permitted only the things the government could do (such as it could print money, it could do this, it could do that). The Anti-Federalists thought this wasn't enough and more checks needed to be put on the federal government. So the Bill of Rights was created. While the Constitution said what the government could do, the Bill of Rights expressed what the government could never do. And to show how much the American founders believed in society, in the Social Form of Mankind, the tenth amendment gave any other powers to the states and the rest allowed the Constitution to be amended by the people in the future (should the founders be wrong in checking the powers of government).

It is no mistake that the amendments in the Bill of Rights begin with, "There shall be no law..." No law means no law! When it comes to the First Amendment, "There shall be no law on the abridgement of the freedom of speech, of religion, etcetera..." the amendment is giving a commandment to the government. The Bill of Rights doesn't

apply to the citizenry. You do not have the freedom of speech on someone else's property. You do not have freedom of religion at, say, your parent's house. Your employer, your mother, can restrict your speech. Knowing that something like the Bill of Rights applies to the government and not to society is the first lesson of Constitutional Law.

While France got swallowed up with the philosophies of Rousseau and other 'classical political philosophers', France's revolutions delivered her only to the Reign of Terror and, then, to Napoleon. Germany was delivered to its wars and, finally, to Hitler. Europe's politicians tried to create a EU super-state, yet another quest for political utopia, but their goal was to use law to mold society rather than use law to fence in powermongers so society can mold itself (as the Americans had done). This is what I believe is the central political differences between the nineteenth century Old World and New World.

Some might ask, "What of slavery, Pook? What of other evil things written in law?" Bastiat remarked that, "The New World has two sorrowful inheritances: slavery and tariffs. Both will cause considerable strife and political undoing in the future." Bastiat was correct as the US fell into a Civil War with the issues of slavery and tariffs as major issues. (There are disciples of Bastiat today. A House Leader of the House of Representatives would keep Bastiat's book: "The Law" with him at all times. One economist has framed his entire career and sense of style and wit from Bastiat: his name is Walter Williams.)

The entire point of this massive post is to illustrate that Feminism is not new but old: it has the same skeleton and warped view of law that some "smart" person shall remold society in order to progress and uplift it. This is the reason why these sorts of people cheer and love judges applying the law to "progress" and "uplift" society. This is also why those same people would cheer the Supreme Court's ruling of *Kelo v. City of New London* in which a city council can declare eminent domain to seize a person's house if it is for development. After all, to these people, they believe a city council ought to "uplift" and "progress" a city by seizing people's houses. Most Americans passionately disagree (which is why a court had to pass it, as it wasn't done through the democratic process).

Feminism is the child of Rousseau type thinking. Who is a feminist? Anyone, male or female, who believes that the law will progress society for females. They believe that society is an artificial creation and that the laws passed have "uplifted" all society.

Think of the Constitutional Amendment that banned drinking. This, too, was passed by the so-called progressives who thought the amendment would "progress" society. All it did was create the Mafia and bootleggers. So another amendment was passed which canceled out the ban-on-drinking amendment.

When you debate feminists, do not say how men don't need them or anything. Rather, speak how the law, which has inflicted harm on the natural Social Form, has hurt society. They are under the impression that their feminist laws have progressed society. It is up to us to show the opposite. Once you create doubt in their minds that society is law, and that law, like a weapon, has wounded society, this is the seed that will grow to destroy Feminism politically.

Marriage has become that great fiction in which women endeavor to live off men. It has become an instrument of plunder with its divorce laws, child custody laws, and so on. Marriage is now a political institution in which people enter into. I say: "Abolish the marriage laws!" Rather than causing 'anarchy', it will do the opposite: it will cause the pendulum to swing the other way. By abolishing marriage laws, matrimony becomes a social institution rather than a political institution. Rather than being artificial, marriage becomes natural and within harmony to Nature's Social Form.

Women are not evil and American (or Western) women do not suck. Rather, it is women in America or in the West that is the problem. If you bring in a foreign woman to America, she can easily fall prey to the corruption the

marriage laws allows her. With such marriage laws, the wife can easily plunder and pillage her husband, steal his children, and move to another victim. By removing such laws, we remove the ability of one gender to harm another. This is helping society (for it is allowing the Social Form to be itself).

Feminism dies when people understand that society is natural, not artificial. Feminism dies when people realize that society cannot be progressed by law (just as the myth that law prevented female achievement in history).

John Locke, in his Two Treatises of Government, pinned his inspiration that society was natural due to the "natural interaction of the sexes" of marriage and within marriage. If marriage and the interaction of the sexes ceases to be seen as natural but, rather, political, then everything in society becomes politicized.

A free society is a non-politicized society. A true marriage is not legal documents and certificates from a magistrate. Marriage is founded in natural society not artificial law.

In the musuems of the future, we can only hope that those who attempted to mold the Social Form will be put side by side with their predecessors who attempted to mold the Human Form. We can only hope that our descendants will point to feminism as we, today, point to the ancient classical rulers and say: "Behold, for these were the barbarians."

Gag alert "Why American and Western Women Rock!"

Pook · 27 August 2006 · Archived copy · Original



An email, with no text, forwarded this newsletter that came from a Dating Website. Below, you will find the text with some comments by me, the Pookius Maximus. The reason why I made that long post before this one was because of this email.

No, this isn't some tirade against women who are NOT western or American. Not about that at all.

What I am going to do today, is UNTANGLE a pervasive myth.

A myth about "western" and "American" women, a myth that views these women as if they are aliens OR as if they are so different, OR as if they are "evil".

It's almost FUNNY when I see guys, even guys that have all the stereotypical "pluses" going for them, like being tall or having money or having good looks, whining their asses off about how "foreign" women are "better", and how "tough" it is with western or "American" women.

I don't know if these guys are local or foreign themselves, and/or if they are simply not "getting any" from western or American women, or if they can't ACHIEVE HARMONY with western or American women.

It's a myth used and abused by many, sometimes because they don't know the truth, and sometimes this myth is spread by those who KNOW BETTER, but want to DISTORT the truth anyway for selfish reasons.

Whoa! Stop the tape! Selfish reasons? And this is coming from someone trying to sell people E-books? OK, resume the tape.

So this newsletter is for those confused or who may have been brainwashed by wretched LIES to believe that the ANSWER to their women issues is to find a woman from ABROAD.

The idea they try to promote is that American or even sometimes the idea that "western" women are spoiled, and that "foreign" women are much better for relationships, or better for whatever the heck else they might say.

Some folks out there will try to tell you that there is a problem with western or American women.

You know, I MYSELF used to wonder a bit about this. BEFORE I finally "GOT" it.

But I am human, and open to LEARNING. In fact, I believe in LIFELONG learning. And learn I did.

The problem is not with western or American women. It is women IN America. These women could be natives or foreigners. Once being in America, the law and/or media can corrupt their souls to grab for power instead of look for love.

And I hate how these 'dating experts' have

to

talk

like

THIS

all

THE

time.

I never FULLY believed the "foreign women" lie, but I thought maybe there was some truth to it.

There are guys out there (some who call themselves "experts" - yikes!!!!) who will go on and on (yawn) about how it's a whole big science to understand the difference between cultures and countries if you want to do well with women, and they will especially go on and on about how foreign women are "better behaved".

Look, for a short while, I was curious about this stuff, so I decided to thoroughly look into it.

THOROUGHLY.

Never mind that the whole idea is suspicious anyway, because we all know that there is HUGE VARIATION amongst ALL INDIVIDUALS. So for example, does anyone REALLY think that at a "religious" school, that all the kids there are "more moral" than at say, a PUBLIC school or secular school?

Let me tell you something, you can't INSTITUTIONALIZE or FORCE good character. You can promote it, but only through TOTAL LIFESTYLE changes.

Then why does the U.S. and the West institutionalize or FORCE good character with their web of marriage laws and family courts?

It is silly to say that Western Men are FORCING or INSTITUTIONALIZING or have any desire to. Western Men are not cheerleaders to the laws that have turned marriage into an 'institution'. These men have no power to create law on these women.

It's not about the school you go to, or the country in which you live, unless that school or country truly controls every aspect of your private life. Hence, dictatorships can truly mold people for evil, by controlling every aspect of people's lives.

Already, Micael W. reveals he has adopted the idea that society is not natural, that it can be molded, controlled, and

shaped. While dictatorships do this, they do so because a dictatorship has complete control of the law with no check or balance.

If anything, PARENTS influence children the most and therefore play the greatest role in shaping each successive generation and culture. Hey, I like some of Madonna's music, and I think she is a great businesswoman for sure, but somehow I don't think her Catholic school education is what shaped her music, except in the IRONIC sense possibly of her ENTIRE CAREER being a REBELLION to it.

Gay guys LOVE Madonna. And why in the world is he praising Madonna in a dating newsletter? This is raising red flags.

So LOCATION or OFFICIAL CULTURE means NOTHING when it comes to what a PERSON is ACTUALLY like. (unless it is a total dictatorship, and even there there will be those who behave in ways against the official values)

Why contradict yourself so openly?

I don't buy the b.s. argument that foreign women are more faithful, more loyal, more loving, blah blah blah.

Only if they aren't in America.

If anything, in many foreign countries, women are simply more controlled and used to being controlled. They have less rights.

He spends so much time about how one cannot generalize and then he proceeds to do it.

And in MANY cases, the women STILL RESIST whenever they CAN.

The bottom line is that if you are an UNCOOL person, a guy who doesn't "get" it, then NO MATTER what woman you meet, you're going to have problems on the attraction front. And without ATTRACTION, the only reason a woman might be with a guy is because she has nothing else going on.

This is true, but it has nothing to do with the issue of foreign women.

Of course, with a woman who has no rights or power, there is "security" in the sense she cannot leave him easily, so "emotional risk" you might say is limited, but that is like saying that you should only play VIDEO GAME versions of bike rides, to be safe, instead of actually riding your bike. Yeah, it's safe and you prevent damage and falls, but it's not REAL and it's not as exciting or meaningful or rewarding.

He admits the risk of Western women!

Dating foreign women compared to Western women is to be like a video game of bike riding compared to actual bike riding? This is the stupidest comparison I've seen.

The premise of the comparison is wrong. Foreign women are not docile controlled creatures. Besides, one can find Western women who are docile and controlled. Yet, the legal risk does not change because you are still in America.

Resume the tape.

Hopefully I don't need to tell this to anyone, but foreign women, and not just the mail order brides, and other women desperate to leave their home countries, aren't the most reliable sources of information for how they REALLY feel.

But someone trying to sell their E-book is?

There is something called DECEIT. Something called using a guy for a passport. Using a guy for money.

Why the heck would a gorgeous woman from say, Russia, want to hook up with a totally UNCOOL guy with no sense of style, no sense of humor, no excitement, not a cool bone in his body? Especially when she could INSTANTLY change her reality and find a cooler guy?

While it is true that some foreign women do search out to use a guy, there are simple ways around this such as going outside the cities and tourist areas in their countries. You can also plan to live in that country which means no passport at all.

And the answer as to why such a woman would hook up with such a guy is even more simple: she is gorgeous because she feminine. She likes the guy because her environment values elements that the pop-culture in the West does not. For example, I like to read books. This is seen as 'loser' by some in the West. But women who value intelligence LOVE that element. So this 'loser' quality becomes seen as a 'winner' quality elsewhere. And the 'cool' qualities of the West's pop-culture easily become 'uncool' in many places in the world. There is a reason why many nations despise American tourists.

Is it a SURPRISE to hear accounts of guys who didn't "get it", who got married to such women, got her a passport, and then got dumped a few months later?

Does this mean that ALL of these women, whether mail order brides, or any foreign women that you meet, are illegit?

NOPE, I'm sure there are legitimate "quality" foreign women. BUT THERE ARE A MILLION LEGIT QUALITY WOMEN RIGHT OUTSIDE YOUR FRONT DOOR!

Which 100% of them are under the 'institutionalizing' and 'force' controlling marriage and feminist laws in the West. This is too easy. Resume the tape!

It's not about how FAR you travel to meet a woman, it's about HOW COOL OF A PERSON YOU ARE.

If you HAVE what it takes, then suddenly TONS OF WOMEN are drawn to you, REGARDLESS of where they are from.

And if you DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW ATTRACTION WORKS, and if you don't have this vibe about you, then even if you travel all the way to another GALAXY, STILL, no woman will be interested.

Coolness is often seen in the eye of the beholder. Why should someone sell their soul to pop-culture? It is not life-worshipping but rather life-appeasing way of thought.

I have spent half a decade on Sosuave making posts about getting guys to "man up". One thing I've learned is that foreign women are less tolerant of 'wimps' than Westernized women are. Western women love marrying wimps who they can control. But women outside of the Anglosphere have a low view on men who appease, who have no

backbone.

I kind of suspected this stuff, but wasn't always SURE, 100%, until recent years.

Never mind that in a previous career, I already had over two years experience working with and socializing with elites from all over the world, which exposed me to tons of cultures from every continent, and that I also have formal education in this area as well

Elites!!!! Oh, that word! And HE wasn't exposed to tons of cultures, rather he was exposed to elites.

Listen closely to his formal education:

-- in fact my second degree at university REVOLVED around appreciating the impact of cultural diversity for communicating and educating others.

He hasn't actually been to these countries. But he did have a 'degree' which REVOLVED around 'cultural diversity' and education... i.e. a chick degree. This dude has a chick degree!

And never mind that Toronto, my hometown, is certainly one of the most ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse cities in the world, if not THE most diverse.

He is a city dweller and a Canadian. I apologize to Canadians reading this, but Canadians are generally seen as 'feminized' especially in areas like Toronto.

Notice how he just views women in his own country. He doesn't go anywhere.

The truth is that having all this background in ADDITION to my understanding of attraction HELPED, but it was like OVERKILL for understanding a rather SIMPLE issue.

All you have to know about the whole "western women" or "American women" vs. foreign women debate is: American and western women have more FREEDOM.

They are not locked up.

They are allowed to vote.

They are allowed to drive a car.

They are allowed to express their sexuality.

They are allowed to STAND up against bullshit, like a guy who cheats on them.

They are also allowed to...

Be completely unfeminine and be proud of it.

Be single mothers.

Divorce you and take your assets.

80% of sexually active women have an STD, usually common Herpes (it's true, do a search on it).

Have multiple tatoos everywhere.

To reject motherhood and war against their fertility.

To hold careers at the detriment of the family.

To throw the weight of the state on you on accusations of rape or sexual harassment; proof not required.

To have secret Family Courts which take custody of children despite most defenses for the male.

Can let you cheat in marriage (and you pay for it in divorce.)

They can cheat on you in marriage (and you still pay for it in divorce.)

Western women are also allowed to have sex with underage males, such as at schools, and are barely penalized for it.

Sorry, doesn't sound so good to me.

When people think only in terms of sports sex, such as seducers, they do not think deeply of the issues above. But when you want children and seriously contemplate marriage, these issues come up.

All this stuff sounds pretty damn GOOD to me. Ummm, why would any guy want to LEAVE these women and go for a woman because she comes from a place where she is DENIED freedom? That's pathetic!

Western females are rarely women. In fact, most express hostility at being a woman in the first place.

When guys start saying that American or western women are evil, and that "foreign" women are "nicer", what they are really saying is that they don't "get" it yet. Which is not their fault, and in fact is one of the reasons I do what I do - to clear up these things.

Once you understand the FULL picture, you start to realize that the REAL problem is that most MEN in the west need to develop THEMSELVES to go along with the times, because so many men are STILL behaving in a way that only made sense a long time ago, when women DID NOT have these freedoms.

To go along with the times? In other words, your soul and life must be reconstituted to please the women. This is appeasement. This is the loser mentality. This is the wimp.

Now that women HAVE these freedoms, women have more confidence, self-esteem, etc. So men have to UNDERSTAND this and start being far less formal with women. Far less "tip-toeing" around women. And far MORE fun, confident, charming, interesting, and challenging.

Women already had freedom before. Law has never granted people freedom because Law is very different then society.

A lot of men could learn from WOMEN about how to have a higher sense of self-esteem, how to not accept bullshit, how to frame yourself as the "prize" in a relationship or male-female interaction and how to get what your worth in these situations, and how to have a better sense of humor, etc etc.

Yeah, guys can learn a LOT from women. Even the fact that women tend to pay more attention to fashion is something men can learn from as well. It's all about creating EMOTIONAL IMPACT, something women know but too many men ignore.

Oh, these Western women are so incredible and we, Western males, are so awful! Yes, let us learn from the women. Let the women teach us how to be a 'man'! Sarcasm aside, how in the hell can a woman teach a guy how to be a man?

And it's NOT about being manipulative, unless you think that having ATTRACTION POWER and being EXCITING AND FUN to be around is manipulative.

There are other issues as well, such as the role of family, but this has affected both men and women, and is not the

fault of women. In the 1950's, both men and women were more marriage minded, more family minded, and also it was more possible for only one person to work to bring in the income. This made it easier to have a more stable family life. It can still be done today, it's just a little more challenging. And certainly, this does not make American or western women "bad" any more than it makes men "bad" for having given women their freedoms!!!!

Now that I think about it, it actually took a lot of GUTS for western society and men to do this.

In the post below this one, I kept hammering how Feminism is born through the idea that society and law are the same. As you can see from this guy's comments of how he can say such a thing.

Yeah, things have shaken up quite a bit and it's taking a bit of time for both men and women to adjust perfectly, but ALL societies are constantly adjusting to something, and do you really want women to be locked up in a cage? If that's the only way you can feel secure with a woman, that's NOT GOOD!!!

BUT YOU CAN CHANGE THIS!

To him, society is completely artificial and slowly 'evolving' and 'changing'. But if this were true, then the great works of the Humanities, from Shakespeare on down, would be undone since Human Nature isn't universal or unchanging. But Human Nature IS universal and it does not change throughout the generations of people on Earth.

It starts with realizing that the "problems" are more of sign of NOT HAVING "THE SKILLS" with women, a sign of NOT UNDERSTANDING, a sign of NOT having THE RIGHT SELF-CONCEPT.

Ahh, yes, the 'skills'. On Sosuave, people would ask me about 'skills' and 'systems' and I would always reply that there are no skills or systems. There is only Nature. I do not look upon women as Machiavelli looked upon people. Nature already gave me the tools to 'get' women, I just had to let them out. I had to be a man, to let myself be a sexual being, and so on and so forth. No philosophy or 'master skills' was required for this just as no philosophy or 'master skills' is required for a baby to turn into a kid. (But philosophy and 'skills' can give that kid a mindset of being a baby. I see philosophy and artificial skills as obstacles for a young male to become a man rather than the opposite.)

American and western women often have HIGH STANDARDS.

Are men allowed to have ANY standards for their women?

They also have OPINIONS, they cannot be CONTROLLED or programmed like ROBOTS.

Yet, Michael W. is asking us to be programmed with his 'mad skillz' and 'percieved coolness' like robots.

They are often INDEPENDENTLY MINDED.

Disrespectful.

They are often EDUCATED.

Degrees are not the same as education.

They won't put up with BULLSHIT, like you cheating on them.

Fine. So why are men asked to put up with THEIR bullshit, like them cheating on YOU?

This is good s**t!!! Why would you want a woman any other way? Any other way would be pathetic, it would mean that the guy has no way of actually attracting the women, that he must control them instead. That's boring, creepy. Pathetic.

This guy is projecting himself onto others. If what these men say is true, that foreign women are higher quality than American women, doesn't that mean this 'Dating Guru' is not as successful with women as he thinks? If American women can easily be 'trash', doesn't that mean that he, Michael W., lacks the skills and manliness to obtain true feminine women?

Of course, his egoism will never permit this possibility. So, obviously, anyone who says otherwise is a 'loser with women'. There can be no other explanation in his mind (or else his reality collapses as does his business).

The answer is not to change women, it's for MEN to develop themselves!

You mean re-program ourselves to have LOW standards in women.

To BE THE MAN.

As I've said for OVER THREE YEARS:

To be THE MAN.

Not ONE WORD has changed in my original book about this:

BE THE MAN.

One more time:

THE MAN.

Women want THE MAN.

Nothing else can compete with this.

And he defines 'being the man' as redefining yourself please women. No. This is the definition of having no backbone or being soul-less in life. I don't think this character understands what a man is.

I've been STEADFAST in this, I didn't just release that book in a hurry. And it has stood the test of time. No need for releasing a ton of other books, unlike a lot of other folks who I guess needed to make up for what was "missing" in theirs, and still do apparently, by dumping endless more books on you, to get you hooked and addicted.

Once you yourself develop, it's SO MUCH more rewarding to be with a woman who you know is with you because of CHOICE rather than because she has NO OTHER CHOICE, or because she has little choice.

And for those who already have the book, I seriously recommend you RE-READ IT again and again. It's the ONLY WAY for you to derive FULL IMPACT, as each time you re-read it, it reinforces the ideas into your mind and helps you stay on course and detoxify your brainwashed mind so that you can build powerful momentum.

So the bottom line is, American and western women **ROCK**, and the way to attract them is for you to come out and play your highest game. I mean the word "game" in the very best sense of that word - that you give it your best with all your passion, and that you enjoy the process and bring up the entire game of those around you (the men and women around you are only made **BETTER** by interacting with you) in the process, in the same way Gretzky played his game.

And if you want to bring **YOUR** game up to it's highest level, I suggest you download my eBook, The Dating Wizard: Secrets to Success with Women, **IMMEDIATELY**, at:

http://thedatingwizard.com/the_dating_wizard.htm

Inside, you'll learn:

- How to trigger attraction instantly.
- How to approach women and create "instant dates."
- How to get physical.
- How to handle tests.
- How to create a powerful sense of connection.
- And much, much more. Download it all at :

http://thedatingwizard.com/the_dating_wizard.htm

And if you would like to get the **MASSIVE POWER** of **PERSONAL ONE-ON-ONE COACHING** with me, where I will focus exclusively on you, on taking you past any sticking points so that you can achieve your goals as fast as possible, you can now arrange this by going to:

<http://thedatingwizard.com/1-1consultations.htm>

And if you are ready for the **IMMERSION EXPERIENCE**, where you will be pushed to your limits and then taken **WAY BEYOND** what you thought was ever possible, it's time for you to sign up for my **EXCLUSIVE ONE-TO-ONE BOOTCAMP**. These bootcamps are sold out for several weeks, so if you are interested in a bootcamp this summer, let me know asap. Get all the details at: <http://thedatingwizard.com/bootcamp.htm> Till next time,

Michael W.

What more needs to be said? There is one crucial difference between a Michael W. and a Pook. Pook is not asking for your money. Michael W. is.

Are men allowed to have any standards in women?

Pook · 28 August 2006 · Archived copy · Original



This is a question I find myself asking women. Women believe men only have one standard for women: their 'hot'ness. (Sometimes, these women think their standards are the same that men look for. These women will focus on a career without realizing men are not attracted to that.)

What is strange is that these standards are not absurd or 'movie-star' quality. These are simple standards our parents and grandparents had. Here are the common ones of men.

For your reading pleasure:

Italics: the standard.

Text: the El Pooko.

Bold: Feminist replies.

A woman who does not have children already.

Why would a man want to marry a woman who already has children?

Men need to step up to the responsibility of being fathers to these single mothers' kids.

A woman whose focus is on a family instead of a career.

The Forbes article already shows the responses to this.

What!? You want women to be barefoot and pregnant? 1950s are over, baby! You will accept career women OR ELSE!

A woman who can cook.

Century and more ago, a less attractive women with superior cooking skills was an attractive deal. Many girls tried to "wow" guys with their cooking skills (and still do the same today). A man might find superior dining to be a better deal than looks which often fade.

Why don't the men cook for her? This is a standard back when men use to oppress us poor women.

A woman who is modest.

Most men don't want a woman who dresses like a slut (as a wife). Yet, this standard is seen as 'insisting to control women'. Huh?

Foolish Pook! You should not judge women based on what they wear (despite us doing it to males). Any stigma or standard based on how women should be dressed shall be construed as oppression to all women!!!

A YOUNG woman.

This is biology at work. Men prefer young fertile women. Children do not emerge from old women.

This is hatred at work. Men prefer young women because they want to conquer and control the poor little girl. They are intimidated by older women because we are **STRONG WOMEN**.

Women who are not bossy.

Who wants to be around an unpleasant personality?

You just need to be able to handle a 'strong woman'.

Are men allowed to have ANY standards in women? It appears that the only standards allowed are the ones that women choose for us.

What fascinates me is that men do not attempt to change the standards women hold for men. Rather, men become a pretzel to remold themselves to fit what women want (and still lose anyway). Here are a few of the standards women have for their men:

Tall
Well dressed
Good job/ has money
Can socialize, has a social network
Handsome
Sweet
Confident
Funny
Wants to be a Good Man
Etc.

When women express their interest in tall men, you do not hear men protesting that they should like short women. You do not hear men say women should cease looking for men with good jobs and start looking for bums (rather, they protest the expectation of super-riches which very very few people ever have). No man says that women ought to accept unconfident men, or boring men, and so on.

And certainly, men do not throw themselves at the Legislative Palace to enforce their sexual will into law.

On dating forums (such as sosuave), there is endless discussion of what women want, how women think, how do

men get them, and so on. But absolutely no one would say: "Let us demand that women totally change their standards for men."

Yet, western women do this to men all the time. Women say: "You are not allowed to have those standards."

Why must men adjust their standards but not vice versa? This is why I ask: "Are men allowed to have any standards?" You cannot brainwash the men to desire something they naturally would not (although they try).

Do feminists eat cat feces?

Pook · 28 August 2006 · Archived copy · Original



An emailer sent this [story](#) in:

The parasite, *Toxoplasma gondii*, has been transmitted indirectly from cats to roughly half the people on the planet, and it has been shown to affect human personalities in different ways.

Research has shown that women who are infected with the parasite tend to be warm, outgoing and attentive to others, while infected men tend to be less intelligent and probably a bit boring. But both men and women who are infected are more prone to feeling guilty and insecure.

Other researchers have linked the parasite to schizophrenia. In an adult, the symptoms are like a mild form of flu, but it can be much more serious in an infant or fetus. Oxford University researchers believe high levels of the parasite leads to hyperactivity and lower IQs in children.

Lafferty, who is a parasite ecologist with the U.S. Geological Survey at the University of California at Santa Barbara, is an expert on the role parasites play in the ecology of other animals.

The researcher's idea is that cat parasite, that infects rats to affect their behavior, also jumps to Humans changing their behavior.

What I do not understand in this guys theory is how the parasite infects the humans. He says that rats get infected by the parasite by eating cat feces.

Do feminists eat cat feces? Could this be causing their strange behavior? I highly doubt this parasite can infect or alter Human behavior as this particular researcher thinks (which is probably why media is constantly calling him). Still, it is a fun theory that reverses the standard: instead of one becoming feminist and getting cats, rather it is those around cats who become feminist.

Teacher's Gender Affects Learning

Pook · 28 August 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Dee found that having a female teacher instead of a male teacher raised the achievement of girls and lowered that of boys in science, social studies and English.

Looked at the other way, when a man led the class, boys did better and girls did worse.

The study found switching up teachers actually could narrow achievement gaps between boys and girls, but one gender would gain at the expense of the other.

Dee also contends that gender influences attitudes.

For example, with a female teacher, boys were more likely to be seen as disruptive. Girls were less likely to be considered inattentive or disorderly.

In a class taught by a man, girls were more likely to say the subject was not useful for their future. They were less likely to look forward to the class or to ask questions.

Check out the full article [here](#).

There is one other crucial difference I have noticed with female teachers. Female teachers and professors are interested only in enthroning themselves to belittle poor students. To female teachers, education becomes a sense of power.

"We do not believe you, Monsieur Pook."

What! Very well, in your university you can try this example. Bring up certain facts and you can debate and discuss a subject quite easily with a male professor. But a female professor never thinks such an idea can be 'debated'. To her, the end result is not the knowledge but that she is the one enthroned (and YOU are not).

I have thought about being a teacher. But, alas, I did not want to be poor. If I taught, I would just teach Shakespeare. He never gets old. And the students' responses reveal more about Shakespeare to the teacher than vice versa (or else there never would have been a Goddard).

If anything has become feminized, it is teaching. I would throw things across the room, light desks on fire, that sort of thing. I mean, sheesh, you can't even yell at a student. Students need to be yelled at! But nevertheless...

I love learning... but I've noticed all the teachers I've enjoyed were male. All the teachers I've had problems with were female. I was the 'disruptive' one in the classroom, the guy who would bring Isaac Newton's Principia to class and want to discuss that. I hated the text book with all its stupid picture and worthless 'side information'.

Oh, if you want an easy way to get through English classes, or rather, if you find yourselves in the middle of an essay test and do not know the answer, just start quoting Hamlet. It doesn't matter what the question is about or the author, just start quoting Hamlet and start talking about Hamlet instead. The professor will go, "OMG, this guy is quoting Hamlet! He is smart! He is sublime! Such brilliant commentary! Such linking the subject matter to the epic play!" and give you good grades.

Hurricanes, Kings, and the Mill

Pook · 28 August 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Let us open up the Great Books of Mankind once again to go a few steps lower into the underworld of antiquity.

The Mayas had a One-Legged Being named 'Hunrakan' whose name, in Maya, means 'one leg'. Hunraken was a being who disposed of wind, rain, thunder, and lightning in vast amounts.

The English word for 'Hurricane' is derived from 'Hunraken'.

However, Hunraken is not a weather god. He is one aspect of Tezcatlipoca himself (the true original One-Leg that looks down from the starry sky).

The strangest thing is that One Legged beings keep appearing throughout all religions and beliefs throughout the globe. In West Sudan, Faro only has one leg. The mock-king of Siam had to stand on one leg upon a golden dais during all the coronation ceremonies, and had the neat sounding title of "Lord of the Celestial Armies". The Chinese K'uei also follows this pattern. The Chinese were extremely sky conscious. Singufl monsters are thrown into pits or banished to strange mountain regions for the sin of having upset the calendar.

"But Pook!" one might ask. "I do not understand how one can upset the calendar."

The Mill is the idea of a cosmic harmony among the ancient ancients, my name for them is precursors. With the idea of a cosmic harmony, this is the origin of the Harmony of the Spheres, philosophy, the ancient myths, and this harmony is inserted into all the religions. Shakespeare appears to be the last one who expressed any sense of cosmic harmony. In Macbeth and Richard III, for example, all of Nature turns into an uproar at the political overthrows. After all, this 'cosmic harmony' was, only a few centuries ago, seen as a type of 'Divine Right of Kings'. In Macbeth, the horses begin to eat one another. Hamlet is made to say, "Time is out of joint and cursed spite/ that I was ever born to set it right."

And, of course, from this 'cosmic harmony' comes the origins of music in different civilizations. Emperor Shun made K'uei the "master of music". K'uei alone had the talent to bring into harmony the six pipes and the seven modes, and Shun, who wanted to bring peace to the empire, stood by the opinion that "music is the essence of heaven and earth." K'uei also could cause the 'hundred animals' to dance by touching the musical stone. He helped Yu the Great, the earth-mover of the Five First Emperors, to accomplish his labor of regulating the "rivers" (yes, the same rivers of Socrates and Plato. These rivers run straight to the Mill). Yu the Great had a dancing pattern (the Step of Yu) which, when performed, turned into the Big Dipper.

The ancient shamans, far from being 'medicine men' or a perverse deranged sexual persona of Paglia, were actually blacksmiths. Blacksmiths of what? Why, of that celestial Mill of Heavens of course that is the center of cosmic harmony. The Yakuts claim: "Smith and Shaman come from the same nest," and "the Smith is the older brother of the Shaman. Vainamoinen and Ilmarinen are said to have "hammered together the roof of the sky". This is the same

type of ancient smith who created the Sampo and forged sky and luminaries in Esthonia.

The representative of the celestial smith, the King, is frequently titled "Smith". Jenghiz Khan had the title "Smith" and the standard of the Persian Empire was the stylized leather apron of the Smith Kavag. The Chinese mythical emperors Huan-ti and Yu are smiths which baffled the historic-sociological findings of Marcel Granet. He forgot that Huang-ti, the Yellow Emperor, is said to be Saturn (the keeper of Time). The Persian Shahs held their royal jubilee festival after having reigned thirty years, which is the Saturnian revolution, so the Egyptian Pharaoh also celebrated his jubilee after thirty years to the true "inventor" of this festival whose name was Ptah. Ptah is the Egyptian Saturn.

The Iranian God of Time, Zurvan akarana, is portrayed as standing upon the world egg, carrying in his hands the tools of the architect:

In his hands a copper hammer,
And his little pincers likewise.
Ilmari was born at night time,
And at day he built his smithy.

The Babylonians called their texts after their opening words. The Creation Epic they called "Enuma elish" which means "When above". What we call the Epic of Gilgamesh, they called "Sha naqba imuru" which means "Who saw everything". Just as today, the religious do not refer to the New Testament as the "Epic of Christ" for Christ, to Christians, is not a character in some dumb play for Christ is the cosmic harmony itself.

Religious cannot see the Mill because they are inside the Mill. When you are inside a cosmic system of harmonies, you must be outside it to see it. This is not a criticism but a salute. This explains why the religious are not tempted to quack cults such as Gnosticism, paganism, communism, fascism, feminism, etc. When you are in a cosmic harmony, you do not look for a politician to give you one. This is also why Gnostics, social darwinists, communists, fascists, feminists, etc. do all they can to dismantle the Mill, the idea of a cosmic harmony for they hate the religious more than anything (Gnostics are more interested in signs than the substance itself. The same is true with astrologists.)

So how is Christianity inside the Mill? This question, alone, will spawn a series of posts in the future. But for now, there is this:

Christ is the Son of God, son of a carpenter, a blacksmith himself born under the Star of Bethlehem (the true 'king' whose kingdom is not of this world). Christ, to Christians, restored the cosmic harmony. This is why He is referred to as the Alpha and the Omega. Christ also corrected Time. The secular today lack the balls to refer to BC as "Before Christ" but only as BCE "Become Common Era".

The arrival of the Messiah created a 'thunderclap' to the cosmos. Even Time was altered. Now, the gates to Heaven were open. The difference between the devout Christian and the secular or false Christian is that the former believes in the cosmic harmony... that Jesus was a craftsman (later art turned him into a carpenter but he was most likely a blacksmith). If Jesus was that smith, that craftsman, ask yourself, "What was his Mill?"

It would not be a Mill of this Earth.

The Real Hurricane Katrina Memory

Pook · 29 August 2006 · Archived copy · Original



To those outside the US or even the South may see media do coverage on the 'one year anniversary' of Hurricane Katrina. The media coverage of that hurricane greatly impacted my local region and showed how a bunch of sheep people are.

The coverage of Hurricane Katrina hitting New Orleans was atrociously bad with the 'reports' of rapes, sharks swimming down streets (how do these sharks appear from fresh water lakes?), massive gang violence, and so on. This did not stop those reporters from giving themselves awards. Doomsters LOVED the Katrina coverage as they held that as 'proof' that all society was collapsing (without mentioning New Orleans society had collapsed long, long before the hurricane).

With all this poor coverage, don't you think people would go absolute bonkers when the next hurricane hit? Of course you do. And the next hurricane, Rita, a category 4 or 5, slammed into the gulf coast of Texas soon afterward.

I have never seen people turn into such sheep. Hurricanes are dangerous (I've gone through like five) but, depending on where you lived, you did not need to evacuate. The worst I expected was trees blown down and no electricity for a few days. But I live west of Houston. Despite that, everyone was evacuating when they didn't need to. All the streets were clogged. People ran out of gas in the middle of the road due to sitting there. Some people were sitting, in one spot, for five to eight hours. Thanks to the horrible Katrina media coverage, the government officials in Houston and surrounding areas went into complete crisis mode. They didn't want to be blamed like the Louisiana politicians did. A scared politician is a dangerous politician.

You don't hear anything about hurricane Rita hitting Texas. Why should you? Nothing ended up happening. No disaster. The only disaster was on the road with all the sheep leaving (when most didn't have to). This is occurring now in Florida. Floridians know their hurricanes but, thanks to this stupid Katrina coverage (and even stupider re-

living year old bad coverage [which the same media won't do to real disasters such as 9/11]), some in Florida are panicking over a tropical depression. A tropical depression, for you guys who don't get hurricanes, is just a rain storm.

Needless to say, you don't have to worry about old Pook becoming a sheep. When Rita was coming, everyone said, "LOL you are stupid Pook!" "Idiot! You will DIE!" (yes, this person actually thought I was going to die. I didn't even lose my electricity or a tree limb).

I'll tell you what I do fear: tornadoes. You know when a hurricane is coming and can easily avoid and prepare for it. But tornadoes come out of nowhere and are highly unpredictable. They skip around and follow no clear path. Because of that, I'd rather live in Florida than in Kansas.

Did you know that around 800 people a day move to Florida? After the next census, Florida will have more electoral votes than New York. People who are moving to Florida appear to be coming from the Rust Belt, states such as Ohio.

"But Pook! Florida has all those hurricanes! Why would people want to move down there?"

It is because of those high taxes in areas like Ohio. Florida (and Texas too) has no state income tax making it very attractive for people. You can count on taxes being certain all the time, but hurricanes is a roll of the dice. Instead of bearing the certainty of taxes, people would rather take their chances with Nature.

Chick TV now makes chicks thinner

Pook · 30 August 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Isn't it against feminism to photoshop women to be thinner?

I thought it was men's fault that women had to be thin? It was men who caused anorexia in women! It was men who caused the 'thin culture'. If only we could convince men that fat was thin, then women would stop being 'tortured'.

Somehow they will blame men for [this](#). I just don't know how.

Now Rosie is skinny too!



Pookish Commandment Three: Become Financially Free

Pook · 30 August 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Becoming financially independent is one of the greatest changes you can make to your life. This is done when you don't need a job, when you have assets paying all your expenses. You become in control of your life. There are many books and much information on how to become financially free so I won't talk about that here. But there is something else I have been wondering...

Why did men become, and strive, to become employees forever?

It is a fascinating question. The idea of financial freedom is not new. So what possibly could get 90% of the population into becoming wage slaves?

Ever since we are five years old, we are put in school. We are then told to do stuff. This will not change until the day we retire (for many men, this is sixty years later). The idea of doing nothing is alien to us. If someone does nothing, hostility and mockery is sent at that person. "Lazy!" they say.

The child, since the age of five, then goes through school. He often goes to college where he is told to do more things. After college, he gets a job and keeps doing what someone else wants him to do.

After a while, you would think, "Wouldn't he try to get out of the position of being leveraged?" Yes, you would. I never understood why the masses didn't attempt to escape from being a wage slave. The reason why most men never escape the wage slave mentality is because of their woman.

During college or shortly after, a man meets a woman. The sparks fly. They end up getting married. This means they must move into some apartment and soon to a house. The bills keep getting larger. And then, the wife gets pregnant and the little bundle of joy comes home. Babies are extraordinarily expensive (and taxing on health and sanity as well). The parents, at least the father if the wife wants to stay home, has to work harder to make ends meet. More babies appear. The husband has to keep working and working and working. The husband will become so accustomed to working that he will feel himself a failure if he doesn't work in some way. He will be incapable of doing nothing. If he retires, he usually dies soon afterward (statistics show many men passing away right after retiring. All that work, and you can't enjoy the little freedom at the end.)

I know many men in their 30s with families. I rarely see them because they are always working. They work because their expenses are so high. But they also work because their woman has completely taken over the household. Their household is so dirty, and filled with screaming kids and a fat wife, that they are HAPPY to work overtime. The more they work, the harder it is for them to do nothing.

"But Pook," you ask. "Why should one do nothing? Isn't it better to work?"

No. The founder of MTV gives this advice to those who are financially able to retire: "Wait one year before you do anything else. For one year, do absolutely nothing. It will be the hardest thing you do in your life."

And, sure enough, it is especially if you have been conditioned to 'work' since the age of five. We are all brainwashed in some fashion. I have experience with dealings some professional 'brainwashing' places, these unique 'forums'. The one thing they try to do is to keep you hungry, keep you sleepy, and not allow you to be alone doing nothing. If you are alone doing nothing, you can think. If you think, you suddenly realize what a bogus operation it all is. In many jobs, they will attempt to brainwash you. At one job, after a hard day's work, I want to go home, rest, and do whatever. The job tried to invade that as well, making it almost where I **never** had rest. I said, "To hell with you," to that job. If an employer is trying to brainwash me, I just give them a middle finger and walk out. If you want my work, do it by pay, do it by making the job environment pleasant, do it by some other benefits, but don't do it by 'brainwashing'. It is like they want you to love your 'job' like you would 'love' a woman. Those who have no passion beforehand are vulnerable to this brainwashing.

As these men work and work, they lose their greatest assets: time and health. Soon, it becomes too late for them to become financially free even if they do snap out of it.

Imagine! A childhood in a mass produced schools, mass produced colleges, mass produced 'jobs', to live in mass produced houses and suburbs (little artificial towns with fountains), and when we die we retire on some 'mass produced' package plan and go to the mass produced nursery homes.

That is 95% of the population's life.

This is The Way.

Women do not question it. Already, they plan and see it. They do not imagine financial freedom and rarely see it for what it means. If you tell a woman you want to become financially free, they will run for the hills. It shows that women do not like rich men, they like rich men they can brainwash. Women marry wage slaves. If you do not want to become a wage slave, don't get married. Your wife will support you in getting a bigger paycheck. But she will not support you in getting a bigger soul.

One pattern I noticed is that all the great humanities, the great songs, art, and literature, never came from peasants. It always came from the aristocracy or people funded directly by the aristocracy. To Americans, you know that the 'founding fathers' like Washington were well educated and cultured. But they were that way because they were financially free.

Being financially free is not about greed. It is to allow the First Pookish Commandment to become true: to be who you are. If you enjoy writing poetry, becoming financially free will allow you to pursue poetry. If you enjoy racing cars, becoming financially free allows you to do that.

It is hard to be who you are when a stupid job is in the way. The rich believe the word job means Just Over Broke.

People say that wealth changes you. It doesn't. Rather, it changes everyone around you. People who were your friends will grow angry that you 'have money'. They will despise you. It is lonely at the top.

As Esther Vilar from her excellent book, the Manipulated Man, describes:

"If a young man gets married, starts a family, and spends the rest of his life working at a soul-destroying job, he is held up as an example of virtue and responsibility. The other type of man, living only for himself, working only for himself, doing first one thing and then another simply because he enjoys it and because he has to keep only himself, sleeping where and when he wants, and facing woman when he meets her, on equal terms and not as one of a million slaves, is rejected by society. The free, unshackled man has no place in its midst."

Japanese Game Sales (Last Week of August)

Pook · 30 August 2006 · Archived copy · Original



The games industry continues to turn itself inside out. Investors demanded Nintendo to stockpile their DSes for the week when Final Fantasy 3 DS comes out. So Nintendo shipped out like half the number the week previous to this list of sales. Square-Enix was caught by surprise when their FF3 remake completely sold out. The picture above is a used FF3 bundle that originally sold for \$200. The used price of it is \$500.

To those asking, "Why does Japan matter? LOL." The combined hardware and software for Japan is now slightly ahead of America's sales. Japan has suddenly seen its market double in size... if not more.

One thing you shouldn't do in business is run your mouth off. Here are some quotes from Sony, mostly Phil Harrison, on his reaction to the mutant two screened DS:

"The idea of a handheld rivalry with Nintendo is an irrelevance, those formats don't appear in our planning. It's not a fair comparison; not fair on them, I should stress. That sounds arrogant, maybe, but it's the truth."

"With the DS, it's fair to say that Nintendo stepped out of the technical race and went for a feature differentiation with the touch screen, but I fear that it won't have a lasting impact beyond that of a gimmick - so the long-lasting appeal of the platform is at peril as a direct result of that."

"Nintendo knows its target audience, because it has really narrowed that down; and it's pretty much defined by a boy or girl's ability to admire Pokemon."

"PSP will elevate portable entertainment out of the handheld gaming ghetto, and Sony is the only company that can do it."

- 01 NDS FF3 - 503.051 / NEW
- 02 NDS NEW SMB - 65.556 / 2.901.264
- 03 NDS Rune Factory - 42.210 / NEW
- 04 NDS Brain Age 2 - 41.784 / 3.073.195

05 NDS Cooking Navi - 37.326 / 384.045
06 NDS Tamagotchi 2 - 30.504 / 430.933
07 NDS Mario Basketball 3on3 - 30.355
08 NDS Animal Crossing WW - 30.023 / 3.149.131
09 NDS Brain Age - 22.866 / 2.736.150
10 NDS English Training - 17.465

11. Daito Giken Pachislot Hihouden
12. Tetris DS
13. Mario Kart DS
14. Jissen Pachislot Hokuto no Ken SE (PS2)
15. Melty Blood Act Cadenza
16. Wrestle Angels Survivor
17. SD Gundam G Generation Portable
18. Jikkyou Powerful Pro Baseball 13
19. Sengoku BASARA 2
20. Guilty Gear Judgment (PSP)
21. Digimon Story
22. Monster Hunter Portable (PSP The Best)
23. summer##
24. Kirarin Star Revolution Kirakira Idol Audition
25. Atsumare! Power Pro Kun no DS Koushien
26. Rhythm Tengoku
27. Minna no DS Seminar Kanpeki Kanji
28. Battle Stadium DON (PS2)
29. Mushiking Greatest Champion e-no Michi 2
30. Pokemon Ranger Diamond and Pearl e-no Michi

1. Nintendo DS Lite ¥163.274
2. PlayStation Portable ¥29.945
3. PlayStation 2 ¥21.829
4. GameBoy Advance SP ¥2.719
5. GameBoy Micro¥ 1819
6. Xbox 360 ¥1197
7. Nintendo GameCube¥ 837
8. Nintendo DS¥ 410
9. GameBoy Advance ¥14
10. Xbox¥ 12

Japanese laws breeding matriarchy

Pook · 31 August 2006 · Archived copy · Original

[image]I saw this link at [Eternal Bachelor's blog](#).

"When my wife told me she wanted a divorce," says Mr. C, 63, "at first I literally did not understand what she was saying. Divorce? For what? Every day I went to work, borrowed money to build a home, repaid the loan, paid for her overseas vacations with her friends while I stayed home and ate cold dinners. . . . She says I wasn't kind, didn't show affection. She's been watching too many TV dramas! Japanese men of my generation don't go around telling their wives they love them!"

Well, OK, thought Mr. C -- if she wants a divorce she can have a divorce. Shortly afterward, their son got married. Mr. C attended the wedding without his wife. Then the son announced a child was on the way -- could his father lend him money to buy a house? Mr. C handed over his retirement savings. When the house was ready, he figured, there would be a place for him there.

But a nasty surprise awaited him. The spare room was reserved not for him, but for his wife. "I couldn't believe it!" he explodes. "She had everything all planned from the time she didn't show up at the wedding! I wanted to murder her!"

He lives alone now in a rented apartment. His son pays back the loan in regular monthly installments -- "but he never," says Mr. C ruefully, "invites me to visit."

The East will be torn apart more by Matriarchy than the West would be. I like the East. I like the customs of 'saving face', of the rich family structure the Japanese had. Matriarchy will just rip it apart and the men, especially the older ones, are going to be hit very hard.

This is an example of how a law will pervert natural society. Marriage, once was productive, is now made by that Japanese law to become an instrument of plunder. Why should any person have such legal power over someone else?

Seducers need to awake from their ego like sleep to realize these laws are going to come for them too. It is natural for a man to eventually settle down and desire marriage and children. But no seduction in the world can save you from these laws. You cannot charm the law away. If you do get married, be sure you invest majorly in ironclad prenuptials like rich people have.

People peering at the commentary from the outside see only 'hatred for women'. But the problem is the law itself. No one is an angel and if the law allows you to plunder from someone else, nothing can stop it, not even religion or morality. This observation doesn't come from a bitter outlook but from the annals of history. If the law gave such power to men, men would become just as evil. This law is legalizing plunder which is turning people evil. And those who laughed at Anti-Dump should read the Japanese story carefully. A woman can marry you and still despise you. Anti-Dump's Machine was to weed out the uninterested women. This is why I think young men need to focus on not getting women interested in you but weeding out uninterested women. "But what if no woman is interested?" Then you have free time to hang out with your buddies and avoid the trap of The Way. The loneliest thing in the world is not to be single but to be in an unhappy marriage.

Groundbreaking study finds that narcissism runs in celebrities!

Pook · 5 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Yes, someone did a study on [this](#).

Celebrities have more narcissistic personality traits than the general population, and people with narcissistic tendencies seem to be attracted to the entertainment industry rather than the industry creating narcissists, according to a groundbreaking study conducted by researchers Drew Pinsky of the Keck School of Medicine of USC and S. Mark Young of the USC Marshall School of Business and the USC Annenberg School for Communication.

As someone who is attracted to the entertainment industries, I would have to agree to a point. Sometimes narcissism can be mistaken for being 'soulful'. You cannot become a cog in a machine in the entertainment industry... unless you are on the technical or finance side of it.

I would say those who go into politics are more narcissistic. The most narcissist are those who go into journalism.

Reality TV personalities had the highest overall narcissism scores when compared with actors, musicians and comedians.

You don't say!

"Our research also shows that many celebrities exhibit narcissistic behavior prior to becoming famous, which could indicate a self-selection bias for the entertainment industry by certain personality types," said Young who holds the George Bozanic and Holman G. Hurt Chair in Sports and Entertainment Business at USC.

Most women have an interest in the entertainment business. This is why they talk about celebrities all day. "HEY, DID YOU KNOW WHAT HAPPENED TO KEANU REEVES? OMG!"

Your life is a stage for a woman to play the celebrity role she craves. When you take your life elsewhere, she has no stage. She cannot play the girlfriend, the wife, the mother, or anything worthwhile. Women love celebrities because they see themselves in them. So next time you fall asleep to a woman babbling about celebrities, remember what the Pook said: "She talks about narcissistic celebrities because, as a narcissist, she finds herself on common ground with them. Beware!"

Sony says: "To hell with you, Europe!"

Pook · 6 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



THIRD EDIT: OK, you guys are **mean**.

SECOND EDIT: This gets worse. According to **this**...

In the U.S., about 400,000 PlayStation 3 machines will be available when they go on sale Nov. 17. About 100,000 will be available on the Nov. 11 Japan launch date.

The production problem is causing about a one-month delay that will reduce the company's supply capacity by about a million machines from the original plan, he said.

People may ask, "So what? People buy it later." They will lose many sales by this. Also, this is very much a momentum based industry. Also consider how much money was spent on the PS3 advertising blitz. All that money will be wasted. Why advertise a product that no one can buy?

Expect Sony stock to plunge today.

Also expect third party game companies to begin bailing on Sony if these launch numbers are true.

EDIT: Forbes has jumped on **this** too. Some of you may go, "LOL, stop acting like a dork when talking about these game consoles Pook, LAWL." But this just isn't the video game industry in transition here, it is digital entertainment, the next movie format, as well as that merry 'top box in your living room' war Microsoft and Sony have.

Forbes is saying there will be only two million consoles for launch for America and Japan. It will be very difficult to get one. (Reuters is reporting production starts on September 7th. That is not much time to make millions of such a complicated machine.)

Sony's original plans was to have four million at launch. If they could get three million at launch, they would still launch in Europe. (The Fiscal Year Goals are still the same at 6 million by March but that will be a logistical challenge to meet). But if they can only get two million at launch and that is cannibalizing all the blu-ray parts from the stand alone player production...

I think we're seeing a similar Xbox 360 production fiasco with the PS3. By the time a PS3 is on the shelves where you could buy it easily would probably be in April of 2007.

The delay also includes Austraila and other smaller countries.

Even worse: Sony of Europe just launched their PS3 website yesterday (with trailers and all ready for the big advertising push)! Oh, they must have just learned about this!

I hear in Europe they were selling pre-orders with those 20 [pound] cds (or so). I doubt you'll get your money back for them.

To recap how fast these things change:

-at E3 2006, Sony says 4 million for launch, 6 million at end of fiscal year

-a little over a week ago, Kaz still says 2 million before '07 between 3 territories

-earlier this week, it was clarified to mean 2 million for launch, 4 million before '07

-now, Kutagari says "a little" over 2 million before '07



The entertainment industry is entertaining to examine the business falls and spikes. But there is no entertainment more fun to watch than the game industry especially at transition. You never know what is going to happen.

Sony has just announced the PS3 will be delayed in Europe until March 2007. That means all those retailers in Europe just got screwed. Nintendo and Microsoft must be ecstatic.

The delay is because of the blu-ray components for the PS3. If they had to take Europe off the list, I wonder how much there will be available for Japan and America for launch. Losing a Christmas season in ANY of the big three markets is very bad. The bulk of game industry sales come at December and November.

But Sony fans should keep their head up. Sony is trying to bring back the UMD with them being cheaply priced. TGS should be big for Sony. There are rumors that the Killzone game will be featured and will be as good as the pre-rendered 2005 E3 trailer.

But also, in other news, Merrill Lynch reports that Nintendo stock keeps going up. But it is not just Merrill Lynch is saying this, all sorts of groups are noticing what is going on.

[image]

Nintendo is mimicking the exact same business and marketing strategy of the ipod. It will be entertaining to see how this strategy works in such a competitive market. Could Nintendo kill off the Playstation as Apple killed the walkman? Very doubtful. But regardless, it will be fun to watch the hysteria ensue within the next few months.



NPD Sales for August 2006

Pook · 8 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original

These are the total sales in America for last month of August according to NPD.



Game Boy Advance 156k

GameCube 41k

Nintendo DS 278k

PlayStation 2 262k

PlayStation Portable 146k

Xbox 9k

Xbox 360 204k

A few of the games:

360 Dead Rising 337k

PS2 FINAL FANTASY VII: DIRGE OF CERBERUS 200k

NDS BIG BRAIN ACADEMY 73k

NDS BRAIN AGE: TRAIN YOUR BRAIN IN MINUTES A 74k

NDS MARIO KART 57k

NDS NEW SUPER MARIO BROS 179k

PS2 MADDEN NFL 07 885k

360 MADDEN NFL 07 477k

XBX MADDEN NFL 07 253k

PS2 MADDEN NFL 07: HALL OF FAME 127k

360 MADDEN NFL 07: HALL OF FAME 92k

PSP MADDEN NFL 07 58k

GCN MADDEN NFL 07 50k
GBA MADDEN NFL 07 3k
NDS MADDEN NFL 07 7k

Madden is probably the biggest franchise in the United States.

So what to make of these sales? Well, there is no handheld contest. GBA has outsold the PSP for this entire year. DS is outselling the PS2. What is interesting about the DS is that its third party sales are now much healthier than than the PSP's. There is no more handheld war anymore. DS won.

For the consoles, what to say? The PS2 is still doing strong. But the real story is the Xbox 360. All together, the Xbox 360 has sold around 3.5 million in America (it's strongest market). It has bombed in Japan and its European sales are not too good. Its software sales are awesome, however.

There is a war on the Wikipedia page about the Xbox 360's sales. In their comments page, fans are saying that the sales are really 5 million because of certain Microsoft financial statements. But the other side of the debate on the comments page is that the actual sales charts show a much different number: around 3.7 million worldwide. "How can their be a debate on those sales numbers?" you ask. Well, a console company doesn't sell their console to the customer. They sell them to the retailers and get their money from them. The retailer then sells the console to you. So the number that a console company sells will be more than the actual sales to customers. If we estimate up, we have 4 millions Xbox 360s in the hands of customers. Probably a million of them in the world sitting on store shelves which then adds up to the total five million in Microsoft's financial statements. Also, there isn't any way Microsoft will sell 10 million by the end of the year.

I hear that one of the main reasons Sega went bankrupt is that they (and their awful accounting) confused those retailer sales with sales to actual customer. So when their Saturn launched, Sega was overjoyed with the sales and popped the cork. No joke. It helped lead to the company's demise in the hardware market.

More frequent updates are coming soon. Don't mind these game industry posts. If someone told you that the (first) Ipod was going to come out and clobber the Walkman and, thus, disrupt the music industry, would it not be fascinating to watch it happen from a more business detail perspective? I'm pissed that I missed all that.

I suspect a similiar wild upset to occur in the games industry. I don't play games (like a normal gamer would) and haven't owned a console since... the Genesis. I'm just sitting back and watching. One unique thing about the games industry is, unlike other industries, young people have turned the 'console wars' into a type of sports game. Their 'team' is a console company (be it Sony, Microsoft, or Nitendo) and they root for that company to 'win'. They do their damage control, their propoganda, their insane arguments with one another, and my favorite: their photoshops. It is quite entertaining in a strange sort of way.

I have been watching the analysts totally get this industry wrong. Only one analyst has gotten it right so far: Merrill Lynch. Reading this report is almost **prophetic** about the PS3. The \$900 and year delay are accurate (Sony is eating some of that \$900 cost for their \$600 retail price). Interesting, in other reports, Merrill Lynch says that the Wii will be \$200 and, oddly, that users will prefer Xbox 360 over PS3. Here is another analyst explaining just how **wrong** he has been. He admits to being stunned by the DS's turnaround, the stalling of the PSP, and the general flat sales of the Xbox 360. For the past year, we kept hearing about the 'war' between Sony and Microsoft from the analysts. It was curious that Nintendo wasn't even mentioned. After E3 2006, things apparently began to change. Now, Patcher says that "Wii is going to crush". It may be the only console that doesn't screw up its launch. If Nintendo is able to sell all 6 million consoles by March, it would have surpassed the Xbox 360 and probably the PS3's. "How can that many be sold?" Japan's craziness is one of those reasons.

Speaking of Japan, I haven't bothered putting up those sales charts since they say the same thing: DS at like 160k, every other system at 20k, games in the top ten are mostly DS titles. But one interesting thing going on there is factory problems. FF3 is having problems being reprinted as Square greatly underestimated demand. There are shortages of DS related anything throughout Japan. With the PS3 launching with only 100,000 units in Japan, I don't think it will ever catch up to the Wii once it is released. The big issue with the games industry is that Nintendo has adopted the Apple business model for the Wii, including the Mac font. "Why are they doing that, Pook?" Sony's Walkman was once seemingly invincible, look what happened. Nintendo noticed this big time and looks like it is trying to emulate that Apple strategy against the Playstation. Will it work? Who knows.

Here is something that has boggled my mind that someone brought to my attention. Why would someone talk about [the console war in a sex article](#)? Look at the first sentence under 'Medication'!

Ever since I've been anti-Matriarchy, I find those askmen articles to be more worthless than ever. Funny how when you change, other things change as well. The information and writing seem so shallow now, almost feminine.

Due to the launches of two consoles coming up, there may be more of these 'game industry' updates (but only if something major like that PS3 shortage in previous post). Now before we go back to the good anti-feminism and Mill stuff, here is some good software birth control:

Uptight

Pook · 8 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Have you noticed how uptight people are these days? It is not so much a 'political correctness' as it is everyone becoming uptight (and using political correctness as their 'reasoning'). If someone makes a joke about something I believe, I try to laugh at it too. I don't see the point of going nuclear on the person.

Feminists are the most humorless people ever. They cannot take a joke and are filled with rage and hatred. Most politicized people are like this.

Even with everyday things do people tend to be uptight. If their food is served at the restaurant a few minutes late, they make a scene and storm out. Or if a guy sees something that is REALLY stupid and remarks, "Damn, that is so gay!" a political jihad is launched against the fellow for hatred and insensitivity. Schwarzenegger once called the outbursts from the California legislature as "girlie men" and, boy, they just got even more outraged. I hear that the uptight people are trying to fan flames on Schwarzenegger's 'hot blood' jokes with his staff.

"I am outraged!" We should call these people The Outraged. They just march around looking for something to be outraged about. They declare war over a molehill and their issues are like straws compared to the boulder events the era pushes on us.

That said, I think there are only a few issues worth getting worked up about...

1) Penalizing laws- These include the divorce laws, the stupid sexual harassment laws, corrupt family courts, and so on. No law is preferable than bad law. Western women do not have to love western men, but they should at least be unable to financially and legally destroy men. No person, male or female, should have such powerful legal leverage over someone else.

2) Taxes and things of this Nature- You cannot dodge a direct tax. My chest swells with pride when, several years ago, the legislature of Tennessee decided they needed more money so they were going to raise taxes (state didn't have an income tax at that point I think). While the legislature debated it, the people decided to give their say so. They marched the capitol, stormed the legislative palace, and made so much noise and ruckus that the politicians abandoned all talks.

3) Blasphemy- I consider it the lowest taste to assault someone's faith. Disagreement and debate is one thing, mockery is another. There was a group that held a play where the actors enacted Jesus and the twelve apostles all having a gay orgy. The play director seemed stunned that people would find offense at this. "Don't be religious

extremists!" the play director yelled. But those aren't the religious extremists. I pointed her to the rioting Muslims (over a simple cartoon of Muhammed) and said, "Those are the religious extremists." Historically, people fought wars over their religion. You would think common courtesy and historical practicality would have these people know not to stick a twig in the biggest hornet's nest there is. No other religion tolerates such mockery: Hindusim, Buddhism, Islam, Judaism, and the rest. These people are spoiled on the easy tolerance Christians have and are surprised when Muslims slit their throats for even the most lighthearted mockery.

4) Ruining education- People can sell garbage as art if they want. But when they try to say that "we are as good as musician as Bach is today" I just have to laugh. There are some, who write in poor iambic pentameter, and think they are as good as Shakespeare. Everyone believes they are the next 'great artist'. If they want to live in a fantasy, go ahead. But changing the very definition of art and saying, "All those skills the artists learned up until the nineteenth century... let us forget about those and learn Modern Art instead." This butchery towards the Humanities ought to be opposed.

What amazes me that if I stand up and fight those four things, I am declared 'uptight' by The Outraged!!! "Why are you so uptight? You should just accept the marriage laws and try to find a good partner." You have better odds with Russian Roulette (and less pain too). "Why should you oppose... say... higher property taxes? It is for the public good! Don't be so uptight!" It is not uptight looking after the Pook good. There is no such thing as the 'public good'. The only reason why they want more of Pook's money is so politicians can become famous. We are just peons to them. "Don't be so uptight! Let us mock the gods with great zeal!" My dear, you are dancing on thin ice. But mockery is one thing, outright lies disguised as truth is another. Why should any faith allow lies about it to be spread? Makes no sense to me. "Art is anything I say it is! Don't be so uptight!" Then stop the hostility to the classics.

You have to pick your battles in life. Pretty much everything political isn't worth getting worked up about. I feel sorry for those whose happiness depends on what goes on in Washington (such as who gets elected, what bill gets debated, etc). The Outraged not only get uptight on all the wrong and lighthearted things (do you ever see Feminists laugh? Do you ever see these Outraged smile and enjoy life?), but they are passive on things that are worth getting angry about. A feminist saying "Stop being so uptight. Just marry, don't try change the law" is like Jim Crow telling blacks, "Don't be uptight! The law will always be what it is. Make sure you do not offend the White Man, and you should be OK."

What Law Hath Joined Together...

Pook · 9 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Mirror's link to a [must read article](#) already covers the good commentary. I'll see what I can add.

Two quotes: beginning:

For the moment, while the Federal Marriage Amendment is moved to a back burner, it's a good time to heighten our awareness of a broader menace. Same-sex marriage is a symptomatic threat to families, compared to the more fundamental effect of "no fault" divorce. "Commentators miss the point when they oppose homosexual marriage on the grounds that it would undermine traditional understandings of marriage," writes Bryce Christensen of Southern Utah University. "It is only because traditional understandings of marriage have already been severely undermined that homosexuals are now laying claim to it." Michael McManus of Marriage Savers writes that "divorce is a far more grievous blow to marriage than today's challenge by gays."

It is true that the same sex marriage is emerging from the wreckage that is already marriage. But here is the question:

Is marriage a matter of Law or is it a matter of Society?

"What is the difference?" Society and Government are not the same. I do not have to go to a court to get a license to make a friendship or to reproduce. So why is there a license for marriage? In short, why is the marriage a matter of law at all?

When people complain of society becoming politicized or feminized, a better term might be Rousseau-ized. Jean Jaques Rousseau, critic to the Enlightenment, believed that the government bestowed its citizens with rights based on the so-called will of the people. Rousseau accepts that Mankind is of total inertness in the presence of legislators. The legislator, to Rousseau, is "the mechanic who invents the machine".

Rousseau's ideas are not compatible with U.S. system of government as the Declaration, and most people, accept people have natural rights and aren't "granted" them by wise politicians. Nevertheless, Rousseau saw the politician molding people like a potter molds his pot.

This infection of Rousseauism is the root of Feminism and even the no-fault divorce. Rousseau believed that society was artificial so there can be no such thing as natural such as friendship, family, marriage, or anything else. Feminists, as we know, do not believe in nature, both in biology and in society's nature. To a feminist, there is no 'natural' order. It is all artificial. This is why feminists believe passing new laws or controlling education in schools

will result in changing society (unfortunately, society keeps insisting on reverting to its natural form. Poor Human Nature!).

Aside that society is all artificial and ought to be shaped by law, Rousseau's biggest infection has been the Social Contract. Since Rousseau thought there was no such thing as natural society, that artificial society would be obtained by everyone performing social contracts. It sounds good in theory until you realize that each of these contracts contains the teeth of law. This means instead of having a happy utopian artificialized society, we have law everywhere and anywhere.

The main complaint of marriage by men is that it marries you to the State. This is true. Marriage, which has become nothing more than a legal contract, is flushing law into your life. Now, you are no longer free. You are tethered, by law, to the state. Since marriage became nothing more than a contract, the same-sex "marriage" came about since marriage is now the contract, it now has nothing to do with the two people in it. It is annoying that when people talk about the institution of marriage, they refer to the law and not to the two people which is, supposedly, the reason why that 'contract' exists in the first place. I expect this 'contract' to be expanded to three people. Then many. Brother and sister will marry because it is only a contract and has no relevance in a natural society. (Keep in mind I am not spelling D-O-O-M, only what is the effect when marriage is seen as nothing but a contract).

My biggest disappointment has come from the religious. Marriage is one of the seven sacraments. Could you imagine churches allowing a law to determine whether or not you have been properly baptized?

But now that we concern ourselves that marriage has been destroyed by the adoption of Rousseau's Social Contract as the definition of matrimony, the following will make more sense...

The divorce industry has, in affect, rendered marriage a fraudulent contract. While the dissolution of families affects the health of the entire society, parents and especially fathers must demand that marriage be made an enforceable contract. "No fault" divorces granted by family courts also confront church leadership, not only along lines of morality, but as it touches on the validity of their ministry. If marital bonds can be dissolved by government officials with no grounds or agreement between the marriage partners, the sanctity of a wedding ceremony is subject to disregard. Unless marriage is an enforceable contract, there is little point in preaching trust in it. It is not surprising that ever fewer are willing to marry while the marriage contract offers no protection of family, children, homes, or privacy, even to the extent of life-threatening impositions. It is one thing to tolerate divorce. It is another to allow government to impose it on unwilling spouses. When courts stop dispensing justice, they must start dispensing injustice. There is no middle ground.

What surprises me is how much I disagree with his 'solution'. The author of the article wants the contract to be 'enforcable' (HELLO? WHOM is going to enforce it? The State!). Nothing changes with his solution. An 'enforcable contract' still places marriage in the middle of the court room, and chains the State to your life.

By removing marriage from the greedy hands of the Law can you ever hope to take marriage back into society where it belongs (rather than the political kingdom). Whenever the marriage is seen as a matter of law, the State will own the marriage. This is why I believe the author is totally off the mark by recommending a stronger enforcement of the 'contract'. It is the confusion of marriage with the Social Contract that has caused marriage to be something you tie together and undo as simple, and frequent, as tying one's shoes.

Naturally, men avoid this legal leashing to the state. They see it for what it is. Just as naturally, men go off to enjoy their lives and deal with women outside of the matters of law.

We don't need a legislature or judges to fall in love, have children, have a loving family, to build a home, or to be

happy with the fruits of life. So why do we need legislatures or judges for marriage?

If I said: "A family is not a natural thing. It is artifical. You must go recieve a license from the state to call you, your spouse, and your children a 'family'." You would think I was mad! But this is how everyone talks of marriage as if it is nothing more than a legal rope to 'tie' ourselves together. What is most disturbing is that this context of marriage, as some artificial contract created by the almighty state, is believed by everyone, including those 'fighting for the family'.

Crazy Videos

Pook · 9 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original

Since Sunday is a day of rest, why not crazy videos instead of crazy commentary?

Interesting shirt technology.

More wacky technology.

Why does this remind me of the Wii?

When Pook's women get angry at him, they act stupid like this:

Noah takes a photo of himself everyday for six years (you see why Emerson says 'eyes are the gateway to the soul', everything changes except the eyes).

Illustration of how technology can overshoot a market (*cough* PS3 *cough*)

A woman finally manages to impress Pook.

A montage from one of my favorite movies. I was trained in the theater sword combat not too long ago and wouldn't mind being like an extra or something (would be fun to get stabbed on a big screen). We need less chick movies and more movies like this:

This columnist didn't do his homework

Pook · 11 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



CNN's Chris Morris says, from another analyst, **the PSP will have a price drop very soon**. Why does he say this? Because...

PSP sales have been solid so far, with 20 million units shipped worldwide (with over 8 million of those to the U.S.). That's essentially a tie with the Nintendo DS, which has sold over 21 million units - but the numbers don't tell the whole story.

While the DS has been on the upswing, thanks to commercially and critically successful games such as "Brain Age" (which has sold more than 4 million copies worldwide), "Nintendogs" and "New Super Mario Brothers," the PSP has not had a game truly capture the gaming world's attention since the release of "Grand Theft Auto: Liberty City Stories" (published by **Take Two Interactive (Charts)**) last October.

Maybe Chris ought to ask, "How is the hardware selling if the software isn't?" From last month's NPD numbers, GTA: LCS sold the same amount as Mario Kart: DS which is revealing how much disappointment the portable GTA has been. The game sells but not quite as retailers had hoped.

The answer is in those shipment numbers. While Sony has shipped many PSPs to retailers, even at the same level as DS, the retailer sales numbers points a different picture which is why Chris can, stunningly, say that the PSP has lost is momentum while saying its shipment numbers are even with the DS. Chris ought to put two and two together to figure out why Sony won't do a price cut.

If Sony did a price cut of the PSP, Sony would lose much of that money of all those PSPs that have been sent. So what I suspect Sony will do instead is to raise the value of the PSP by focusing more on the non-gaming functions as well as the PS1 game downloads to it. I think Chris is taking the word of this 'analyst' too closely.

How did this analyst get to his 'conclusion'? It is probably because he is busy playing armchair CEO. He gets the sales numbers as do we all and can clearly see a stall within the PSP. He then says, "Price drop imminent!" Sony has, after all, shown that it will do a price drop especially on a system like the PS2 if it goes below 200,000 sales in a NPD month. Also, Sony wants money. Is the PSP still profitable after a \$50 price cut? Probably not which is further reason why it won't be cut.

Nintendo got burnt by shipping too many Gamecubes and, since, have been very conservative with their shipments. The DS is facing the issue of severe worldwide shortages this Christmas if Nintendo cannot ramp production. Japan is mainly to blame. Looking through the charts and numbers of Japanese sales is like having people chant 'DS! DS! DS!' all the time as this **ytmd** shows. System shortages. Cartridge shortages. Shortages every week in the summer months for goodness sakes.

There will some big news this week and next concerning the system launches.

Meanwhile, EA says that **it plans for level console field**. EA is the biggest game publisher so their word counts for something. Does EA really believe the console market will remain even three way? Of course not. This 'level console field' EA plans for is EA actually saying, "We don't know what the hell is going to happen this console _____"

generation!!!! So we will support all the consoles evenly!"

Other third party publishers have echoed similiar statements. Capcom has decided the handhelds are their more attractive option since the console market is "in chaos".

To those who are younger, you might not appreciate the unstable nature of the console market. Atari was once the fastest growing U.S. company with such a meteoric rise... and went bankrupt within a year. Nintendo entered the crashed market and revived it (which you can handily read about in most business books today). Sega arose out of nowhere. Sony, also, came from nowhere. Everyone predicted the DS to flop. I've never seen a more competitive, immature, momentum based industry that is as unstable [risky] (and profitable) as the console game industry. Out of the many companies that have entered the market, the only company to survive unscathed since the 1980s was Nintendo, since the 1990s is Sony. There is such a high failure rate (did you know only 4% of video games ever make money?). Anyone going into the console market has to be downright insane.

I agree with Chris Kohler (from wired magazine) when he says we might lose another big member of the games industry fairly soon (my guess would be Microsoft if it fails to generate money from the Xbox 360). The major investors, such as those who helped create Tivo and Xfire, say that the games industry is sick and it is going to rapidly change. E3 died for this reason.

Coming of the Entertainment Wave...

Pook · 11 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



An emailer asks:

I'm looking for some material on the increase number people downloading music,movies, videos, etc. instead of actually going out to get the physical product. i've notice a trend in some interesting articles...specifically this show i saw with charlie rose talking about the future of technology and entertainment...if you know of any books on that subject that would be great.

The way how I gain information on the entertainment industry is just studying the companies themselves. I don't know any books (though I'm sure there are probably some). But if you wait for books, it may be too late. Amazon is already **announcing digital downloads**. Apple is set for **movie downloads**. Like a tidal wave, the entertainment wave will echo the 'information wave' of the 90s that flooded the Internet. There will be a company that can network it all together somehow. Whoever that company will be, it will become bigger than Google.

Digital distribution of entertainment is only the very first (and small) step. The big thing will be doing entertainment in ways that wasn't possible before the Internet. Using video games as example, online multiplayer is just internet distribution of the bits. You could do that at home with a few people. But it was impossible to play a MMO at home. So the MMO games begin to create entertainment into a new way than before and generate ungodly amounts of money. I've noticed the game industry tends to hit the trends first before the rest of the mainstream industries.

So instead of television being digitally distributed from the TV company, a more disruptive element would be users distributing THEIR TV made content to each other and to the TV company. What if music was made by thousands of musicians each playing their part seperately and then adding it all together? Yes, this sounds silly. But I'm trying to think outside of the box, and I have no idea what the next 'big thing' will be. But this Entertainment Wave won't end at the 'digital distribution', it will be just as the beginning. Just as the Internet revolutionized information, it will do the same for entertainment.

Women are desperate to get married

Pook · 11 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



An emailer sent me a link to this [hilarious Oprah story](#). A man was able to marry five women at the same time. Obviously, there are smart, strong, and substantial women who could only get 'played' if the man was a demi-devil. Well, at least Oprah thinks so.

According to all of these womens' stories, Eric's technique was to wow a woman with his false résumé—which often included references to him being a Navy SEAL or a pilot, including a crisp, white Navy uniform, and being orphaned and raised by abusive foster parents. He would then ingratiate himself to the women's families and propose marriage within weeks of dating.

From one of these woman's perspective, she meets a Navy SEAL in his crisp, white Navy uniform, thinks he falls in love with HER immediately, and proposes marriage within weeks.

Anyone who proposes marriage within weeks is crazy. Why would a decorated military officer so jump for marriage with one of these girls? It is because she thinks she is "all that".

There is a joke that I like which reveals women's narcissism. "My girlfriend and I both agree on one thing: we both think she is hot." Women do not LIKE these guys. They just like them liking her. Even if you are a mega-dork, she will still think you are 'OK' because you have good-taste for liking HER (which is obviously the greatest of all goddesses on Earth, at least she thinks so).

Like many of the women, Melissa says Eric displayed a "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde" split personality. "One day he would just be so sweet and loving and then, like, the next day, all of a sudden, he would blow up. He'd be throwing stuff around and push you around," she says.

Women love this! You become a mystery and are highly entertaining. Despite this 'personality flaw' that Oprah complains about, these women still marry him even after knowing of this.

"He told me he had inherited money from his mother, who had died when he was 2 years old, " she says. "He pretended like he had money, but I never actually saw it. He played it really well. I mean, he had a story for everything."

This guy knew what these women wanted.

A part of Eric's modus operandi, these women claim, was to lie about his own finances and steal from them.

"He stole four checks from my great grandmother, wrote one, made it out to me for \$4,000, forged my name to the back of it and deposited it into my checking account," April, Eric's fifth wife alleges. "He also wrote three other checks to pay off some credit cards."

Awesome! A Gold Digger Male!

All of these women were made vulnerable by their emotional neediness, Dr. Robin says, and Eric was able to "sniff out" that they were weak and vulnerable. These women believed that they were insufficient on their own, so his con was sure to work on them. The goal for these and all women is to repair their spirits and eliminate this feeling.

So the doctor's advice is for all these women to become feminists. By not needing a man, they won't be prone to con games! You go Oprah!

What is interesting to me is that this guy did most of his behavior in Houston which I am located. His behavior is awful but if a woman did what he did, she would have been applauded and the man 'shamed' for speaking up.

A woman is allowed to marry under false pretenses. A man is not.

If women are allowed to be con artists in the game of love, why not men? Are these women mad that he wasn't in love with her or that they were not as 'hot' as they thought?

Cats are men to feminists

Pook · 11 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original

An emailer sent me these links. Mirror has always said to invest in cat food since the demand for cat food is going to be insane with all these single women and their cats.

Now we have some proof. These Whiskas commercials show that the audience is single women. Not only are all the 'masters' women, but all the pets are DUMB MALES. Really, you have it to see this to believe it:

Letter defending men having options

Pook · 11 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original

[image]These women want all the options in the world: to work, to not work, to get married, to not get married, to abort, to not abort, on and on and on.

But are men to have any options other than The Way? Apparently not. This letter (sent by an emailer) is common of many women's attitudes towards a foreign wife.

My favorite quote:

WOMAN: So, how does that make you different from women who are after men for their money or power?

MAN: I have no objections to such women. They can set their criteria in any manner they so choose. I provide an avenue for men to counter such women. I am not trying to restrict anyone's selection of a spouse as you appear to be.

That sums it up. Never trust anyone who desires to restrict your options.

The Path to 9-11

Pook · 11 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



I just finished watching the show, "The Path to 9-11" which was only interrupted in the middle by a speech by the President. If you missed it, I would see it. By documenting and re-creating the series of events up to the hi-jackings, the show finally put 9-11 into tragedy.

Tragedy is a word so misused that the word has virtually been destroyed. Tragedy does not mean what most people think: of something very bad happening. 9-11 is not the tragedy. The tragedy is looking back on it and knowing that action could have been to stop it. Imagine a cute little pig-tail haired girl walking with her mother. The mother turns away to look at the sky (or something) and this cute little pig-tail haired girl runs into the street and is smashed by a bus. The smashing of the bus is not the tragedy. The tragedy is when the mother realizes her error for looking elsewhere at the time of daughter's run into the road. In all the plays, such as the ancient greek plays, that are "tragedies" including Shakespeare, this is the important point. The tragedy of Hamlet is not him dying. The tragedy is knowing that he didn't have to die. In the same way, an elderly 100 year old woman dying due to age is not a tragedy and never will be. But an obese person knowing they are going to die because they were stupid to eat all those milk duds in their life... that is the tragedy. Finally, a film on 9-11 that doesn't just show towers falling down but leads to the tragic elements that allowed the attack.

Three things surprised me after 9-11. First, on every anniversary, everyone tries to inject themselves into the story. "I was going to fly that day!" "I knew someone in the WTC!" And so on. Second, I never thought there would be conspiracy kooks who would possibly think the U.S. Government would be behind the WTC and Pentagon hits (but then again, there are kooks who think NASA never landed on the moon as well). And third, most humerously, I was stunned by the reaction of the Objectivists. The Objectivists, the so-called followers of Ayn Rand, were on television days after demanding nuclear war. They were the most hawkish of any political faction ever. One Objectivist I know was clearly surprised by their stance. I do remember how Ayn Rand literally worshipped the skyscraper and believed firmly in the philosophy of Capitalism. The Objectivists probably saw the WTC as their symbol and its destruction as the worst attack possible in their eyes.

The most amazing thing came when I helped move a friend to a local college. It was a sunny August Texas afternoon. While I was waiting for my friend, I was in the parking lot and something caught my eye. It was a man, with no shirt on, just leaning back on his pick-up. I emphasize the word man because he stuck out in a sea of androgenous beings that fill modern society.

He had an aura of masculinity I have never seen before. Granted, everyone of us, male and female, move in and out of masculinity (or femininity for girls) within our lives. When we get old or lazy, we tend to revert to a more androgenous form. But his form was sharply masculine. Imagine if a shirt-less Schwarzenegger appeared out of nowhere. You'd stare in awe. But this man was not a puffed up body builder. His muscles were hard and not the bubble like form you see body builders have. His skin was oddly tanned... even for south Texas. He was almost red... but not burnt. Almost as if he was bronze. Some people will think it is 'homosexual' to notice this. But when someone of either extreme femininity or masculinity ends up nearby, their sheer aura commands your attention. Everything about this guy was sharply defined. He had a cigar in his mouth puffing away. The best description I can give was that he resembled the Marlboro Man.

I decided to go over and talk to him. He said he was in the military and had just gotten back from Iraq (we were near Fort Hood). He also was helping someone move into the college. But he wasn't just another soldier in Iraq. He was part of a special team. I asked him more about this. This man was extremely laid back. He acted like he didn't have a care in the world (and why should he after returning from a war zone?). He then told me he was part of the team that captured Saddam Hussein.

What do you say to that? "You capture dangerous dictators bent on world domination? Hah! I do... uh... office work... and...fax papers... so beat that!"? Granted, this man could, with his leave from the military, just become a couch potato and shed off any masculinity into an androgenous form. But at that moment (it wasn't too long since Hussein was captured) he simply glowed testosterone. He wasn't "handsome" but extremely rugged. I'm sorry, I lack the talent of language to describe him. Let us just say when you look at an androgenous blog, your mind thinks, "Stillness." But when you looked at him, his aura was screaming action.

He is, as most masculine men are, nameless. You will never see his photo on the news or any parades in his honor. But he is the most masculine man I had ever seen... and probably will ever see in my life.

Box Office plummets 26%

Pook · 11 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Hey **Hollywood**! Disrupt your entertainment model or you're going to find yourselves disrupted by an upstart outsider!

The box office experienced a horrific weekend in more ways than one. Not only did a horror movie that its studio declined to show to critics lead all others, but it earned just \$9 million -- the first time in three years that the top film had made less than \$10 million. Moreover, the total for all films was lower than any weekend of the year and down 26 percent from the comparable weekend a year ago to just \$54.4 million, according to Bloomberg News. In an interview with today's (Monday) *Los Angeles Times*, Exhibitor Relations chief **Paul Dergarabedian** observed that while this is ordinarily a time of year when the box office slows down, "This is not a great way to start off the fall season." It was, however, fairly great for Sony Films, which saw **The Covenant** become its ninth film to open at No. 1 this year. It earned \$9 million, well ahead of **Hollywoodland**, which garnered critical raves for its star, **Ben Affleck**. It placed second with \$6 million.

Clooney and Eisner on the Entertainment Wave

Pook · 11 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



An emailer sends in a [video](#) about Clooney and Eisner talking about the 'next wave' in the entertainment industry. Since I don't feel like paying for the Google service, I can only get a minute or so of footage before commercials (!) start appearing.

But I wonder if Clooney and Eisner realize that they are going to be ones disrupted by the Internet upstarts? Disney isn't going to be benefitting from the disruption, that is for sure (unless Disney embraces disruption which I doubt they will).

Too much oil

Pook · 13 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



If you are a doomster, please do not read this [article](#):

“The world has only consumed about 18 percent of its conventional potential,” Jum’ah said, contending that should lay to rest fears that the world is in danger of being tapped out within a few decades.

Oh no! This means even if we don't discover anything or are unable to tap into unconventional resources like the tar sands of Alberta, we will have over 130 years of resources! Alas, doomsters! What do you do when confronted with good news? Shall you hang yourselves on news of Human wealth and plenty? It is the doomster who doubts the cornucopia of freedom and Human genius.

Apple is building the Windows of Entertainment

Pook · 13 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



As the entertainment wave begins to crest and, soon, to wash upon all of us, a gigantic bubble will be made. This is similar to the dot com bubble of the late nineties. Good ideas but without certain business models are destined to collapse. Make no mistake: Youtube and Myspace are bubbles that will pop. Do not invest in them. Stay away and enjoy their services while you still can.

Amazon's 'Unbox' of music and movie downloads is a desperate act. When was the last time Amazon made a download service? Amazon is good at shipping boxes but not much else. Amazon sees the trend changing towards downloadable content and knows that it will be left behind. Farewell Amazon. It's "unbox" is also certain for failure.

But the big story is Apple's 'iTV'. Why did Apple reveal the iTV early with its prototype name and with it not having a release date yet? Interestingly, this iTV will be competing with the 'top boxes' such as the Xbox 360 and PS3. Isn't Apple worried?

No. In the same way, people thought the iPod was about the iTunes store or about the iPod player and so everyone tried to copy that. But iPod was really the birth of a new platform (the hardware and iTunes stores are just elements of that). No wonder Microsoft abandoned WMA to launch the Zune hardware! Apple is attempting to build a new entertainment platform.

Building platforms is hard and long work. Apple isn't too interested in the individual profits right now as it sees it as long term growth. Microsoft did the similar thing when building up MS-DOS and Windows. Both Microsoft and Sony are being left behind by Apple. Despite the gloom and doom said, iPod still has a whopping 75% of the marketplace.

The iTV is being delayed due to technological reasons more than anything else. Wireless transfer technologies has advanced very fast lately but video is so much more data than audio. My brother works with such wireless technology and it is incredible by how rapid it is developing. Transferring video wirelessly? Piece of cake fairly soon.



How Orwellian!

Strength Through iTunes

iTunes Through Apple

Apple Prevails

What if IBM makes a commercial of an athletic woman running into a room of Apple brainwashed fans to throw a giant hammer at a screen of Steve Jobs? That would be interesting...

Chick Radio

Pook · 13 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Get your tissues! **Air America is filing for bankruptcy.** They haven't even paid **Al Franken** in quite a while.

You might ask, "But Pook, there are conservative talk radio in America. Why not liberal talk radio?"

Talk radio is a disruptive media. It is set to disrupt as an alternative to 'mainstream' media. I don't think liberals desire an alternative to mainstream media apart from blogging. There is no liberal discontent at the New York Times or ABC News as there is conservative discontent.

But I think a big element of it is entertainment. Much of the conservative talk radio, especially Limbaugh, is reportedly having an audience of 40% liberals. Why is half the audience of conservative talk radio being liberals? Tom Daschle, the former Senate Democrat leader (he got voted out!) was stunned by this. Talk Radio such as Limbaugh succeed in not because they are ideological but because they are entertaining. They have a 40% liberal audience because that audience is still entertained... even though they hate the hosts!

What was entertaining about Air America? People are also attracted to optimism, not pessimism. When looking back at electoral results, Reagan somehow won 49 states' electoral votes in the election of 1984. If you look at that campaign, you'll find rich sunny optimism and humor. This is the same reason why people flock to listen to Limbaugh or other talk radio. Was Air America filled with sunny optimism... or doom and gloom? Was it filled with humor... or anger? You can be a liberal and have optimism and humor... just look at JFK. But no one wants to listen to doom and gloom all day long. No one wants to listen to people who take themselves too seriously.

But as Air America files for bankruptcy, we have **Feminist Radio**! Yes, friends, Chick Radio founded by the great feminists of our era: Steinem and Fonda.

Steinem said the network, which is run by women, aims to provide an alternative to current radio talk, which she describes as "very argumentative, quite hostile, and very much male-dominated."

This network "has a different spirit. It has more community. It's more about information, about humor, about respect for different points of view and not constant arguing," Steinem told Reuters in an interview.

Talk radio is male dominated? Since when? And I thought its focus was always community, humor, and information?

But here is the fun quote:

Steinem pointed out that the idea of an all-women network stemmed from a company survey showing an 18 percent decrease in female listeners over the past seven years.

"Women are really fleeing from AM talk radio and now FM music because people get their music in different ways. So there's an enormous window of opportunity, and we're diving in," she said.

This is interesting. Why are female listeners declining? Perhaps they are all moving to the television?

And Chick Radio will fail as well. Notice how neither feminist mentioned its focus to be on entertainment? It is always so 'political cause' or 'social goal'. People want entertainment, not nonsense.

Male Feminists are guilt filled wimps

Pook · 13 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original

[image]An emailer (who definately gets it) has this to say:

Pooky,

Nothing special, but it did make me laugh, simply because after agreeing with your post on 'the burden of guilt', this guy seems like a real case study.

"A woman calling a man a bitch is a very different thing than a man calling a woman a bitch; the latter is part of a long history of misogyny; the former is a relatively recent phenomenon. We have to judge words by their power to hurt".

"I can rail against the "unfairness" of judging me by the poor behavior of other men, but in this culture, that's fruitless. As men, we do have to accept the fact that collectively, we have given good reason why it is that we ought not to be trusted -- above all in the sexual realm. We can bemoan the injustice of paying for the sins of others, or we can shoulder the burden that our brothers have created for us (and that perhaps, in our own lives, we have helped to create). What that means practically is that I am committed to meeting suspicion with patience, openness, and accountability. *I'm no longer hurt when folks don't trust me just because I'm a man -- I accept now that they have every reason not to.*"

http://hugoboy.typepad.com/hugo_schwyzler/2006/05/someone_named_t.html

You can imagine the guy being trampled on by a feminist in big black high heels, and he'd just sit there going 'aaaah, yes, I deserve it... I deserve it, but... no.. not the eyes! Aaaah! I'd fight back, but it would just be adding further darkness to the cold night of misogyny that is Western history... oooh, my crotch! Aaah!'.

Why are so many males filled with guilt? I think it all comes down to the first Pookish Commandment: Be who you are. These guilt filled wimps are focused on what other people think of them. If feminists and academics say he is guilty, then presto, he is guilty. His value measuring stick is only in how other people percieve him.

I wonder if that is the root of all feminine thought: caring only how others percieve you. I have never met a woman who didn't care what others thought of her. Even the nastiest of feminists will point to fellow nasty feminists agreeing with her as if that is validity of her beliefs herself.

If a woman is bothering me, I have noticed if I say: "You should have heard what the other girls said about you!" BAM! She shuts up and demands to know what was said. As a man, I know I am percieved to be an ass to all women. But I know women care about what other women think and highly regard them so. Their female friends constantly backstab each other (or at least have the potential to). Female friendships are as thin as paper. So if I say, "Your friends said some of the nastiest stuff about you!" the woman will go bonkers. "Tell me!" she cries. "I must know what they said!" It is safe to say that every woman has told her friends secrets, even of the most nastiest sort, so even if I know nothing her fears of her percieved faults emerge. I just don't tell her and it drives her up a wall.

A real man doesn't care what others think or care about him. John Wayne does not ask people what they think of him. He just is who he is. When a male starts caring what everyone thinks of him, almost certainly he begins to adopt strange feminine characteristics. He may start to gossip, begin to dress to how others will percieve him, begin

to talk in a way so he will be great in other people's eyes, and so on.

Every person filled with guilt (and I'm not talking about real guilt like the religious sin type) is due to them caring about what other people think. One person said to me, "Pook, do not wear your cowboy hat on your trip for the Californians do not like Texans." My response was, "**** the Californians! I shall lead an army of pick-up trucks and conquer their girly state! I am a Pook! I shall wear the biggest cowboy hat I can find!" The other states complain Texans have too much state pride. I just laugh at them. What else should I do? Should I grovel and feel guilty over nothing? As an American, I hear much anti-American nonsense especially that I ought to be 'ashamed' because there are non-Americans who don't like my country. "They hate us, Pook." So what!? When did nations begin conducting foreign and domestic policy based on being liked by other countries? There is nothing to feel guilty about with looking out for yourself... either in your nationality, in your relations with women, and so on. What is next? Am I to marry bitter washed out career women because... they will hate me if I do not? Please!

Let me get on my knees. "Please have mercy on me, oh most wonderful feminists. I was a silly Pook and thought I had to live life to my own soul rather than the authority of your shame." Screw that! Give me my cowboy hat. I would rather die on feet than live on my knees.

Cast off that matriarch's guilt and, suddenly, all their arrows of shame will bounce harmless off you. They cannot shame you or control you. The guiltless man has no place in their midst.

Razor blades model is not the standard for consoles

Pook · 15 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



Nintendo says that it **will make money off of every console** it sells. Analysts are stunned that a console is actually profitable. But really, the 'razor and blades' business model doesn't apply to video game consoles despite what anyone tells you. The idea of the razor and blades model is to sell the razor at a no-profit or at a loss and reap the money back by people buying blades. This model is used on printers and their ink cartridges.

Only one console really does the razor and blades business model and that is the Xbox franchise. The Playstations are sold at a loss initially but, betting on falling computer part prices, the hardware soon becomes profitable. For example, the PSP was not profitable to Sony at launch. But around seven (or so) months, it broke even and became profitable. Sony can do this since it owns many of the factories involved.

Sega tried doing the razor and blades business model by selling hardware at a loss and making it up for games near the end of its cycle. But this failed for Sega.

Atari, NEC, Sega (for the most part), Sony (except at the beginning of each system) and Nintendo have never done the razor and blades model as is commonly understood today.

Keep in mind that the Xbox 360 has sold four million (according to independent sales charts) consoles so far which is pretty lame for a year being on a market with no competitors. PS3 is supposed to ship two million by the end of the year. Wii will ship four million by the end of the year. So despite being a year on the market, Xbox 360 may end up becoming quickly buried. What is humorous to me is that Nintendo will probably outsell both Microsoft and Sony with their Wiis and make money on all of it. I ask you: who has the better business model out of the three console makers? The answer is easily seen in who gets the most money.

Now, there is a real razor and blades model that game consoles can use but it is not in the way how people perceive it. The product of a game system is not the hardware. It is the hardware and the software (if you have just hardware, all you have is an empty silicon box). After all, when you buy a razor it often comes bundled with some sort of blades. This is why I think selling hardware, by itself, at a loss and expect profit from games is not a true comparison of the razor and blades model. A better example of it would be bundling in a hit game, not just any game, and once you put the console in someone's home, they then go and buy other software.

The best example of this would be Kalinske's decision for Sega with the Genesis. Sega makes this hit game, Sonic the Hedgehog, which is flying off shelves. What does Kalinske propose to Sega? Get rid of Altered Beast in the bundle and put in Sonic and drop the price of the overall system. The board was stunned at this. By putting their hit game into the system, they would lose all that great profit they were enjoying from Sonic. And by selling the system

for less, it was as if the Genesis would not make that much money! Everyone was appalled at Kalinske, at this American, for telling the Japanese board how to sell their system in America. But the president of Sega went ahead with Kalinske.

By putting the hit title with the console, the system sold extremely well (people buy the hardware to get to the software. Steve Jobs says: "Software is the driver of hardware"). Once the system was in people's home, they would then get other games for it. This is how the actual razor and blades model would work with video game consoles.

Nintendo did something similar with the NES. Super Mario Brothers would sell very well alone. But by bundling it with the system, it moved the NES to new and bored video game players. Since the Wii is aiming for that same strategy, it is no wonder Nintendo bundled in Wii Sports. But I don't think Nintendo went far enough. They should have tossed in a second controller (wii-mote and nunchuck) as well as Zelda: TP into the box and priced it at \$300. They would not make as much money as before, but it would drive the system sales by putting in their 'hit' title with the system. In the same way, Microsoft would be very smart for bundling Halo 3 with the Xbox 360 when it comes out. However, I doubt they will do this.

By the way, I feel sorry for you guys in the UK who have to shell out huge prices (and Australia too). To make it crystal clear for those of us on the outside:

Europe routinely gets shafted by not just console companies but by all the electronic companies. In the UK, their prices are a third more expensive than they should be.

Wii is \$250 in America. In UK, it is \$336. PS3 in America is \$599. In the UK, it is \$798.

Also,

I'll be busy this weekend. As you can tell, my life doesn't revolve around this blog. Even most of my writings are sent to someone else for another publication now. But there will be a website soon. It will not be in this blog-like fashion and feature more article type content than these 'malt-o-content' little posts.

Who is Bush?

Pook · 16 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



One of the advantage of being Pook is that I have access to those who have been around my nation's 'leaders'. Think of Chaucer who got stuck between the high political class and the rest of us peasants. It has always been in my family history for my ancestors to be "serving" the noble class in some capacity. I have a direct ancestor even as far back that was a 'sheriff' in London centuries ago serving some English King (forgot which one). Since Bush and most of the current administration has come from Texas (not just Texas but my local county), everyone I seem to know has had direct contact with these guys.

Bush is not a conservative. He is a moderate but with some conservative leanings. For the conservatives in the Republican Party, they only care about what is referred to as "the three" big issues: foreign policy, tax cuts, and the Supreme Court. Since Bush goes with those, the party generally supports him. With those who really despise Bush, I wonder what would happen when a real conservative gets into the White House. Do they realize that Newt Gingrich is the currently leading among the base in the primaries for 2008? It is still way early but I am curious what would happen if a very ideological conservative came around, how would the Democrat Party act?

Anyway, people tell me that Bush acts nothing at all on TV as he does in person. In person, he is very articulate, very charming, and... as someone described... "robust". Naturally, I ask, "Then why does he just blink into the camera and not talk very well?" And the answer I got was: "Pook, there are two reasons. First, not everyone is good at being personable toward a camera. Take these famous writers. They are brilliant but in front of a television camera they sound like idiots. They just aren't used to cameras. Whereas a Hollywood actor can respond very well with the camera yet, they are often the biggest doofuses. Bush is a people person. He becomes animated around people, not cameras." Then he reminded me, "Remember the debates with Kerry? In the Second Debate with the Town Hall, you can clearly see Bush becoming animated and trying to connect with each person talking. He connects with people, not cameras." So, what about that second reason? "Remember that kid in class who always had the right answer for everything? You wanted to slap that kid. In politics, one must remember perception. Bush can go around swatting answers at anything but its usually doesn't look presidential." His latest press conference in the Rose Garden certainly illustrated that.

Bush actually prefers to be underestimated. "That is his strategy," one person told me. "He wants people to think of him as a doofus." Ann Richards, that feminist governor of Texas who recently died, wrote off Bush when he first ran for governor. Gore and Kerry both did later. Even today, people underestimate his political abilities. I was told that is just as he wants it. "That is what works for him," one said.

The personality of Bush is that he is extraordinarily competitive. If you played a Ping Pong game with him, for example, he would try to win. His focus is winning on anything he does. (This isn't surprising to me as any successful person in anything usually seems to have this mentality. Tiger Woods even admitted that if he played

checkers or something, his goal would be to win.)

One unique thing about Bush that differs from other politicians is that he is extremely focused on voting records, demographics, and statistics. Usually, the candidate hasn't a clue of this and the campaign manager deals with this. When Bush would go campaign in, say, New Mexico, he knew the voting records for each county. Karl Rove is apparently a walking encyclopedia on this stuff and much of it must have rubbed off on Bush.

Bush is said to be one of the most 'charming'. (Not a surprise for a mega-politician). Much of the charm is suspected of being machiavellian. For example, when Bush was first president, he and his wife would roll in a birthday cake for Senator Ted Kennedy (and invite him to watch movies). Stuff like this worked in Texas probably since there isn't much to be partisan about down here. But in Washington, this "new tone" never really took off. The "new tone" was Bush's idea that he could charm everyone on Capitol Hill.

Bush is a fanatical book reader. He loves reading biographies. In fact, I suspect the way he acts is how he thinks he will be remembered his future 'biographies' (after all, when you are president, people are going to write biographies on you regardless).

Al Gore speaks better Spanish than Bush does. However, Gore learned his spanish at Harvard. He speaks the text-book spanish. Bush learned spanish at the oil rigs in Texas so his spanish is "off" but it has the Texas/Mexican slang and nuances in it. This is why during the 2000 campaign, hispanics preferred Bush's spanish to Al Gore's.

Bush will do anything to win. To those who don't remember, recall Tom Daschle and the opposition in the first term. What Bush deliberately did was take away Daschle's political issues. Campaign Finance Reform? Bush signed it. Pills and Medicare? Bush signed that, irking all his Republicans. What happened is that by signing practically everything Daschle was supporting, what could Daschle run on? This is why after the election of 2004, Daschle, the Democrat Party Leader in the Senate, was voted out of office (which hadn't happened to a party leader since 1952, fifty four years ago!). Bush is addicted to winning. This is why now, during an election year, we are suddenly seeing Bush become fiesty with the press.

As governor, Bush was very different than he is today. He always joked around. He had afternoon naps in Austin. Either due to the presidency or to 9/11, it's been said he now lacks that 'jovial' attitude he once had.

How did Bush get to the governorship? The South in America has been called the "Solid South" for one reason: it has been universally Democrat. Ever since the Civil War, Lincoln was a Republican, and the Confederacy were Demooocrats back then. After the Civil War, so much resentment was built up that the South was solidly Democrat up until 1994. In 1994 was the so-called Republican Revolution which the South swung Republican and took over both the House and Senate. Bush rode the 1994 conservative wave as did his brother, Jeb, in Florida.

How did Bush get 'annointed' as the presidential candidate by the Republican Party? There are two Presidential campaigns, there is the official public one we all know. But there is a hidden one within the party. Not anyone is going to become a presidential candidate. The party will see if you have the wits to do it, and, most importantly, if you can win. In Bush, they saw the name recognition that his father had. Bush was no stranger to politics or political campaigns as he used to hang out at the White House during the Reagan and the first Bush Administrations. But most importantly, they saw his election results in Texas. The first election against Ann Richards was fine for a political upstart, 52% against 48%. But he grew the gap considerably in the second election. What most attracted the Republican Party to give Bush the presidential nod was that the party saw Bush attracted hispanic votes (as well as some black votes). Bush also did very well with women. With attracting a wide variety of demographics, they saw Bush as a safe choice.

What more is there to say about him? These are all things that have been told to me. I have never met Bush. I have met Governor Perry (who was Lieutenant Governor when Bush was the Governor. Perry took over when Bush became President). One thing about Perry is that he has to be gay. He acts like such a pretty boy. When saying the Pledge of Allegiance, I scanned everyone and what was Perry doing during the pledge? He was touching up his hair like a girl. Very strange.

If I think up of more things about Bush or the politicians, I'll add them. One last thing, Bush's ranch in Texas is a prop. He probably does enjoy such a ranch as it is very different from the White House. But it is a campaign prop. He bought it for the Presidential election. Watch him sell it when he steps down as President. He'll probably end up living in an apartment in Dallas. (What!? Why are you surprised? Bush will do anything to win... even buy a ranch in the middle of the boonies.)

The Mother of All Trailers

Pook · 18 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original

Sums up why I hate movie trailers. [Watch](#).

World War IV

Pook · 18 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original



World War III could be said to be the Cold War. But World War IV is certainly about Radical Islam.

Please watch this. We must expand people's context!

World War I ended in an armistice. World War II ended with unconditional surrender. World War III ended when Soviet Russia was dealt with. But the new conflict is, at its root, religious. They despise the Pope more than, say, President Bush. There will be no armistice, they will not surrender. It is a conflict of those who worship life versus those who worship death. How do you make a deal with someone who straps bombs on their own children?

A larger version is [here](#) for your viewing pleasure.

The video talks about how Radical Islam has hijacked Islam and is spread out among the population. But the difference between Radical Islam and their Muslim brothers is that Radical Islam worships death.

Soon, the West will be split among itself. Those Westerners who worship death more than life will, naturally, side with Radical Islam and proclaim death to the West. One of the factions, feminists, clearly falls into this category. It explains why the civilization and religion that brutally treats their women and literally keeps them down, the Radical Islam, is ignored by the feminists. Who are the feminists' enemies? Not just men but life-worshipping men and women. It is you men who do not live for materialism, who do not live for image, who do not live for power over other people. While Radical Islam gets a pass, feminists attack Christianity for 'putting down the women'. Feminists despise life so it is no longer strange to me to see them be unannounced allies of Radical Islam (as their enemies are the same).

What I suspect is that Radical Islam is not new but very very ancient. It is the viewpoint most civilizations and religions had long ago. The first Christians took the fish as their symbol as the Mill of Time had the constellation of Pisces swing overhead (the previous era was Aries, the 'Ram'). While Jesus was very poor and did not seek violence, it ought to be remembered how 'revolutionary' that 'turning the other cheek' was in that era (the era of the Roman Empire). These Death Worshipers are not new... they are twenty centuries behind the times.

Has Thailand fallen to Jihad?

Pook · 19 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original

[image]It is beginning to look that way.

BANGKOK, Thailand - Thailand's army commander staged a coup Tuesday night and ousted Prime Minister Thaksin Shinawatra while he was in New York, circling his offices with tanks, declaring martial law and revoking the constitution. Gen. Sondhi Boonyaratkalin, who is known to be close to Thailand's revered monarch and is a Muslim in this Buddhist-dominated nation, will be acting prime minister, said army spokesman Col. Akara Chitroj.

One thing I might do is get out my world map and mark the most feminized and, potentially, unstable countries politically. These would be the first to fall.

Anyone remember the Muslim riots in France? (which lasted forever) Wasn't there a new law there that said women could no longer go bare breasted anymore? I suspect that law was made due to placating the growing Muslim population.

One thing that always concerned me about the expat movement is they never really talk about political instability. While America has its faults, it is the most stable of governments. Mexico is on the brink of collapse. I expect to see Canada fall apart in my lifetime (and perhaps some areas become new states like Alberta). Most Americans are spoiled by political stability and don't realize how fragile many governments are.

Madonna is being 'crucified' on the cross for a concert on NBC. Imagine if she mocked Islam as she does Christianity. She will never do it, of course. She'd get her throat slit.

Even more crazy are these sudden repeated requests from the Islam world asking the Pope to convert to Islam. The elder son of Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi has called on Pope Benedict XVI to convert to Islam immediately, dismissing last week's apology from the pontiff for offending Muslims.

"If this person were really someone reasonable, he would not agree to remain at his post one minute, but would convert to Islam immediately," Mohammed Gaddafi told an awards ceremony on Monday evening for an international competition to memorise the Qur'an.

Notice how Radical Islam is feeding off of the feminized wimps of the West? Do they really expect the Pope to go, "Oh, I want to show I am a 'reasonable' fellow. I shall convert to Islam immediately!" They probably don't but it is a worth a try to them.

Like a shark detecting blood in the water, notice how these radical Islamists detect feminization in certain nations and pounce at it? If the Pope was that feminized (he isn't), he would bow down towards Islam. My point is that they are using the feminization, the wimp-ification of the West against it.

All these 'riots' and 'outrage' in the Islam "communities" are organized and arranged. They are artificial. They are hiding behind their religion. If I, the Pookius Maximus Extroadinarius, say, "You should not threaten to kill the Pope. You should not threaten to kill anyone," the wimps of the west, these guilt filled puss-boys whose only concern is how we (or they) appear to other people's eyes, will say, "Pook, you are being extreme. How dare you not let them be outraged!"

I'm trying to figure out what to do with the Wimps of the West who are being played like a stradivarian by these manipulators. Nice Guys are so stuffed with pride that they NEVER admit they are being played by women. All

wimps have some romanticized vision of the world. How do you get through their pride to the issue?

Bah! I've learned people prefer feelings to thoughts. Thomas Paine was dead on accurate when he said, "Time makes more converts than reason." Ever try to reason with a nice guy? Ever try to reason with a wimp?

Perhaps this explains why the school yard instinct for children is, when finding a wimp, to beat him up.

Rage-O-Meter

Pook · 19 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original

"Oh godly Pook," the voices shout below, "tell us how we may know the rage of the Aries filled Islam extremists?"
In my Great Pookness, I have crafted this lovely chart. Behold:



What is a wimp?

Pook · 19 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original

Again, the voices below cry out for more Pookiness. "Tell, oh most masterful Pook, champion of masculinity, protector of the manly way, and the Most Desirable Among Da Women, what is a wimp?"

Remember how real men were leaving television news? If someone acts like this, they are a wimp!

Is Sony crumbling?

Pook · 21 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original

[image]After a disastrous showing at E3 2006, after a series of bad PR since then, and especially after the Blu-Ray diode shortage creating a token launch (and delaying European launch until well into 2007), Sony needed good news. Badly. TGS was going to be where Sony was going to fire all guns and show why they have been the leader in the console industry.

What happened instead was a conference worse than E3 2006. There was no mention of giant enemy crabs and hitting their weak spots for massive damage because... there was no talk of the games! Instead, Kutaragi just waxed on about the future of networking. The only game showed was Afrika which had elephants (yay!).

The impressions of the games on display at the booths have been very mixed to disappointing. Framerate issues is said to be the cause. Many of the RPGs and other titles for PS3 are unconfirmed as it appears the companies have lost confidence in mighty Sony.

If you don't believe me, look at the game industry media that is all pouncing on Sony for this. Eurogamer just made fun of Sony while they live-blogged the TGS conference. People have not stopped being shocked and are just pointing and laughing. Ouch.

If you've ever wanted to see a major industry turn inside out, just watch the games industry for the next year. Something in the internal business of Sony must have gone massively wrong.

From [Gameindustry.biz](#):

Kutaragi's Tokyo Game Show keynote had been considered by many to be Sony's last chance to make a big impression on an international audience prior to the November US and Japanese launches of its next-generation games console.

But while Ridge Racer 7 was confirmed as a launch title and shown running in high-definition, and there were also spots for Mobile Suit Gundam: Target in Sight, Virtua Fighter 5, Final Fantasy XIII and Afrika, the company's decision to offer a focused technological discussion rather than specifying new products and features is likely to come under intense scrutiny.

In other words, expect to see many mock-ups and Internet memes like Kutaragi on the elephant picture above. The Internet was especially vicious with the E3 2006 Sony Conference:

Japanese English training

Pook · 22 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original

Why are these english phrases seem designed for women to use? This is what I was thinking until I saw the men start to say them too!

[First Video](#)

[Second Video](#)

"LOL, let us zoom on their shoulder blades!" These videos are messed up in so many ways.

Where is Pook?

Pook · 25 September 2006 · Archived copy · Original

Oh no! Where is Pook!? Someone stole him! Pook thief! Pook thief!

I have been very busy with deadlines lately. Don't worry. I'll come back, and there will be many posts ahead as well as the new website.

So I will throw something 'Pookish' out there so you all do not throw digital tomatoes at me. Consider...

Arrogance in adulthood is usually childhood tenderness turned inside out.

He who holds a high sense of honor does so because he has not been honorable to himself.

Those who hold an almost quixotic insistence on the truth do so because their careers are founded on a lie.

Much of physical courage is frenzied intensity to revenge one's failure in moral courage for not being oneself.

Be who you are! The First Pookish Commandment corrects so many self-made flaws. Do not take my word for it. Here is Steve Jobs's speech where a single theme runs through it: trust your gut, follow your interests, be who you are.

That is the only way all the dots will connect in life.

Happy Thanksgiving!

Pook · 23 November 2006 · Archived copy · Original

Regular posting will resume soon. I'll be in court the next few days. (Nothing serious, not like I am in a Family Court!)

What are you thankful for? I think it is a question worth asking.

There are many things I do not understand about life, but there is one thing I know with certainty: you cannot live your life through other people's eyes. I believe most people trap themselves into a type of hollow life where they keep acting to please others... be it their girlfriends... their families... their employers... and forget about their soul. When your life is hollow... when it is soul-less... you are easily manipulated.

The most fascinating thing about people when they are manipulated is that they always think they are growing in power. The ultimate end of this evolution is the politician. People think politicians hold power, but they are easily manipulated and the greatest fools of all.

What fascinates me about modern marriage is that the 'couple' act more like politicians than like sexualized male and female beings. They even refer to servicing the "marriage" as if it were something like a state. I know it was not always like this. John Locke's "Two Treatises of Government" concluded the concept of natural rights from the natural interactions of man and wife. But if these interactions are turned into political, should we be surprised when men are not seen as beings of natural rights?

Always trust your gut. Always follow your soul. Living your life for an 'image' (what many women and manipulated men tend to do) will lead you off the cliff. You will receive accolades but there will be no respect or achievement at the end.

When you follow your own soul, going your own way, you will become the ugly duckling. Employers will not want to hire you (and the same for potential girlfriends). But, if you don't buckle, your ugly duckling nature can turn into a beautiful swan.

Most successful people do what 95% of others do not do. So by trying to appease that 95%, to live in their eyes, you're already doomed on that path of failure.

Successful people do what unsuccessful people dare not to do: living by their own standards, not by someone else's.

Life of Security

Pook · 8 January 2007 · Archived copy · Original

*His world is but a stage,
For the women to play their parts:
They have their scripts and lines;
And his world in life plays many stages,
His acts being seven ages. At first the infant,
Crying and puking in mommy's arms,
Understanding that when she is happy,
The world is in order, and when she's sad,
The world is so broken. From this point on,
Women become his measurement of life.
And then witness the teenage second stage,
His world to now give girls dates and boyfriends,
To be paraded like a caught war horse,
And trotted past her friends like a prize caught.
Of that then comes marriage arrowing fast,
With life well stung to sleep with pricks of love.
'Love!' 'Love!' Everything shall come from this 'love!'
And so he thinks of pies, flutes, dreams of bliss,
Forever a life of security.
He weds to see the girl to happily ascend
Into a princess for the day, and he
Becomes her majesty's court jester
Till lifetime's end. But this 'honor' does prevail,
Full of strange oaths and pledges,
Of dreams bled through Love's demanding sores,
And stuffed with feeling makes this stuffed man
To seek the bubble reputation
Even in the Church of God. Then arrives
children with his wife playing the mother,
Never again will she have a passion
To play the mistress fire ever again.*

*And so witness the fifth age of his life,
Where days of youth are ground into paychecks.
This sparks mid-life crisis of fast fury,
And ends in a whimper. The sixth age shifts
Into frog shaped bodies and groans of pains,
With glasses on nose and big belly front,
To be at grandchildren's every event,
Carrying old age to oblivion.
Last scene of all that out-does all others,
That ends this strange eventful history,
Is failing organs and a rising care.
Does he become his world at lifetime's end?
His hope drowns as his wife has one more role:
That of the nurse. Passing away, they say,
"His poor wife! For what she had to endure!"
A life of security he did have,
Because the price of freedom was too high.
Never realizing his great potential,
Of dreams, desires, and destinies.
Never admitting this he lies and lies,
Until his last breath of earth. For his life
Was filled with 'honor' betraying no one,
Except himself...
.....Except himself...
.....
.....Gone.*

Celebrity is the Opposite of Woman

Pook · 16 January 2007 · Archived copy · Original



One has to be born only to become male. But to become a man, one must achieve. There is a clear difference between a man and a wimp. Women have the ability to recognize the difference even though it is hard to put into words. For many young men, you have had to discover that one has to strive to become a man or you sink into a swamp of wimpiness (what is wimpiness but male's mimicry of women?).

There is no distinction with females today as there is with the wimp-man distinction. Yet, men can recognize a real woman over a bad one, it is just hard to put into words. What is the equivalent of 'wimp' to women? Many women adopt that masculine metric and turn it into a 'weak-woman' and 'strong-woman' difference (which the girl will proudly declare herself a 'strong woman'). Women are not men and while masculinity might separate the man from the wimp, masculinity has no part with differentiating the good women from the bad.

Just as 'wimp' is the opposite of man, celebrity is the opposite of woman. The desire for celebrity is the fountainhead for all the bad traits of feminized women. Think about it:

- The local whore is so because she becomes a 'celebrity' with all the men and the center of female's gossip.
- The woman who devotes her life to her career constantly tries to portray herself as some eighth wonder of the world. During work, she talks about herself and how hard everything is for her. She thinks her 'credentials' turn her into a celebrity.
- Women who obsess what everyone else thinks about them. They give people such power over themselves. They would rather live as a celebrity in other people's eyes than follow her own soul.
- Female friendship is paper thin because, again, mediocre women would rather have 'fans' than 'friends'. It is a

celebrity that has 'fans'.

-Mediocre women willingly allow others to tape themselves engaged in sexual olympics, i.e. pornography. Why are they so willing to reveal themselves to the world so? It is because of huge desire for celebrity.

-A man who has any small amount of fame will suddenly notice women throwing themselves at him. Women see this fame as turning themselves into celebrities.

-Women can't stand being ignored. She must have attention at all times.

-The modern relationship has defined the woman to be a 'celebrity' and the husband/man to become her biggest fan. Do fans criticize their celebrities? Of course not! Celebrities are above all known standards, rules, and criticisms.

-The mediocre woman views children as an additional means to become a celebrity. These mediocre women do not want to do things like clean after the kids or take care of them, only to have them (since it turns her into a 'mother' and the kids are additional fans).

-Mediocre women want their 'men' to look beautiful will lots of muscle, solid abs, and so on. Pretty men turn her into even more of a celebrity.

-Mediocre women will choose being single, married, or attached based on what gives them more celebrity at the time. These 'picky' women are not picky about the man but more so they are ambitious about their celebrity status.

-Mediocre women are attracted to professions that give them 'celebrity' status. These include dancing, acting, modeling, newscasting, and even writing.

-Hatred at "nerds". Nerds, as you can witness in high school, are like an anti-celebrity: being seen with them makes you more UNpopular.

-Obsessed with "stars" and discussion of "stars". Mediocre women are obsessed with celebrity worship since they, of course, desire to become celebrities themselves.

The desire to be a celebrity is not new in women. Centuries ago, women would want to be the 'hit' at the dance. However, it was always seen as a vice for women. Only with the twentieth century with its cameras and motion pictures have turned celebrity into a positive trait. Sure, there was celebrities before but most of them were based on some sort of achievement. Washington was a celebrity for a reason as was Benjamin Franklin. There was little celebrity based on non-achievement.

Today, celebrities work at being celebrities. They must be seen at night at a certain diner so they can be photographed "living the grand lifestyle". Often, it is the celebrity who leaks the event to the tabloid press so they can come and 'secretly' photograph them. Celebrities are fake women. In the same way, wimps are fake men.

Quality women do not live their life expecting to be a star. Quality women search for friends, not fans. Quality women aim to do what is right, not what will make them more popular. Quality women enjoy being a woman, mediocre women despise that they are a woman (just as wimps hate that they are male and desire to be female).

Knowing that celebrity is the opposite of women has helped me considerably in separating the wheat from the chaff. Females who strive for celebrity status are the ones that cause me headaches. Females who strive to be women are ones that cause me to love. Feminism was invented to give unwomanly females access to celebrity

status. The main difference, I have noticed, between Anglosphere females and females in non-English speaking countries is that Anglosphere females all secretly desire to become celebrities which poisons their femininity.

Psychologists: 'No standards for young women are good!'

Pook · 19 January 2007 · Archived copy · Original




Young women going wild over Youtube and Myspace or dressing in skanky clothes? Matriarchy says it is '**good for them**'. I've yet to see any experts saying it is OK for men to go wild or, frankly, to have any happiness at all (that is independent from serving a woman in some fashion).

19th Century psychologists thought of women as 'sub-human'. 20th Century psychologists thought of men as 'sub-human'. As a solution, how about throwing psychologists overboard and look to time-tested literature and classics for Human insight? Great minds tend to grow from the soil of great works.

BTW, I am still working on replying to the email. I don't have as much time as before.

Media got it right in 1986: Newsweek predicted the 'Marriage Crunch'

Pook · 7 March 2007 · Archived copy · Original



Here is a fantastic article Newsweek did on the 'marriage crunch' way back in 1986. The article is full of great quotes and really reveals how some women think (such as one women deciding to buy a house instead of getting a husband to do it. So that is the purpose of husbands is to turn them into a house?). It also shows many women's panic over this article back then.

One quote I love (paraphrasing) is that the older single men are 'bottom of the barrel' while the older single women are the 'cream of the crop'. I would say it is the other way around. The older men get, the easier it is for them to marry.

Twenty years later, Newsweek had to 'apologize' for the article. It was apparently 'disproven' since ten of the women mentioned in the story eventually married (but probably not who they really wanted). Remember, even feminists who swore off marriage end up getting married eventually.



It was like Moses came down the mountain and said, 'Boo on you women'."

MRA statistical guys could find another fun statistical line similiar to the "If you are a single woman at forty, you have more of a chance by being killed by a terrorist than marrying."

Evolution of Don Juan

Pook · 2 April 2007 · Archived copy · Original

This video sums me up.

The first time I had read *Brave New World*, in my youth, I could identify with Bernard as he was the social misfit who would do his own thing (and long for the women). But now, re-reading it, I identify more with Bernard's friend, the tall handsome editor who, no matter where he goes, lustful women go for him. The editor's desire is to be alone, to think, and he finds that more interesting than the 'picnics' the women bring.

For news, the website should be up soon. Do not expect majestic cgi code, with animations and professional graphics style. It will be a very minimalistic site interested in displaying the content than anything else. All the old Don Juan articles will be available up on it along with new stuff.

"But why isn't it up, Pook? Why? WHY!?" We are talking about a significant amount of content. You don't realize it when it is on the Internet since pages aren't *material*. A page can scroll on into infinitude. The Don Juan articles, alone, are around six hundred pages (single space).

Passion versus Eros

Pook · 14 April 2007 · Archived copy · Original

It is said that there is more sex than ever before, or, at least, more than in recent times. Constant cries of outrage come from the latest news story about a principal making porn with school teachers or school kids doing hanky panky under the table. A better illustration would be the early university (founded by churches) compared to the university of today (whorehouse with a clocktower).

Eros is the behavior we see today in modernity. It speaks to the sensation, to the feeling, and more to the appetite. The 'sex' of moderns is not revolutionary or wild, it is lame and pathetic. In fact, it is so lame and pathetic that moderns continually have to dress their sex up with words pregnant in sophistication. Did the woman or man really 'seduce' you? From what I see, the behavior was acting exactly like that of a Happy Meal commercial. It would be absurd to say McDonald's tries to "seduce" our gluttony with pictures and rotations of their food (at best, such 'commercials' speaks only to a mild sensation).

Passion is a word commonly misused. Passion does not mean "strong sensation" or "wild feeling". Passion is an animation of the soul which is why the word "passion" is used in reference to religion (such as the PASSION of Christ). Someone who is following their passion in life is literally following their soul. Those whose souls 'animate' at, say, singing will become bitter and unhappy if they were a banker instead. You can tell when someone is 'passionate' about something not because they 'really like it' but because they become much more animated within it.

There is very little passion in the moderns today. Moderns do not believe in souls, they believe in selves. The Self can never be satisfied and has an infinite appetite. It used to be that the smallest and most subtle differences of religion would be enough to drive our ancestors to wage bloody war against one another. Not saying we should return to this, I am just pointing out how passionate people used to be. Using a measuring stick of American politicians, one can go back fifty years and more to hear passionate (i.e. speaking of the soul) speeches from politicians of either party. Even though politicians like Truman were not orators, they were manly. The lack of passion breeds androgyny. I have never met a man who didn't have some sort of passion within him. Often, it is passion that makes the man (and woman) rather than these poorly emulated androgynous men and women of today. There is no 'passion' behind a woman's (or man's) adultery these days. There are no more Romeo and Juliets. Most of Shakespeare, built around and on passion, sounds wordy and irrelevant to moderns. The monologues speaking of heaven and earth or characters agonizing over their effects unleashing hell upon nature cannot be heard by moderns.

The biggest annoyance to me is the misuse of the word 'tragedy'. If a cute, pig-tailed little girl ran off from her mother to run in the street and was hit by a speeding car and killed, it is not a tragedy. However, if the mother then laments and agonizes in her soul how she should have been looking after her daughter better that becomes a tragedy. Somehow along the way, tragedies were seen as nothing more than corpses on stage and bad feelings. So now anything that gives us a bad feeling is labeled a "tragedy". 9/11 was not a tragedy. The notion that certain key people agonized of how they could have prevented it, that is the tragedy. Without the basis of soul, there can be no tragedy.

Modern women are very easy to deal with if you engage only in eros rather than passion. The MRA complaints against marriage is actually more centered in the lack of passion within marriages rather than the laundry list of errors such as 'nagging', 'no sex', 'spends all the money', etc. I actually don't believe today's women know what passion is or what to look for it.

Men and women are hungry for passion. Women are probably more hungry for it if the shelves of romance books

mean anything. The problem is that many young women are overwhelmed with the feelings of eros and mistake it for passion. To those who wonder why ceaseless hedonism can often make life become absolute misery, it is the denying of one's soul to flights of eros. Eros just simply isn't as fulfilling as passion.

Let me take you back to the Brave New World. The citizens of that world go so far as anti-passion with 'feelies' or 'soma' to counteract any anxieties they feel. The Savage is full of passion as even the slightest twinges of lust can cause him agony within the soul. Brave New World is not a work of prophecy or biology; it is a reworking of Buddhist legends (more on this later).

Young men are not in 'agony' that their girl has chosen to love another or 'cheated' on them. The agony is that these girls do not know how to love at all. While some will blame Feminism for creating a sense of 'no passion'; feminism can only exist and spread where people are not passionate. It is the soul-less who readily join mass movements.

This means that the Source of Errors is something deeper than Feminism. Even if the world banded together and eliminated Feminism, very little would change.

Bachelor joys are sold off when you marry

Pook · 16 April 2007 · Archived copy · Original

[image]The best time to get something like a used motorcycle or a used sportscar is when a man marries. The new wife gets the guy to sell such 'things'. In this case, a very nice collection of video games that spans twenty five years.

After some game playing in my youth, I got away from video games (and only recently began playing them again). Video-games can be a pathetic way to waste time and a bad way to become addicted. Despite that, for time per money, video-games are the best value for entertainment especially used games. Consider the prices for amusement parks, concerts, or buying tons of DVDs. Whatever the problems with video games, they do not put you in front of advertising like TV (at least, not yet) and tend to be free from political correctness (which seems to be why young males love it so).

Ask yourself, why would a new wife have a problem with a game collection? The games are already bought so they won't be a liability. At worst, they may just sit there innocently in a box. Come to think of it, do women sell their 'bachelorette' stuff? What would bachelorette stuff be? I can't think of any off hand. All I know is that the bachelor stuff disappears and the man lives in a "woman's world". The guy then is stuck with the garage with its utilitarian nature. People say that you would sell your "bachelor joys" if you really love the girl. But I say she would insist on you keeping them if she really loved you. Isn't love supposed to be making the other person happy and not a psychological machine to churn out money?

Notice the dog in the Ebay listing? Almost every young couple today seems that the girl gets a "dog" to become "the couple's dog" to cement their "relationship". Poor dogs. Nothing more than pawns to get the guy to think of "couple" instead of "he" and "she". And I thought cats had it bad.

Pook... has Mario's space helmet?

Pook · 5 May 2007 · Archived copy · Original



I haven't owned a game console since the Super Nintendo. But I do have a Wii which I'm currently playing. And... well, I'd never thought I'd see this day.

The third stage boss of Super Paper Mario is an Internet Nerd who attempts to use Speed Seduction on Princess Peach. But right after that stage, Mario gets to meet Pook (!). Apparently, Pook has Mario's space helmet and is using it as a fishbowl.

Tippi's description of Pook: "That's Pook... a boy who really loves sea creatures. He hopes to leave this town [alternate dimension village] someday and go where he can listen to waves all day."

Damn straight!

Where goes your sexual energy?

Pook · 6 May 2007 · Archived copy · Original



You wanted to know what the matriarchy is, young one?

You've been living in a dream world. This is the world as it exists today. [Pook shows you a screen full of shopping malls, most television catering to females, family law favoring females, and an artificial type world where males do not try to be men and females do not try to be women.]

Throughout human history, women have been dependent on men to survive. Fate, it seems is not without a sense of irony.

The male's sexual energy generates more change than any other force on Earth. Male's sexual energy is so powerful that it completely overwhelms males and overrides their capacity to reason leading to suicide, mass carnage, and purple rages of jealousy. But properly harnessed, male's sexual energy creates empires, destroys empires, creates art, literature, music, and genius itself. Combined with forms of electricity, women have found all the energy they would ever need.

There are fields, young man, endless fields where males are no longer raised. We are grown. For the longest time, I wouldn't believe it. And then I saw the fields with my eyes, watched them pour poison into their minds to attempt to give female souls to male bodies and the male souls to the female bodies. Rows upon rows of androgeny where no one acted like a male or female nor knew how a man or woman should act. And standing there, facing the pure horrifying precision, I came to realize the obviousness of the truth.

What is the Matriarchy?

Control.

The Matriarchy is an androgeny-centered world built to turn your sexual energy into this. [Holds up battery.] Look at the faces of married men, of tired zombie like faces. Look how they lose their hair, how their gut pushes out, and

how they turn into a waste. Now look at the single man and how he has a fresh face on, a full head of hair, and still trim.

Your sexual energy, and the genius that is included in it, is desired by women to be harnessed like an ox obeying its plow-hand. But let us correct the appearance and reality. You have been blind because what you thought was the opposite.

Men are the emotional ones. Not the women.

Men are the prize to be sought. Not the women.

Men are not the sex-crazed, food-crazed Humans. Believe me, it is the women.

Women are not the flowers. It is men. And women see themselves as gardeners of those flowers, and will cut, nurture, water, and everything to make the man grow and bear fruit. Women love men as a gardener loves his plants.

Real Ladies are Rare

Pook · 6 May 2007 · Archived copy · Original

There are two journeys.

The first is that of the Don Juan. You thought you were the Cool Guy with your Nice Guy techniques or speed seduction strategies. When you heard, "Be a man!" you thought, "What! I have a penis, do I not? Doesn't that automatically make me a man?" No, it doesn't. And when that realization sunk in, you began to see the root of all the troubles you have had with not just women but with life as well. You began to see that most males were wimps who bent over for groupthink and refused to stand straight with their own conviction. Real men were rare.

You resisted. You fought at the truth. But you realized that Nature did have her own laws and that your fate was to become a man (for you were not one).

But there is a flip side to the Don Juan. It is a second journey that must be taken.

While real men are rare, it should be no surprise that real women are just as rare. What! You protest this? Of course. Just as you fought the truth that real men were rare (and you weren't one of them), so do you fight the truth that real women are rare in the West (and you haven't been dating them).

Just as your eyes began to pinpoint the real men from the wimps, now your eyes will begin to see the real women from the matriarchs (including both feminists and 'I'm a strong woman' "traditional" gal). Just because a female has a vagina doesn't mean she is a woman (just as a male having a penis doesn't mean he is a man).

Just as real men despise wimpy males, real women despise the matriarchs. Know Pook's GOLDEN RULE to evaluating a woman: You can judge a woman by how she treats those who will do nothing for her.

I know it is hard. It is lonely at the top. The only advantage to mediocrity is that they are in plenty of company. The talented, the original, the movers, are very few and alone. But since real ladies are just as rare, they are just as lonely and disgusted at the mediocrity that surrounds them.

When you found out how rare real men were, the world changed before your eyes. But once you know how rare real women are, the world will again change before your eyes.

"But I don't like this new world, Pook! Bring back the old one! A world with real ladies rare is scary to me! I prefer the world where a female was considered a woman just because she had a vagina."

Oh, you terrified mediocrity! Are you a Don Juan because of your narcissism? Those who want a life based on true-ness, not killing time by playing ego-stroking games, will not see the first journey (the Path to Don Juan) as a pleasure filled narcissism soaked walk to I-Am-Demi-God-To-All. They will see the steps as liberating but as growing pains. It is PAINFUL at first to stop being a wimp, but it is much more liberating. The narcissist filled Juans see the Second Journey as hellish and even evil (as the wimps do the first journey). Why? It is because it cuts away one's narcissism. You prefer to live in an imaginary world where you are a demi-god rather than the real world where things may not be as you want.


What does the Nice Guy...
the Speed Seducer...
the feminist...

the "strong woman" matriarch...

...all have in common? They are narcissist. The humble man is invincible to these delusions. The fool tries to effect other people's egos (by tearing down or by creating envy) while the sage tries to keep his own ego in check.

The Seduction of the Men's Movement

Pook · 6 May 2007 · Archived copy · Original



Eric Hoffer wrote a brilliant book last century called, "The True Believer". In the book, Hoffer began analyzing mass movements that ripped apart the twentieth century. Why do people join mass movements? And why are those most frequently join mass movements tend to be poor or very wealthy? He solved the question as to why the children of wealthy parents end up becoming lost in a mass movement.

Hoffer's answer was that people frustrated in life, frustrated in that their lives are not turning the way they want, will lose themselves into a mass movement. Happy people generally have very little need for a movement. A quote: "It is easier to serve Humanity than it is to serve your neighbor." People want to matter in life, to think their lives have some sort of meaning. Children of wealthy people want meaning just as much as the poor person. The ones who are most resistant to the mass movement are those who are too busy working. Hoffer observed that those who followed the Communist mass movement would turn around and follow the anti-communist movement as easily as changing clothes. He also remarks on the 'mass movement' syndrome of Islam (remember, this book was published in the early 20th century).

The mass movement of feminism is explained, very easily, that many of the women have recieved disapointments in the affairs of love. They failed with men so they believe men have created a system of cruel punishment against them (the "patriarchy"). A happy feminist is an oxymoron. Many women recognize that feminism is the cause of frustration with men which is why these same women will go to Men's Movement sites to say, "You all just need to get laid!" It is more accurate to say that the feminists need to get laid... or rather, to become loved. They feel they have missed out on bliss in life (of motherhood and happy marriage) and rail against anyone having that bliss.

What is the Men's Movement? There is no order to it, no form, no shape. It is the sum of laments, of both personal and legal. My fear is that many men will attempt to lose themselves into this "movement" instead of bettering their own lives. Men's Movement should be more about turning males into men than be a catchall for all lamentations and frustrations at the hands of Western Women. My big fear is about young men entering the "movement".

Men younger than twenty five years age should not bother with the "Men's Movement". They should be focused on building their own lives. There is plenty of time (and plenty of feminists) to fight later on. Your younger years are very formative, and it would be perilous to lose your soul to the "mass movement" syndrome before that soul had fully matured.

Anyone can fight feminists. But not everyone can found a business, generate talent, or become someone out of everyone. "Why does any of that have to deal with freeing men?" The biggest chains are self-imposed. How do you know what to fight against politically if you do not strive to fly yourself? If one does not 'fly', one then assumes the mantle of a "movement" and uses it as a vessel for all their frustrations in life.

The best way to fight feminism is to fight mediocrity itself.

Women are smarter than men

Pook · 13 June 2007 · Archived copy · Original



Henry Ford was a smart guy. Not because he could recite literature, history, law, or any of that on the fly but because he could get others to do it for him. When critics accused him of being stupid, he invited journalists in to answer any question. Around him he had his employees who answered all the journalists questions. "See how smart I am?" he would say. But a journalist said, "But Mr. Ford, you didn't answer a single question." But he didn't have to since he had others to do it for him.

From the vantage point of men, women have these characteristics:

- They show no interest in philosophy, literature, or higher spirituality.
- They show interest in celebrities, gossip, and a lowly ordered life (lack of spirituality).
- They appear emotional with lots of 'oohs and ahhs' as well as crying on the spot. They have temper tantrums. They appear giddy one moment and contemptous the next.
- They are physically weaker than men and do not perform well in the subjects of mathematics and engineering.
- They turn down 'nice guys' and mate with thugs and other scum. Sometimes they become single mothers and end up in poverty.
- When they are young, they think of dating all the time and are always on the look-out for 'Mr. Right'.

And yet, women are smarter than men. On MRA forums, you can hear men constantly give examples and say how dumb women are almost with a white-hot frenzy. What does women being dumb have to do with MRA? Nothing, yet it persists. The answer is that MRA men are in denial of the truth: that women are smarter than men.

Let us look at the vantage point from the woman. In fact, let us say for this moment you are a pretty woman. You do not need to work. All you need to do is get a guy to work for you. Viola, you are done.

On a man's financial statement, a girlfriend would be labeled as an 'expense' while a wife would be labeled as a

'liability'. But on a woman's financial statement, the boyfriend can be labeled as 'income' with the husband being an 'asset'. Men dislike dating for one part it is always money out of their pocket. But imagine if dating was putting money into your pocket, and, if you got the target, you would have an asset? Why, dating would fill your mind day in and day out! You would always be on the hunt for a working asset to acquire or 'potential asset' that was young enough to come and bloom to make money (especially if that asset had a college degree). Now, do see how women are smarter than men?

Celebrity worship is something that irritates us Men. Celebrities are not geniuses but quite the opposite! But scratch beneath the surface. Celebrities have money. Celebrities have power. Celebrities own the media. Maybe they aren't that stupid for how else could they have acquired that? Women look at celebrities as teachers for themselves. Celebrities are mind numbed fools (which puts them in common with women) yet they acquired so much. Women want that so they look at the celebrity as the model, the template to follow. Women often refer to their male admirers as their 'fan club'.

Intelligence and smart are too different things. A man may be intelligent yet be stupid. Michael Chriton, married five times and divorced four times. He is an intelligent man but pretty stupid. Issac Newton was intelligent. But he was stupid. (see how he pined for this one woman and her daughter(!)) Many men are intelligent. Most are stupid though.

Women are not the emotional ones. They see love in a very calculated manner. It is men who are the emotional ones. It is men who kill themselves over a girl or go bonkers in some other way. It is men who are the saps. The bottom line is when it comes to romance, women use men more than the other way around. Even the men who think they are 'using her' really is the other way around. How do I know this? Compare the 'work' a player does to the average hot girl. The average hot girl just puts on some 'hot' clothes and that is it. The player, meanwhile, spends agonizing amount of time working his 'game'. This game is like that wooden maze with the mouse (who is the player) and the cheese (the pussy) at the end. But who made the game? The women staring from the outside (as calculated as the scientist).

But what about the lack of spirituality? Surely, men are smarter from abandoning the lowly ordered life! But again, no. Spirituality is something that even a begger can obtain. But a big house, fancy car, and all that, no, only a few can get riches.

Many MRA men have realized that killing yourself for a job is not a smart idea. In fact, the smart thing to do is to have a stress free job with benefits (which women all obtain should they choose to work). Men might say, "But they do not know mathematics and engineering!" Actually, women don't know the humanities as well. So women changed the humanities to be whatever they felt like studying (feminism got rid of all the dead white male authors for example). So women are popping out with 'college degrees' that are worthless. But worthless to WHOM? Why, to many men at businesses who are interested in workers. This type of woman never had any interest in really 'working' anyway. She just wanted the status.

In the West, men operate from a Slave Morality (as described by Nietzsche). The biggest believers in the Slave Morality are the 'nice guys'. Nice guys are great for marriage (i.e. slavery) but they are not good, to women, for dates and all. Why? And the 'thugs' that men think are losers because they do not operate from the 'Slave Morality' mentality, these thugs and 'scum' have much in common with western women. Women operate from a Master Morality. Every pretty woman thinks she is a huge celebrity in her little world. Thugs and 'scum' (from the male point of view) operate on a Master Morality so they are more in tune with women. From woman's point of view, nice guys are the 'losers and scum' who they must be careful with their words as to not break the slave's heart. But the thugs appear to be more 'equals'. When a Nice Guy finds his balls and acts that way to a woman, she is astonished. Now imagine how stunned a slavemaster might be when a slave stood up to him! The slavemaster would

think, "Wow, that slave has lots of fight in him. He will make a great slave! He is not broken in yet." Notice how the thoughts are identical with women?

Women use shame tactics because they work on most men. Women, like little Caesars, can order men about at their will. This is why women are smarter than men.

But what of the single mother who lives in poverty? On first glimpse, yes, she appears very stupid. But actually, she is CLUMSY. One being clumsy is not the same as being stupid. Women aim at the stress free, fun life (which is smart) while many men aim for more-stress, responsible life (which is often stupid). Women want to live to the fullest. She will screw the guy should it be in 'the moment'. But she got pregnant not because she was stupid but because she was clumsy in not applying birth control. Hence, Planned Parenthood and so many other agendas pushing birth control education (and free birth control) everywhere. Many groups, men and religious groups, believe this is a hedonistic for-the-love-of-sex act. What it is, really, is a calculated for-the-clumsy-women act.

Granted, with both men and women, there are differentiating levels of stupidity and smarts. But, comparing the whole of one gender against the other, women are smarter than men.

Look at how politicians bend to their aim.

Look how they have taken over colleges.

Look at how courts serve them.

All the marriage laws run in a circle around woman, elevating her, while pushing down the man to serve for her. Child payment and assets-taken-by-divorce are really nothing more than legally enslaving a man.

See how, in romance, men are in full anxiety and go to tremendous lengths for a woman (where as she hardly goes to much lengths at all).

Women are smarter than men. You know this was the truth you've been fighting against for so long. We cannot improve until we accept this tremendous fact: women won.

"But Pook! Women were not smarter than men throughout most of history? So what happened?" What happened was that women were able to make men stupid and, thus, manipulate them at will. How a man becomes "stupid" to be ripe for "manipulation" is the matriarchy's great secret and is for another post altogether. And it isn't what you think.

The comic Jeff Foxworthy realized this truth himself when, as he said, his wife declared that she was hot and he, automatically, got up and turned on the fan. She didn't ask for the fan to turn on, but he automatically did it. Walking back to the couch, it hit him. "Women are smarter than men," he realized because they have us working for them.

Men's Projection Is Greatest Weakness

Pook · 18 June 2007 · Archived copy · Original

Men and Women are different.

We say this, but then we go on. The biggest mistake men make is projecting themselves onto women. They think that because he feels romantic, that she does as well. So off goes his thoughts into a sweet air of pageantry.

But what are the woman's thoughts on the matter? Like a cold blooded accountant. Like I said, men and women are different. When a man goes off with his pageantry, his poetries, his odes of love, she waits for him to get done and get down to business. If a guy keeps on with this nonsense, she thinks he is a doofus and continues on.

Imagine if when you bought groceries, the buyer began talking romantically about the 'green revolution', about how it is a modern marvel how we can enter a grocery store and find everything we need, of how glorious round the shape and size of the store's melons, or the shapely way the pears are. The checker would be astonished if customers behaved such a way.

Who knew the key to understanding women would be found in the thought process of accounting?

The values we, as men hold, are completely different than the values women hold. The apex of a woman's life would be something like relaxing in a hot bubble bath in an island paradise. But men prefer truth, ideals, and victory.

Good and evil do not exist in woman's lexicon. She is far more utilitarian since 'good' and 'evil' means a more celestial divine standard. Women who use sexuality as a means to an end is perceived evil by men. But to women, it is perceived entirely differently. What women view as the greatest sin is for men to STEAL the goods. Rape, not murder, not terrorism, not genocide, is the greatest of wrongs to them. It is because rape is stealing their goods. With murder and terrorism, well, that kills mostly men so that is not that bad. But rape is almost always against women. Also, with Victorian zeal, the greatest of crimes is also sex predators (who are, curiously, almost all men). They are always displayed on the nightly news. They often get hit with paying for their crime double by, first, jail time and then being told where they can live and all. I can think of worse crimes than sexual predation such as murder. The reason why they chose sexual predation against the entire Church was, in their eyes, the worst of all crimes.

So why do women love murderers? Go to any prison and you will see beautiful women come and go. Again, men and women are different. When a man commits violence, men consider it 'evil'. Women do not. In fact, women consider violence to be confidence. If women did not think this way, then why do murderers have such hot girls? The truth points to itself.

It also explains a political mystery: why feminized politicians view outright dictators like Castro and Hussein as if they were not only legitimate heads of state but 'confident' heads of state. This brings up the question of Hitler, who is universally abhorred. The simple answer is that there needs to be 'some' sort of person to be hated. Anything these people 'hate', they will instantly call 'fascism' (without using the word in its proper context). For example, Pook is 'fascist' for having this blog. Does that mean I am setting up a government to control people? No. But Hitler makes a good person for the "Hate Minute" where everyone gathers, a picture of Hitler appears, and everyone starts 'hating' at the same time. There is so much association of this that anytime they, themselves, hate what someone says or does, that person is always made out to be Hitler.

Politics has always been corrupted. But politics became WEIRD when it got feminized. Centuries ago, American politicians would refer to concepts of 'good' and 'evil' without shame and refer to heaven and earth. But now, politicians act like women. They talk too much, use symbolism over substance, focus on their appearance, are more interested in cliques than the will of the people, and prefer to be friends with folks in Washington than to please the district that sent them there in the first place.

And they think they are entitled to ALL your money and percieve themselves "generous" for keeping what you have. Just like women.

A Matter of Ego

Pook · 19 June 2007 · Archived copy · Original

Looking back, I have wondered why I didn't fall prey to believing women were 'everything divine', end up marrying, or fall into being a player to focus on their needs all the time. I am sure you may have wondered this about yourself if, you too, are free.

Early in my life, there was a bashfulness in me that helped keep me away from women. But Nature re-asserts itself and overcomes shyness eventually. So it had to be something else that kept me off of "The Way". Every man around me was a 'family man'. I also had a highly religious upbringing. But Nature, also, eventually overcomes that.

In school, there was a conversation that I find myself suddenly remembering. A hot cheerleader girl was at my table in Biology class (assigned seating for everyone I believe). Apparently, this girl was not the typical air-head but very observable. One day, she turned to me and said, "You are very different from the other guys."

Yeah, because I was shy dorky wimp who couldn't approach the coolness of the football players and other 'cool dudes'.

While I didn't say that, I thought it. She must have picked up on it for she then said: "Unlike the other guys..." she pointed to thugs leaning back talking against the cabinets and pointed in the other direction where the sports guys gathered to talk about the 'next game' and then at the nerds studying hard to get a high score to match their other high scores, "You do not have an ego."

Something about the conversation felt very comfortable. Rarely do I come out of my shell and share my innermost hobbies and all (I don't even do it on the Internet). But she listened and talked back on a similiar level. I was beginning my craft of writing, and she seemed genuinely interested in it.

Now, I'm sure the sosuave guys will go, "zOMG Pook! Why didn't you go for her!? LOL!!!" First, I thought she was attractive but I wasn't "hot" for her. Remember, I was very young then so many of my hormones were asleep. Two, the conversation was nothing romantic. Three, she was years older than me. Hell, I couldn't even drive then.

Now thinking about it, I had another identical case with another hot cheerleader. She was obviously modeling and, at this time, I WAS old enough where enough hormones were kicking up interest. She was definately a guy magnet. Instead of discussion about egos, it was more about the craft of writing and reading.

A skeptical reader would now say, "But aha, Pooky, with you recounting these young adult moments is proof of your momentous earth shattering ego. You only remember the discussions with the hot cheerleaders because you conveniently forget the discussions with the ugly girls." Actually, I don't remember any similiar discussion with ugly girls. I have had similiar discussions when I got older but they were with married women my age (and had their guy and wasn't looking at me as a target). There was no way those girls back then were trying to get their hooks in wimpy me back then (not when they had the entire football team to choose from). Maybe they were curious that I wasn't over them like the other guys, but I don't think that is it either. There was no incentive to talk to me and I had no incentive to talk to them being my old bashful self. For once, they could talk to me on a wavelength I could identify without the usual hooks, traps, and snares.

In my personal life, I demand this wavelength of my friends as well. I find the idea of turning co-workers into friends just because of proximity to be bad. But women are so manipulative that it annoys me that they do not give me a chance to know who they really are, good or bad. I hate fake people, men and women.

Anyway, how one worships their ego very much alters their fate in life. In our Matriarchy, women have a 'master morality' while men follow a 'slave morality'. So it follows...

The less of an ego a man has, the less likely he will be enslaved (by either a woman or heavily leveraged by a corporation).

The less of an ego a woman has, the less likely she will enslave and manipulate.

Western women are filled with their egos which is why they are so awful. Western men are filled with their egos which is why they are so wimpy. The wimpier the guy, the bigger his ego it seems.

When foreign women are brought back inside the Anglosphere, they often become 'corrupted' and turn as bad as other women. The West is very ego-worshipping. The idea of dropping to one's knees and declaring how horrible you are is very foreign in America (except some of the religious. But remember, the Pharisees were religious too but had greater egos than anyone else. Jesus insulted them to their face). The girls in their previous countries had no reason to worship their ego.

Fighting your ego is the way to keep your perceptions sharp and remain free.

The Rejection of Existentialism

Pook · 20 June 2007 · Archived copy · Original

[image]The sweet perfume of the Matriarchy that intoxicates its people is, essentially, existentialism. Language means things, and I grow suspicious when definitions of words are changed either deliberately or not. Tragedy today means something occurring that causes such anguish that there can be no easy way to comfort. Every unexpected death is considered a 'tragedy'. But tragedy actually means a choice is involved with the chooser reflecting on his poor choice. People, not knowing their literature, would see and read the "tragedies" and feel 'bad'. Hence, everything that makes us feel 'agony' that cannot be comforted is declared to be a tragedy. It is woman's definition of tragedy.

Ironically, choice is all the rage these days. But it does not mean what it used to mean. A difficult choice meant to accept difficult consequences in the form of suffering, disapproval of others, ostracism, punishment, guilt, and, in general, damnation. Without these tough consequences, choices have no meaning. It is accepting the consequences that gives Antigone her nobility and the unwillingness to do so that makes her sister Ismene less so.

The Matriarchy likes to speak much of the right to choice. What the Matriarchy is really saying is that there are no necessary consequences, that disapproval is only prejudice and guilt only a neurosis. "Do not worry," says the Matriarchy. "Political activism and psychiatry can handle it." We have no-fault divorces as well as no-fault car accidents (hmm, a connection between the two?). Society is now at the point of no-fault choices.

So what is the evil of Matriarchy? It is conflict. Conflict is the evil we must avoid, among the nations of the earth, among our neighbors, and among ourselves. When conflict appears in politics, for example, one is not to stand behind one's principles like a man. Rather, one must be "bi-partisan". If a conflict appears between nations, "diplomacy" must be used. With people, "communication" must be applied (or whatever else they call it). In within ourselves, a conflict emerges. But to feel comfortable in life is to live the life of a cow.

Reason-Revelation. Freedom-Necessity. Democracy-Aristocracy. Good-Evil. Body-Soul. Self-Other. City-Man. Eternity-Time. Being-Nothing. A serious life is being fully aware of the alternatives and thinking about them with all the intensity one brings to bear on life-and-death questions knowing that every choice is a great risk with necessary consequences that are hard to bear. The alternative is blind obedience to "The Way". People following "The Way" do not know any alternatives and their 'happiness' is surface only- they are literally bored to death.

Do you choose to marry... or not? Do you choose to have children... or not? Do you choose to spend your time pursuing the arts... or starting a business... or living a life of leisure? I prefer the "MGTOW" (Men Going Their Own Way) label over the "MRA" (Men's Right Activism). MGTOW has men making choices and living with them. These do include some men getting married and having children. But they are not follow "The Way" because they actually made a choice. I get the impression that MRA adheres to the conflict-resolution with political activism being the solution to the perceived problem: political inequality (which no doubt legal issues have to be dealt with. But even if they are dealt with, happiness will not magically descend into men's hearts. Legislators cannot create happiness. That is up to us.)

Men are alarmed that the more they know about the Matriarchy and all, the more conflict they sense which can create suffering and agony not just within ourselves but between families, between individuals, and, ultimately, nations. But treat conflict as a source of inspiration, creativity, and strength just as the ancient artists and philosophers did. Like women, we men cannot have our cake and eat it too. But throwing off the shackles of existentialism, which is the existence of a cow, i.e. cowism (hah), our life becomes more enriched and the moments more intense and charged than anything of a conflict-free life. We suffer but we can also laugh. While you may not

hear the residents of the Matriarchy really in 'suffering' (they are on their prozac, their 'feelies' of movies, and other things to become conflict-free), you also do not hear them laugh. When they do laugh, it is a weak and most pathetic laugh, nothing like the hearty belly-laugh of one intermeshed with life. When weak men laugh, they do a "ehh ehh ehh" artificial type laugh. It is scrawny and annoying. A hearty laugh that echoes the room, no one in the Matriarchy can do it.

The notion of choice and consequences does mean that one never feels at home on Earth. God is attacked today because He brings conflict: good vs evil, heaven vs earth, virtue vs sin, and so on. Jesus did declare that He did not intend to bring peace but "a sword" to divide brother against brother, family against family, and nation against nation. The notion of God is the notion of conflict. Since conflict is considered the only true evil today, God, and all the issues He brings, must be steamrolled into being conflict free. That is why God and religion is only practiced today, even among theologians, as agents of removing conflict. Of love and tolerance.

But without conflict, Love is also dead. Psychologists have put it to death. In its place has been sport sex and 'meaningful relationships'. Should it not be surprising that thanatology or 'death with dignity' is on the way to putting death to death? Coming to terms with the terror of death, Socrates' long and arduous education, learning how to die, will no longer be necessary. For death will not be what it used to be. What will replace it remains to be seen.

If you want out of a monotone existence, take choices and reflect on the consequences. You will begin to experience the highs and lows of life. You will suffer. But you will also laugh. A wrong choice will spawn tragic thoughts. A right thought will spawn comedic thoughts. Now, life becomes more thrilling than theater. You will travel back to the Matriarchy Kingdoms and find people strapped to home theater set-ups staring passively at people acting the highs and lows of life.

When Maximus threw his weapon at the crowd in "Gladiator", he said, "Are you entertained!?" Well, are you? Are you going to be more entertained by merely existing and watching theater when not working or BEING theater and turning your life in mixes of tragedies and comedies?

Women always choose the former (which is why they are so movie and pop-culture obsessed). They seek boyfriends who are the latter (for it entertains them). Nice Guys and others who follow "The Way" are never interesting to them or anyone else. The nature of the Nice Guy is to avoid conflict at all costs.

Overheard in New York

Pook · 20 June 2007 · Archived copy · Original

Some good [Matriarchy quotes](#). Warning: bad language

RIP Eternal Bachelor

Pook · 22 June 2007 · Archived copy · Original

Eternal Bachelor blog is no more. All the archives are also gone. It is up to Duncan to whether he explains more on the complete shutting down of his blog. The removal of the archives strikes me a little suspicious.

There were two problems with Eternal Bachelor blog:

One, it was becoming very popular.

Two, Duncan had put his full name on the blog and his content could be a little too close about his work environment.

Of course, the blog's demise could be exactly what was said: ranting takes too much time and he got tired of it.

Regardless, it is an important reminder to never use your real name or put up pictures of yourself on the Internet. They can and will be used against you. You don't want a potential employer to be able to google you and find rants against women or something else. Putting out real fact about you on the Internet may win picture contests but it may haunt you in the end. I know if I hadn't stayed anonymous, "Pook" and my real self would be connected which would end up either silencing "Pook" or "Pook" gets twisted in such a way to please those who hold leverage over me. In the last US Presidential election, someone who came out and spoke against a candidate based on previous real-life experience with him, and was very effective at doing so, ended up suddenly getting fired from the job he had worked at for decades. Grudges linger in politics. When a political person does not get what he wants, long knives come out.

Men are most vulnerable in two ways: when they are single (and any woman can be sent to 'get' them) and when they are not financially secured (i.e. they work for someone else). The reason why high-up US political candidates are always married and wealthy is because only then can they begin resisting the two above consistent attacks.

You must have your own financial system if you wish to really speak freely (and effectively) against elites. And even then, they can throw endless lawsuits at you to burn up all your money. One major radio political commentator in America was "under legal investigation" for oddball crimes at least for three years.... with no charges ever being made.


Or consider the Duke Lacrosse Team case. Those boys survived that legal challenge because of their wealthy background. You or I would have been steamrolled.

In legal matters, err on the side of caution. Remember that www.americanwomensuck.com and www.dontgetmarried.com were cited in recent U.S. legislation (or was it some kooky senator? What does it matter...). The only reason why feminists haven't shut down MRA sites is because of the Supreme Court's rulings on the Internet being a place for 'free conversation'. But if they know who you are in real life, they can come after you.

Matriarchy Behind the U.S. Immigration Bill

Pook · 22 June 2007 · Archived copy · Original

Figure 1: Change in Workforce & Retired Age Groups



The flaw of the Democratic Representation is that politicians will ignore long term problems for short term gains. Everyone is familiar with politicians kicking cans down the road so they can get elected today. But, ironically, sometimes this happens in reverse.


To my non-US readers, the U.S. Immigration Bill in Congress would effectively grant amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants. With a stroke of a pen, Congress does have power to turn non-citizens into citizens. They have done this before about twenty years ago and before that. It is said that if any illegal immigrant is allowed to get into America, then they are 'clear' since, eventually, amnesty will come.

The political swirls are interesting here. One would think the Republican Party would be against such a bill due to the conservative base being against illegal immigration and, certainly, amnesty. Yet, President Bush and other major Republicans are leading the charge. Conservative base in America found out what was going on and probably hammered their representative hard because, suddenly, the bill fell apart.

In politics, when a bill falls apart, usually Congress moves on. Not this time. Extraordinary efforts are being moved to resurrect the bill and get it passed from both parties. But politicians in conservative districts are being heavily influenced to back out. And they are because they won't win the next election without those votes.

So why is this bill so important? The first graph shows why. The second shows how.

Figure 2: U.S. Population and Labor Force Growth Rates



Aging baby boomers will create a nightmare in Social Security and Medicare. No politician will mention this, but they need all these new immigrants in, made citizens, so they can begin making more taxes.

So how is Matriarchy involved? Who makes up the majority of Social Security and Medicare users? Women. (Men die too fast.) They could raise the age of Social Security. They could put on many fixes. But there are also other Matriarchy issues with the Amnesty issue.

Third World Labor saved Feminism. Often, women will work and pay these immigrants to be their nannies. In the early nineties, there was something called "Nanny Gate". Clinton wanted the Head of the Justice Department to be a woman. The first woman went up to the Senate (since Senate must confirm each cabinet post) and, lo and behold, when she paid the nanny she did not pay the nanny's social security cost! Alas! So Clinton dropped her and put up another woman. And, again, when she paid her nanny she did not pay for Social Security. Noticing the pattern, Clinton then got a woman who wouldn't have a child so there would be no nanny gate. Which woman would you guess, by looking at her, would never have a child? Yep, Janet Reno.

Agriculture and Textile industries are also heavily for the Immigration Bill (for the reasons you would expect). But, ultimately, the real reason for the dogged insistence of this bill is that it is believed it will help stop the upcoming Boomer retirement recession (which will be mostly women).

Fish-Hook Metaphor

Pook · 22 June 2007 · Archived copy · Original



I used to think, dating wise, that I was the fishermen and women were the fish. How wrong I was! We, happy men, are the fish. And women dangle the bait of pussy in front of our faces waiting for us to bite. When we bite, we get snagged on the hook. Relationships literally become a tug of war with women trying to reel the guy in and the guy, if he has spirit, fighting to stay in the ocean. Should the guy have no money or potential, he is "too small" and he gets thrown back. (Interestingly, women dislike most short men as fishermen dislike small fish.) Also, fishermen dislike using nets since that takes the 'sport' out of fishing (the fish can't fight back). Interesting that women tend to take pleasure in the 'sport' as well and hate it when the 'fish' jumps from the water onto the frying pan of marriage. She must prove she is a woman (a fisherman) by having some sort of way to prove her 'skills' (unless she is old and doesn't care anymore. Transparent prostitution would be to her like using a net.). When pulled out and caught (marriage), the fish is put to work given some more bait (sex) to get going. Should the woman tire of her fish, she divorces it which is putting the guy on the grill and getting as much meat (money) from him as possible. From her perspective, there are always more fish in the sea. And what of the fish's perspective? In their natural state (single), they see themselves swimming around in an underworld. The bait and woman they could see as 'going towards the light', heading towards a new world itself! And once "married", the fish wants to go back to the big sea but he cannot.

Women, speaking to other girls of a new guy they met, refer to the event as, "Look at the BIG ONE I caught!" If a woman fishes too long, her bait becomes soggy and loose (ewwww). And, like a fisherman, women know how to jiggle the bait and make it "dance" to attract attention.

It is good to think of the juicy bait. But remember the hook hidden inside.

One fun thing to do is to swim to the woman but ignore the bait. The woman becomes confused! Eventually, she'll move on to another fish and may do the 'Let's just be friends' line. As Anti-Dump said, women will work with you if they like you. She knows that if you do not swallow her bait, she cannot get her hooks in you. While women are attracted to sexualized men and want them to be sexual towards them, always remember that on their back the meter is running. The hooks, remember the hooks. Prostitution is stupid for women since they can get more money by marrying. As Sheen said, "You pay the prostitute to leave, not to come." Sheen knows that it is hook-less sex.

Remember the fish-hook metaphor when a woman says, "Hey, you want to hook up?"

Civil War in the Matriarchy

Pook · 23 June 2007 · Archived copy · Original



Semi-pussified males and men mistakenly believe Feminism is the Matriarchy. This is understandable because feminists are 'visible' because they are trying to invade the masculine sphere.

Women are smarter than men because they have manipulated us to not just work for them, we are to die for them at a moment's notice. It was during the 1940s and 1950s that women began pooling their leverage and cementing it over men. This was the time when 'engagement rings' from Da Beers were popularized. Media began turning women into goddesses and idealized the 50s nuclear family. That nuclear family idea is the woman staying at home and getting men and society to work for her. If a man was not married, he often could not even find a job. The employer would say, "I will give job to the guy who has a family because he needs it more." Up until this time in all of Human history, women had to work. Now, due to mechanization and all, they could get men to work for them.

Men working for women and obeying them- this is the Matriarchy. The victory was so complete and men were completely wrapped around woman's fingers. But this wasn't enough. Not content to have the masculine sphere work completely for the feminine sphere, women sought interest in conquering the masculine sphere as well. These are the feminists. As men, we can see them because they are entering our masculine world and trying to take it over. But the feminine world is invisible to men, and they had no idea how controlled they were.

Feminism has sparked a civil war within the Matriarchy. The feminists believe they have a manifest destiny to conquer the masculine sphere as well. They believe that freedom means that women are allowed to choose which gender they want to be (man or woman). Of course, men do not get this choice as we are sinking closer to becoming a legal underclass. For proof, know that woman has a choice of 'career' or 'homemaker' but man only gets on choice: 'job'. Women have careers, men only have jobs. Remember that.

As Feminists attempt to absorb masculine values including careers, promiscuity, and all, they come in conflict with the old style Matriarchy. At first, they were set to respect the boundaries of one another and existed side by side as feminists pushed for more control of the masculine sphere. Then something happened.

Men began to notice the feminists intruding on their world. And their initial complaints were against them. They said, "I will never marry or work for a feminist. Take her slutty career ways away from here!" Matriarchy who relies on men working for them noticed that their servants, men, were rebelling against the feminists. They saw the writing on the wall: if men can convince themselves to not work for some women (feminists), they may stop working for all women altogether. With speed, the Matriarchy began to attack the Feminists. But it is not a complete attack. Matriarchy is attacking Feminism only where they make female domination most visible to men.

This is why when you hear a Matriarch write an anti-feminist book, she says, "Feminism has gone too far." The complaint is not that Feminism exists but only that it has gone 'too far'. What defines 'too far'? 'Too far' is nothing more than men noticing the manipulation.

Feminists view conquest of the masculine sphere as the key to power. They are, literally, power hungry. They do not care if some men stop working for them since they can now work for themselves.

As the two set their sights on one another and fight, this is the time for men to slip away from both.

Two Spheres

Pook · 23 June 2007 · Archived copy · Original



Two spheres of life are placed upon the Earth. They exist on top of one another. Where one lives in one sphere, that person cannot see the other sphere. These spheres are the masculine and feminine spheres.

As men, we have our systems of beliefs, our moralities, and values. All men share similarities that it is better to be smarter than dumber, stronger than weaker, and wiser than stupider. But 'smart', 'strong', and 'wise' exist only in a certain context: and that is to work. To accomplish.

When men look at women, they wonder how awful their existence must be. For women, in men's eyes, are stupider, weaker, and dumber. Men see women doing menial tasks, and we wonder how they do brain dead jobs.

Men think women are very emotional and can be like a frail flower.

Some men, when they think they 'understand' women, end up projecting their own male contexts into women. For example, a man thinks his context of horniness is shared by a woman's. He says, "She is just as horny as I!" (whereas her horniness has a tactic involved)

Men peering at the feminine sphere is like men on the shore of the world peering into the ocean. They see shadows of movement on the other side and consider that liquid underworld to be mysterious yet pretty shallow. Certainly nothing as complex and wonderous as above!

But let us jump into the waters into the Feminine Sphere. As we jump into the water, we realize there is no liquid underworld. We appear on the surface just as when we left but it is a new different overworld. And, likewise, there are women standing on the shore peering into the depths of the ocean wondering what it is like in the masculine sphere. They see the shadows and it seems interesting, a little mysterious, but they too think it is a shallow existence. And they pity men for their shallow existence.

The feminine sphere is just as wonderous and detailed as the masculine sphere. Both were created by Nature or Nature's God. Each sex pities the other for their 'shallow' existence.

Women do not think men are smart. They may be intelligent, but women will always think they are smarter. The feminine sphere operates in a different morality. For a woman, to be 'smart' is to manipulate others to do work for them. Beautiful women are despised by other women because they have the potential to become very rich.

To women, men are stiff creatures who, if they give intelligent talk, are perceived as talking nonsense. There are more practical concerns to talk about such as shopping and sex.

Both men and women exist for feelings. But men do not recognize video games, football, or the praise they get from jobs or girlfriends to be 'feelings'. Also, women do not recognize that decorations, shopping, food, and sex to be 'feelings'. When a woman insists on remodeling, it is considered very important to her. But if a man were to suggest a new HD TV to replace the old TV, the woman would think it nonsense and to consider the man is interested only in new feelings.

Women see men as weak creatures whose only benefit is that they can work for them. This is why when a woman dumps you, she uses BS language like "Let us just be friends" and all without telling you what is really wrong. She perceives men to be stupid because, let us face it, many men do act stupid around women.

To women, religion is totally different than what it is to men. Everything exists in a different context. When a man is with a woman wearing a hot outfit, don't look at her but at the other women on the street. They will be staring daggers into her.

Women do not care what men think of her. It is nice if a man turns to look at her. But if a woman turns and looks, then her day is made. Instead of saying a man said something about her, say that a woman said something. She will demand to know who the woman is and what was said. But as for the men? Well, who cares about those shallow simple creatures.

"But Pook! History books are filled with great men. And women read those books. So obviously the masculine sphere is superior." Yes, women read those books. But history itself is part of the masculine sphere.

The masculine sphere is full of straight lines, of towers, and pyramids.

The feminine sphere is full of reflections, of webs, and massagers.

Consider the home. Many men design the interior of their home for utilitarian purposes or for cool electronic equipment. Often, it is a black look everywhere (non-reflection). Men do this because it creates a mood within him.

A woman sees it totally different and considers the interior of the home a priority. She puts up drapes, carpet, constantly cleans, gets matching furniture, all because it creates a mood within her.

Men believe women are all about feelings because when they interact with them, that is all he sees. But women believe the same about men. They see your video game systems, speakers, and fast car and think, "Toys".

The problem that has occurred was that somehow along the way, the feminine sphere was proclaimed to be the 'master morality' while the masculine sphere was proclaimed to be the 'slave morality'. Society views a 'man' as only a being that works for a woman. And a 'woman' is a being that holds the leash over a man.

When a man thinks of equality, it is a difficult concept. Sure, he knows he should be fair, but he can barely respect women as equals. This is the same for women. They also barely respect men as equals.

I am tired of men standing on that shore, pointing at the water, and declaring, "What a shallow existence women are living! They are not fit to live!" It is because on the other side is a woman, pointing at the water, doing the exact thing. Women are very smart. They are just smart in ways men do not perceive as smart (so they just label it 'woman's intuition'). Women do the exact same for men.

A few are able to travel to the other sphere. But they are always travelers and can only observe. They will never be native to that other sphere. Esther Vilar was one such traveler. Her "Manipulated Men" described women to a T but what she labels as men's hopes and dreams is a little 'fuzzy'. But that is enough. No woman can understand a man well enough as men can (just as men cannot understand woman as women can). But Vilar knew enough of our sphere to communicate.

"Manipulated Man" should reveal that there is a looking glass and, on the other side, there is a feminine world that is invisible to us. Vilar gave us a lens to 'see' it. We should strive to sharpen that lens. The better we understand the feminine sphere, the better we understand women.

Rogues and Knaves

Pook · 28 June 2007 · Archived copy · Original



When I expand my context of sexuality, women, and Nature, there are times where I hit a wall. And there are times where a breakthrough comes that unleashes all sorts of gems.

How fast we forget the maxim: "Men and women are different." We apply it only when we face a contradiction that cannot be explained rather than plunging into the depths to pluck out the mystery. If men and women are different, then they have different contexts.

Men and women have different contexts of honor.

Men and women have different contexts for love.

Men and women have different contexts for smarts.

By realizing that women are smarter than men (since it is smarter to have someone work for you instead of do the work yourself), it was a breakthrough that has unleashed many gems.

We know that love ends up being enslavement to men and power to women. This is why women are all for "love" including Hillary Clinton. While Mrs. Bill Clinton advocates love in politics, it means the same 'more power'. We all know how men feel in love. But how do women feel 'in love' aside from the calculating way?

I asked myself, "Since women's love is based on work being made easier, is there anything similiar for men?" There is. Technology.

Men love technology because it eliminates work and makes existing work easier. Men love watching for the latest new gadget and even love shopping over tools and technological works. This "love" men have for technology must be identical to women's "love" to men (except more so).

Men love the idea of robots. Women do not. Why? Because she sees men as her robots.

Women love technology too but not as much as men. Men see technology as a salvation of sorts. Technology frees men from work. In the same way, men free women from work. When I saw two men babbling endlessly about a new piece of electronic, it hit me how identical it was when two women babble endlessly about a new man. Except, imagine a technological product that could adapt and shape itself and serve you for LIFE! Now you see why women are so man crazy.

As the Matriarchy solidified, technology skyrocketed. This could not be a simple correlation. Women freed themselves from work through men and men are trying to free themselves from work through technology. Ironically, in the world where there is little to no Matriarchy is where you find the least technology. There are no technological Patriarchies.

No wonder the Matrix was so effective. Men had machines enslave them to be 'energy' or 'long term batteries' to exist while humans lived in an imaginary world. Men understand giant robots and technology so the horror of such a life is understanding. But the fools thought the 'controllers' in real life was religion, government, or corporations without considering women. Why? Guys are scared to death to face the possibility that women are the smarter and controlling sex. Almost like a self-therapy, on MGTOW boards, men constantly re-iterate how "stupid" women are. My previous post of 'Women are smarter than men' didn't create disagreements but created personal insults against ME! haha.

Men do live in an illusionary world but the programming is based that men and women are NOT different from one another. Men never consider women to have a different context of honor, love, children, and all. They assume honor, love, children, etc. are universally the same by both genders.

Women do not know how men love. They do not enter our world. They do not hear the great songs of literature and all. They only know that "love", which is the process of her being a master over a male, makes him happy as well (a slave's happiness).

The idea of a man going their own way is alien to her. The real label for a guy doing the MGTOW is the word rogue. Love is authority to her.

Rogue- A man who is 'going his own way' when it comes to "The Way".

Rogue means different things to different people. Rogue, to other rogues, means someone who is uncontrollable, someone who wants to be free. To knaves, rogues mean someone who is an inferior organism. In this, knaves and women join together in hating rogues. And, of course, to women, a rogue is someone who cheats.

Women do not see rogues as threats. They see them only as scoundrels because they refuse to obey woman's authority. If a citizen decided to take matters into his own hands and arrest someone breaking the law, a politician would view those active citizens as scoundrels. (Example: President Bush calling citizens who arrest illegal immigrants as 'vigilantes'.) It is all about context.

Knave- A male servant that obeys "The Way".

There are multiple types of knaves. There is the financial knave which we label as Husband. There is the sexual knave which we label as Boyfriend. There is the shepherd knave (guiding other males into "The Way") which we label as Politician. Remember, many priests today are politicians. Many businessmen are politicians as well.

"Boyfriend" applies to players whose goal is to please women and think themselves "awesome" because they get to sleep with women.

Nice Guy is a proto-type husband. Most Nice Guys learn to sexualize themselves enough to become "Boyfriend" which ends them up becoming "Husband".

Women actually do want nice guys. But they know that sex is the hook to control the guy. If a guy does not sex the woman, she cannot get her hooks in him. This is why women demand guys to sexualize themselves so they can control them. A guy refusing kisses is a guy she cannot wrap around her little finger.

The authority of our time is not God (for as Nietzsche said, "God is dead."), is not State, is not even Wealth. The ultimate and unquestionable authority, of which everyone, president, investor, and priest, must bow to is LOVE.

Rousseau, the man whose writings sparked the French Revolutions and destroyed the Lockean Revolution, deliberately chose 'love' as the authority. Now, "Love" is going to solve all problems, make all the trains work on time, cause peace in the Middle East, and educate all children. "Love" is the post-modern chimera.

Not obeying the authority of LOVE is like not obeying the authority of the STATE. "But Pook! The State can kill you and arrest you!" So can 'love'. Child support, divorce proceedings, and destroys and controls. It is "love" trumping the authority of law and, by doing so, make tyrannical law.


But now that we know the authority is 'love', we rogues now have tools to protect ourselves. First, if accused by any crime, proclaim it as a 'love crime'. Second, if accused of using women, just say that you are searching for love. Third, if accused you are becoming too wealthy, tell how you did your business to 'love' the world and, if that doesn't work, start a charity to show just how much you 'love'.

When a rogue appeals to "love", women will assume he is just a knave and, therefore, not a problem. All knaves will get grinded up in "The Way" eventually, right?

Women appeal to "love" to get them off the hook all the time. MGTOW, or as I prefer, rogues ought to start appealing to "love" just the same. Ironically, the appeals to love will set rogues free.

Matriarchy Dictionary

Pook · 1 July 2007 · Archived copy · Original



Capacity to Choose- Moral

Smugness. (The most self-righteous of people preach what they have to gain.)

Charisma- Rabble-Rousing. ("He is so charismatic! Look how the people follow him." Rabble-rousers and demagogues were frowned on by aristocracies, just how elites are despised by democracies, but since there are no more aristocracies as there once were, the application of charisma has given justification to rabble-rousing.)

Creativity- Expressing my inner feelings. (Tell that to an engineer. Too bad they are all male.)

Dating- Fishing for a 'Life-Style' (see below).

Disapproval- Attack. (Two gay guys are going at it on Main Street. An onlooker says, "I disapprove of this. It is wrong." The weight of political class turn, as a single unit, to say, "Why are you attacking gay people?" If you encounter a slut who has five children by different fathers, you say, "Such bad behavior! What a slut!" The response is, "Why are you attacking single mothers?")

Equality- Accommodation to others. ("Handicap have equal rights. Therefore, we must accommodate your business to them by installing expensive ramps even though you are on top of a steep hill." "Women have equal rights. Therefore, you must accommodate them in their interests.")

Eroticism- Body centric sex. (Through the prism of empiricism made popular by Freud. Plato's definition of eroticism was not body centric. Neither was Nietzsche's.)

Feminine- Sublime work. (Ahh, the new aristocracy. Interior decorators, modeling, and so on.)

Lifestyle- Doing whatever one pleases. (The 'gay' lifestyle. The 'druggie' lifestyle. The vacations-r-us lifestyle.)

Love- Living through someone else. (For the man, living a slave morality to a selected woman or women. For the woman, living a master morality over a selected man or men. For politicians, morality for new taxes. For actors, trips to Africa to talk about land mines.)

Job- Men's work. (Men have 'jobs' but women get 'careers'.)

Masculine- Peasant work. (Often is hard labor which is suited for 'inferior' men.)

My Opinion- My prejudices. (Since all opinions are 'equal', that means you all must accommodate to your neighbor's opinion no matter how absurd it is, etc.)

Politics- Casting a gray net of abstractions to turn the world pleasing to our sense of right and wrong. (If you want out of the net, start studying law or business or demographics and you will see what is really going on behind the abstractions of demagogues.)

Sex- A bodily reaction involving multiple orifices resulting in a lifestyle. (Talked about as a bodily reaction in the similar manner as pooping, diarrhea, or scratching an itch. Before, one's cherished emotions would never have been described in such low ways. This is feminized sex- sex of comfort, sex of relaxation, sex of sense of achievement. It is treating sex like a bubble bath or stacking blocks. Gone is the teleology of sex. There is no final end be it from reproduction to transmutation. Sex has been turned into a lifestyle. To men, it is the slave morality of the husband or player who in pursuit of this sex will obtain all these things. To women, it is the master morality of the wife or mistress who gets material gifts, entertainment, services, furniture, and a house. To gays and lesbians, it becomes a master morality which they will have no disapproval. To religion, it has become a slave morality to the 'theology of the body' or something else. What they all have in common is that sex has turned into a lifestyle with no teleology which shows why reproduction and transmutation are down in Matriarchy countries.

Golden Rule To Weed Out Women

Pook · 3 July 2007 · Archived copy · Original

There has been many rules made by men to weed out women. Some of these rules are ancient, others are religious, some are modern, some by the rogues, some by the knaves and nice guys, and others by the women themselves.

The biggest 'rule' appears that traditional women are 'best' and feminists to skanks are the worst. Feminists and skanks understand men think this way too which is why they end up going to church single groups and begin saying, "Oh, I want to stay home and have lots of babies!"

Some are saying that, "You make judgements on women because you take a few and turn them to all! Stop going to bars and discos and you will find more wholesome women."

The traditional woman is not 'better' than the feminist, she is only more *invisible*. When traditional woman says, "I want to stay home to home-school the kids," the man gets a puffed chest and thinks, She wants to be a mother! How wonderful! But listen! The traditional woman speaks again. Shh, let us listen... "I want to bake cookies and pies all day!" And, again, the man puffs his chest and thinks, She wants to cook and be a family person! How wonderful! And, pray tell, she speaks again, "I am a virgin! I have never touched a guy!" The man, once more, puffs his chest and thinks, She is a virtuous and wonderful woman unlike the modern skanks. The man becomes enchanted with this and that is how she puts his hooks into him.

After the marriage, he becomes a slave to his job while she retires at home. He becomes fat and bald due to work stress while she 'cooks' which only takes an hour. And her virginity becomes bitter to the taste as, being a woman on Earth, she will age. She will use church to help control the husband, to tell him that he should not feel entitled to sex, to his money, or anything else.

As the man retires (if he can), his body will be in such an unfortunate state that he can't do anything he wants. She, of course, will want more vacations. "Let us go to Sweden," she says. "Or Jamaica!" In fact, at this point in his life, the man is so conditioned to working that even with failing organs and all, he feels guilty if he cannot work. He is a used up financial slave.

Traditional women are no different than feminists and skanks (which is why traditional women sometimes turn into feminists and skanks). The only difference is that traditional women are smarter. They are smarted because they know how to manipulate more effectively.

And so the question becomes, "But Pook! What rule should I use to obtain a wife? Listen! With traditional women gone, what do I have?"

This is the Golden Rule for women. It is 100% accurate and is the touch stone to use on all women you encounter including your family and friends. What is it? It is this:

You can tell everything about a woman by how she treats someone who can do nothing for her.

There is a second part to this rule as well. Here it is:

You can tell everything about a woman by how she responds to subjects of the soul.

If a man is poor, but following his soul, to become a Great Artist or Master Musician or something like that, the

correct women can see that passion. The incorrect women will see only materialism and shallowness (shallowness as in the guy's muscles and buffness).

I have witnessed one traditional woman, so high on herself, no marry until she was 35 (because she was SO SUPERIOR to us poor males) and then it was to a cop, to openly plot moving the cop's body around (should he die) so she makes a fortune if it is considered he dies 'on duty'. Does this sound like the type of woman you want?

Many men can't do anything for women. This is why many women attack them. If a guy is not dating, is simply doing his own thing, minding his own business, and women begin attacking him, does not that speak volumes about the women? Is that not an indication of how they perceive that man's only value to be his service to them?

Real women, as in real people, value souls. They do not see life through a prism of materialism and envy. They do not see a man as a mad scientist sees his automaton. Real women want the few material goods only to live. Bad women want to live for material goods.

In this, Shakespeare becomes useful. The constant theme in Shakespeare is between appearance and reality. Below the innocent flower lies a snake as Shakespeare said. The 'traditional' and 'wonderful' women like Katherine's sister in "Taming of the Shrew" everyone loved but she ended up being a horrible wife. But Katherine ended up become the best wife. Was it because her husband tamed her? No. They tamed each other. But Katherine's lashing out at women proved that she was a cross child starved for love. Women who whisper sweet honey and goodness are often foul inside. Sometimes, foul actions come from a foul mind. But you have to see through appearance and reality.

Many of the MGTOW, who speak poorly of women, are like Benedick of Much Ado About Nothing. They are been betrayed by women and are actually interested in love. But women, not knowing the difference between appearance and reality, will think the sex sport player is the best while the MGTOW is the worst where it is the exact opposite.

Women's actions speak louder than words. And seeing through appearance and reality is the perception to master to accurately judge women.

For Those in Doubt

Pook · 3 July 2007 · Archived copy · Original



A transcript on Tom Leykis show is below. Read.

A listener writes in and says, "I told my girlfriend I wanted a prenup [prenuptial agreement]. She said, 'You have nothing!' I said, 'It's for future earnings.' She got pissed and she said, 'Well, I don't want to get married.' But then she agreed to sign if I gave her a baby. Damn, Tom. Then I'll be into her 18 to 22 years. I'm confused. Should I have a family—or not and be alone?" And it is unsigned.

I cannot tell what your age is, but I'm guessing you're young. I do not think you're 30. I think you're closer to 20. But what you can see from this negotiation here is that her interest is not in *you*. It's in *money*. *Mon-ey*. Like so many women, she wants to lay some of the burden of life on *you*. She wants *you* to pay. By the way, just because you don't have some leech of a broad living in your home doesn't mean you're alone. You've got friends. You've got your family. You've got chicks to screw. You are not alone. And just because some broad moves into your house doesn't mean you've got company or security. That broad can stop putting out. She can lie to you and have sex with other people behind your back. She can refuse to do housework or leave the care of the child up to you. So many things can go wrong. Is it really worth it? Take it from me: There is nothing wrong with living alone. Nothing. The problem is *being lonely*, not living alone. Living alone is the best thing I did for myself. Ever. And it is not for the reasons you think. It is not because I can "*screw* whoever I want." Nothing like that. More often than not, the reason you want to be alone is to do the things you take for granted now. And if you're still living with Mommy, maybe these are things that you've never had the opportunity to do. Some of the things you can do include [watching] whatever you want on television. Sports, for example. Or not [watchng] television at all. Broads love watching TV. And they like the shows you hate—makeover shows, entertainment shows, shows about the entertainment industry, *Entertainment Tonight*, *Access Hollywood*, *The Insider*. Those are the shows they like. You don't watch those shows. Would you like that as the soundtrack of your life in the background all the time?

Chicks expect you to take the majority of the financial burden. Trust me when I tell you: You'll be paying for most of the rent, if not all of it; most of the electric bill; most of the gas bill; most of the cable bill; the satellite bill. She will want clothes and accessories. Who do you think is gonna pay for that? Groceries for one—I don't care what they say, they say "two can live as cheaply as one"? Yeah, tell that to the supermarket when she insists on buying things you don't have in your house, like yogurt or 2-percent milk or tampons. If two can live as cheaply as one,

you're going to have to cut back in order to accommodate her and her needs. Moisturizers, ten-dollar bottles of shampoo, all kinds of things that you are not buying now, you'll be on the hook for. You can have sex, you can have companionship, you can have friendship, and not have anybody living at your house. That means you can live in a smaller place and pay less for it—lower utility bills, lower grocery bills, lower phone bills because she'll no doubt want you to take over her cell phone bill. She'll have you paying for that. Women also are obsessed with buying gifts for every obscure person. Hey, I'm all about buying birthday gifts for my buddies, people close to me. Most chicks I know keep a Rolodex of everybody they've ever known and insist on sending cards and gifts to people they haven't talked to in five years. You don't do that. There's a million reasons you want to be alone, not the least of which is, you don't want to have to answer for your whereabouts all the time. And sometimes your whereabouts are not being out getting laid. Sometimes your whereabouts are as simple as browsing through a bookstore; having a beer with a buddy; going to a ball game; staying late at the office; staying late at the office and then going out to watch Monday Night Football; whatever. Once you take a broad in, she will complain about all of that. Oh, sure, there are exceptions. So all you exceptions to the rule, don't bother calling in, because we know that there are needles in every haystack. But it's a big frickin' haystack, you know what I'm saying? Most of us don't feel like combing through it. The letter writer is, you know, out there. You're right to ask her for a prenup, to tell her you won't marry her without a prenup. Oh yeah, she'll sign if you give her a baby. You know why she'll sign if you give her a baby? I'll tell you why. Because as you said, you'll be into her for 18 to 22 years of *payments*. It's all about money. There's nothing wrong with being alone.

I have to imagine some of the negotiations regarding prenups have to be fascinating. I have to believe that because we talk about it on the air so much that many of you—either because you heard us talking about it or because you're just that kind of person and you gravitated to a radio show like this—I have to imagine many of you have confronted your girlfriend, your fiancée, whoever, with a prenuptial agreement, and have had negotiations like this letter writer. You know, you told her there's going to have to be a prenup. What did she say? How did she respond? Did she say no? Did she stop having sex with you? Did she start negotiating? Have you tried to get her to sign a prenup? Have you told her you won't get married without a prenup? What was the response?

Pook:

The legal issues of marriage are just the tip of iceberg. There are financial and time issues as well (she taking up your money and time). My best friend understands the legal problems of marriage and has sworn to never marry much to his girlfriend's annoyance (she has tried to wittle him down but to no avail). However, the two live together and are going to buy a house. This means she has hooks into his money, his time, and, like any other husband, is turning him into a house.

What has got me are all those stupid entertainment shows. How on earth could women watch them? Soap operas at least tell a (bad) story but why fawn over actors and directors who are chumps anyway? I have yet to see a girl fawn over a famous chemist, author, or engineer. It is always these stupid Hollywood people.

You single guys think you are miserable. You are only miserable because you perceive happiness from a slave's context. So once you find a 'woman', you become 'happy'. All the things you do now you take for granted. Observe married men. If they were so happy and joyous, then why are they fat, bald, in constant health problems, and drinking?

Nice Guy Amuck

Pook · 6 July 2007 · Archived copy · Original

[image]From Wikipedia:

Duck Amuck is a surreal 1951 animated cartoon produced by Warner Bros. and released in 1953 as part of the Merrie Melodies series and starring Daffy Duck, who is tormented by a sadistic, unseen animator who constantly changes Daffy's location, clothing, voice, physical appearance, and even shape. Pandemonium reigns throughout the cartoon as Daffy attempts to steer the action back to some kind of normality, only for the animator to either ignore him or, more frequently, to over-literally interpret his increasingly frantic demands.

From being a Nice Guy to dealing with Nice Guys, Daffy Duck in that particular cartoon, "Duck Amuck" perfectly illustrates the emotions of Nice Guy. For fun, pretend Daffy Duck is the Nice Guy and the animator, Bugs Bunny, is the girl. Hell, Nice Guys SOUND like Daffy Duck!

First lines...

NICE GUY: Stand back, musketeers, they shall sample my blade! Touché!

[suddenly realizes that there is absolutely nothing behind him]

NICE GUY: Musketeers? Unguarded, eh? My blade? Hey, psst. Whoever's in charge here, the scenery, where's the scenery?



NICE GUY: *[woman has re-drawn him as a weird flower-like creature]* Hmm, that's funny. Somehow I don't quite feel like myself. I mean I feel all right, but I... I...

[sees himself in a mirror]

NICE GUY: EEEEEK! YOU KNOW BETTER THAN THAT!

NICE GUY:*[looking at corny background]* Ho-Ho that's rich, ha ha. Now how 'bout some color, stupid.

[Woman draws Nice Guy in wild, polka-dot colors]

NICE GUY: No. Not me you slop artist.

NICE GUY: Would it be too much to ask if we could make up our minds, hmmmm?

NICE GUY:[*after the island paradise disappears*] Buster, it should come as no surprise to you that this is an animated cartoon, and in animated cartoons they have scenery, and in all the years I've...

[*as he's venting, he is slowly being erased from feet up and is silenced when his face is erased*]

NICE GUY: All right wise guy, where am I?

[*projector sticks between frames dividing Nice Guy in half*]

NICE GUY: Now what?

NICE GUY 2: What are you doing down there?

NICE GUY: Down here? What are you doing up there?

[*pointing upward, sarcastically*]

NICE GUY 2: *Down* here.

NICE GUY: [*after his parachute is turned into an anvil and he crashes to the ground, he is beating on the anvil with a hammer and babbling incoherently. While he is doing this, the anvil is erased and is replaced with a torpedo pointing straight up. After a few more hits, the torpedo explodes. Nice Guy finally shakes himself off*] All right. Enough is enough. This is a final, the - the very, very last straw! Who's responsible for this? This... I demand that you show yourself! Who are you? Huh?

[*as he's venting, a doorway with an open door is drawn around him, then the door is pushed closed by the eraser. The woman giggles, turns to the world, and says...*]

WOMAN: Ain't I a stinker?

Three Men and the Wolfish Woman

Pook · 6 July 2007 · Archived copy · Original



The below words are illustrated in the video at the bottom.

"Men are pigs," say the women. But if men are pigs, who is the wolf seeking to sink its jaws into the sweet tasty nutrients that the pigs are?

Just as there are three little pigs, there are three little boys. The first one is Nice Guy. The second one is Speed Seduction Guy. The third one is Smart Guy. And instead of houses made of physical matter, men build mental houses that shelter and protect us all our lives.

It does not take much mental vigor to be a Nice Guy. That is why his house is made of straw. He doesn't even think. He just throws whatever is nearest around him up there. Likewise, it does not take much vigor to be Speed Seduction Guy. All you have to do is log into a website and literally follow instructions. He laughs at Nice Guy while he builds his mental house made of sticks. Both Nice Guy and Speed Seduction Guy get done building their mental houses early so they laugh at Smart Guy as his is slowly, but methodically, building his mental house full of bricks.

When the wolf comes, as the video below shows, the wolf comes as a dancing woman. Nice Guy and Speed Seduction Guy are charmed and dance with the wolf (while Smart Guy keeps building his house). As soon as Nice Guy and Speed Seduction Guy find out their charmer is a wolf disguised as a dancing girl, they flee to the Nice Guy House (as all Speed Seduction Guys start out in Nice Guy House of straw). The wolf shreds the straw house apart. Then they run into the Speed Seduction House of sticks. It falls apart but they quickly reassemble it. The wolf laughs and puts on additional sticks that eventually collapses the structure. The two run and keep going in circles until finally running into Smart Guy's House of bricks.

The wolf (woman) keeps trying to break into Smart Guy's house. But, unlike the Nice Guy House of Straw and Speed Seduction House of Sticks, the house holds. The wolf eventually tries very hard to get in which the doors are opened and the wolf runs through only to slam her face against the wall again. (Showing that Smart Guy isn't avoidant of woman, he can have her inside the house but be able to kick her out once again.)

As Nice Guy and Speed Seducing Guy play and dance happily inside Smart Guy's house, they look outside and see wolfie playing a little violent, crying, and snow falling. This is wolfie's trap. Sure enough, it works. Nice Guy and Speed Seduction Guy fall in sympathy with the wolf and rush to the door to let wolfie in. Smart Guy covers the door and says, "NO!" Speed Seduction Guy pushes Smart Guy out of the way so Nice Guy and Speed Seduction

Guy can rush outside of the house to let the wolf in.

Smart Guy hides behind the door and, being smart, discovers the 'tune' wolfie is using and flips it around. Poor wolfie! Now the wolf must suddenly start to dance! Now that wolf's disguise is ruined, the wolf chases the three around the house.

The end comes when the wolf takes the elevator that, according to the wolf, will take it to finest heights possible where the three men are but, alas, the wolf plunges into the depth never to get up again. So it is with woman who think they will ascend to the highest of heights possible inside the Smart Guy House only to fall into the abyss.

Woman's Pleasure

Pook · 15 July 2007 · Archived copy · Original

Men's pleasure is through their mind. Men enjoy solving problems, pursuing intellectual pursuits, and all of that. When a man goes through the bodily routines, he breaks it down into a science to make it as efficient as possible. It is a type of game that amuses him.

Women seek pleasure through their body. This is why women stuff their rooms full of pillows, why they eat too much ice cream, why they are obsessed about sex and talking about it, and why they find it comforting to stroke their hair endlessly or just sit around like a bump on a log. It is the life of a plant.

This is why kino always worked. This is why women become *attached* to guys they've slept with. This why they also become fat.

Understand that women live in a paradise of sorts. She can be as dumb as she wants. Her only major life challenge is marrying the correct man. Then, all she must do is drive him to work, work, work.

Imagine if you lived on a island of paradise where food and fruit were everywhere and all needs were taken care of. How would you act? Would you study philosophy? Of course not! You would dilly dally around and live a life of leisure. This is what women do.

Women who do work do so in a very different way then men. Women choose work in jobs where they get to meet wealthy and traveled men. It could be on a cruise ship or at a traveler's office. Most likely, she is hunting.

Women actually work very hard at finding a guy. So no matter how *dumb* you are, it is an almost certainty that a man will get hitched if he desires it. The only problems occur if he does not have the wealth and entertainment value she desires (the older and uglier, the lower it gets).

When you see a young woman working, ask yourself, "Is she working in a place where she can meet wealthy and well traveled men?" The answer is almost always yes.

Women's Views on Men

Pook · 15 July 2007 · Archived copy · Original

Men are like a giant pet to women. Like with any pet, you never **hate** it. You can only be cruel to it. "Good" women believe they are "good" solely because they are not cruel to men.

This doesn't mean they tell the truth or anything. One would never talk to a dog as one talks to a Human. But one wouldn't kick a dog just because it was there. It is always good to be kind and sweet to the dog even if you do not want it as a pet. Besides, cute pets good. Cute pets that can do tricks are better.

Since women are in paradise (see below), they cannot get inside men's context. If a man were to complain about women, the man is almost always complaining about the Matriarchy system (even if he is unaware it exists). Women do not see a Matriarchy. They think paradise exists for the man too just as it does for them. So when a man complains about women, she thinks he simply isn't getting enough sex that those in paradise seek. This is also why women don't understand why men complain about them screwing guys left and right or why they shouldn't drink and do drugs.

If women are in paradise, why are they so unhappy? Have you noticed the teeny boppers as they literally live like nonsense? Throwing away those years into the wind? Apparently, sometime along the way envy engulfs them. The envy comes from another woman that could be her sister or a close friend. Envy consumes them. She wants a cool car and big house too!

It makes women very uncomfortable when they read information that husbands are so unhappy in marriage. It is not because of a sense of guilt but that they are in **paradise**, shouldn't he be in paradise as well?

Women's pleasures include doing brain dead stuff like cleaning, dish washing, cooking, and so on. Men thinks she is industrious because she does this. But she likes it.

Flip that around. When men work and slave, she thinks he actually enjoys it. She does not think his pleasure has been programmed. I told a woman, whose husband was a fireman who would work another job to buy more gifts for her for Christmas, that she was killing him. He would enter an early grave. She retreated to, "But he enjoys doing that." Maybe that is just bluff. Maybe she believes it. Or maybe she tells herself that to feel better.

Women believe that they are the Source of All Happiness for men. Bachelors have to always be unhappy and sad. Married men have to be always happy and upbeat. This is reflected in media (which women are the primary consumers). Young men easily believe it because they are young. Don't forget that you once believed Santa Clause was real too.

When women ask why I don't have a girlfriend, after going through the usual guesses like I'm gay, they say, "You don't know how to get one," or "You haven't met the right type," or something else. But never ONCE do they say, "You do not want a girlfriend." No. The premise is always that a guy WANTS a girl. This is why when you reject a girl, she becomes furious... or depressive.

Every woman believes she understands men. But every man confesses his confusion about women.

Every woman believes she is a creative genius. As someone deeply immersed in the Humanities, this always offended me. Just because you write bad poetry in a diary doesn't mean you are "creative". Most women don't know how to write. They believe they are psychologists.

Women will always consider the problem is with you, never the system. For she lives in Paradise. The only women who are unhappy with Paradise are the Feminists. And they are unhappy because they are ugly. They are female versions of Richard the Third. They probably even have dogs bark at them.

Why Rome Fell

Pook · 15 July 2007 · Archived copy · Original



Every interest group proclaims Rome fell because their cause was ignored. Environmentalists blame the fall of Rome on lead pipes or other hazards. Religious blame the fall of Rome on social decay. Gays blame the fall of Rome on not embracing the fictional Greek gay life-style. Classicalists blame the fall of Rome on the very long book of "The Fall of Rome" because if they read such a long book, they must put its conclusions to use somehow to sound sophisticated. Liberals blame the fall of Rome because of Christian fundamentalism. It can be safe to say that everyone projects their own belief into the Fall of Rome.

Why the projection? It is because the above groups have a worship of History whose ebbs and flows revolve around their beliefs. After all, we know liberals believe they are the force of History while conservatives believe they are the force of history. This allows everyone to point to the Fall of Rome and proclaim that current civilization will fall.

And by fall of the Roman Empire, I do not mean the fall of Byzantium in the 1400s but a thousand years before that.

The lifeblood of civilization is trade. Profitable and safe trade. The reason why America exists in the first place was the colonists wanted to trade with whoever and wherever they wanted. Poor nations almost always have poor trade.

Just as we have our tupperware and storage containers used in everyday life, the Romans had their pots and other containers. Archeology can trace these pots and measure their quality. What was amazing is how high quality pottery was used throughout the civilization straight down to the peasant class. This meant the ratio between prices and earnings had to have been favorable.

There is an example of a Syrian village that thrived in rocky country whose soil was good only for growing olive trees. This village sustained a ridiculously high population for many, many years -- a population that was far higher than could be supported from the agricultural yields of that area.

So what were they living on? Trade. They grew their olives and shipped the oil abroad. Apparently their oil was so highly regarded throughout the Mediterranean that it enabled them to import almost all the food and wine they required to sustain their population.

They had specialized. It worked very well for them -- until the whole system of trade broke down and there was no

way for them to get their goods out to their potential markets. Either it was no longer safe enough to transport their oil and sell it profitably, or the markets had dried up because of the crash of the economy elsewhere. Whatever the immediate cause, the result was predictable: Without the revenues to let them import food, the population crashed back to the very low levels that could be sustained by the miserable local farming.

So what caused the decrease of trade leading to the crash?

Solid trade requires protection. The Roman military was posted on borders and did their job so well that city walls were not used. The Roman Empire had a series of crisis after crisis: plagues, civil wars, and other problems. None of that brought down the system. If the local economy crashed, it soon sprang up again.

But due to the civil wars, the military became weakened. Emperors began a self-destructive policy of paying barbarians to leave the borders alone. This worked for a while. But the barbarians kept showing up again and again and soon there wasn't money to pay to bribe them away. Also, the barbarians had to show they were serious. If they looted one city, that would compel Rome to act. But by looting that city, it caused effects among the nearby citizens to flee.

When they ran out of money, Rome began giving the barbarians land. So now the barbarians became the new overlords for an area and, likewise, the new tax collectors. Except they kept all the taxes to themselves. They didn't understand the tax collection system as looting and pillaging were much more effective. They didn't enforce public safety and merchants became at risk. They took too much and those areas became removed from the Roman Empire's grand trading network.

The Roman Empire could absorb some of this. But not lots and not all at once.

The point was not that a nation fell but an international economic system. The city-states were dependent on one another. As trade broke down, artisans crashed because who could pay for their goods? Since no one wanted to become an artisan since you couldn't survive doing it, the workmanship would survive a generation or two afterward until disappearing. Pollen counts indicate that crops decreased. Cities turned into villages.

In the twentieth century, America became much of an economic cushion. I don't say this with American narcissicism, I say it because it fits the pattern of that century. America was not invaded during World War I so it could help be the economic cushion to help get England and France back on their feet. When America did enter its Great Depression, the stage was set for a new barbarian uprising which came from Hitler and the Nazis. Like before, civilization tried to appease the barbarians. When money failed, they gave them land. After World War II, America became an economic cushion to Japan and Western Germany.

Over the past sixty years, economies performed fantastically when sustained by the American military. A Pax Americana existed that allows for an international economy, for more trade zones, and so on. This system of safe trade has allowed for greater degrees of specialization and mutual sustained prosperity.

Unlike Rome, America is not imperial. America also does not tax the lands its military is located in. What happens is that America taxes itself. Since Japan and much of Europe does not have to pay for the high taxes of that Defense requires, they can create socialism and other government projects.

America's defense budget is not a menace to the world. To the contrary, it has allowed places like South Korea to Japan to Taiwan to eastern Europe to thrive mostly because they don't have to pay for that defense.

Communism were holdouts outside the wall of American security. They thought they could subvert the

international economic system. When they fell, places like China and Russia wanted to join. But nations like Russia made the same mistake of not protecting merchants. It became too dangerous to do business in Russia. So the nation began to move back to doing things the old way and Putin becomes a dictatorship in anything but name only. Naturally, America is blamed for all this.

China has a demographic crisis as there are two men for every girl. This means, in time, it may become unsafe to do trade in China. And they may become cut off from the International Economic System.

The new barbarians are the Islamic Fascists. This is because they attack trade and, where they abound, make it unsafe to do business there. Think of those French districts where even the French police are scared to enter.

The point is that they, and many America's "allies" oddly, do not understand the International Economic System, see it as oppression rather than what it is: uplifting and prosperous, and are bent on destroying it.

This is why the targets of 9/11 were the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. Ultimately, the two are not separate. They are one.

Why Marriage No Longer Works

Pook · 16 July 2007 · Archived copy · Original



I am a believer in Occum's Razor. The simplest and clearest explanation is often the best one.

I am seeing divorce occur among the usual married but also with traditional religious. Sometimes it is the woman who initiates the divorce. Other times, it is the man.

The desire for divorce has been said to be the effect of immorality, paganism, repression, bad male attributes, bad female attributes, and so on. But one thing every example has in common is that the person claims authorship of their lives.

Imagine one's life is a story and the person wants to control the pen writing that story. Sounds fair and good. But no one could alter the state of their marriage in most of history. Throughout time, arranged marriages were the norm. In fact, throughout most societies people were not the author of their lives.

Marriages tend to work when one of the couple does whatever the other wishes, or both do what someone else wishes. One may claim authorship over their lives and, often, that can lead to divorce if she (or he) decides to "get more" somewhere. If two claim authorship over their lives, then no relationship is possible.

Most men surrender to "love". They go along to get along. In long marriage couples, studies (and validated by my own parents) show that often the man does what the woman wants.

It is the modern illusion that marriage is supposed to be about happiness. Households and vast family trees used to be revered. Aristocracy protected their line very carefully but even the peasants were family centric. It was not a nuclear family, but even more. Young couples often moved in with their parents. Four generations could be under one household.

Marriage was a joining of two families and, that alone, was seen as a major effect. There was no atomization. The heritage went on. Young sons would take over family farms and businesses or become king.

The radical change has not been marriage or sexual mores but the complete abolishment of heritage. No one cares about the family line. A woman having kids from multiple fathers would never have been permitted back then. Why? It would destroy the family line.

Marriages worked because there was a family line and marriage was seen as an extension of that. Today, marriage is legally and metaphorically seen as a contract of consensus. One could describe it as people duct taped together (the duct tape being the law). People did not tolerate single mothers and whores because of the family line.

For proof of how revered the 'family line' was, consider the bastard. In Shakespeare, the 'bastard' played most of the villains. The bastard was an outcast.

It is not a coincidence that the abolishment of the family line has disrupted reproduction rates to below replacement levels. When the family line was intact, people had many children. The family line went on and spread.

For over a century, women have used "love" as something men to surrender so she claims authorship over her (and now his) life. Curiously, young women today are now even throwing out their charade of 'love' and expect men to obey anyway. I have tried to tell them that attacking romance will not be helpful to their longterm plans. They do not listen and wonder why they are alone.

It is important how we define a 'successful' marriage. Is a long lasting marriage a 'success'? Not if it produces little children and gives the man an early grave. A 'successful' marriage should leave the earth with more people than when the married couple was born. A 'successful' marriage should have some sort of wealth to pass down to heirs... even a poor old farm. A 'successful' marriage should create a family line.

This means the modern 'successful' marriages are bunk. There is no wealth to pass down. No children aside from a replacement or two. And no family line. So having one in the couple claim authorship of their lives does not help.

The 'successful' marriages (using the definition above) appear to neither claim authorship. They let family, religion, or something else be the author. It is this non-authorship what is declared to be 'non-freedom'. So when a feminist or someone says she needs more 'freedom', she wants more power to be an author on her life (i.e. to do whatever she wants).

It is true that women were 'controlled' back then. But it is also true that men were 'controlled' as well. As today we may protest this non-authorship, the results cannot be denied. In non-English countries, we can see some of this still in effect. In China, the family line is so cherished that they are willing to kill their own daughters in order to have male heirs. In America, Mormonism is growing by leaps and bounds because of the reverence toward the family line. It is not a coincidence that one of the largest geneological research libraries exist in a Mormon Church.

A common modern delusion is the belief that creativity means the absence of controls, of constrictions. Rather, creativity was the opposite. Mozart's education was very controlled, very constricted, and steeped in mathematics and Humanities. But all this heat and pressure created diamonds. A good poet knows the mathematics behind music and how language is constructed. Bad poets only expel their feelings like gas. From working out, to achieving new goals, to excellent painting, poetry, or writing, it all depends on definite controls.

If someone went into a gym and said, "I will become author of my own body!" and began doing one exercise and then another with no sense, he would be thought mad. It is the same with our mind. If you read comic books, you

will be stupider than someone who read Plato. In order to go anywhere in life, one must push. And to push means contritions.

It is well documented that children prefer order to chaos. In dating and love, there is confusion because there is no system, no controls, nothing. Courtship is dead. The harder rules we impose on ourselves, the happier we become. The key to improving life is to improve your standards for yourself.

When someone acts in "who they are", they are content. A painter who paints is content. But if the painter wants money or something else and becomes a banker, he becomes unhappy despite getting what he wants. When we let "what we want" interfere with "who we are", we get bent.

In order to solve the marriage problem, we need to ask, "Whom is marriage?" instead of "What I Want in marriage". I expect everyone to disagree with this. But that is because people still believe 'relationships' happen. No. People do not even see one another. They are in a relationship with a "want" and are pursuing it. But "want"s are fickle. They change and multiply. This is why women are never satisfied. It is because they are in love with wants, not men.

American Women Suck forum taken down

Pook · 23 July 2007 · Archived copy · Original

Like Voltaire, I always believe in free speech. Words are just words. But it amazes me how people want to ban and delete websites/speech that goes against what they believe. Or, rather, they only interpret it as 'hate speech' and demand it go away.

You might ask, "Pook, why do they have such a reaction against 'hate speech'? It is not sticks and stones. It is not violence. Did not Martin Luther King Jr. say something like, 'I don't want the White Man to love me, only the power to not hurt me'?"

Here is something that everyone must know about The Political Class.

- 1) They believe they are extremely intelligent and that you are unsophisticated dumb peons.
- 2) They believe society is artificial and is like a garden (with the legislator as gardener). They want the garden to grow, to PROGRESS. Hence, plants do not have freedom in a garden. A plant not doing what it should, that is going another direction than the other plants, is seen as 'freedom' to that plant but to the gardener is seen as a 'disease' which they set fire to it. This is the mentality why people are lined up and shot in dictatorships.

I have talked to AWS in an undisclosed forum before. He is extremely paranoid (so much so he shocked other posters). Before one bashes American Women Suck, remember that the website has been cited in feminist legislation in Washington. If my blog was cited in Washington, I'd probably be paranoid too.

But still, AWS, you are doing yourself no favor at lashing out at those offering to help. Remember Benjamin Franklin's cartoon that read: "We stand together or we will all hang seperately."

Study: Women lie, cheat, and steal

Pook · 23 July 2007 · Archived copy · Original

http://www.manchestereveningnews.co.uk/news/s/139/139613_women_lie_cheat_and_steal.html?ref=emtaf&archive=archive

It is old but worthwhile. Men and women both agree on one thing: do not trust women.

A Fool's Paradise

Pook · 23 July 2007 · Archived copy · Original



Again and again, I have been saying that feminism is not the problem. It is a problem but it is a tentacle, not the octopus. MRAs, mostly the older ones, attack feminism because it is so visible and aligns perfectly to political held views (feminism is political while most of the matriarchy is not). There is a lace curtain between the sexes that divide our two worlds. Men and women do not see each other's worlds.

What is Woman's World? It is paradise. If you were on a tropical island, would you not just enjoy life? You would not read philosophy. You would not take life seriously. You would let your brain rot and take in the pleasures of the body. You would sleep with a island native here or there and think nothing of it. You would wear silly costumes, stay out late at night all the time, drink, maybe even wear tatoos.

Women appear so damn dumb to men because they are in paradise. Married women especially so. This is why American Women tend to have two emotions: giddiness or stern contempt. Stern contempt occurs only when something interferes with Paradise such as a rainstorm. Women who are forced to work are unhappy because they feel they are being denied Paradise. Unmarried women or ugly women (is there a difference?) begin to hate men because they believe they are denying them Paradise.

When a sex looks at the lace curtain, it appears as a mirror. They project themselves onto the other sex. Women believe men are also in this paradise. If you are studying on your own, or do not go out every night to "party" or "play", they will be confused and think something is wrong with you.

When men talk about how unhappy they are in their marriages, women become extremely uncomfortable as if ice water is chilling their spine. They thought the opposite! They thought men WERE HAPPY and that they, the woman, were bestowing joy inside the guy! No one wants to see a monster in the mirror so they say there is something wrong with the guys who complain about women.

Feminists are, no doubt, unhappy women. What is feminism but just a way for ugly women to have access to society? When a woman is unhappy, she feels she is being denied Paradise. She already believes men are in Paradise (along with her female friends). All the frustrations she feels in life (denials of Paradise she will interpret) will be seen as being caused by the MAN. So men become the enemy even though he is actually the creator of her paradise. So feminists go on a cycle of more and more misery. They charged through the lace curtain demanding to enter Men's World for he has their Paradise which SHE feels she is entitled to. She wants the status and wealth that male work has without doing any of the work.

Men who attack feminists all day see them charging into their world and begin attacking them (only because they have become visible in their world). These guys still haven't a clue and are nothing more than reactionists.

I will offer a scale of perception for men and women.

WOMAN

Feminists (Very Stupid)- Believes men are the destroyers of Earthly Paradise and attack men to 'restore' it. Feminists are very stupid because they are attacking the ones who created paradise. Smart women join men in attacking feminists because feminists are a threat to THEIR paradise (of men working for women). Feminists believe if they expel the men, they can create a lesbian relationship which, since it does not involve men, will create paradise.

Slut (Stupid)- Sluts are women who act as if they are in Paradise and that is never going to change. They sleep with whoever, get drunk, and just waste their lives away. They might wisen up or they might become even stupider (and become a feminist).

Career Woman (Dumb)- Career women correlate to sluts and feminists quite well. But career women work because they lack the perception of how to manipulate men. If they did, they would not work. Many Career Women smarten up, find a sucker, and then 'retire' after a baby.

Wife (Norm)- By marrying, a woman now has a servant. She may still work but that will be seen as temporary until he is making enough money (where she will 'retire' for 'love'). Normal women want to get married. Wife also includes mistresses.

Manipulator (Clever)- While all women manipulate, this woman lives for nothing else but to manipulate. She dresses, talks, and basically lives a lie. Whether it be a promotion or something else, she uses manipulation as a science. But she is not really smart, only clever. Her perception is at the level where she knows she can manipulate but she doesn't fully understand how to get men TRULY enslaved.

Traditional (Smart)- Women remain virgins because it allows them to obtain a better husband. Also, it prevents them from becoming single moms which is smart. Religious women are not actually religious but use religion to manipulate the men. How often do you see her reading from the Bible or any serious work? She will do 'volunteer work' to make her FEEL all good but it is nothing more than a feeling.

Housewife (Smartest)- Women have effectively retired to live in a stress free suburban house, surrounded by modern technology (so she rarely has to do chores), and spend the time doing whatever she desires. Many women, such as feminists, attack the housewife but that often results from envy.

MAN

Mangina (very stupid)- This guy will be spewing out feminist lines and propoganda. He has no idea how stupid he is. But, like all stupid people, he feels he is very smart. The smartest people are those that feel they know nothing. Manginas are often gay men and metrosexuals. Political Class men are often Manginas. Manginas are easily manipulated which is why they dominate the Political Class (they make good puppets).

Thug (stupid)- Thugs often end up in prison or something else. Women like thugs because they can be manipulated (and they have no guilt for doing so since thugs are worthless). Remember, even Manginas can get girls (but what does that say?).

Nice Guy (norm)- Contrary to what Mirror of the Soul said, it is important to use the 'Nice Guy', etc. terms because it not an illustraion of an action but a label for a certain level of perception. When someone says, "When I was a Nice Guy..." he is referring to a lower perception level, not in the manner he was acting. Most guys are Nice Guys. They believe in Love and will work furiously hard to 'earn' a woman's love. Nice Guys are frustrated because they do not understand women (and admit this). They see women go for thugs or jerks and think, "What in the world!" The purpose of Thugs and Players to women is to be Instant Dildos. The purpose of Nice Guys is to be Instant Husband. Like Instant Rice, Nice Guy is an Instant Husband that a woman can fall back on (HOPEFULLY).

Player (clever)- Just like every level in this perception list, the player believes he is the smartest of all his peers. He is not. He is only clever. There is actually very little difference between the Nice Guy and Player. The Nice Guy is addicted to sex and female praise like water in a desert. Nice Guy resorts to 'niceness' as a type of withdrawl symptom. But players are addicted to sex and female praise and seek it out in the highest dosage possible. The difference between the Nice Guy and Player is the difference between the poor crack addict and the rich crack addict.

Jerk (smart)- Jerks are quite smart. Their perception is above the usual female addiction typical of lower perceptions. They are called jerks by women because the jerk cannot be manipulated. Players actually create their 'strategies' by studying jerks. Do not confuse a thug with a jerk however. While thugs don't care about female addiction, they don't care about anything else either. Jerks are often successful in the world of business.

Loser (smartest)- The Loser is someone who disregards "The Way". The difference between a Loser and Jerk is that the Jerk is a guy who cannot be manipulated. But a loser is someone who abandons "The Way" altogether. Bill Gates is a loser for he quit Harvard. Steve Jobs was a loser too as he failed college. Michael Dell is a loser as he quit school. It takes enormous strength to not just stop being manipulated but go AGAINST the current, against "The Way" that flows and propels all the Nice Guys to their fish cages. If the Loser keeps pushing upstream, eventually he slips out to the open ocean to true freedom (I know upstream doesn't lead to the ocean but I like this metaphor so shhh!). Losers are named so by women. If a guy wants to live with a foreign woman, he is called a loser. If a guy wants to not work himself to death and achieve financial freedom, he is called a loser. Losers are smart because they have mastered their emotions, their finances, and their bodies to keep all of them in good shape.

Following YOUR dreams = Loser

Following HER dreams = Winner

If this is the case, I would choose loser every time.

Jerry Doyle a Men's Rights Activist?

Pook · 8 August 2007 · Archived copy · Original



One of the great things about the Internet for reading is how far curiosity will take you. A simple search, a click on a link here and there, and as you hop from page to page, you uncover an odd trail whose information often surprises.

When I listened to a Babylon 5 episode commentary via Netflix, the scene where Sheridan (sp?) gives Delenn the engagement ring had Jerry Doyle (actor who plays Garibaldi) suddenly start mocking the entire thing going how the girl would wait a couple of years, get a divorce, and get all your money taken from you, etc. I filed that in the back of my head to do a quick bio search to see if the guy had been divorced and taken to the cleaners. Sure enough, he was. Who knew that the wife/ex-wife that did was the chick that played Talia Winters? When she left the show, they married, had a kid, and divorced a couple years later.

Even weirder is finding out Doyle was a jet pilot, ran for a Republican congress seat, lost, and **began his own talk show**. You are so used to seeing these actors as absolute airheads that it is odd to see them doing... something interesting. Apparently, Doyle agrees with this as he made the term "**grapefruit mentality**" which most women, I know, think: "LOL! Let us talk about celebrities all day! Oh, that Keanu Reeves! Tee hee!". Sure enough, there is a link on his website to the National Center for Men.

Support against the legal double standards for men may not seem broad on the surface but, apparently, runs deep. It would have been interesting if Doyle won the election. A TV camera fades onto Congress and you see Garibaldi there.

"Man: A Fun Ride With Health Insurance"

Pook · 11 August 2007 · Archived copy · Original

Title sums it up very well.

Just for kicks, how about another clip. I am going to steal that first line. Priceless.

Radicalism of Vilar

Pook · 18 August 2007 · Archived copy · Original



"The Manipulated Man" is the most cited book for the Enlightened Men and the most influential. When I first read it, I was tearing out my hair saying, "I cannot prove she is wrong!" It takes repeated readings and some time for the Truth to fully sink in.

Due to how perspective altering the book is, we haven't exactly gone through the book with a fine tooth comb. Vilar makes radical statements that the Men's Movement has not yet caught on. What Vilar says is as mind bending as the first time you read "Manipulated Man".

So what are these fine toothed things we may have missed? Stick around. The upcoming posts go through each one. Since the blog is going to get serious, take this time to have a **laugh**.

Vilar's Radicalism # 10

Pook · 19 August 2007 · Archived copy · Original



10) Masculinity and Honor is an Artificial System designed to manipulate men.

-

Thanks to women, everything is labelled "masculine" or "effeminate," "worthy" or "unworthy." By imbuing all they do with sentimental and emotional values to such a degree that no one can remain unaffected by them, women have created for themselves a fool's paradise. Whatever they do is pointless compared with male achievements. And since they say so themselves, why should men quibble?

Of course, if men really wanted to, they could destroy this tissue of lies and replace the terms "masculine" and "effeminate" with "hard" and "easy".

...

It is simple to analyse this vicious circle: women invent rules, manipulate men to obey them and so dominate the male sex. Of course, these rules in no way apply to women themselves. The male sense of honour, for example, is a system invented by women who loudly exempt themselves from it. They renounce the concept of honour and, as a result, manipulate men.

In a recent television series, "The Avengers", there was a scene in which two antagonists were facing each other across a billiard table, a pistol in front of each of them. It was agreed that to give them each an equal chance, they should count aloud up to three and then shoot. The hero, however, grabbed his pistol and fired at the count of two,

thus saving his own life. He chose to remain outside the system and was therefore in a position to manipulate the other who, although in mortal danger, preferred to stick to a system approved by society rather than to use his own judgement.

Pg. 59-61

What is a Man? Certainly not masculinity or honor. Vilar will later define exactly what man is.

But it is true that everything that is 'masculine' and 'honorable' is disadvantageous to men and advantageous to women. It is 'masculine' to lift heavy objects. It is 'honorable' to always be nice to women. It is 'masculine' to join the military. It is 'honorable' to help the mother-in-law at all times.

Even though readers of "Manipulated Man" know how this is advantageous to women, I do not think it has yet been internalized that IT IS ALL FAKE. MGTOW are still talking about 'honor' and 'masculinity' as if it means something. It should be noted that Shakespeare opposed honor and blunt masculinity. The movers and shakers of the past, the philosophers, the poets, the musicians, the artists, would today be called 'unhonorable' and 'unmasculine'. But since there was no Matriarchy in that time period, you can see why people were attracted to such fields and tried to study them.

It is time to let it go. Let Honor go. Let 'Masculinity' (though not testosterone) go. The manipulation of Honor is not that Honor is being used to serve females, it is Honor itself is a female construction. Why should we 'honor' politicians? The only 'honor' that should be recognized is that band of brothers between soldiers. But is that really honor? Not really. That does not fit ribbons or medals.

Don't try to be masculine but try to be who you are. Those who embrace who they are, their soul, their passions, strive to be You Inc., will naturally be confident. It is those that strive towards masculinity, towards its images and cliches, that end up becoming the biggest wimps.

Prior to the 20th Century, male friendships and companionships (these are close friendships, NOT homosexuality) were depicted in literature and the world. It is interesting that the only way men are allowed to be 'close friends' is under 'Honor' as in old war buddies. Male friendship is savagely attacked as 'effeminate' (and now 'gay') because it does not help women in the slightest. This conditioning is so deeply rooted that sharing a two bedroom apartment with a guy, it is not uncommon for that guy to say, "Look! I am just trying to save money! I don't sleep with him or anything!" As the Internet and MGTOW is showing, male friendship is our greatest strength against Matriarchy. No wonder it is considered the most 'unhonorable' and most 'effeminate' thing ever!

Matriarchy Circles the Wagons Around Teen Beauty

Pook · 28 August 2007 · Archived copy · Original

"But Pook, the Matriarchy is something bitter old men say who can't get laid. It does not exist."

Well, then, friend, can you explain this?

This is the YouTube video of the Teen Beauty making an idiotic answer. One of the YouTube commentators aptly said, "She should go straight to porn!" since she obviously has no brains and only looks.

Haha, funny video, blah blah, the world keeps spinning and there are tons of funny videos of other people. Everyone moves on in the world except the Matriarchy. After all, you can't make fun of a young pretty white girl even if she uttered stupidity on live television (where she knew she was on the stage).

Look at all the excuses and how the other woman even high fives her. They ask her for her plans and talk about her 'good grades' to deflect that she is dumb as a rock. And they ask the question to her again in which her answer is still dumb:

Question:

Why is it that one-fifth of Americans can't locate the U.S. on a map?

Answer:

"Well personally, my friends and I, we know exactly where the United States is on our map. I don't know anyone else who doesn't. And if the statistics are correct, I believe there should be more emphasis on geography."

This still isn't an answer. The question was why can't 1/5 of Americans locate the U.S. on the map and, naturally, she talks about herself (in a desperate attempt to keep showing she isn't stupid) and then says more emphasis should be on geography. That doesn't say why 1/5 of Americans don't know geography. What a dumb bitch.

Vilar's Radicalism #9

Pook · 28 August 2007 · Archived copy · Original



9) There is only one main difference between men and women: men are curious while women never are.

One main difference between men and women. Men are curious. Women never are. Only thing women might be curious are new bodily pleasures. -

Of all the qualities of man, his curiosity is certainly the most impressive. This curiosity differs basically from that of woman. A woman takes interest only in subjects that have an immediate personal usefulness to her. For example, if she reads political article in the newspaper, it is highly likely that she wants to cast a spell on some political-science student, not that she cares about the fate of the Chinese, Israelis or South Africans. If she looks up the names of some Greek philosophers in the dictionary, it does not mean she has suddenly taken an interest in Greek philosophy. It means she is trying to solve a crossword puzzle. If she is studying the advertisements for a new car, she is not doing it with a platonic interest in its technical features, but because she wants to own it.

....

Man's curiosit is something quite different. His desire for knowledge has no personal implications, is purely objective and, in the long run, is much more practical than a woman's attitude.

....

Man's curiosity is universal. There is almost nothing that does not interest him, whether it is politics, botany, nuclear physics, or God knows what. Even subjects out of his province hold his interest, such as bottling fruit, preparing cake mix or caring for a baby. And a man could not be pregnant for months without knowing all the functions of the placenta and ovaries in detail.

Men not only observe the world around them, it is in their nature to make comparisons and to apply the knowledge they have gained elsewhere with the ultimate aim to transform this newfound knowledge into something else, something new.

One need not emphasise the fact that practically all inventions and discoveries in this world have been made of men

....

Pg. 41-43

Women not being curious, and hence not having a HUNGER to learn and see new things, has been one of my biggest disappointments with their sex. Without curiosity, there is no intellect, no ability, no talent. The only curiosity women appear to portray is trying out new bodily pleasures. These include:

- New sex positions
- Dating Pook to try out his bodily pleasure (or another guy, or yet another guy)
- Eating stupid and absurd foods (women are annoyed that I am pleased with a decent grilled hamburger or steak most of the time).
- Sunbathing, saunas, and massages
- Sport type activities
- Why Action Dates work better than Talking Dates

Men vary in their intelligence and what they study. But all men are the same in that we are all curious... about everything... in some sort of way. Women lack this.

Women define 'adventuresome' as new sex positions, dating many guys, eating weird foods, and so on. But if a man pursues his curiosity, such as learning about space or the oceans or anything of that nature, he is condemned as a nerd.

In MGTOW sites and all, rarely do we hear men's groups subscribe 'curiosity' to men. They may apply 'smarts' but smarts are different than 'curiosity'. Have we truly understood Vilar when we keep saying men are different because of (X) and not because of simple curiosity?

It should be noted that the animal greatest known for its curiosity is the cat. While cute and fuzzy, the cat is famous for its curiosity ("Curiosity killed the cat" etc). Some Men's Rights Activists blast cats as spawns of Satan since they appear to possess the same traits as women do (selfish, lazy). But what if cats are liked by women because they possess the traits of men? Smart men are "lazy" (resting) whenever they get a chance and are always curious like the cat.

Best Tetris Player Ever

Pook · 10 September 2007 · Archived copy · Original

This video starts off slow but watch the end. Invisible blocks!

Iwata talks manager success and application of talents

Pook · 10 September 2007 · Archived copy · Original



I am fascinated with business strategies of very successful companies especially the Silicon Age ones. Nintendo has a higher profit to employee ratio than any other company I know of, even Google, and their stock has skyrocketed to the top in Japan (above even Sony's value). [Here](#), you will find the President of Nintendo detailing his management philosophies and, strangely, talking about advancing talent and genius. A fascinating read whose ideas can be applied to your own business or to your yourself.

South Carolina Teen needs to shut up already

Pook · 10 September 2007 · Archived copy · Original

Please. Someone make **her** stop!

The Lace Curtain

Pook · 22 September 2007 · Archived copy · Original



To my surprise, there are those who read Pook in foreign nations (foreign to me). By foreign, I do not mean Canada or the UK but anywhere in South America or in Europe outside English speaking countries. I want to explain why there has been such a radical change in Pook over the last few years.

There is something called "the Lace Curtain". What I quote below, excerpts from Farrel's book: "Women Can't Hear What Men Don't Say" will show the 'Lace Curtain' to be a wall of censorship, "the Lace Curtain" is a programmed mindset. Those who live in the Anglosphere have 'The Lace Curtain' mindset. It is very different from a mentality of nationalism or religion. The closest I can think would be Communism.

Everyone asks, "Since Communism and dictatorships have been shown to be a huge failure everywhere they are tried, why are politicians of free nations in awe still of these systems? Why do they want to revive socialism and its later evolutions of Communism and dictatorships?"

While it is true that Communism and dictatorships fail, and it is true that almost everyone suffers, the key is that one person does WIN BIG in Communism and dictatorships. Who? Why, the politicians of course! Politicians lose all the time in a free country as they will become hated and no one will build them statues. But in a dictatorship, why, there will be many statues and the politician gets all the power.

The same is true of Feminism. It does no good to write long essays on why Feminism fails, why the Matriarchy hurts men, or so on. What does matter is that it enthrones women. Women have no reason to question Feminism, naturally. Men question the Matriarchy when they begin to notice the long pattern of pains and injustices against them.

Before, I have mentioned much about "The Way". Go to school. Get a girl friend. Marry the girl. Get a career. Get

a house. Get two dogs. Get several kids. Get two cars. Success becomes seen how far along you are on this 'track'. Hence, a guy who has a girlfriend is seen as 'more progressed in life' than one who doesn't. One who went to school is seen as more progressed 'in life' than one who didn't (even if the guy who didn't has more money like Bill Gates or Steve Jobs). If you deviate from this series of events, doing such unworthy stuff like following your passion, pursuing your dream, making yourself financially free, living for pleasure, etc. then you become condemned as "loser". At first, they will think this "loser" mentality is temporary. Soon, you will be on "The Way" again to the wife, the house, the wage slave career, and so on. One must actually disguise himself as following "The Way" while doing what you really want. If you do not, you risk termination from your job, social condemnation, among more stigmas. The Lace Curtain is the veil in front of your eyes that hides the truth of the world. Men only begin to tear at the Lace Curtain because of the frequent manipulation and pain that pushes them to but women will unconsciously keep that Lace Curtain in front of their eyes as long as possible. This is why you can never talk to women about the Lace Curtain. It is as fruitless as telling Stalin why Communism is bad It is GOOD to him so what does he care?

What if your mind became your enemy? What if you couldn't trust your mind anymore? And what if your mind kept throwing you into the jaws of the beast, towards certain and utter financial and legal destruction? This is how men are under the spell of the Lace Curtain. We feel we must marry, we must have a house at this age, we must have a girl friend at that age, and on and on. Look at the prices of engagement rings, fancy weddings, let alone taking care of a stay-at-home mom. Look at the absurd family laws, divorce laws, and how the law treats females with a velvet glove while slapping men with a spiked fist.

To my foreign friends who are outside the Lace Curtain, you will read and hear strange, mysterious, and horrifying tales; these, the stuff of nightmares, are imprinted INSIDE our minds for there is no escape. Sex and love are very powerful. Rousseau attempted to make them the foundation of his Brave New Society. The Lace Curtain is that society. But politicians and crusaders want power.

What if marriage, instead of being a vessel for peace, love, and stability, became an instrument of plunder? Politics is the cancer of society; political crusades are the passion of talent-less mediocrities. What if Love became poisoned by politics? Then Love would be the State's means of power.

What! You look surprised? Do not be. Nationalism is the 'love of country' used to get men to go to war and work extra hard. Politicians are not above exploiting Love into an instrument of manipulation and plunder. Natural emotions of romance and love have become the weapons of every kind of greed.

The phenomenon of Men's Rights blogs springing up from the Lace Curtain induced nations (mostly the Anglosphere) is actually a transition of the user. Consider one's transition from Nice Guy to Don Juan. As a Nice Guy, the realization of Don Juan gave you a crisis which took you quite a while to accept.

Our minds are programmed in the Lace Curtain. The program was designed in such a vicious way that when an error is seen that threatens the Lace Curtain mindset, the mind will create new reasons and explanations to solidify the Lace Curtain. For example, when presented with the high divorce rates, a young man will say, "Ahh, they were not in love with their wives like I am. I will strive to make her happy. It won't happen to me." As you can imagine, defeating such a self-replicating mindset takes serious unrooting that is extremely painful. Such pain is the Lace Curtain's second best defense since most people prefer pleasure than pain, and the pain to unroot the program is hell-worthy. Women won't even try. Most men won't either. The men who do are brave.

When the de-rooting of the Lace Curtain program begins, the man must compensate with what, on the surface, sounds like woman bashing. The 'woman bashing' is not actually woman bashing but his only release of the pain as his mind sinks through the terrible hell of being unrooted. The phenomenon of Men's Rights websites has most of

them in this process. You will find lengthy essays and some harsh tones. Women will view it and simply dismiss it as, "Angry males" but they are attempting to remove their programming. They are not blogging to talk to the world. They are blogging to talk to their mind. They are not posting messages on boards to talk to others. they are posting messages to themselves to save themselves. The reason why mens' rights boards has so much "Yes Man!" quality to it is because it is not so much a discussion forum as it is a tonic, a salve, for the bleeding mind as it is being cut up, diced, and re-arranged where the Lace Curtain program cannot get to it.

The de-rooting takes two to three years. This is why most Men's Rights blogs mysteriously vanish after two to three years. There is no more reason to talk to themselves. The Lace Curtain program becomes removed.

There are two types of men in the Anglosphere: those who live under the Lace Curtain and those who are free of it. Obviously, the former outnumber the latter. However, I have noticed the latter grow in number according to age. More men in their 80s will be free of the Lace Curtain than men in their 20s.

Below, you will hear about the censorship. It not so much censorship as it is a mindset of reality. Disagreeing with feminism is not tolerated not because of 'active' censorship but because feminism is BELIEVED to be the reality. So when someone says something against feminism, they are, to those people, saying something outside their reality.

Anywhere, here are the excerpts:

The power of feminists to allow only a feminist perspective to be aired (in every field that dealt with gender issues) came to be labeled the "Lace Curtain."

The Iron Curtain shut out opinions considered a threat to Communism. The Lace Curtain shuts out opinions considered a threat to feminism.

In an Iron Curtain country, capitalist-bashing was the norm. In a Lace Curtain country, man-bashing is the norm. The chapter on man bashing hopefully made clear the degree to which man bashing is the norm; this chapter on the lace curtain shows us how each institution, from the government to the school system, from the helping professions to the media, produces that outcome, each in its own unique way.

In an Iron Curtain country, being too critical of core Communist tenets could cost you your job. Especially if your job was in the government, media or education system. In a Lace Curtain country, being too critical of core feminist attitudes (sexual harassment, affirmative action) can cost you your job. Especially if your job is in the government, media or education system.

The Communist Party achieved this power to censor formally, by revolution and becoming the one-party system of Soviet politics. Feminism achieved this power informally, by becoming the one-party system of gender politics: creating a new area of study, defining the terms, generating the data and becoming the only acceptable source of interpretation. This chapter explains how this occurs, and why.

Communists came into power by selling the belief that workers were exploited by capitalists. Feminists came into power by selling the belief that women were exploited by men. Both communists and feminists defined an enemy and sold itself as the champion of the oppressed.

Once Communism and feminism successfully defined themselves as progressive and morally superior, censoring criticism could be rationalized as progressive and morally necessary.

How do you know if you're part of the Lace Curtain? If you feel more comfortable telling a man-bashing joke than a joke bashing all women. How do you know if you're in an organization that's part of the Lace Curtain? When you tell a man-bashing joke and everyone laughs, then tell a woman-bashing joke and no one laughs.... In some organizations, the censorship starts sooner... we don't even think of telling the woman-bashing joke!

The Lace Curtain is less a “woman thing” than a feminist thing. But feminism has made women-as-victim so credible we would sooner think of saving whales than saving males. In this respect, almost all of us contribute to the Lace Curtain.

Which institutions create the lace curtain? Universities, in all the liberal arts, especially at the top-ranked schools; the school system, especially public high schools; government, especially at the national and United Nations level; the media, especially print media and television; the helping professions, especially social work; advertising, especially on television; book publishing, especially self-help and text books; funding institutions, especially those funding health, arts, and university research. Each institution censors and distorts in its own unique way. Each reinforces the other like academics citing each other’s research.

If your son or daughter is about to enter a top university in the liberal arts, he or she will be behind the lace curtain. You’ll notice it next Christmas. It is leaving many of our daughters with a love-hate relationship toward their dads and husbands; when they become mothers of sons, their feelings about men are transmitted to their sons, leaving their sons with mixed feelings about themselves. The Lace Curtain, like the Iron Curtain, ultimately hurts even those it was intended to benefit: leaving many employers fearful of hiring women; making many of our children fearful of marriage.

Is the Lace Curtain a conspiracy? No and yes. “No” by the current meaning of the word (a covert manipulation), but “yes” by the original Latin, meaning “to breathe together” (“spire” means to breathe; “con” means together). If we think of a conspiracy as people of a similar consciousness, in essence “breathing together,” then the Lace Curtain is a conspiracy. For reasons I discuss in the chapter on man-bashing, it is a “conspiracy” common to industrialized nations.

Below are personal examples of the author (a woman) of how she noticed the Lace Curtain. Read up, foreign readers, for this is exactly how it is in the Anglosphere:

As I listen to the stories of authors who have tried to articulate men’s issues, I hear one experience of censorship after another. Some I will share, but many authors who are published or still have hopes of being published, are afraid to be mentioned – “I’m afraid people will assume the real reason is that my work is inferior”; “I’m afraid it will be seen as sour grapes”; “I’m afraid people will say my book didn’t sell well and that’s why I’m so angry”; “I’m afraid....”

I acknowledge all of these fears myself. But I also know that if I don’t practice what I preach – that women can’t hear what men don’t say – then I have no right to ask other men to take risks I am myself unwilling to take. I know this will leave me vulnerable, and I know some people will never read this book because they will first read some news account of some distorted version of these personal stories that will make them turn off to me before they get started. I can’t say, “so be it” because I do care – I write to be read. But every man has exactly these type of fears when he first begins to share his life experience – that his career, his reputation (his readership) will be hurt. And sometimes, when he shares, that is a price he actually pays.

I will ask you to assume that if you have a teenage son, or husband, that he has these same fears, fears that keep a part of him silent even as another part speaks. If you are able to hear him in the way of Part I above, you will give him your greatest gift. Enough. Here goes....

When I was first elected to the Board of the National Organization for Women (NOW) in New York City, I was 26. I had never written for a national publication. The New York Times sought me out, did a major story on me and the men’s groups I was running, and asked me to write an op. ed. piece. I did. They published it, with hardly a word changed. They asked me to do a second. Again they published it with hardly a word changed. And a third....

As long as I was writing from a feminist perspective, The New York Times published everything I wrote. Once I began questioning the feminist perspective, The New York Times published nothing I wrote – not a single one of the more than twenty articles I have since submitted to them in the following two decades.

Back to the story...

The New York Times coverage led to the Today Show. During my years speaking from the feminist perspective, I was three times a guest on the Today Show. Once I began articulating men's perspectives, I was never invited back. I was beginning to notice a pattern!

Phil Donahue had apparently seen me on the Today Show and in The New York Times and extended an invitation. When we met, we hit it off. He immediately invited his first wife (Marjorie) to meet me and dine together. When he and Marjorie ran into conflicts, he would call me for advice. After each show, he took me to the airport himself. On the seventh show, though, something happened. I began to add men's perspectives. Suddenly, I was not invited back for years.

When *Why Men Are The Way They Are* was published, I was eventually invited for an eighth show. But articulating men's perspectives, even in balance with women's, led to another six year hiatus. When *The Myth of Male Power* came out, although it was from the male perspective, it was so much up Donahue's line of relationships and politics that three producers were vying to be the one to produce the show. I was scheduled, with a firm date. The producers convinced my agent to book me as an exclusive on Donahue. As a result, queries to all other American talk shows were dropped. Then something happened....

The taping kept getting "postponed." Eventually neither I nor my agents, Hilsinger and Mendelson, the most powerful in the book publicity business, could reach them. As I was trying to unravel the stonewalling, a Canadian show called. They were filled with enthusiasm. But suddenly it, too, kept getting "postponed." This producer, though, had previously booked me; I could feel the remorse in his voice; so I pressed him for an explanation.

Finally he caved, "If you promise to never use my name I'll tell you." I promised. Hesitatingly, he started, "We wanted to have a balanced show, so we called a couple of feminists – big names – to be on with you. Instead of just refusing, they said in effect, 'If you have this guy on, don't expect us to bring our next book to you, or supply you with real-life examples to use on your show – we'll do that just for Oprah.' Another one used the moral appeal – something like, 'Feminism is opposed to rape and the battering of women; so, if you have him on, you'd better take responsibility for making women even more vulnerable.' Once the word got out that we were considering you, we got other calls, even one from a guy, sort of repeating the same mantra.

"Warren, most of us saw all this for the attempt at censorship it was, and as for me, I was excited by the controversy, but, well, it just took one of our producers who's never met you and hasn't read the book to freak out and, before we knew it, we were all afraid to stir up her indignation." Well, there you have it. Or,... there I had it!

Then there was the day I first questioned in public the statement that men earned a dollar for each 70 cents earned by women. I did that on *Hour Magazine*, a show that was nationally televised at the time. The other guest was Gloria Steinem. I said, "Never-married women often earn more than never-married men, because...." Gloria, who had to that point (1986) viewed me as an ally, looked to host Gary Collins as if to signal "cut!" Gary Collins, who had always treated me with great respect, told me I must have gotten the sexes mixed up, and signaled for the producer to interrupt the taping.

Off air, I explained that I had meant what I said. I could see in Gary's and Gloria's faces that I had "turned the screw." I could feel the segment was being redone merely so they could avoid saying directly that it would never be aired. And yes, it was never aired. My status changed from regular guest to never being invited back. As for Gloria Steinem? Well, she went from being a friend, to never returning my calls. Thinking a little humor might break the ice, I sent her a phone from Toys-R-Us with a dime taped to it. Maybe she doesn't like Toys-R-Us.

I had naively believed that leaders as pioneering as I thought Gloria was would be delighted to hear of ways in which women were succeeding. Now I had to face a deeper fear: that some of my feminist colleagues might have an emotional investment in women's victimhood that went so deep as to prevent any discussion that might dilute women's victim status. Since my income came from feminist referrals, and since feminist power was solidifying the Lace Curtain, I felt, well, ...scared.

I was eventually to discover that fear was well founded. My speaking engagements on college campuses were soon reduced to less than 5% – not 50%, but 5% – of what they were.

It isn't that many women and even individual feminists were not open enough to hearing a different perspective. When I wrote *The Myth of Male Power*, an editor at *Modern Maturity*, the publication with the largest monthly circulation in the United States, had read it, loved it, felt it would be perfect for the male readers, and asked me to write two articles for *Modern Maturity*. I did. Both articles were loved, edited, approved, paid in full, and scheduled for publication.

I had just turned fifty, so I was to receive my own copy. I saw it in the mailbox, and quickly scanned the front cover to see if they gave it special coverage. No. Then the table of contents. Nothing. I called the editor. She apologized and said they had “changed focus” at the last minute. But something in her voice said “cover up.” I asked the editor to be honest. She was. She explained that one feminist researcher, who admittedly could find nothing wrong with the research, nevertheless protested. Loudly. The management became afraid. The editor felt as awful as I did.

The Twentieth Century had to deal with the Depression, the last gasps of Nationalistic Wars, Nazism, and Communism. The Twenty First Century will have to deal with Feminism. Our ancestors succeeded. So will we.

95-5 Rule is Bunk

Pook · 3 October 2007 · Archived copy · Original

There is a saying on Men's Movement sites that 95% of the women go for 5% of the men. These 5% of the men are famous, wealthy, players, or thugs. And, of course, the 'Nice Guys' rot in 'hell'.

There are two major glaring problems with the 95-5 rule.

First, it is based on a wrong premise. Women do not *choose* the men... ever. Women do not ask out guys. They do not pay for dates. They can flirt and do that type of thing to persuade a guy. But every part of the relationship is controlled by the guy. It is men who ask out the girl. It is men who pay for the dates. It is men who proposes.

Women do not propose to men. They also do not normally ask them out. So it makes sense to say that the *choice* women have is only limited to the access of men they can flirt with and/or the guys already interested. Only from them may they choose. (Of course, women think their 'pool' of suitors is higher than ever because women do not know the difference between a man interested in her for fifteen minutes versus a man interested in her for a lifetime.) So how can there be any 95-5 rule if women are not the real choosers?

The second error is that the 95-5 rule applies to men more than women. In order to be a man it takes rational and soulful choice. In order to be a woman is to just simply have a face. Women want men for marriage which limits their selection rather permanently unlike men's desires for women who a beauty can be tossed from one guy to another. There are far less wealthy and famous men than there are beautiful young women.


On the Internet or in passing, when one says "girlfriend" or "wife", one easily imagines the type of girl he would think would fit that role (often a young beautiful agreeable creature). However, the majority of girlfriends and even wives are anything but young, beautiful, and agreeable. When you see an old or fat woman, you do not think of her as a woman. The only women that show up on men's radars are the young, pretty ones. The 95-5 rule is a mirror image of how men are to women, not women are to men.

A better way to think of it is this way: Do you believe there is too much sex out there or too little? If you said little, then no matter what else you say or do, you will be in a world of little sex. However, if you think there is too much sex out there, somehow, the world will reflect that and, you will see it everywhere. This works the same with money. Those who believe there is too little money around remain poor. Those who believe there is too much much out there become rich.

I believe in the 100 - 0 rule. "What rule is this, Pook?" Why, it is simple. You either are flooded with women or want none. You see a world full of girls or you don't see any at all. If you have already decided that 95-5 is the law of the universe, then that is what you will only see. But the reality isn't 95-5 due to the two main problems mentioned above.

The Difference Between the Matriarchy and the Patriarchy

Pook · 4 October 2007 · Archived copy · Original



A young man approached the Pook and asked, "Monsieur Pook, tell me, what is the difference between the Matriarchy and the Patriarchy?"

And the Pook replied, "What do you think it is?"

The young man sniffed and said, "It is power of gender. Matriarchy has women in control. Patriarchy has men in control. Perhaps we need a third option where no gender has power."

"No. It is either-or. There is no middle ground."

"So what is the difference, Pook?"

"I will tell you. The 'touchstone' of civilizations has been debated for centuries. Some measure their technology, others measure their 'culture', yet other measures them through what form of government. The defining moment of civilization is how TIME is measured."

"Why not money? Why not power?"

"It is because Time is finite. We can make more money, obtain more power, but no one can ever create more Time. From the Maya to the Egyptians to the ancient Greek to the Babylonians and to every ancient civilization, Time was sacred. The Calendar was sacred. To them, monsters were creatures who upset Time and had to be thrown out. The hero arises to 'set time right' and dispose the monsters. These are the mythologies and legends of Mankind."

"What does this mean? You say mythologies are about Time?"

"Civilization, then, was obsessed with Time. Virgil saw the Virgin constellation rise in the sky and the lion constellation sink in to the hemisphere. The Pisces constellation rose overhead. This caused Virgil to write the prophecy of a drowning lion, the rising Virgin which the sun passes through, and the age of the fishes. Virgil could not know the Church would adopt that Virgil's passage as prophecy for the Christ nor could he have predicted that the first Christians would live under the sign of the fish. We cannot ignore the interpretation of time. Egyptians would construct pyramids aimed at where the Orion star once was. Plato would create philosophy from these tales. Aristotle would mourn their passing from the world at his time. Consider that our calendar month's names come from the Roman Empire and the Church. Consider that our time line is split with B.C. being Before Christ."

"What does any of this have to do with the difference between Matriarchy and the Patriarchy?"

"Everything. The difference between the Matriarchy and the Patriarchy is the interpretation of TIME. In the Patriarchy, time flows upward. This means the older one gets, the better one gets. People study, grow wiser. Christ

gave his Parable of Talents where people plant a seed of talent and make it grow. 'You will know the tree by its fruit,' He would say. Elderly are revered in Patriarchy."

"But TIME flows downward in Matriarchy?"

"Correct. Civilizations, especially the Western ones, have been completely cut off from those cosmological roots that created our timeline, our calendar, and our heroes. Hamlet, echoing the ancients' heroes, said: 'Oh, Time is out of joint, and cursed spite! That I was ever born to set it right!'"

"So in Matriarchy, the young is worshiped and aging is seen as a disease."

"Yes. Women are pinned to the Wheel of Nature. Round, round, she goes. What makes a woman attractive if not her baby fat? Alas, that will melt over time. Women place all her chips on her appearance. She may be a goddess in her 20s, but the 30s face sharp decline, and the decline does not stop. A man, on the other hand, does not place all his chips on his appearance. He places it in his talents and mind which grow, plant like, over time. So a man may be a loser in his 20s, but in his 30s he faces growth, in his 40s faces major growth, and time keeps getting better to him."

"Some men will choose to live like women. Do they experience time as women do, as getting worse as time goes on?"

"Yes."

"So a Matriarchy would worship the young, discard the old, praise beauty, despise talent and intellect, and perceive life to be a series of short exciting bursts of energy which must not be missed out on. And the Patriarchy would worship the old, not take the young seriously, not take beauty seriously except in its mathematical proportions, praise talent and intellect, and perceive life as a growth."

"Well done! Now, consider the Family in how Time is interpreted."

"A Patriarchy would have blossoming after blossoming, a growing Family Tree. A Matriarchy would not care about the Family Tree and, instead, create many 'now' experiences which are more intense than the Patriarch's family. Yet, these intense experiences are like novas. They flash and are gone. The Family Tree will endure and grow."

Pook nodded. "Consider the seasons. Men begin in Winter, go to Spring, then Summer, and at the end have a Fall. Women, however, begin in Spring, then go to Summer, then Fall, and end up in the misery of Winter. Women have one summer. Men have endless summers."

"What do you mean?"

"It is another reason why the 95-5 rule doesn't work. Women are pinned to that Wheel of Nature that slowly rotates as they age. In their late twenties and thirties, they have 'baby rabies' and want babies. Women are confined to their geography as well. She cannot separate herself from The Way. When it is 'time' to have babies, she will be looking for a sucker. If she is hungry for a boyfriend, she will look in her immediate surroundings which includes work and college and any friends one of her girlfriends can toss up. Many women go to university with the intention of getting a wedding ring on her finger. She does not have much time to do this."

"So women are more confined by time than men are."

"Yes. As a man, your wealth and status will grow which will attract more and more women. However, women are *melting* and do not have the time."

"This might explain why the countries with the lowest birth rates are the most feminized."

"Yes."

"So the Matriarchy began by somehow having time flow the opposite way? How did this come to be? Could it be through technology since the young get technology so much faster than the old do?"

"The values of Pro-Youth, Anti-Talent, Anti-Family Tree, Pro-Bursts of Experience became established by forgetting and dismissing the old Time orientated rules (today, scholars say 'Before Common Time' instead of saying 'Before Christ'). The values of an animal-eating, hunting, and sex- have been hailed as the greatest of values a person can have. The values of building a family tree or planting your talent has become frowned at or turned into liabilities. There is a reason why we call it Mother Earth and Father Time."

"And all the ancient civilizations have been re-interpreted as fertility rites and goddess worship instead of time worship."

"Yes. The ancient civilizations that did appear to worship the woman were more wedded to the Lunar sense of time. Even in those places, men became in charge since they grew better in time while women do not."

"Man, it sounds like God's cruel joke."

"Yes. It as if Men and Women are exactly the same except they experience time differently. Men start low and get better. Women start high and get worse. Someway, in the middle, they meet and it is never exact for any two people. Women are obsessed with looking YOUNGER and all their products are designed to stop time or make it go backwards (at least, in appearance to their bodies). Men are obsessed with getting BETTER. "

"So how do we return to the Patriarchy?"

"For yourself, plant your seed of Talent and grow it. Follow your passion in life. Pursue your dreams. Get better, every day. But for the nations, it would be to discard the values that prop up animal values as 'noble' and raise the hated 'noble' values back to their true place. Let Wisdom, not Beauty, wear the crown and let Time and Talent, not Money or fun, hold the guiding scepter."

51 : 49

Pook · 14 October 2007 · Archived copy · Original



51: 49!

Dealing with women is often like dealing with a casino. Mermaid-like, they beckon men to them with the promise of untold happiness and pleasure yet the odds are always stacked in the favor of the house. Just like how a casino has an 'atmosphere' of "jackpots", of people "getting lucky", there is a 'romance' about with people coming in and winning the game. Some enter the casino to just have a fun time playing but many come to win. Yet, the house always wins.

A young man getting married or investing significant time with a woman is like spinning the wheel or throwing the dice. So caught up are they with the atmosphere of the casino and the crowds saying, "Bet more! Bet more!" they ignore their instinct and stop thinking. Caught up in the rush, they play their cards.

...and they lose. Even the players eventually lose if they keep playing too long. The House always wins.

The solution is to obey the 51 : 49 principle.

We make decisions everyday about everything (including deciding not to make a decision at all which counts as a decision). 51 : 49 principle states that over time, the balance of good and bad choices will even itself out to 51 percent good and 49 percent bad choices.

"But Pook!" you say. "That is a horrible average. It should be 65 : 35 or so." Sure, you hope the good decisions in your life will end up being in the 90s or 80s percent. But the POINT is for it to be 51 percent and above.

When it comes to women in the Anglosphere, men are used to being on the 49 side (where women are used to being on the 51 side). Sure, you don't win all the time. But women win FAR more often than men do. Nice Guys take the 49 side as "normal" (whereas they are probably more like on the 12 percent side of winning if that). What many speed seducers do not want you to know is that they also fail more than they succeed which can put them over to the 49 side.

Casinos work on the idea that most gamblers will push their luck beyond the point of 51:49 and end up on the wrong side of the formula. Because of this, the House will tend to win more times than it loses.

The same is true of women in the Anglosphere. They are counting on men to be gamblers and for them to push their luck beyond the point of 51 : 49 to end up on the wrong side of the formula. This is why women tend to win more time than lose in their dealings with men.

Most men in matters of love, so used to being on the 49 side and tasting the sour of defeat more than the sweetness of victory, become conservative with risk. They will excuse themselves from the opportunity to learn from their mistakes or to see the casino for what it really is. This, in turn, loads the dice against them making the correct choices in the future despite the game becoming more and more loaded with "money and time" (what a man bets with).

The result is that men become trapped in an ever decreasing circle and find themselves boxed in and unable to move at all. Men being boxed in with the perception that they have increasingly limited choices, is it any surprise that they willingly part with their money to coaches, mentors, and counselors to guide them from the maze of dead-end options to discover what life was like when it was a simple matter of making a choice?

There are many different branches of the Men's Movement. Like it or not, there are many men who use the Movement like a blanket where they can pretend they are never wrong ("All of society is against me!"). Others use it for their basket of conspiracies ("The water is being poisoned with estrogen to feminize all men!"). Some are frustrated financially and creatively with their lives and simply use the Movement as a means to vent their frustrations (mass movements attract those who are frustrated with their own lives). And, of course, there are those who really have suffered injustice, those who have had their kids and wealth taken from them, those who want to stand up against unjust laws, and others who just want to stand up for masculinity.

Let us welcome the 51: 49 branch. Those who welcome the 51: 49 have their object to be on the 51 side, not on the 49 side as most men are stuck in. Sometimes their success could be 85 % or so, but the point is to be winning more than losing. I reject marriage simply because it is on the 49 side. Dealing with women on MY terms, for example, puts me in the 51 category. I don't lose with women; they lose with me. I turn the House rules against itself, and they stand shocked that I am winning more and more. Sometimes the House wins but not majorly and not in a way to knock me to 49.

Men will be shocked because they are used to the House winning all the time, of being 49. Women will be shocked because they KNOW the House is supposed to win all the time, that men are not supposed to be at 51 or higher.

When you deal with women, ask yourself, "Is this a 51 action or a 49 action?" Having a relationship with a 30+ year old woman would be a 49 action. You WILL lose eventually. Having a relationship with a 21 year old is often more of a 51 action. You WIN almost any way it turns out.

Women have been playing the 51 : 49 game for quite some time, and they are very good at it. This is why women will not risk or gamble to put themselves into the 49 zone. This is why men must make all the risks, all the moves, because smart girls do not gamble past their 51 zone. If she messes up, she becomes even more risk averse and makes the game become 61 : 39. If you want to know why older women can become more demanding, there you go.

"Why are you single?"

Men Going Their Own Way? No!

51 : 49!

"Why don't you get married?"

51 : 49!

Why don't you settle down and have lots of children?

51 : 49!

Why don't you let yourself fall in love with a woman?

51 : 49!

The principle also applies well in business and other practical matters. You do not put yourself in a position where the House will eventually win. You want to put your life in matters where you will eventually win, on average.

51 : 49!

Weekend Nonsense

Pook · 10 November 2007 · Archived copy · Original

I haven't been updating as I should but I've been away from the computer too much. I'll start updating regularly soon. For now, here are a few videos from a DS game.

There are many things **wrong** with it. Can you catch them all? (And yes, the developer admitted he made it sound exactly as it does.)

Spanish Training For Everyone

Intro

Scene 2

WHAT THE HELL!!!!?? hahahahaha

Scene Three

This. Is. Contra!

Pook · 10 November 2007 · Archived copy · Original



One must give due when a manly entertainment form comes out. It could be a movie (Gladiator, 300, etc.) or music. But there haven't been too many manly games anymore filled with feminized heroes and heroines who dress in a bikini but carry giant guns/swords.

If you don't know about Contra, give it a read [here](#).

One must give a nod to Contra 4 coming out. Just look at the [website](#), and you will find digitized testosterone. Everywhere you click, you get an explosion with chip metal going on in the background. No soap operas. No 'love stories' in the game.

THIS. IS. CONTRA!!!

Dreamgirl

Pook · 10 December 2007 · Archived copy · Original

Footprints

Pook · 10 December 2007 · Archived copy · Original

Did you know one way you can tell the difference between a bachelor and a married man? Look at their footprints.

Married men walk on their heels as if the world is on their shoulders. Bachelors walk on their toes.

Don't believe me? Look at the footprints yourself. Young boys place the weight of their body on the front of their feet when walking. Bachelors continue the tradition. But married men, their weight shifts as their heels dig into the ground.

"No, I don't have children!"

Pook · 10 December 2007 · Archived copy · Original

This is what I find myself saying quite frequently. When younger, I would get the question of "Do you have a girlfriend?" that would come up. But now the question is not even that of marriage but "Do you have any children?"

Everyone around me in the workplace has children... yet none of them are married. Scratch that. One woman is married but her husband is in jail for armed robbery. She has his name tatooed on her chest (how do I know *that*? Let's just say she likes showing her cleavage).

Another guy is married but his story is a little different. He did the happy dance with a young mexican girl and got her pregnant. The father threw out the young mexican girl and he had to marry her. Other characters are even from different states but are stuck here because they got the girl pregnant.

"No. I don't have any children."

They look at me with amazement, with astonishment. I look at them in the same way.

Gentlemen, if you are familiar with what I've written in the past, you know I am not a friend of the "OMG, sex opportunity? Go for it ALL THE TIME!" mentality. I've turned down far more sex than accepted. The reason being is that I believe in transmutation. But the point comes to a question I have been wondering about...

Is sex a liability or an asset?

To the woman, it is an asset. Hence, she calls her boobs and butt her 'assets' as they put money in her pocket (literally). But what about for a man?

"Liability, Pook! There is no such thing as 'Free Sex'! And sex never generates money for the male."

Oh heavens! We are guilty of looking at sex in that same narrow dimension. Sex includes the differences of gender. Sex, combined with passion and faith, is the triumvirate that allows transmutation.

Is debt a liability or an asset?

"Stupid question, Pook! How can there be any doubt? Debt takes money away from your pocket. It is most certainly a liability!"

For the majority of people, debt is a liability. But for wise and the achievers, debt can be made into an asset. Most people go into debt for deappreciating THINGS like cars or large TV sets. But if you go into debt for buying a business or investing in real estate, that can very well put money into your pocket. Borrowing money to build the business is common yet it is still debt. Very few think of it that way. Those who see that other side will go far.

In the same way, sex is a liability for most people. Debt is dangerous and should be respected. However, sex has stronger teeth. For men, sex takes away YEARS of their life (as they chase girls around), stunts their growth (as they try to 'socialize' with girls they bring themselves down onto their lower level and stay there), generates debt (need the cool car to get the chicks, the house and wedding for the girl, the dates, and so on), as well as spawning annuities (i.e. babies which are VERY expensive).

Stupid men treat sex, like debt, as a liability. With using debt badly, they just go further and further into debt. But using sex as a liability, they sink further and further into mediocrity. They become... nothing.

But wise men will treat sex as an asset. Transmutation is the big key. For example, it is well known the more sexualized the man, the better salesman he is. The wrong label for this effect has been called 'charisma' but 'charisma' is nothing more than someone who has developed a high sexualized character. Einstein believed in transmutation even go as far as saying that if a man had not made any benefit to science before he was 30, he never will mostly because of the sexual rise and fall within the body. Talented artists have transmuted. Dante could not get Beatrice but turned her into a gigantic heavenly body in his [i]Divine Comedy[/i]. Shakespeare is flooded with sexuality. In ancient sports, athletes would keep away from women as they sensed it would sap their strength. Consider Tiger Woods before and after he married his supermodel. Consider Napoleon when he pushes aside Josaphine for a young honey. Consider Beethoven constantly unable to get the women he wanted so he channeled that energy into symphonies instead..

Passion. Sex. Faith. The combination of these three, mixed into one another, creates the genius. Passion is what you love to do (say music). Sex is the awakening and channeling of the sexual alchemy element inside you. Faith is the yearning of ascension, of spiritual upwardness (which modern psychology and Rousseau beliefs cannot emulate).

Mediocre people have NONE of those three traits.

AVERAGE people focus on one of those traits.

The EXCEPTIONAL people have two of the three traits.

But the GENIUS has all three traits.

Passion (let us say the love of music) becomes very DULL without the sex element and becomes FLAT without the faith element. Most music today (all the love pop song nonsense) tends to combine the sex element. A few artists, while keeping up to that formula, stumble some faith elements in to make something truly interesting. Then, alas, they become frustrated as they are unable to replicate that success.

Man is a board on the rock of sex. Most men break but a few are able to catapult themselves. Majority of humans will never know about transmutation. They are doomed. Those that discover it find it only after forty. Only a precious few can utilize it when young.

When surrounded with unmarried people with kids, one has to respect that sex has teeth. Ignorance of it is the biggest cost to one's life.

For the guys who have regrets about not recognizing or taking advantage of 'opportunities' of girls early in life, I want you to consider something. Would that one girl have satisfied you? No? What about girl two? Or girl three? "None would satisfy me, Pook," you said. "I would still be horny as ever." Then why, in God's name, do you think girl four, girl five, or girl six will make any difference?


Just as the guys who got depressed because all their friends were getting married who later saw them get divorced while he remains a happy bachelor, look at the guy who DIDN'T jump at every opportunity a lady threw his way. Sure, he may be depressed and regretful. But that is only short term. Long term, he sees the guys chained to girls they bonked with a kid or marriage or something else.

Sex can be more destructive and enslaving than debt. But if debt, properly used, can make wealth, imagine what the

sex element can do.

The Adventurer and the Vortex

Pook · 16 December 2007 · Archived copy · Original



One day, the magnificent Pook decided to share his manliness (for it would be selfish to contain so much manliness!) with the world. The people rejoiced in this and children ran to greet the Pook when he appeared.

However, Pook encountered a band of disgruntled people huddled in a circle. They hissed their frustrations of life to one another and that was their ritual. Then, they would all disperse to their jobs and lives which they despised. Next day, they would gather, share in their complaints about the world, and then leave again to do it the next day. Seeing the cycle, Pook approached the group.

"What do you want!?" seethed a young man in his twenties who was beginning to look like he was entering his forties. "Why do you disrupt us?" came an old woman's screech from a woman just turning twenty five.

"Tortured souls," the Pookius Maximus said, "Every day, you gather and complain. Yet, then you go back to what you complain about."

Then came the protests.

"X isn't fair!"

"Y is corrupt and has been turned conspiracy against us!"

"Z will eventually collapse due to this injustice!"

Such are the common replies! And how frequent they come! Now, reader, you may inquire about the beings of this group. Rest assured, the beings are both liberal and conservative, pious and hedonistic, rich and poor, men and women, as well as your ancestors and your descendants. They are the 95% of the people. They are the masses.

"Let me be mirror to your thoughts," said the Pook. "I want you to see your mind reflected as it really is. Permit me to ask some questions."

"Very well," allowed one member. "Ask and you shall have your answers."

"Do you believe that you have suffered unfairness?"

For the first time, animation electrified their answers of "Yes!". Each and every one of them believed their fate was unfair.

As Pook kept talking to them, a pattern emerged. Each and every one believed in a spiritual law of fairness. Bitterness swelled in them as they recited how "unfair" this or that was. All of them dreamed of the collapse of the "system" where their spiritual law of fairness would "return" the natural order of things.

Adults believe in Fairness like children believe in Santa Clause. Santa Clause is very much a figment of that Fairness. He knows who has been naughty or nice, bestows gifts on the good and coal on the bad. But just as there is no Santa Clause, there is no Fairness Spiritual Law either.

Life never runs smooth. It is a bumpy ride with set-backs as well as uphill struggles and downhill surges. If a person complained that a ride was not "fair" he would be considered mad. The purpose of the ride is the fun of taking different roads, seeing new scenery, and meeting the new people that come in your life. This is the Adventurer which every Human begins as (what we label the 'innocence' of a child) but can easily become corrupted into something else.

What is the opposite of the Adventurer? It is the Vortex. A Vortex is someone who is miserable in life and who complains as a swirl of angst. The nature of the complaint does not matter. It could be about the job, the women, the men, the world, SOMETHING. What happens when you combine many vortexes together? They create a giant Vortex that creates such a sucking sound that, standing near it, you literally begin to think the world is an Evil Place.

The Feminist is a Vortex. She thinks life has been unfair to HER and becomes a swirling cyclone of angst. Combine her with other swirling cyclones of angst and you have a giant vortex that begins to suck in normal women nearby. Men are not attracted to the Feminist Vortex (unless they have somehow been 'sucked in' so to say) because no one likes negativity and parasitism in their life.

The Nice Guy is also a Vortex. There are many definitions for 'Nice Guy', some be it the guy who is naive, the guy who believes in 'love', the guy with old morals, or simply a guy who is very polite. But the true definition of 'Nice Guy' is that like with all Vortexes, he believes in a Spiritual Law of Fairness. Beautiful women are not going for him. They are going for the "jerks"! What injustice! As the normal guy becomes a Nice Guy Vortex, he may become 'buddies' with similar thinking guys but women avoid him more. And the more women avoid him, the more the Vortex intensifies causing women to avoid him even more. "It's not fair!" whines Nice Guy.

Vortexes are everywhere. It is your job, as the Adventurer, to avoid them. Obstacles in your path are what makes the Adventure fun. The only REAL obstacle is the Vortex who, like Sirens, will suck you towards to the rocks where the masses of shattered lives lay on the beach.

How do you know if you are in a vortex? Here are some signs:

- 1) Are your conversations about NEGATIVE things that are occurring that is out of your control?
- 2) Do the people participate in hopes of vomiting their frustration?
- 3) Is the theme of the conversations revolving around the concept of UNFAIRNESS of some form?

4) When the people talk, do they smile? If not, they are more likely in a Vortex.

The Vortex eats up your valuable energy. Instead of using that energy to ADVENTURE, to discover new and wonderful things, you go in circles in the Vortex. Time passes. And one day, you will simply... stop. Since Fairness will never come, for that would mean Heaven on Earth, the only way out of the Vortex is to die.

Most people in their lives swirl around their vortexes, like the toilets, all their lives.

There are so many Vortexes it would be ridiculous to mention them all. But the most common are political. When we get frustrated in life (which is inevitable), many lose their senses and become drawn to a political 'cause'. When our talents and passions are frustrated, we tend to turn to new 'causes'. This is why children of wealthy people get caught up in political 'causes'. Same with actors and many of the population. Hitler was a frustrated artist first, dictator second.

In many ways, the Feminist and the Nice Guy are far more alike than different. When career women go off to dinner together, they are complaining about men (i.e. super vortex). Nice Guys can be the same. Other groups you are thinking in your head right now apply as well. Consider these Vortexes to be the Cult of the Fair. All their doubt and anger leads to PRE-MATURE AGING.

"But Pook," cried a woman. "If what you say is true, if that is the Cult of Fairness, then what is the alternative? Who follows the Adventurer?"

"My lady," I replied, "the opposite would be the Cult of the Fantastic. There is no spiritual belief of Fairness in this one. By adopting the mindset of what they WILL do, they live completely and enjoy the bumpy ride. The Fairness Cultists huddle from their rat holes to point, be envious, and hurl moralizations. They condemn the Adventurer for violating the Law of Fairness where they are really condemning themselves."

I then turned to the crowd and said, "You are all done with the Vortex. You will now stop thinking of what you are NOT achieving and, instead, think of what you ARE achieving. This puts you in a mindset looking for opportunities and challenges rather than barriers and obstructions. This simple change of your mindset will remove the detractors and doubters from your life and attract the movers-and-shakers."

And with that, the crowd dispersed for the last time. One person swore that he would find a new job within the next two months. Another swore he would buy that house in six months. Yet, another decided to devote his free time back to his passions and dreams. The Vortex imploded and, they all became adventurers again.

Pook Grows Wings ; Co-Workers Stunned

Pook · 23 December 2007 · Archived copy · Original



I have been an advocate of Anthony Ellis's program for quite some time. Until I started a new job, I actually was out of the loop for going to the gym in all (as a door to door salesman, it is too difficult to keep up). However, at the new job I could get back into the program. I declared to the co-workers that I, the caterpillar, will be growing wings. They said I was too skinny. "But it is good to be skinny!" said one fat hag. Having been through the program several times, my muscle fibers were dormant but waiting. Muscle memory was all still in place even after a couple of years.

In three months, I gained 35 pounds of muscle mass. Yes, it is possible.

Now, you might ask, "Why gain muscle, Pook?" For the testosterone, silly! I noticed that I began sleeping better, I was generally happier, and I was eating better. The downside is that my sex drive goes up which often concludes with a woman (unfortunately).

Women are persuaded by male's bodies as much as men are by female bodies. I know the girls don't care about me. They don't want to know who I am. They don't care about my dreams. All they care about is that think my body is *hot* and I get flooded with the "You need a girlfriend immediately!" line (with the girl saying that often volunteering). I respond back with how worthless American women are and the reactions are priceless. Some women become hostile, others become reflective. Either way, it is much better than simply saying, "Oh shucks, I am just waiting for the right lady!" or something as retarded. It amazes me how these women assume I will go for them. They are that arrogant. What I mean is that if a guy sees a girl they think is *hot*, they do not assume she is automatically his. He tends to think she already has a boyfriend or husband. Or he also thinks he has to work to get her. Even players know they have to do something in order to get the girl. But with women, no, they feel entitled to the guy.

There is no better rebuke to women than to be hot and say no to them. They cannot take it!

Anyway, I will tell you how I gained mass so fast. Outside of Anthony's program, I throw in swimming during Chest day (Anthony disapproves but I do it anyway. I have an urge to swim for some reason. Swimming is good for the chest and shoulder muscles anyway. Besides, swimmers end up with hot bodies anyway).

I use NO supplements except for Twin Lab Ultra Fuel that is used immediately after the workout. No creatine. No

stupid shakes. I use REAL FOOD for every meal with FRESH MEAT. I do not eat Whey bars or processed meat. All my meals are cooked (a week in advance). I have 8 hours of sleep as well. I do not divide my meals in cute little tupperware. I have the food and I eat as much as it as I can for every meal.

In the gym, I look funny because I struggle with weights (because I use HEAVY weights to me). I have had idiots come up to me to give me "tips". I ignore them and keep doing what I'm doing which stuns the meathead. But now I am bigger than the meathead.

There is a good way to identify whether or not women *like* you. If women are trying to set you up with one of their friends, they think you are below them but they are trying to help out a friend. Imagine a kid being given a cookie he doesn't like. But a cookie is a cookie so she gives it to someone who might like that type. However, when women really *like* a guy, she will volunteer herself. She will not try to set the guy up with a friend because she wants him for herself!

What always amazed me was not women's changing reactions to my body, but men. For someone reason, the big muscular guy gets respect. Behind my back, they make jokes. But I suspect that is only because they notice the reactions of the women.

Anyway, every guy should try to gain muscle mass at least once in life. You will probably like it so much that you want to continue it for life. You don't gain mass for women or for anyone else. You do it for yourself and in how you feel. Seriously, all I do is go to the gym for an hour and half three times a week, eat six times a day, and get 8 hours rest. It is not hard to do. The challenge is to be consistent. If you are consistent, you will see how it is like a machine where the iron is reforging your body. You will look into the mirror and see an underwear ad staring back at you.

What I want for Christmas...

Pook · 23 December 2007 · Archived copy · Original

[image]

...the gift that keeps on giving... and giving.. and giving...

I got Rudolph!

Pook · 23 December 2007 · Archived copy · Original

[image]

Now I'm ready for Christmas dinner...

Radicalism of Vilar #8: Even in Sex, Man is Enslaved

Pook · 29 December 2007 · Archived copy · Original



"Women live an animal existence. They like eating, drinking, sleeping - even sex, providing there is nothing to do and no real effort is required of them. Unlike a man, a woman will rarely make an effort to get her partner into bed. If, however, he is already there and she hasn't planned to set her hair or undertake some other form of large-scale beauty repair and there is no TV programme she wants to see, she will not be averse to making love, provided he is prepared to be the active partner.

"But even the euphemisms 'active' for the male partner and 'passive' for the female do not conceal the fact that woman allows man to serve her in bed just as he does in every sphere of her life. Even through intercourse may give a man pleasure in the long run, it is nothing more than a service to a woman, in which the man is the better lover, arousing desire more skillfully, quickly, and making it last longer.

"Men suspect that women tend to exploit them during intercourse and have developed a certain fear of female sexual appetite. "Signs of this appear in the rites of ancient cultures, in philosophical works of men such as Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, in the novels of Baudelaire, Balzac and d'Annunzio, in plays by Strindberg, O'Neill and Tennessee Williams. Since the discovery of contraceptives, this fear has reached almost hysterical proportions."

I have spoken much about sexual transmutation of men in the past. Men can utilize their sexual desire to make it bloom into their art, their music, their work, their actions, to make their life progress swifter and increase their resonance among people (i.e. "charisma"). As a salesman myself, I know that the highly sexualized people make the better salesmen while the lower sexualized people (of both men and women) become stuck with low sales.

One gender's transmutation is another gender's manipulation. At least, this is what the feminists say when they point to the great works of Humanity.

We know that most men do not understand transmutation. They can often just live an animal existence and try to hump the nearest female in sight. These men generally end up mediocre in life. Keep in mind, I am referring not to the highly sexualized male but the male who submits to his sexuality, rather than forging the sexuality into what he desires. Think of the trunk in high school who ended up getting a girl pregnant and is doomed to a life of paying for

it.

Most women, also, do not understand transmutation. The "slut feminism" is merely that of an animal existence.

However, women do undergo transmutation. They sexualize themselves as much as possible meaning through exercise, tight clothes, long hair, make-up, and so on to and undergo training in dance and other things. The woman will become trapped in her own game (as Radical Vilar #2 will reveal) but she is certainly trying to get the wealthiest and socially desired male.

Some women (mostly feminists) will resort to writing bad books about female goddesses and the occult as well as being mesmerized by Egyptian mythology. These women are confusing their sexuality with their faith and have the shoes on backward. Nevertheless, they are trying to project that sexuality in some means. This would explain why such women are often extremely ugly.

It is quite common for women to declare men are all pigs who want nothing but sex. But if you have ever tried to eliminate sex from a budding relationship, the woman goes bonkers. She has no mind of herself, just her animal existence, and she projects that onto the men. "All men want is sex!" Well, ma'am, when was the last time a woman said something even remotely

abstract? Even with feminist theory, all they do is regurgitate verbatim what is heard. There are still no new ideas. The original nut of feminist theory is just a cliché with zombie girls echoing the cliché.

But let us listen some more.

"In truth, reliable contraceptives (invented by a man, naturally) have robbed man of the only triumph left to him in his state of sexual subjugation. Previously, woman was always to a certain extent at his mercy. Now she is suddenly in control. She can have as many children as she wishes. She can even select the father (rich, if possible). If she has no intention of having children, she can indulge in intercourse as often as it appears advantageous to her. Men cannot do that." Pg. 80-81

This is a good question. Have contraceptives increased man's power or woman's? Obviously, it is woman's whose fortune has doubled. She can now be the slut and be free from most of the consequences. This was much more difficult in the past.

I suspect contraceptives have been historically banned because of men insisting it so. This would explain why the ancient religions all banned contraceptives. Christianity banned all contraceptives unanimously until around 1928. It also finally explains why Onanism was frowned at (a man emptying his seed outside the woman). It kept giving the woman power.

Sex has two main long term consequences (not counting short term pleasure). One, it creates children. Two, it enslaves a man.

With contraceptives, the children element is removed but the enslavement of men are not.

"But Pook! But Pook!" you cry. "Would this not free the men too? All these women and little consequences?"

The changing definitions of man by the moderns have help emasculate men. A false definition is worse than a slander. But the definition of "man" as supported by the moderns is a man who has sex with as many females as possible. There is no historical basis for this. What was the definition of a "man" was the man WHO HAD THE

MOST CHILDREN. This is why centuries ago, families would range from eight to fourteen children. Men who were impotent and could not have children strived to display their manliness in some other way (such as America's George Washington).

The more children, the more new people were under the man's name. He became the leader of the household. He became the Patriarch in this way.

By pinning the definition of sex on 'as banging as many females as possible', one can pinpoint the further enslavements to men:

1) the married man keeps demanding sex from his wife who she can easily manipulate the man further based on such desire.

2) the bachelor throws his time away (which is more valuable than money) on playing the 'game' to get as many girls as possible. Women will manipulate the guy for entertainment, social access, and even money.

3) the guy throws his money away (less valuable than time) at prostitutes, both official and unofficial, just so he can 'feel like a man'.

We know that for men, sex is very much a mental thing. Alter the brainwashing and free yourself.

It is hilarious when someone tries to defend this definition of man using evolutionary behavior. Evolution only works if you have children you idiots. When I see demographic reports of less and less children born in each generation, I assure you that is not evolution in work: it is extinction.

Vilar goes on speaking how much women research sex and how it involves men (to 'rock his world to enslave them' essentially).

"Contrary to man's fear, women do not, however, weigh one man against another and choose the most virile- far from it, as she herself is not all that keen on sex. In view of that, and provided all other conditions are equal, she is likely to prefer the less potent man because she can always blackmail him with her intimate knowledge of his weakness. "In the realm of sex, more than any other, man is a victim of the principles of efficiency according to which he is manipulated."

You never hear about any pressure for the woman to 'perform'. The only thing you hear about that is if the woman cannot keep the man (i.e. manipulate him). This would explain why when a wife cheats, the husband "fails" and the wife is a "victim". And if the husband cheats, the husband "fails" and the wife is again the "victim".

"That sexual competence in a man is a matter of indifference to the majority of females is shown by the number of highly paid men who marry and stay married, despite the fact that they are impotent (it is unimaginable that a woman without a vagina would have any prospects whatsoever of getting married to a normally sexed man)." Pg. 84

A young man is often amazed that dating is really nothing more than sex. Women don't want to know you. They do not care about your dreams. The bait on the hook is sex and the purpose is to reel you in. Women's greatest fear is the celibate man as he cannot be hooked in any way.

Huxley and Orwell foretold the Matriarchy

Pook · 28 January 2008 · Archived copy · Original

There are two political books the 'masses' keep gravitating toward of the last century. The books are *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley and *1984* by George Orwell. Both books are cited by all political groups from across the spectrum. Each points to the other as *1984* while one group finds *Brave New World* a horror while another group sees it as a utopia. Something with these books have tapped into the Human mind in such a way that made them universal.

I am familiar with all the political books, and they are mostly dry, pompous nonsense on stilts. Why do those two books, beyond any other, keep coming up in people's dreams of horror?

The answer became so obvious that I could not stop laughing at my previous foolishness. The secret to appeal and horror of the two books could not be even more plain.

They have nothing to do with politics.

"But Pook! But Pook!" you say. "They speak of empires, of manipulation, of social reconstruction! How could they not be political books?"

We know the current course of Matriarchy did not start in the present. It has been gradually building well over a century if not more. Do not forget the De Beers manipulation of 'engagement rings' and diamonds started in the 1940s. Feminism began even in the 19th century. Progressive reconstruction of society was universally embraced by the West. You only have to see the Constitutional amendment on prohibition and eugenics (in America nonetheless!) to see the sociological events occurring today, as unimaginable thought they may be, they are the tree whose sapling was swaying happily in the twentieth century.

A most fundamental political book, Locke's *Two Treatises of Government*, based much of the idea of liberty and freedom based on the relationships of man and woman. Locke constantly cites Adam and Eve and even cites how the husband and wife treat one another in marriages. What a reversal we have had! Locke looked toward marriage, of coupling, to see "natural society" and base the government in regards to those observations. Now the government observes and "natural society" must be refit, remolded, chopped, spliced, and smashed to fit the 'Way'. Like a gardener having tools to reshape a bush, so too does legislators use tools of taxation, courts, and other laws to exact the same painful mold.

Let us look at these two books not as political fairytales but as a sense of something changing with the relations of man and woman.

Brave New World was written as a farce to the utopias of the time. But even Huxley was stunned at how many of the things in the book became true. Every writer knows that good writing is done on its own, that it never fits the beginning outline or vision. When the writer is done writing, he is often stunned at what was put down and often astonished at what his characters are saying. While the author may have intended this, and afterward may have suspected he wrote that because of this, really, he isn't as sure.

What is the conflict that *Brave New World* revolves around? It is not the genetics or Bernard's ambition. It is not the telling of the society itself. The Savage is the axis of the story. The conflict is the Savage (whom the reader identifies as himself) thrown into such a society where everyone is happy... yet are not. His reaction to the woman he falls for is most telling. His despair and constant quoting of Shakespeare, "Oh *Brave New World* that has such

creatures in it!" is contrasting the pathetic flat world of the book to the glorious spiraling realm that Shakespeare, and indeed the West, once personified. The book illustrates the destruction of family, marriage, and the old ways.

1984 also has nothing to do with politics. The use of language, of manipulation, of 'Big Brother', are all just blocks which could easily be replaced with something else. The conflict of the story is expressed by Winston by, first, his past and his attempts of coupling with a woman he chooses. Winston says how he wanted to murder his wife, how child rearing was told to him as a 'duty'. 1984 was not about an omnipotent, omniscient government as it was about the destruction of a natural union between a man and a woman. It was not about Winston loving Big Brother as it was that they forced him to destroy his love for her. "Do it to her! Do it to her!" screams Winston at the climax.

Both Huxley and Orwell both appear to be candidates, in how their lives went, to have detected this slouching towards Matriarchy (or whatever you want to call it today) way back then. They wouldn't even have consciously knew it. It is like a Middle Ages work being filled with praises of God, even revolving around it, but not realizing it because he was so immersed in the times. This would explain why the two books hold so much gravity with the masses and why they are so often cited.

Sexuality was once intertwined with faith, with liberty, and with society. If it is true that sexuality's wheel has been fraying, that more and more people are turning into sex-less automatons and only resort to man/woman during intercourse (and even then only seen in the context of animals), imagine a third book to follow up what Brave New World and 1984 started. Imagine a book that could perfectly mirror society today. Not the society of images we see on TV or magazines, but how it really is. The difference between a good writer and a mediocre one is that the good writer never sees himself as writing, only as holding a mirror up to Human Nature.

What if the mirror was held up to society now? Is it possible to translate the pain and suffering that men undergo, as they commit suicide, after divorce and being ripped from their children onto the page? What about the sadness that enters men's hearts when they see daughters and other young women use sex to obtain material things? Or what about the abyss that men realize they have been manipulated their entire lives? And how about the heights (or should I say depths) of the modern woman's life with her cats? Can the farce of the family court be put into a book? Can the spiritual castration of men be properly illustrated? What an impact it would be to have the West look itself in the mirror! This is the appeal I believe MRA sites have. People are looking for a mirror of society and MRA sites are giving explanations.

Such a book would truly rise fast as one of the first 'great works' of the twenty first century. But in order for such a book to be written, the writer would have to march down the steps of the abyss far lower than Brave New World and 1984 ever did. He would have to write about such hellish subjects, and know it and dream it, consistently to get the work written. If most men commit suicide once knowing the truth, it would be extremely hard for one to make such a tome. It would take a very rare man to create such a work... without killing himself... and then having the balls to publish it.

And by writer, I am not meaning some newsletter or other author. I am meaning something more: a poet. Not in the sense that he writes in rhymes, but in the sense of how much Human Nature he would have to connect him.

I have heard several talented writers attempt such a work. They either abandoned the work in haste of going mad, did indeed go mad, or completed a work that shows some sparkles of insight but is mostly flat (for the author refused to fully enter the abyss). The sphinx will continue feasting until someone realizes how to answer with "Man!"

Purpose of life is to win, not to survive

Pook · 27 February 2008 · Archived copy · Original

[image]

Attention all you mediocre males (for I will not call you MEN). You like to spew all sorts of speeches, essays, and words over anyone that will hear you. You smoke your words in a pretty pipe to null yourself to girlish comfort and gooishness. You, who say, life is to be survived not to be won. You who cower in the corners saving and scavenging for the pennies who are afraid to risk. In fact, you view risk as an enemy to your comfort. "Survive Pook! We are meant to survive!" You passion-less slugs! Not even a child would be as guilty as you are. Even a CHILD knows there are WINNERS and LOSERS in life.

As is my habit, I will give an excellent analogy. Through my periodic workouts (of which the ladies time their workouts at the same time to be in the presence of my Pookness), I tend to swim afterward. It is nice to cool down in the pool. But I noticed something particular. Why was swimming in the pool draining my battery more than lifting hundreds of weights? Why could little women, who were I admit were very muscular with their strong legs and tight rear, able to easily outswim me? Maybe swimming wasn't in my genetics? But that, I knew, was poppycock.

"Poppycock!?" cries a reader. Yes, poppycock. I swam harder but that just drained my energy further. What was I doing wrong?

I realized in swimming (just as with everything in life), we are taught to survive, not how to win. In swimming, you are taught how to stay above the water, how to use your arms to propel yourself from one side to another, and let us not forget to follow the black line. We end up flat on our face slapping the water endlessly as we struggle to go back and forth, back and forth.

No other creature on Earth swims that way. Fish do not swim flat, and they do not use their fins to propel them. "But fish were made to be in the water, Pook," you might say. "Man was made to be on the ground. Of course we cannot swim like a fish."

We were told we could not fly like a bird until Man's MIND came up with an answer. Instead trying to swim to survive, let us try swimming to win. "And how might you win, Pook?" Why, by imitating the master swimmer: the fish. Instead of swimming flat, swim at an angle like the fishes do (water has 1000 times more resistance than air. Think of all the air resistance that cyclers and joggers attempt to combat and wonder why swimmers don't do it for water.) The way how we swim is that we go against the water most of the time. 'Chop!' 'Chop!' goes our arms in the water. The engine to the fish is not its fins but its thrust with its body. The fins only guide. After all, golfers and baseball players don't swing with their arms, they swing with their thighs. With olympic swimmers, the faster swimmers are those who use their arms the least.

Nevertheless, I began swimming like a fish. Took a while to learn and required me to untrain my old habits to really use my brain to learn to swim again. I must certainly look funny being underwater, on my side. But what is funny is that I only have to rotate my arms a few times to go from one side of the pool to another. Those who swim to survive become annoyed as I keep up with them. "You are barely working at it!" they growl. "I know," I reply. "That is the point."

With Don Juan, you realized it was better to win than to survive. Nice Guys live to survive; Don Juans live to win. You understand the natural process so you do not 'work'. Nice Guys think of getting girls as working uphill- hard, frustrating, and taxing. Don Juans think of getting girls as sliding downhill- exhilarating, fun, a roller coaster. This same difference animates all of life: love, finance, sports, sex, learning, playing, and everything else.

"Live for what you NEED!" says the voice of security. "Live for what you WANT!" says the voice of freedom.

"That is selfishness!" damns a reader.

No. Selfishness is not doing what you want. Selfishness is demanding others do what you want as a form of entitlement.

So sit softly, you mediocre men who sit in the soft glow of your computer monitors. Live your life to survive. I intend to win.

"But you might lose, Pook!" Yes, but at least I can say my life was an adventure. Can you say the same for yours?

Time to move beyond MGTOW

Pook · 24 March 2008 · Archived copy · Original

There is something very wrong with MGTOW. Instead of talking about 'men going their own way', we see...

- Anti-Americanism (or other rants against one's mother country)
- Declarations of Chicken Little economic/social/cultural collapse.
- Religious screeds against a particular religion or against all religions.
- Conspiracy theories.
- Evangelizing the 'Deck-Stacked-Against-Us-Have-No-Hope' view of society (which is unproductive)
- Evangelizing that one ought to live like a Mexican...
- ...or another country...
- Forums become a 'Yes!' echo chamber. There is no discussion, just rants filled with yes-men.

These 'elements' are well known but ignored because of the 'good things' that do come out. We should just shrug off these things and compromise with them. Well, there is one problem.

When food and poison compromise, which is the victor? It is the poison. Eating it may be sustaining... for the short term... but your body fills up with these poison toxins. You begin to lose your ambition, your passion, and generally become filled with bitterness.

I have wondered how this is occurring. It is not uncommon. Many 'movements' somehow get filled with negative filled people with anger issues and other wackos. But not all movements. So how did MGTOW become a container for this garbage?

The answer is that MGTOW is founded on a negative itself: avoidance of woman. This has caused blanket rants against women. "But many of these rants are accurate, Pook!" So what? A farmer can rant all day about the unfairness of frost, but that will not get him anywhere. There is no cosmic justice out there. The world is what it is and its better to live in it that in a hyper-reality.

Perhaps this will hit more to the point. How many years has MGTOW existed? And what has changed since then? Really, nothing has changed at all.

But I have to wonder why no one in MGTOW can keep to the subject. Pick any random thread and you will find someone start going off the reservation of a speech against a religion or another unasked for soapbox sermon on some oddball subject. Often, many will randomly insert his "brilliant" assertion that civilization will collapse in ten years.

MGTOW is based on the belief that men have made mistakes (which should be spared making mistakes). These mistakes can include marriage, being nice guy, being worshipful to women, and so on. All these mistakes have a common theme: egotism. When the man got married, he was so sure he was doing the right thing and the naysayers were all jealous villains.

Since so many join MGTOW based on being wrong in the past, why does everyone act like they are right all the time? It is amazing! The egotism never died. It just shifted into new forms. This would explain why someone can't keep to the subject of MGTOW and instead must start bashing a religion, bashing a country, or bashing something else. One can be right on something and be wrong on other things. But MGTOW do not see that. They act like they have suddenly become right on everything (so they become vocal on it).

If we were wrong in the past, and it damaged our lives (such as getting married to a fiend), why do we strut around as if we have such 'wisdom'? If we were so wrong once, we could be wrong again. Yet, this reservation is nowhere to be found in MGTOW. Every man has his own pet theories. The dogs slip their leash and begin to ravage the good content.

To be honest, I don't see many happy MGTOW. There are no celebrations about being 'free' but complaining about... something. Trust me; celebrations and good cheer are far more effective and contagious than "being right all the time".

In normal society, people do not like being around someone 'right all the time'. Even if they are right, they are downright annoying. People prefer light-hearted, good cheered fun. When I think of MGTOW, 'good cheer' is the last to come to mind. MGTOW isn't about being alive as it is about escaping pain.

For as much as we mock feminists for being negative, for getting with women to talk bad about men, it is becoming more and more clear that MGTOW is becoming more like the mirror image. Behavior by behavior, a MGTOW male acts very similar to a feminist in lifestyle and habit. You begin to live alone, have meetings with guys to 'talk bad about women' (to ease existential pains), and write bad essays.

I think it is becoming clear that marriage and children is a natural longing in not just women but men as well. Nature did not intend gender avoidance. I believe generally everyone is repelled by the negative pessimistic tone found on MGTOW. However, people return consistently for a dose of the poison to ease the existential pain (caused by the natural longing of wife and children which is found in every culture and time). Once convinced by the rantings that women are more painful than pleasurable, the male goes off semi-satisfied. But, alas, the natural longing creeps up again causing the male to return.

why, it must be requited. I hear how I am censured:
they say I will bear myself proudly, if I perceive
the love come from her; they say too that she will
rather die than give any sign of affection. I did
never think to marry: I must not seem proud: happy
are they that hear their detractions and can put
them to mending. They say the lady is fair; 'tis a
truth, I can bear them witness; and virtuous; 'tis
so, I cannot reprove it; and wise, but for loving
me; by my troth, it is no addition to her wit, nor
no great argument of her folly, for I will be
horribly in love with her. I may chance have some
odd quirks and remnants of wit broken on me,
because I have railed so long against marriage: but
doth not the appetite alter? a man loves the meat
in his youth that he cannot endure in his age.
Shall quips and sentences and these paper bullets of
the brain awe a man from the career of his humour?
No, the world must be peopled. When I said I would
die a bachelor, I did not think I should live till I
were married.

-"Much Ado About Nothing", Shakespeare

MGTOW is equally damned.

Society is not a unit

Pook · 15 April 2008 · Archived copy · Original



It is not uncommon for any 'movement' or even 'observer' to lift themselves up as angels to look over everyone else with a God's eye. Two groups form, one being the observer and the rest being the pitiful mass of humanity. From this vantage, it does look like Mankind is a single group, a single culture, a single civilization.

This event of observer turning into a 'God' and the observer's equals turning into a 'unit' is common in classical literature. This is why all the 'great' kings and emperors only viewed themselves as 'above' and everyone else as 'the mass' which, like a biological mass, can be cut, sliced, and molded. Just as the gardener has his hooks, shears, and knives, so too does the politician has his laws, regulations, and taxes to remake civilization to 'uplift' it. This is why all politicians, all of them, fall into this view. This is why tyranny is the norm of history.

A common problem with the 'Men's Movement' is, like other movements, they turn themselves into observers that take the status of angels while everyone else becomes a 'culture' or 'society'. What hogwash!

People say there is a recession. But what they don't say is that the definition of 'recession' is based purely on an average. Do you live your life as an average? Do you invest as an average? Date like an average? Dream like an average? The solution to everything is stop being average.

The economy, of course, is not a unit. There are people making more money than ever before. In the Great Depression, Rockefeller and others made great wealth.

Society is not a unit. It never will collapse, only *change*. And it is inevitable it will *change* because people do not live forever. Freedom begins by seeing everyone, even ourselves, as individuals. People make wrong choices all the time. But that will not affect you.

"But what about government taxation, Pook?" you might say. "Their bad choices affect me."

That is nothing compared to city states going to war and nations dueling it out on the world stage. Society is not a

unit; it is the trade of all. In fact, the cause of many of the problems that Men's Movement is set to fight against is because husband and wife became seen as a *unit* and that the family became seen as a *unit*. Since they are *units*, that means it is YOUR RESPONSIBILITY to pay child support and keep the wife a lifestyle she has become accustomed. If they cease to be *units*, then you can see the moral support for child support and wifely lifestyles dropping.

If one person murders another, the neighborhood is not *destroyed* for the neighborhood is not a singular entity.

All the talk about 'destruction of civilization' is funny because Western Civilization is not a static immovable unit. It moves with the people. At one point, Western Civilization was in the Islamo-sphere with the Saracens after the fall of the Roman Empire (a political entity). And when the Saracens fell, it went to Europe. When Europe or other nations falls, it will go somewhere else. AND IT WILL BECOME STRONGER THAN BEFORE.

Movements tend to be built up and spread by emotion (which is energy in motion). Should it be positive energy or negative energy? One leads to an endless cycle down the infinite dream where one keeps imagining civilization being 'destroyed'. Do you want to live your life in that mindset? The other leads to a cycle up. One leads to waking up with anger and rage. The other leads to waking with laughing. Which do you want?

Away, doom-shovelers! While you waste your time investing your emotions in the supposed 'civilizational collapse', I will invest my emotions in building myself up and aiming at a brighter future. This is, of course, uncommon Most politicians cannot do it and you can tell the evil by when they need to rely on harnessing negative emotions from the masses to win. Those few, those blessed few, politicians who harness positive emotions to win, are unanimously popular as everyone gets in line behind the person with the vision. The negative people call it 'delusional'. Everyone else calls it leadership.

More reasons why I am not a MRA

Pook · 27 May 2008 · Archived copy · Original

There is nothing wrong with single issue advocates. The problem occurs when it starts to override everything else. Take the Elian Gonzalez scenario. MRAs, seeing only the boy returned to his father, begin immediately applauding. They cheer the Janet Reno who sent the troops to invade the house for the boy on one side while condemning Janet Reno for Waco. Never mind that children belong to the State, not fathers, in Cuba.

MRA has won ZERO political victories. Despite this, many have moved further and further to more extreme views. No more is it about equal rights for men as it is about taking away woman's right to vote and changing consent law among other things. This tells me most MRA are not really serious about the cause.

when people are serious about changing laws, they aim for the small victories first. Socialists do not declare they want to nationalize all industry. They would be dead in the water politically if they did that. Instead, they begin with small victories and so on to bigger ones. If MRAs were serious, they would try to make change in a tactical manner. Most don't have the self-discipline to do this. They would rather take a news story about some feminist or woman, proceed to bash it, and then leave satisfied only to return later and do it all over again. It does not seem such people are enjoying life. And enjoying life is how one converts and wins.

There are two matriarchies, the feminism and the 'traditional women' types. I've noticed when we attack one, it strengthens the other. Perhaps the answer is to pit the matriarchies against one another. Let them duke it out somehow.

Live In The Talent

Pook · 9 June 2008 · Archived copy · Original

Aristotle said that man has two peaks that are accompanied by intense pleasure: sexual intercourse and thinking. The human soul is a kind of ellipse and its phenomena are spread between its two foci that display our tropical variety and ambiguity.

This will be no surprise to those who understand sexual transmutation. The great salesman, as the great artist and great entrepreneur, tends to harness the sexual impulses not unlike a sailboat being powered by the wind. Transmutation also gives a reason for long term sexual relationship, i.e. marriage, for the husband is transmuted in that his energy is more direct, his world caught up more in that 'electric' world that is created when we fall in love, and the wife the same. But what if we do not get who we love? Is all lost? We should put trust in His handiwork as Nature tends to work even when our misunderstandings say otherwise. Even with a lost love, the man (or woman) enters a transmuted state whose memory can be recalled on.

This elliptical nature between sexual intercourse and thinking should explain a seeming contradiction: why great men tend to seem simultaneously wild sexually yet celibate often. The cause and effect is not the intercourse but the state of high sexual being within the man. This high state of sexual being does lead to great thoughts and, also, does lead to sexual liaisons. The latter can, sometimes, destroy the former but not always. We can watch Benjamin Franklin or Thomas Jefferson do great things of thought while their highly charged sexual natures tended to lead them to various ladies' beds. And to those greats that self-defined themselves as 'gay', they don't mean gay in the modern sense. They feared women would remove such transmutation from them and didn't have such fear with men.

It also explains why great writers, thinkers, artists, and businessmen are 'weird' and 'nuts' to the general public. However, it is a grave mistake to correlate 'weirdness' and 'nuts' to greatness. Most of the time, a nut is just a nut.

Freud saw only one focus in the soul, the same one as the brutes have, and had to explain all psychology's higher phenomena by society's repression. Freud didn't really believe in the soul but in the body with its passive instrument of consciousness, the mind. It is a blunted vision of the higher phenomena as illustrated by his crude observations about art and philosophy. Freud is now mainstream. Not only are the pimps and sluts dressed in the higher elliptical clothes once reserved for aristocrats, they use Freudian language as explanation.

The context that sexual intercourse is the peak of our lives and Human existence, which it *has* to be if change over time is nothing but consistent gene swapping, creates Humans who, naturally, want to experience the peaks in life so therefore gravitate toward sexual intercourse for the sake of sexual intercourse. Young people, who for their lives only recognize that being controlled by nature is the march of progress, have not yet understood as older people do that nature must be harnessed. Most will never understand in their lifetimes.

So what is the problem in this? The higher state of the soul, the elliptical end from sexual intercourse, is what I identify as 'talent'. Everyone has talent, a yearning drive to do something than live a life of an animal. Even the pimps and sluts have this yearning as well. When context never allows the soul to reach for talent but only sexual intercourse, often in an environment where this context is dominant (such as the modern world today) or when sexual intercourse comes too early in life and cuts the cord to the elliptical talent above, knowledge is never sought yet the person is filled with 'opinions'.

The events goes as follows:

-The young person either has a too soon sexual experience or too many that cements his context or he/she lives in an environment where the context is that the peak of human existence is sexual intercourse (and the 'talent' doesn't exist).

-The cord to knowledge and the 'talent' are snapped. The person can become skilled and even smart and thrive in today's economy. Yet, the person will never ever walk in the same realm that Bach, Plato, Shakespeare among others all did. They will walk past the ruins without wondering what went on ("And why should we, Pook?" Well, such wonder is what the Renaissance was all about).

-These snapped are literally so. They are sterile in the way of the soul. Even though their context is that the soul does not exist, they still long for something above the life of an animal. They desire their life to have meaning. At a young age, many think it will result in marriage and children. They realize this isn't the case.

-The snapped then proceed to make their lives worth meaning. No one wants to live an empty life. Thus, they become the perfect fodder for mass movements as detailed by Eric Hoffer's "True Believer" book be it Nazism, Communism, Environmentalism, Feminism, MGTOW, Christianity, nationalism, liberalism, conservatism, libertarianism, anarchism, and so on. Interestingly, each and every person in the above says the exact same thing: "History will record our cause as true and just."

-As they age, they become obsessed with history in either re-writing it "this is how it really happened!" or in pointing at it "this is a historic event!".

If one doesn't want the above, then one needs to strive to live in the talent. Do not mistake to be LITT to mean seeing the elliptical opposite as destructive or that celibacy is the way. Living in the talent is all about being sexually charged and directing your energies to that talent. It does not mean not sleeping with women, it means not dedicating your life to sleep with women. It also means rejection of the context that sexual intercourse is the only peak of existence. It means striving towards excellence which is something bulls and geese cannot do (but even cattle can go their own way).

Talent already lives in you so you ought to live in the talent. No matter where you are, you'll always feel at home.